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AL HABAD:
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NOTICE.

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

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

M. S. HOWELL.

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

At the end of the last prefatory note add

Whenever I say "Our Master", my meaning is "the learned 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 "AlBa'ī", my meaning is "YH" (Sn. I. 3).

* A, After "printed in Egypt" insert "in 1288".

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

Am. Add

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

ANI. The celebrated Ḥāfiz, and the Traditionist of the Age, ABū Nu'āmAHmad Ibn 'Abd Allāh alMihrānī AlIṣbahānī aṣṢāfī (b. 334 or 336, d. 430), author of the Ḥilyat alAuliyyā (Portraiture of the Saints) and the Tārīkh Iṣbahān (History of Iṣbahān).

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

AW. Read "Abu -iKāsim 'Abd alWārīth Ibn Sufyān Ibn Jubrūn, known as AlḤABĪB, 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 Ḥāfīz Muḥyī-ṣ-Sunna, or Rukn ad-Dīn, or Zākī Allāh, Abū Muḥammad Abū Ḥusayn Ibn Masʿūd, known as A[lF]ARĀ, or Ibn A[lF]ARĀ, A[lB]AGHAWĪ (from Baghā or Baghshūr, a town in Khurāsān between Ṁarv and Harāt), al-Shāfī, the Jurist, Traditionalist, and Commentator (d. 516, at, or past, 80 years of age), author of the Maṣāḥīḥ as-Sunna and other works.

* BK. The Burḥān-i-Ḵāṭī, a Persian Lexicon, by Maulānā Muḥammad Ḥusayn 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 Ḥd, by the author of the Text (see Ḥd 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 AlHādī, a Commentary by the same author on another grammar of his, the Mabādī fi-Ṭasrīf; 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 alHādī” (not Sharḥ alMabādī).

DA dł. The Diwān alAdab, on Lexicology, by Frb.


* Dm. For the second paragraph read “Also the Commentary entitled Taʿlīḥ 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 Hajibiya 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 Hajibiya” is the Kafiya of IH, on which TDT is said in HKh. V. 17 to have written “a great Commentary, like that of R.”]

Dn. The Shaikh allslām Abū ‘Amr ‘Uthmān Ibn Sa‘īd alUmawi (their freedman) alKurṭubi, known as AṣDānī (from his residence at Dāniya, a city in Spain, one of the governments of Balansiya), the Ḥafiz, Reader, and Traditionist (b. 371, d. 441).


[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 Ḥafiz 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, IAt, ITr, and others. BM. 66 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 Muhammed Ibn 'Ali ALFAYYUMİ, the Reader and Lexicologist (d. 770), author of the Msb.

Fr. Abû Ibrâhîm Ishâq Ibn Ibrâhîm ALFÂRÂBÎ, the Lexicologist and Philologist (d. about 350, under 70 years of age), maternal uncle of Jh.

Fr. ALFÂRİDÎ, about whom I have no information.

Hd. The Grammar entitled AlHâdî fi-nNahw wa-sSarf, by 'Izz adDîn 'Abd AlWahhâb Ibn Ibrâhîm alKhazrajî azZanjâni, author of the CHd.

IAB. The Hâfiz of the West, Abû 'Umar Yûsuf Ibn 'Abd Allâh, known as Ibn 'Abd ALBARR, anNamari (from anNamir Ibn Kâsit, a well-known clan) alKurtubi, the Jurist and Traditions- ist, the Doctor of Spain, and the Master of his Age in Tradition and Memorials of Antiquity (b. 368, d. 460 or 463, at the age of 95), author of the Isti'âb fi Ma'rifat alA'şâb.

[Pupil of AW.]

IAS. The Hâfiz of Syria, nay, of the World, Thïkat adDîn, or Nûr adDîn, Abu-IKâsim 'Ali Ibn Abî Muhammed AlHasan adDimashkî ashShâfi'i, known as Ibn 'AsâKIR, the Traditionist of Syria in his time (b. 499, d. 571), author of the History of Damascus.

IAz. The learned Jamâl adDîn Abû Muhammed AlHuSaiN Ibn Ba'dr Ibn AYYAZ Ibn 'Abd Allâh, the Grammarian (d. 681), author of a Commentary on the Taṣrîf of IM.

JJZ. The Hâfiz Shams adDîn Abu-IKhair Muhammed Ibn Muhammed alKurashî adDimashkî ashShâfi'i, known as Ibn ALJAZARI, the Reader and Traditionist (b. 751, d. 833).
IMH. Ahmad Ibn Muhammad, known as IBN ALMULLA AL-HALABI (d. about 990), author of a Commentary on the ML.

JDB. The Kadi-I-Kudat JALAL ADDIN Abu-lFadl 'Abd ArRahman Ibn 'Umar ALBULKINI, the Shafi'i Jurist (b. 763, d. 824).

Jhz. Abu 'Uthman 'Amr Ibn Bahr alKinani alLaithi (from Laith Ibn Bakr Ibn 'Abd Manat Ibn Kinana Ibn Khuzaima) alBaqri, the celebrated Philologist of the Basri school, and one of the Masters of the Mutazilis, known as ALJAHIZ, because his eyes were prominent, and also called ALHADAQI, for the same reason (d. 255 at AlBasra, over 90 years old).

Kfj. The Shaikh Muhyi-dDIn Abü 'Abd Allâh Muhammed Ibn Sulaiman arRumi ALKAPIYAJI (so called from the frequency of his reading and teaching the Kâfiya of IH) alHanafi, the Jurist, Theologian, Commentator, Traditionist, Grammarian, Logician, and Philosopher (b. 788 or 790 or before 800, d. 879), one of Syt's Masters.


KIM. The Hâfiz and Kadi Abü 'Abd Allâh ALKASIM IBN MA'N Ibn 'Abd ArRahman alMas'ûdi alKûfi, the Traditionist (d. 175).

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

Lth. ALLAIÎIH Ibn ALMuzaflar (so named by Âz), or Ibn Nasr (as the author of the KF says in the Bulgha), or Ibn Râfi' (as others say), or Ibn ALMuzaflar Ibn Nasr (as in Mr. I. 46), Ibn Sayyâr alLaithi alKhurâsânî, the Philologist, Lexicologist, and Grammarian, who was Secretary to the Baramika.

* MAZ. The Mu'addimât alAdab, an Arabic-Persian Lexicon, by Z4 edited by Wetstein.

* MDh. After "alJauhar" insert "(c. 832-8)."

[This is the year given in the BW. The TM (No. 9) has "about 403", which must be wrong, because IBshk. 89 says that he entered Spain "about 430", while HKh. II. 330, 384, 488 says, that he died "after 430".]

Msb. The Glossary entitled AlMiṣbāḥ AlMuṣīr (c. 734), by Fm.

SBd. AsSayyid ashSharīf Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥasānī al-Maghribī, the denizen of Egypt, al-Mālikī, known as AsSAYYID ALBULĀIDĪ, the Reader, Commentator, and Grammarian (b. 1096, d. 1176) author of a Gloss on the A.

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

SIM. The Ḥāfīẓ Abū ʿUthmān Saʿīd Ibn ʿAlī al-Khurāsānī, resident of Makka, the Traditionist (d. in, or after, 227), author of the Kitāb asSunan.

SJj. The Sayyid Zain ad-Dīn Abu-lḤasan ʿAlī Ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥusainī al-Jurjānī al-Ḥanafī, known as AsSAYYID ASHSHARĪF and AsSAYYID 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 "Rittershausen" 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 Kādī Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn 'Umar Ibn Wākid alWākidī alAslāmī alMadānī, freedman of the Banū Hāshim, 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 Kādī for four years under AlMa'mūn, dying in office.]

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

[Pupil of SBd. Cited by Sn under the designation of "AlBa'ḍ".]

YIM. The celebrated Ḥāfīz Abū Zakariyyā Yāhya Ibn Ma'in alMurri alGhatafānī (of the Murra of Ghaṭafān, their freedman) alBaghdādī, the Master of Tradition in his time (b. 158, d. 233 at age of 75, or 77, or 70 and odd, years).

* YR. The *Irshād alArib ilā Ma'rīfat alAdīb*, commonly known as the *Mu'jam*, or *Ṭabaqāt*, alUdābā, by Yākūt abRūmī, also called alḤamāwī (see Mk), edited by Margoliouth.
CHAPTER XXVI.—THE س AND ش OF PAUSE.

§ 617. Affixed to the ك of the fem. in pause—一组 substituted for the ك of the fem. in pause and continuity.

CHAPTER XXVII.—THE PARTICLE OF DISAPPROVAL.

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

§ 619. Its meanings

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

§ 621. Its position in the sentence

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

PART IV.—The Common Processes.

CHAPTER I.—COMMON PROCESSES IN GENERAL.

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

**CHAPTER II.—IMĀLA.**

### § 626.
Common to n. and v.—colloquial meaning—conventional meaning—an affection of Fatha with or without |—classification—a dialectic peculiarity—not practised by Hijāzis—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 ī and Kasra—which of the two stronger—more obviously Kasra.

### § 627.
Kasra before j when effective—and when not—anomalies with ā—the ā disregarded—effect of disregarding it—

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>628.</td>
<td>Condition of efficiency in cause of Imāla—pron.</td>
<td></td>
<td>747-748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629.</td>
<td>Final j—its Imāla in v.—and in n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>748-749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630.</td>
<td>Intermediate j—its Imāla in v.—dispute as to cause—and in n.—dispute as to allowability.</td>
<td></td>
<td>749-751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631.</td>
<td>Imāla for consonance</td>
<td></td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632.</td>
<td>Imāla prevented by letters of elevation and by j not pronounced with Kasr—reason for such prevention—preventives enumerated—effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>751-756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in restraining expressed Kasra—and, according to IM, expressed  {
—but, according to others, Kasra alone—  {
why added by IM—not supplied Kasra or  {
—theory that letter of elevation is not preventive in vs.—criticism on
}  {
---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—  {
—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 —condition of contiguity to | relaxed by some—preventive of preventive—its contiguity to | —this condition relaxed by some—  {

§ 635. Two other causes of Imāla—such Imāla anomalous—  {
 and  {
eq}  {
etc.—  {

§ 636. Properly no Imāla in  {
from reduplicated—  {
and  

| § 637. Imāla for conformity | ... | PAGE. | 763 |
| § 638. Fatha pronounced with Imāla before (1) |  | 763-768 |
| - (2) | - (3) | conditions and predicaments of such Imāla | of feminization in pause—quality of such Imāla— | s of intensiveness included, but not s of silence—no Imāla of | before s | this exception why inserted by IM—"s", not ṣ, "of feminization" why said—dispute as to Imāla of Fatha before s of silence. |
| § 639. Imāla peculiar to v. and decl. n.—irregular in |  | 768-771 |
| indecl. n., except hā and nā—heard in jā,  | —some ps. pronounced with Imāla— | ḍ | and  | Imāla not forbidden in n. accidentally uninf.—allowable in pret. v, and excellent in  | —reason for not pronouncing 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  |  | 772-796 |
| - in  | - and  |  | - kind of pause meant in this chapter—difference between pausal letter and
initial—objects of pause—pause common to n., v., and p.—its modes—its predicaments—meaning of "predicaments"—principal modes mentioned in IM and Aud—remaining mode there mentioned—alterations in pause reducible to seven—reduplication virtually included—or to six—pause with no alteration—variability of modes—their inequality in effect—or equality—their allocation—detailed discussion—word paused upon—sometimes pronounced with Tanwîn—pause upon word quiescent in final—upon n. pronounced with Tanwîn, and not fem. with ُ—most frequent dial.—upon ُٰؤن—dispute about it—upon n. mobile in final—modes allowed when final is not ُ of femininization—(1) quiescence—meaning of "mobile" here—exclusion of final in acc. pronounced with Tanwîn—sense of "quiescence"—its applicability—its originality and prevalence—its sign—sometimes a circle—treatment of Tanwîn—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 .prevent—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 ُ of femininization, the ُ of the pl., and the
accidental vowel—reason for disallowance with the ɔ of feminization—with the ♯ of the pl.—
with the accidental vowel—(4) reduplication—
explained—its object—letter added—sign of reduplication—its rarity—its dialectic peculiar-
ity—its conditions—extent of its occurrence in nom., gen., and acc.—and with ɼamma, Kasra, or Fatl:a— anomalous—or merely rare—reduplication not properly applicable to acc. pronounced with Tanwin—(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 Fatl:a—
of Kasra in یع — dial. of many of the Arabs
in case of n. whose final is Hamza—dial. of some of Tamim—their treatment of n. whose
final is not Hamza—dial. of ɼijžis—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—ɼamma transferable from
ɔ of pron.—exs.—Քաղե and Քաղե—transfer
to mobile—Քեղե̣ and Քեղե̣—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 Fatḥa—but retained when such vowel is Damma or Kasra—foregoing modes practised by those who sound Hamza true—modes adopted by those who alleviate—by people of AlHijāz.

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

§ 644. Final of v.—pause upon v. whose final is (1)
sound—(2) unsound—(a) in ind. and subj.—
final not elided here, but quiescent—(b) in apor.
and imp.—with \text{\textbar} of silence—or without—

826-829
importation of \( \beta \) of silence—this \( \beta \) why so named—its positions—first position—\( \beta \) allowable here, not necessary—except in one case—another case added by IM—remaining positions to be found in § 648.

§ 645. Elision of final \( \jmath \) and \( \imath \) in terminations of versicles, and in rhymes—nearing of "terminations of versicles"—such elision more suitable in \( n. s. \) than in \( v. s. \)—elision of quiescent \( \jmath \) and \( \imath \) in \( i n d. \) of defective \( n. \)—likened to elision of quiescent \( \imath \) in \( a p o c. \) of \( \kappa \) \( \alpha \) —allowable in terminations of versicles—and sometimes necessary—and frequent in rhymes—elision in these positions thus established—\( e x. \) in rhyme—elision of \( \imath \) of defective \( n. \) in continuity—and in terminations of versicles—in pause necessary—or allowable—\( I \) not elided in terminations of versicles, or in rhymes—\( S \)'s description of reason for elision of \( r a d. \) \( \jmath \) and \( \imath \) in rhymes—his meaning—\( I \) not elided in rhymes—elision of pronominal \( \imath \) and \( \imath \) (1) in rhymes—\( e x s. \) pronominal \( I \) not elided—(2) in terminations of versicles.

§ 646. Pause upon \( \mathfrak{t} \) of feminization—\( \mathfrak{t} \) (1) kept in \( a \) \( p. \) —\( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) \( \mathfrak{t} \) \( \ddot{b} \mathfrak{t} \) —\( \mathfrak{t} \) (2) kept in \( p. \) and \( v. \) —pause upon \( \mathfrak{t} \) (3) \( n. \), after sound quiescent—(2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retained or changed into Й in n., after (a) vowel—(b) unsound quiescent—о. f. of verbal й of feminization—of nominal 5—opinion of S, Fr, IK, and most GG—of Th—Tanwin in acc. of n. made fem. by й why not converted into й—pause with ѵ preferable in sound pl. and what resembles it—why preferable—pause with ѵ here—as dial. var. or anomaly—dial. vars. of أَرَأَيْتُ —its number and pausal form in each dial.—opinion of Ks—of GG—of IH—أَرَأَيْتُ mentioned among verbal ٍن. —opinion of R—أَرَأَيْتُ or أَرَأَيْتُ as proper name—أَرَأَيْتُ or أَرَأَيْتُ —analysis of this word—pause with ѵ preferable in other formations—pause with ѵ in such as مِنْ يَعْلَمُ ۗ رَحْمَةُ —opinion of IJ—ت for ѵ sometimes found in Codex—أَرَأَيْتُ —pause in such cases—pause upon ѵ how affected by orthography of Codex—pause with ѵ in such as دَأَيْتُ ۗ رَحْمَةُ —sometimes أَمَّا—pause upon ۙ when not for feminization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

positions of pause with \textit{(2)} $\$ or $\$ \text{mostly} \$ \text{and} \$ \text{and} \$ \text{seldom} \text{and} \$ \text{but never} \text{for} \text{sometimes only} \$ \text{and} \text{or} \text{and} \text{or} \text{or} \text{or} \text{or} \text{or} \text{this} \text{—pause upon} \$ \text{the only quiescent followed by this} \text{—} \text{pause upon} \text{of pron., masc. or fem.}—(3)$

retention of $\$ \text{better than elision—elision in acc. better than in gen.—practice of some Readers—(6)}$ and $\text{and}$ and $\text{and}$ and $\text{and}$ and $\text{and}$
and its conj. or omitted—dispute as to whether this or be part of n. in last two also quiescent—discussion as to whether conj. after s be part of word—in continuity, conj. (a) better elided when s is preceded by quiescent—but i of tō not elided—(b) indispensable when s is preceded by mobile—but sometimes omitted, and s even made quiescent—in pause, conj. always omitted, and s quiescent—Raum and Ishmām disallowed by some in s of pron., after Damma or Kasra, or i allowable, without dispute, after Fatḥa—allowed by some after any consonant or vowel—

(7) ُءُدُحُسُثُ in َدَقُي and ُهُدُحُسُثُ pronounced with Kasr and conjoined with i—never pronounced with Damm—i sometimes elided from ُدُحُسُثُ in continuity, with or without quiescence of s—always elided in pause, with quiescence of s—(8) ُقُمُ، ُحَقَّامُ، and ُلُلُ، or ُقُمُ، ُحَقَّامُ، and ُلُلُ—preferably with s, sometimes without—sometimes quiescent in continuity—(9) ممثل ممكَن and ممكَن—always with s.
§ 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 ُ of pl.—and of ن of ind.—practice of Y—disallowed by S.

CHAPTER IV.—THE OATH.

§ 650. Common to n. and v.—definition—jurative prop., (1) verbal—its v. how attached to the sworn-by—quasi-jurative vs.—(2) nominal—opinion of S—improbabilities in it—opinion of KK—their argument—أً of inception prefixed to أً—vowel of its Hamza—meaning of إمانة—meaning of إمامة إله—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.—quasi-jurative—sometimes not so—also quasi-jurative—sometimes not so—pronunciation of its final—(3) the sworn-by—(4) the oath whose correl.
is corroborated by the نَحْا, etc., used in place of oath—and so كَ—and expressions denoting a vow or covenant—object of oath—three things involved by it—(1) the oath—(2) the sworn-to—what part of it is corroborated by the oath—(3) the sworn-by—not always God.

§ 651. Liberties taken with oath—(1) suppression of
(a) jurative v.—(b) sworn-by—illustration—
(e) enunc in nominal jurative prop.—this suppression necessary or allowable—theory of Fr
—(d) نَ—and Hamza of اَيّمٍ—dispute as to whether elision of its Hamza be a liberty—
امَّ الْلّهِ, وَلَدَّ مِنَ الْلّهِ and اَيّمٍ إِلَى الْلّهِ—these contractions used only with الله
Hamza of اَيّمٍ or اَيّمٍ اَيّمٍ—(e) منَ نُونٍ (f) jurative p.—(2) substitution of لَمْ for jurative لَمْ—(3) preference of فاطِلًا over دامَمًا—dial. vars. of this word—
only اَمْرٌ used in oath.

§ 652. Oath adjuratory or not—correl. (1) of adjuratory—sometimes headed by لَا or لَمْ—or by
red. أَنَ—sometimes a mandatory enunciation
—(2) of non-adjuratory—four ps. used to connect it with oath—these four why chosen—
not used—correl. a nominal or verbal prop., aff. or neg.—nominal attended, (1) if aff., by 
uncontracted or contracted
—nature of ḥ—wha it is prefixed to—ḥ in
— (2) if neg., by ʾa or ṣ—this ṣ or ḥ attended, (1) if aff., (a) when its v. is a pret.,
by ḥ with or without ʾād, or by ʾād ḏ alone—لىد ḏ
best—except with aplastic vs.—ḥ alone, or ḏ alone, allowable—nature of ḥ prefixed to

correl. separated from oath by condition headed
by ʾād — (b) when its v. is an aor., by ḥ with or
without ʾā of corroboration—omission of ʾā—or of ḥ—opinions of BB and KK—aor., in sense of
present, allowable as correl. of oath—and then
corroborated by ḥ without ʾā — (2) if neg., (a)
when its v. is a pret., by ʾa or ʾ—if pret. in
sense, by ʾa—if future, by ʾ or ʾān — (b) when
its v. is an aor., by ʾa or ʾ, the latter with or
without ʾā of corroboration—or by ʾān — ex. of
ʾā and ʾān disallowed by Mb—ʾm or ʾān
not allowable—or very rare—subsidiary ḥ
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 يَازَلُ, 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 يُ، not لا—IU and IUK on suppression of لا—none of the four ps. suppressed except يُ.

§ 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) د —its government —(3, 4) و ت ل — dispute as to its origin—not a contraction of أيمن or من الله و من الله — يمين — and — and — all three vars. said to be contractions of أيمن —theory of contraction possible in من الله — not in من الله or من الله — since it would imply occurrence of أيمن in gen. or acc.— يمين الله م — م من الله a possible contraction of يمين الله , but not من الله — theories as to their origin.
§ 654. Exclusive privileges of ب — mnemonic verses —
exs of ب in adjuration — adjuration not an oath
— apparent evidence to contrary — but held by
IM and 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
— corre.: 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 ل لا أدراك and
لا أدرك — dispute as to whether prep. ل
be suppressed here — ل أدراك — acc. prefer-
able — gen. allowable in لع — ex. — and allowed
by KK in other ns. — nom. necessary in
certain phrases — acc. or nom. allowable in
others — cases allowed in لع — ex. of all three
cases.

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

CHAPTER V.—THE ALLEVIATION OF HAMZA.

§ 658. Hamza heavy—produced with difficulty—alleviated by some—by most Hijāzis, especially Kuraish—remarks of ‘Ali—but sounded true by others—by Tam‘m and Kais—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 Mb 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—ext. 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 ٞ, by conversion—i.e., change—no other mode possible—its alleviation not obligatory—opinion of S on ١٠٩٠٩٠ and
—and of III—(2) when quiescent is ی, by well-known betwixt-and-between—elision and change disallowed, and strange betwixt-and-between impossible—(3) when quiescent is a sound letter, or a rad. ی or ی, or a coordinative aug. ی or ی, by elision after transfer of vowel to quiescent—not by betwixt-and-between or change—ن is—رفت and and كا is—مر and conjug. of ی—exs. of alleviation where quiescent is not in same word as Hamza—س and alleviation obligatory in cat. of ی, and of pret. ی and aor. ی —i. e., in certain deriv. of ی —and frequent in cat. of س —more so in اس than in ج —cause of its frequency—consequent elision of conj. Hamza—اس —distinguished from —explanation of mode of pausing upon final mobile Hamza—no explanation needed for quiescent Hamza—two methods of pausing upon final mobile Hamza—the first explained in chapter on Pause—the second begun by alleviating Hamza—modes of alleviating, and then pausing, when Hamza is (1) not preceded by ی —(2) preceded by ی —Hamza
usually converted into \( \text{l} \) in latter case—treatment of the two \( \text{l} \) 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 \( \text{l} \) or quiescent or \( \text{i} \)—this change confined to hearsay—

\( \text{されました} \)—but regular in metric exigency—\( \text{exs.} \). of it not explicable as dial. \( \text{vars.} \)—\( \text{سئ تت}, \text{aor.} \)

\( \text{يَفْصِلُ وَقَلاَنَ} \) or \( \text{يَفْصِلُ وَقَلاَنَ} \) said to be dial. \( \text{vars.} \)—\( \text{وَقَلاَن} \), for \( \text{وَقَلاَن} \) cited by S at end of verse as \( \text{ex.} \) of this change—but not really so—

though in continuity \( \text{وَقَلاَن} \) would be—this change restricted to case where Hamza and preceding mobile are both pronounced with \( \text{فَاً}, \text{ثَامَّ, or كَسْر}, \) respectively—\( \text{و} \) or \( \text{i} \)
quiescent when thus substituted for Hamza—cases where this change is not allowable—

anomalies in connection with initial Hamza—irregular elision of Hamza in and or —elision of Hamza sometimes avoided by transposition.

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

—their rad. Hamza elided, and *—their conj. Hamza then dispensed with—their measure—elision obligatory in and * not in * or *—regular form of these three impr.—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 of art.—* with * . Hamza expressed— being constructively quiescent— with * . Hamza elided— being actually mobile—more frequent than and treated like or
and 

and 

and 

and 

explanation of second 

and 

and 

or 

and 

and 

dis-

allowed by IH—comparison between 

, 

, and 

in respect of retention or elision 

of conj. Hamza— 

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 

a mispronunciation — allowed by some—but disallowed in KF—(2) ى after Kasra— — (3) ; after Damma—

if first quiescent, and second mobile, which never occurs in position of 

, then, (1) in position of 

, first incorporated into second — (2) in position of ج , second changed into 

— incorporation why not adopted here—

— if both mobile, then second changed, (1)
if final, or non-final but pronounced with Kasr, into ى — (2) if non-final and pronounced with Damm, into ئ — (3) if non-final and pronounced with Fath, into ئ; if first be pronounced with Fath or Damm, and into ى 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 ى in all three sorts — non-final into ى in four; and ئ in five sorts — exs. of (1) final— (2) non-final pronounced with (a) Kasr — prescribed action necessary — ١٣٣٣ pl. of ١٣٤٤ — not ١٣٤٤ — ١٣٣٣ in IX. 12 — or ١٣٣٣ — its second Hamza converted into ى or sounded true — how pronounced by Readers — softening or sounding true allowed in reading the Kur, but not conversion into ى — two former pronunciations not peculiar to ١٣٣٣ — conversion best according to GG — (b) Damm — (c) Fath, when first is pronounced with (a) Fath; or Damm — pl. and dim. of ١٣٤٤ — doubt as to whether ١٣٤٤ be Arabic — (b) Kasr — opinion of Akh on two of the nine sorts — ١٣٤٤ or ١٣٤٤ or ١٣٤٤ — 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 — its second Hamza not put betwixt and between — not a case of two Hamzas according to Khl — a case of two Hamzas according to S — and therefore mentioned here by IH — but not according to Kh — opinion of S approved — occurrence of sounding true and softening — interpolation of \(\text{\`}\) between the two Hamzas — no conversion when Hamzas are separated by original \(\text{\`}\) — alleviation preventable by interpolated \(\text{\`}\) — and therefore prevented by existing \(\text{\`}\) — combination of two separate Hamzas ineffective in causing alleviation — — Hamza of elided in cat. of — o.f. of — elision adopted here instead of conversion — and extended to its variations — Hamza converted into pronounced with Fath in cat. of — and whether word contain two Hamzas or one — treatment of more than two consecutive Hamzas — predicament of two Hamzas combined in two words, if first Hamza be (1) inceptive — first not alleviated — mode of alleviating second — interpolation of \(\text{\`}\) — exs. — treatment of two Hamzas after entry of \(\text{\`}\) — 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 ﺔ preceded by Damma or Kasra, respectively—least light when first is ؕ or ﺔ preceded by Fatha—last combination peculiar to dim. incorporation or pause prescribed for second
quiescent—pause constitutional or accidental—
concurrency of two quiescents pardonable (1)
in pause—concurrency why allowable here—
not real unless first be a letter of softness—
when pardonable in continuous speech—(2) in
incorporated letter preceded by letter of soft-
ness, provided that both be in one word—mean-
ing of "letter of softness" and "letter of
prolongation"—
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—
pause how far made applicable to them—
and "م لف" disallowed by
Mz—Ishmām allowed by S in nom. of n. acci-
cidentally, 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—| converted from Hamza why not elided—(5) in such as _عَلِيٌّ مُّلُكٌ_ and _هُوَ أَلْلَهُ_ combination of two quiescents optional here, necessary in preceding cases—concurrency of two quiescents not pardonable in other cases—

الْحَلْقُ المُّبَطَنِ الأَنُوْمَالِ—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—

ْيُسَلَّمُونَ،ْيُسَلَّمَانِ—(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 _ا_ or _ي_—nor when _ا_—elided in _عُرْنُ_ and _أُرْسُنُ_—but not in _لُ_ of *apoc.* and *imp.* in defective _v._ how treated upon affixion of _nom.* _prons._—why not converted into _لاِنْ_ and _ِ_—elided _خُفُ،_ and elided _لُ_ of _ِخُوُشُ_ and _ِخُوُشُوُ_—how treated upon mobilization of _فُ،وُ،_ and _ِيُ_
respectively—لwhy treated differently in
\( J \) and \( \dddot{e} \) why not elided—vowel of لin خ،
خاي in خابا and خاي, خاس, خاوا, خاوا, خاوا,
why not elided—vowel of لin خ، خاي, خاس, خاوا, خاوا,
and also in خابا and خاوا, quasi-original—and permanent—hence
return of their خs inevitable—ل's why retained in خابا and خابا—first quiescent
why converted into or خ، خاوا, and mobilized, in خابا and خاوا—elided خ in خابا and خاوا
مت not restored in خ and خة—its restoration allowed by some—if first
quiescent be not a letter of prolongation, then it is mobilized—reason for its mobilization—
except (1) single corrob. ن—(2) ن
but not ن of ليم خكن—(3) Tanwin of proper
name qualified by خ pre. to proper name—
elision of Tanwin, on account of concurrence
of two quiescents, anomalous in other cases—
خ and خخشون ل—determination mobilized with Kasr when prefixed
to conj.Hamza—transfer of vowel from conj. Hamza to preceding quiescent—exs. with Fatha
—and Kasra—and Damma—transfer dis-
approved—second quiescent mobilized (1) when
mobilization of first is avoided for alleviation—
second then pronounced with Fath, not Kasr—Damm not used,
with some exceptions, for averting concurrence of two quiescents—incorporation practised by
some in apoc. and imp. of reduplicated v.—
emitted by all in ٌِٔ when a v. of wonder—
(2) sometimes when second is final of uninflect.
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 neces-
sary, but usual—(c) َ َ —(2) Fatha prefer-
able 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 ـ.

here—(4) Damma preferable in (a) ـ of pron. of pl., after Fat'a, in (a)

reason for Damma according to Khl—and to others—(b) ـ—possible explanation of Damma here—(b) ـ of pl., after Fat'a, in explicit n.—in other cases ـ pronounced with Kasr after Fat'a— ـ of pl. sometimes pronounced with Kasr—and ـ of ـ and ـ with Damm— ـ of pron. pronounced with Kasr after Fat'a—and similarly ـ of pl. in explicit n.—(c) ـ—(5) Damma or Fat'a allowable, besides Kasra, in ـ and ـ—

Kasra preferred in ـ—Fat'a sometimes found—Damma rarely—all of this applicable when aor. is pronounced with Damm of ـ—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) Fatḥa necessary before fem. pron. and Đàmma before masc. pron. — Kasra, in latter position, a weak dial. var.—Fatḥa considered erroneous—reason for Đàmma—this vowel chastest here—Kasra explicable—Fatḥa not forbidden by analogy—Fatḥa necessary in م before art.

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

§ 666. Vowel of final in (1) م، (a) before س of art.
—Fatḥa not caused by transfer from conj.
Hamza—opinion of ک—(b) before any other quiescent—Fatḥa sometimes used in latter case—and Kasra in forms:—(2) م
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 quiescent allowed by some—answer to their argument—such beginning said to occur in Persian—explanation of this occurrence—pausing upon mobile not impossible—meaning of “pausing” here—initials of words generally mobile—sometimes quiescent—conj. Hamza then needed—quiescence of initial found in (1) ns., (a) non-inf.—(b) inf.—initial of these inf. ns. why quiescent—their formations—incorporative quiescence of initial in inf. ns. on measure of بَحْيَتُ (3) لَيْفُ—(2) vs., (a) pret. and imp. in vs. of inf. ns. before mentioned—(b) imp. of 2nd pers. in unaugmented tril. sound in بّ and ذ—(3) ps., ۱ and ۲ of art.—quiescence of initial generally found in vs. and inf. ns.—not in pure ns., except ten irregular ns.—not in ps., except ۱ and ۲ of art.—Hamza in these ten ns. a compensation for actual or virtual elision of ۱—
not found in all trils. whose √ is elided—
why prefixed to these ns.—finals not actually
elided in √, √, and √ —but virtually
in √ and √ — actually in √ if be con-
sidered aug.—and virtually in √ also—o.f.
of (1) — proof of Fath of (a) its √ — (b) its √ — evolution from o.f.—elided L — no
evidence in √ —opinion of Zj—(2)
(3) — not to be copied—its M — (4) √ —
evolution—(5) — (6, 7) and √ —
— L not elided from √ — or √ ——their
evolution—conj. Hamza why combined with
L—fems. of √, √, and √ , and √ — (8) √ —
according to (a) BB—vowel of √ in o.f.
—derivation—measure—evolution—(b) √
KK—evolution—objections to their opinion—
BB's opinion preferable—(9) √ — evolu-
tion—dial. vars.—proof of Fath of √ and √
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 √ —total number
fourteen—twenty-two in FB and KF—conj.
Hamza in these ten ns. a compensation for actual, imaginary, or potential elision of \( \text{\textdagger} \) —

Hamza in their \textit{dus}.—Hamza of \( \text{\textdagger} \) — according to S, \textit{aug}.—but, according to \textit{Khl}, \textit{rad}.—

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

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

\textit{Khl} on Hamza of \( \text{\textdagger} \) — (3) \textit{tril}. or numerically \textit{quad}. \textit{pret}.—but found in \textit{quin}. or \textit{sex}. \textit{pret}.—and in their \textit{imps}.—and in \textit{imp}. of \textit{tril}. whose \textit{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 أَلْ and إِمَّ as worthy of separate mention as إِمُّ — distinction between them possible—but immaterial — إِمُّ, not specified here—أَمُّ, dial. var. of أَلْ, should be mentioned—rule in case of doubt—conjunct أَلْ — conj. Hamza why put —dispensed with when quiescent initial becomes mobile—أَسْتَنْثِرُ — but أَقْلَعُ, rather than أَقَلِّعُ, for أَقَلِّعُ — dispute among BB as to whether conj. Hamza be orig. quiescent or mobile—opinion of majority—and of S—its vowel, according to latter opinion—and to former—opinion of BB—and of KK—objection to latter—rules for determining vowel—(1) Fatḥa necessary in أَلْ—(2) Dammā necessary in (a) pret. pass.—(b) imp. of tril. when such imp. is orig. pronounced with Dammā of ع—Kasra sometimes found before original Dammā—causes of these two vars.—Kasra said to be corrupt—(3) Dammā preponderant over Kasra in 2nd pers. sing. fem. of imp. of tril. when Dammā of أَلْ is accidentally replaced by Kasra—opinion of F on Ishmām of first and third letters here—and of IM—(4) Fathā
preponderant over Kasra in \( \text{شـ} \) and \( \text{شـ} \)

(5) Kasra preponderant over Damma in \( \text{شـ} \)

(6) Damma, Kasra, or Ishmām allowable in pass. of such prets. as \( \text{شـ} \) and \( \text{شـ} \)

(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—\( \text{شـ} \), \( \text{شـ} \), etc., not said—\( \text{شـ} \) a poetic license—\( \text{شـ} \) at beginning of second hemistich—Hamza of art., after interrog. Hamza, not elided, but (1) converted into \( \text{شـ} \) —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 \( \text{شـ} \) the only method mentioned by F and many—dispute about this \( \text{شـ} \) —softening agreeable with analogy—used by Readers, though less approved—easy in comparison with change—no difference here between Hamzats
of 
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CHAPTER VIII.—THE AUGMENTATIVENESS OF LETTERS.

§ 671. Common to n. and v.—no augmentation in p. 8.
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—auxgs. 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 auxg. letters, with their mnemonic combinations—best of such combinations—meaning of "letters of augmentation"—reduplicative augment, coordinative or non-coordinative—non-reduplicative coordinative augment—aug. repetitive or non-repetitive—repetitive auxg.—its condition—repetition (a) of two out of three rads.—opinion of IM on and of KK on —of Zj—of rest of BB—opinion
of KK preferred by BD—non-repetitive \textit{aug.}—

in letters of augmentation—these ten letters why peculiar to augmentation—

remaining seven letters—measurement or exemplification—its use—

constituted as measure—its crude-form, not its actual conformation, here intended—\textit{rads.} how represented in measure—this representation explained—

exs. with three \textit{rads.}—and with more—measurement of \textit{tril.} agreed upon—but of \textit{non-tril.} disputed between BB and KK—three opinions among KK—thus four measures possible for

\textit{augs.} how represented in measure—representation of repetitive \textit{aug.} disputed—\textit{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 \textit{rad.} and \textit{aug.}—his definitions (1) explained and exemplified—

— (2) criticized—neither definition inclusive or exclusive—accurate formula for recognizing \textit{aug.}—(3) defended by IUK—improved definition of \textit{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 — *أُدِّيْدُعَ* and *يُتَشَْعَرَ*—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 ب 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
§ 674. when judged to be aug.—their three states—said to be foreign—its first—why decided to be aug.—both its not rad. or aug., nor second aug.—its rad., and its not imagined by any one to be rad.—aug. with (1) three rads.—(2) four or more rads., when it is (a) non-initial—(b) initial, if word be a v.—positions of aug. in n. and v.—additional exs.—how known to be aug. in these exs.—both its rad. in صيصة and in عاصية and in فوضية and not aug. in last two formations—nor initial when aug., and when rad.—aug. in يا جّح.

§ 675. not aug. when initial—opinion of majority—always aug. when medial with three or more rads.—its positions in such cases—positions of aug. 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 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 and and exceptional—derivation of of conditions of aug. μ—exs.—additional condition—μ fulfilling conditions judged to be aug. in absence of contrary indication—such indication decisive—μ—opinion of AAMr—μ—non-initial μ not judged to be aug., except on plain indication—and its vars.—opinion of Mz—μ—and its cat.—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. μ aug., (1) when final, upon two conditions—additional condition—apparently applicable to final Hamza also—μ as a termination—
judged to be *aug.* unless otherwise indicated—

- derivation and declension of *حسان* — and of

- predicament of *ن* when a double letter, or a sound and a soft letter, are interposed between the / and the *ف* — another condition added by some— of *رمان* — (2) when medial, upon three conditions—for three reasons— *ن aug in عوندن* — but *rad. in (a) ن نيِشل*, though *aug. in ن نيِشس* (b) —

- though *aug. in عوندن, حنطل, عنبسبب* and

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

§ 678.  *

*in (1) fem., (a) ضْرَبَة, فَرَبْت* and *

*but not فَرَبْت, "fem." explained* — *

*sing. or pl.—quiescent* of femininization
not reckoned by IHsh — nor mobile § by R — (b) and its variations — contrary opinions — (2) aor. — no other aoristic letter reckoned by IM among augs. — aoristic letters held by R to be ps. — (3) certain inf. ns. with their derive. — and without — (4) quasi-pass. — & in other positions Т not judged to be aug., unless so indicated — aug. when (1) initial — (2) final — and —(3) medial — of —(4) quasi-pass. — in other cases Т rad., unless otherwise indicated.

§ 679. § aug. in pause — § and І rarely aug. — exs. of and & І for & И — & І & pl. of silence, nor І of distance, really aug. — а letter of augmentation — regular only in pause — necessary there, or allowable — its augmentativeness denied by Mb — but genuine, though rare — proved by (1) for & І & pl.
§ 680. س aug., (1) regularly—س of جدسة and س of جدسة—refutation of Z on former—(2) by hearsay theory of S—loss of mobility in س and س of طاع and س of غاط and س of غاط as compensation for it—aor. of أسطع 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. ل aug. in (1) dems.—added there to indicate distance—generally mobile, and pronounced with Kasr—(2) زيدل, عبدل—نحاجل ambiguous— ل 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 ل of عبدل—contrary opinion expressed by him—remaining instances dubious — augmentativeness of ل denied by Jr—no evidence of it in ل of dem. —this ل rightly not a letter of augmentation — ل 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—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 س in لم is merely incorporative—but not in أس in الم—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 ز added by Sf—and of س is not reckoned by S—said to be substituted for م—ب for غ—
for ل — ف — for Hamza—these substitutions rare and anomalous—originals of substituted letters—substitution recognizable by reversion to original—

conclusion to be drawn from absence of reversion—subst. said by IH to be recognizable by (1) "the paradigms of its derivation"—meaning of this phrase—

and (2) "the paucity of its usage"—meaning of this phrase—المثال

substitution here recognizable by first test also—

this pl. not from مثال—(3) "the fact that it is a deriv., while the letter is an aug."—

while it is a rad."—ما—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"—

or افعل — افعل — افعل — افعل and not unknown—subst.

how recognizable in them—causes of substitution.

§ 683. Hamza substituted for seven letters—its substitution for letters of softness regular and
irregular—regular necessary and allowable—necessary found in ل, ع, and ف—order of mention—substitution for و and ا necessary in four cases, where و or ا is (1) final after aug. 6 دأو — 6 اً — | associated with و and ا—substitution retained with adventitious ا of feminization, but disallowed with un-adventitious — converse case—predicament of two augs. of du.—no substitution in quant. curtailed form of voc. ُ ُ ُ or ُ ُ of ُ ُ — 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 ا is transformed—this substitution extended to 6 فاعِل and َْ َْ َْ when not act. parts.—dispute as to whether act. part. be subordinate to v. in transformation and sounding true—manner of substitution — ا or ا disregarded in act. part. by Mb—Hamza in both 6 كاَّ ْتَلِل and 6 بَاَّ نِع written as ا—but not changed into pure ا in either— rad. ا not sounded true in ُ بَاَّ نِع, any more than rad. و in ُ تاَّ نِع—dotting of ا in مَفَاعِل and dis-allowed—(3) after 1 of مَفَاعِل in pl., when
such $ or $ is an \textit{aug.} letter of prolongation third in \textit{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 \textit{sing.} is (a) not a letter of prolongation—(b) not \textit{aug.}—$ and $ anomalous—as also $ —(c) not third—(4) second of two soft letters having $ of $ between them—reason for changing soft letter after $ of \textit{pl.} into Hamza—dispute as to whether this substitution be peculiar to \textit{pl.}—this Hamza also written as undotted $ —fifth case peculiar to $—IHsh's rule for it—two cases included under this rule—$ and $—substitution in these \textit{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 ُ permanently pronounced with ـāmm-R’s formula for it—this substitution good, regular—no substitution when ُ is (a) accidentally pronounced with ـāmm—(b) doubled—(2) a ی pronounced with Kasr between ِ and double ی—irregular substitution of Hamza for letter of softness when (1) an ِ, (a) to avoid concurrence of two quiescents—(b) from proximity of outlets—(2) a ُ when (a) an initial, pronounced with (a) Kasr—cause of this substitution—its irregularity disputed—ِ of ۪طیبٰی not converted—(b) Fath—(b) a letter of prolongation—reason for substitution here—(3) a ی when (a) an initial pronounced with Fath—ِیذی اذی for ۪یلش لُل—for ۪یلش لُل—(b) a letter of prolongation—substitution of Hamza for ِ and ئ rare, irregular—substitution for ِ in (1) ْ۪لَا and ْ۪لَاوُ—evolution of ْ۪لَا—its pl. of paucity—and of multitude—substitution, though anomalous, obligatory in ْ۪لَا، not in ْ۪لَاوُ—ْ۪لَا—(2) ْ۪لَا and ْ۪لَا—Hamza a subst. for ِ in ْ۪لَا—not in ْ۪لَا—substitution for ئ—
these allowable and irregular substitutions why not mentioned here by IM—substitution of Hamza for ۳ and ۹—very strange.

§ 684. substituted for four letters—or five—its substitution for ۹ and ی 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 ۳ s, and be not ۹ or double ی if they be ۹ s—this condition indicated by IM—(7, 8) that neither of them be ۳ of ۹ whose qual. is ۳ فَع۸ل, or of its inf. n.—these two conditions indicated by IM—reason for sounding ۹ true before ۹ or double ی—(9) that ۹ be not ۹ فَع۸ل denoting reciprocity—this condition indicated by IM—
— this condition not applied to — (10) that neither of them be immediately followed by another transformable letter—this condition indicated by IM—first of two consecutive transformables usually sounded true—second being transformed—or sounded true—first sometimes transformed, and second sounded true—

and objections to statement that is for — or — six

modes of accounting for — or eight—consequential transformation—two transformations allowable when separate, and not absolutely disallowed by IM when consecutive — (11) that neither of them be of word ending in augment peculiar to ——this condition indicated by IM— and — conflict of opinion when word ends in and — or abbreviated of feminization — of feminization disregarded—two other conditions—that be not a subst. for a letter not transformable—nor be in place of such a letter—reason for sounding true in as explained by IM—and by some—another condition—not needed— and
weakness of two last — ی of du. convertible into ی — substitution of ی for Hamza (1) obligatory—meaning of "obligatory"—(2) regular, but not obligatory—its substitution for ی or Tanwin in pause upon (1) acc. pronounced with Tanwin—(2) v. to which single corrob. ی preceded by letter pronounced with Fath is affixed—(a) ی for (b) تاجج — (3) why substituted for ی in these positions—its substitution for ی — ی for ی — explanation given in KF.

§. 685. ی most extensive subst.—substituted for nine letters—its substitution why so frequent—regular and anomalous—regular for three letters—for ی in two cases, where preceding letter is (1) pronounced with Kasr— یتلال and یش عرب — ی why, then converted into ی — (2) ی of dim.—for ی in ten cases, where ی is (1) preceded by Kasra, and (a) final— ی why then converted into ی — (b) before ی of feminization— ی why then converted into ی. — no distinction here between separable and inseparable ی — two anomalies—(a) یسر — its measure and other peculiarities—(b)
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or πι, ~

anomaly — no third anomaly — used as pl. — and — IBr's explanation of before ِ of femininization, abbreviated or prolonged—(d) before aug. ِ and ِ —(2) ِ of inf. n. having the ِ of its v. transformed, and its own ِ preceded by Kasra and followed by ِ and ِ — transformation rare where ِ is lacking— — anomalous to sound ِ, true when conditions of transformation are fulfilled— — no counterpart of it — not an inf. n.—(3) ِ of pl. having its ِ sound, and its ِ preceded by Kasra, and, in sing., either (a) transformed — , then overpowered by Kasra in pl. — no necessity for ِ after it here— — or (b) quiescent, provided that in pl. it be followed by ِ — ِ then overpowered by Kasra in pl. — five conditions of conversion here — ِ sounded true if ِ be missing — — explained as expanded from — or contracted from — or transformed from ِ to distinguish pl. of ِ bull
from pl. of زور slab (of dried curd)—also sounded true if mobile in sing.—طيل و and جيد—or if ل be unsound—(4) final, fourth or upwards, and after Fat'a—why changed into ى in pret. and pass. part.—pret. here conformable to aor., and pass. part. to act. part.—يشابن تدأينًا تغازِيًا and (5) quiescent, single, and immedi-
atly after Kasra—为什么不 and وى—ل (6) of ep. and ىًدنًا فُئلَ and الأعْليَة ep.—use of اًدنًا as substantive—
 فُئلَ ل — التصيًا — المتصي 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 سيد and ىًدنًا فُعلَ their measure ىًدنًا فُعَلَ—not ىًدنًا فُعَلَ ىًدنًا فُعَلَ and ىًدنًا فُعَلَ sound ed true if ى and ىًدنًا فُعَلَ be in separate words—or if first of them be mobile—
or adventitious in nature—or quiescence—وُرّة حدوة عووية، أيوم ضيون ريا and نفو—dim. of n. whose third is a mobile ى، and whose broken pl. is on measure of
treatment of this in *dim.* how accounted for—*dim.* of ُسن د when an *ep.* of ُسن د and ُعوم د—*pl.* and *dim.* of ُضوئ ُل of ُمفعول from v. whose ُع is pronounced with *Kasr* in *pret.*—this ُل why converted into ُب— ُن sounded true if ُع of v. be pronounced with *Fatha*—reason for either treatment of ُب—different versions of *ex.* cited in *Aud*—(9) ُل of *pl.* ُنء ُعصي ُنؤول ُنؤول, and ُنؤول sounding ُل true anomalous in *pl.*—necessary in *sing.*— ُنؤول ُنء ُعصي and ُنؤول ُنؤول—IM's language in *Alfiya*—(10) ُع of *pl.* ُفعل sound in ُنؤول and ُنؤول ُنؤول ُنؤول more frequent— ُنؤول sounded true if ُل be unsound—or be separated from ُع by ُنء anomalous—substitution of ُع for ُن and ُع in *gen.* and *acc.* of *du.* and *perf.* *pl. masc.*—its substitution (1) for *ل* (a) regular—(b) anomalous or weak—(2) for ُب (a) regular—(b) anomalous—dispute as to regularity of ُضم ُضم ُضم and of ُضبُل, ُضبُل, ُضبُل, and ُضبُل its substitution for *Hamza* (1) regular, but not obligatory—(2) necessary—substitution of ُب and ُع for *Hamza* necessary in two
cats.—and anomalously substituted for many letters—its substitution for rest of above-mentioned nine letters confined to hearsay—frequent in such as (1) أَمْلِيَتْ and meaning of "such as"—second duplicate not converted in unaugmented tril.—substitution of أ for (a) first duplicate in فعل阑 when a non-inf. substantive—not ending in أ of femininization — and (b) second duplicate or third triplicate in (a) أَمْلِيَتْ—dispute as to whether this form be deriv. or original—(b) رَبِّيْكَ (c) أَمْلِيَتْ—(d) لَمْ يَتَّسِعْ نَظْنَةَتْ (e) سُبْحَةً — تَسْرُّتِ (f) يَا تَمَيْي (g) not used—(h) تَضْعُضَ — تَضَعَ (i) — its measure and formation—(j) كَهْدَيْتُ (k) — its formation—(l) مَكَأْيِكَ (m) Qَيْرَ اَطْ — their — their formation—(n) دِیْمَاسُ and (o) شَوْرَازُ — its sing.—substitution of أ for أ، ب، غ، and these four
substitutions weak—and for & substituted for eighteen letters in all.

§ 686. substituted for three letters—for | in one case, where preceding letter is pronounced with Damm— for ى in four cases, where ى occurs (1) quiescent, single, in a *sing.*., and after Damma—ى unchanged if mobile—or incorporated—or in a *pl.*, preceding Damma being then converted into Kasra—(2) after Damma as ل of (a) *فَعَلْ*—(b) a *n.* ending in fundamental, inseparable, ي of feminization—(c) a *n.* ending in *aug.* and ى—(3) as ل of *فَعَلَى* when a substantive—سَعِيًا *فَعَلَى* َرْيَا, and said to be anomalous—meaning of "anomalous"—spellings of —(4) as ع of *طَلَبَيْنَ لَكَ* when (a) a substantive—*طَلَبَيْنَ لَكَ*—(b) an *ep.* acting as a substantive—*ٍضْيَزَيْنَ* and *حَكَيْكَ*—opinion of IM and his son—its differences from saying of GG—language of Shl—*طَلَبَيْنَ* as a substantive—substitution of (1) for | (a) obligatory in such as (a) *ذَوَّارَبُٰ*
and cause of conversion in dim.—and in broken pl.—(b) غوربار and
روهی (c) نصورب and اودم (d) —— and
(3) —— عصری and الیوان (f), etc., and الیاث , etc.,
—cause of conversion—i's here assumed to be
orig. — (b) weak in such as and
—every final ی converted by Fazâra and some
of Kais into ی in pause—reason for such
conversion—heaviness of ی why tolerated in
pause—similar excuse for conversion of ی into
Hamza—ی retained by Tayyi in continuity—
ی converted by some of Tayyi into ی in pause—
ی more frequent then, in dial. of Tayyi—
ی retained in continuity—reason for conver-
sion of ی into ی or ی — (2) for (a) obliga-
tory in such as (a) طالبی, موسی, موری
and میائیم, میسر and بوطر and 
بقوی (b) — ضورب — پیش — میاسیر
(2) —— تقوی — (c) غورب — (b) anomalous, weak, in
such as (a) — — (b) — مشئو — reason
for change of ی into ی here—(c) —
dispute as to reality of change in ی
—dims. of ی and عین —— of ضعیف and
—retention of not obligatory—opinion of IM—thed last said to be a weak *dial. var.—substitution of for Hamza (1) allowable—*pl. *not a satisfactory ex.—(2) necessary—substitution of for .

§ 687. *substituted for four letters, (1) , necessarily, in alone—evolution of —vowel of its generally restored in prefixion— *said by Akh to be a *for (a) aprothetic—(b) *to *of 1st *—(c) *to *of 1st *— *more correct than *—(c) *to *explicit , or to pron. other than *of 1st *— *combined with in —explanation suggested by F—opinion of S—another explanation reported by F—opinion of *—*dial. vars. of (2) of *of *some—(3) , (a) regularly before , when is quiescent—language of IM—reason of conversion—immaterial whether and be in one word or two—written as , though pronounced as —change of into 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) بَذَاتُ مُسْتَعْتَمِمٍ—opinions of IS and IJ—sometimes pronounced with undotted ح—(b) رَأْمُ—opinions of AASH and IJ—(c) نَغُمُ م—why used as subst. for these four letters.

§ 688. ب substituted for four letters, (1) صَفْعَانِيٍّ وَمَضْفُوعٌ 2، and 3 بَرَأْئِيٍّ—opinion of S—of Mb—of others—that of S preferable—ن here why not a subst. for Hamza of feminization—(2) لِلْعَمَّ—orig. لِلْعَمَّ—or a separate dial. var.—نَمْعُ—and 3 بَرَأْئِيٍّ—Alphs; characterized by IH as anomalous, and لِلْعَمَّ as weak—(3) م—(4) Hamza—alleged substitution of ن in فَعَلْانُ, masc. of فَعَلْ, for Hamza of فَعَلْانُ—"substitution" here merely alternation—this application of "alternation" tropical.

§ 689. ت substituted for seven letters, (1, 2) ر و ت and ق, when (a) a ن—such substitution (a) regular in نَفَعٌ 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 د—not included with د and د—dialectic peculiarities—د and د
—(b) irregular in numerous expressions—د and د، د，—possible o. f. of د—its rel. n. (3) س—said by Fr to be a dial. var.—its why not original—regarded by IH as sole instance of unincorporative sub-
stitution for س—(b) ست—its formation—
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(d) ḍīm — 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) ḍ, in ḍēm — dispute as to whether its last s be substituted for ḍ, or for l converted from ḍ — meaning of l here — (4) ʾī, in (a) ʾūḏ for ʾūḏ — its last s a subst. for ʾī in pause — or in pause and continuity alike — such substitution not regular — subsidiary to introduction of conj. ʾī in continuity — conj. ʾī elided in pause — last s of ʾūḏ quiescent in pause, rarely in continuity — mostly pronounced with Kasr in continuity, with or without conj. ʾī — proof that s is not for feminization — (b) ʾūḏḏ — (5) ʾā, in (a) ʾāḏḏ, ʾāḏḏ, ʾāḏḏ, etc., in pause — continuity sometimes treated like pause, and pause like continuity — (b) ʾāḏ and ʾāḏ — (b) ʾāḏ and ʾāḏ — regarded by many as a dial. var. — measure of ʾāḏ — like that of ʾāḏ — its o.f. — measure of ʾāḏ — (d) ʾūḻ — (e) ʾūḻ — (6) ḍ, in (a) ḍ — (b) ḍ — (c) ḍ — distinguished by some from ḍ.

§ 691. ʾī substituted for two letters, (1) ʾī ʾī — (1) ʾī ʾī — dim. of ʾī ʾī — or a sing. n. peculiar 1367—1369
to the *dim.* effect of *dim.* formation on its sense—alternatively *diptote* when used as names—alternative forms.

§ 692. perPage 1369–1370

 substituted for two letters, (1) **, (a) regularly in * after a letter of covering—reason of substitution—(b) anomalously in attached nom. pron. of every pret. v. of 1st or 2nd pers. after a letter of covering—in dial. of Banū Tamīm— of v., if perPage 1370–1374 , then incorporated into  of pron.—substitution why anomalous—(2) — and .

§ 693. perPage 1370–1374 substituted for three letters, (1) ** in (a) — regularly after , or — and mostly then incorporated into it—causes of conversion and incorporation—incorporative conversion not relevant here—after conversion necessary, and incorporation usual—(b) anomalously after —conversion why anomalous—exs.—confined to hearsay—(b) some anomalous formations, (a) and —(b) —reason for supposing its to be a subst. for —this substitution not to be copied—contrasted with cases (a, a) and
| § 694. | ج substituted for ؤ 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—vocalization of ج—substitution more anomalous here than in cases (1, a), (1, b), and (2, a)—ج in possibly a subst. for ئ of كودُا. |
| 1374—1378 |

| § 695. | ص substituted for س before ق، خ، غ، خ، خ، خ، and ط—substitution how accounted for—similar to إمالة—not allowable after these letters—but not prevented by separation from them—regular, but not necessary—زَرْأٌ. |
| 1378—1381 |

| § 696. | ج substituted for two letters, ص and س، when quiescent before د—(1) for س سدَل وسَدَر of what conjugs.—cause of substitution—simulation not allowable here—(2) for ص—quiescent ص، before د، pronounceable (1) as pure ج—cause of change—(2) as ص simulating |
| 1381—1389 |
sound of \( \dot{\text{j}} \) — simulation why not allowable in \( \text{s} \) — *exs.* meaning of IH’s words on this subject — mobile \( \text{s} \) before \( \text{d} \) not changed into pure \( \text{j} \) — but sometimes made to simulate \( \text{j} \) — though more rarely than quiescent \( \text{s} \) — conversion into \( \text{j} \) allowable only when heard — simulation similarly restricted in \( \text{s} \) separated from \( \text{d} \) by more than a vowel — mobile \( \text{s} \) converted into \( \text{j} \) before \( \text{q} \) in *dial.* of Kalb — simulation by \( \text{z} \) and \( \text{sh} \) — its cause — its rarity disputed — meaning put by Jrb upon “simulation” in case of \( \text{z} \) and \( \text{sh} \) — these two letters not made into pure \( \text{j} \) — summary of previous discussion — (3) as pure \( \text{s} \) — simulation more frequent than substitution, and sounding plain than both — meaning of “sounding plain” — comparative frequency of such pronunciations as are allowable in quiescent \( \text{s} \) — and in quiescent \( \text{s} \) — 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) \( \text{f} \) — (3) \( \text{s} \) — (4) \( \text{z} \) for two letters, \( \text{z} \) and Hamza — (5) \( \text{g} \) for two letters, \( \text{g} \) and \( \text{z} \) — (6) \( \text{h} \) for \( \text{g} \) — (7) \( \text{g} \) for \( \text{h} \) — reciprocity between them — (8) \( \text{q} \) for \( \text{k} \) — (9) \( \text{k} \) for two letters, (a) \( \text{q} \) — reciprocity between them — (b) \( \text{t} \) — (10) \( \text{j} \) — (11) \( \text{sh} \) for three letters, (a) \( \text{k} \) — (b) \( \text{j} \) — observation by IU — (c) \( \text{s} \) — (12) \( \text{y} \) — (13) \( \text{p} \)
for ل ص wrongly put here, instead of ض ح, by some MSS—ح، not حب, given by lexicologists for حل ل (14) ل (15) ل (16) ل (17) ط (18) ن (19) ل (20) س (21) ز (22) ص (23) ط (24) د (25) ث (26) ن (27) ب (28) ف (29) م (30) ت—adduced by Z as evidence that س is a letter of substitution—(b) ش ل (23) ط —no instance of its unincorporative substitution—(24) ذ ل for two letters, د س ذ و not reckoned by IH among letters of substitution—(25) ث ل for two letters, ث د ل for two letters, (b) ف (27) ب (28) م (29) ف (30) ت.

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،ل، and ل 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،ل، and ل found in ns., vs., and ps.—ل not rad. in decl. ns. or in vs.—rad. in ps., uninfl. ns., imitative ejs., and foreign names—formations sound or unsound—quad. n. or v.—quin.—condition of reduplication in quad.—definition of unsound formation—its unsound constituent—Hamza not technically termed "unsound"—formations divisible into (1) formed, and not formed, with Hamza—both being sound and unsound—(2) reduplicated and unreduplicated—both being sound and unsound—these two divisions omitted by IH—reduplicated also formed, and not formed, with Hamza—definition of "formed with Hamza"—and of "reduplicated"—such formations as لط لnot named "reduplicated"—seven divisions of unsound formations—their names.
§ 698. Positions of unsound letters—א and י—and agreement between unaug, ו and י in (1) occurrence of either as (a) נ —(b) ע —(c) ל —(d) ע and ל—double; or י as rare here as double guttural—double Hamza not used—double א extraordinary—(2) precedence of either before the other as נ and ע respectively—precedence of י more frequent—only instances of either—difference between them in (1) precedence of נ before י as נ or ע and respectively—converse precedence not found—י and י as ע and ל, respectively, more frequent than double א in in and held by S to be a subst. for second י in why not converted into ל—or incorporated into second—א in held by Mz to be original—opinion of S correct—his remarks on why substituted for its last י —(2) occurrence of י as (a) נ and ע —like כ and ד and (b) נ and ל —not so used in either case, except in (a) ק' —opinion of R—homogeneity of נ and ע rare—less disagreeable with separation or incorporation—(b) זרא —its o. f.—its component letters—reasons for considering its ע א —its dim.—ע א more often than א י
或 rejected - رَوِيَتُ - أَوَّلَتِ - رَأَيَتُ - رَأَيَتِ - similarity of ن and ل rare in tril.-(3) occurrence of غ, ع, ف, and ل, contrary to, with possible exception of ذاو - o.f. of يَا -and of نَا, بَا, غَا, etc.-their orig. a -but, according to F, a - of يِمِينِ, جَمِيمٍ, جَمِيمٍ, etc.- measure of جَمِيمٍ.

THE AND AS F S.

§. 699. (1) retained unaltered - why so treated -
(2) elided in (a) aors.-o.f. of عَمَلُ -لزْنُ - مَعْلُومن - -their - why elided - elision desirable for alleviation - their - why not elided - or their Kasra - and of - why not elided - theory of KK on reason for elision - retained if letter after it be pronounced with Fath - يَعْلُ - يُعَلِّقُ - يُبْخَرُ - يَبَخْرُ - يَبْخَرُ and - - يَبَخْرُ and - - يَبْخَرُ - يَبَخْرُ - يَبَخْرُ - يَبْخَرُ - -elision extended to remaining variations of aor., and to imp.-(b) inf. ns.-o. f. of عَدَة said to be (a) عَدَة - its - why elided - two qualifications necessary for elision - one not sufficient - no elision in simple substantive -
transfer of vowel the intended mode of transformation in *inf. n.*, and elision merely consequental—or elision intended, and transfer subsidiary—(b) $\text{ذَد}$ — $\ddot{s}$ in $\ddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ a compensation for elided $\dddot{s}$ — in $\ddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ and $\dddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ why combined with $\dddot{s}$ — elision of $\dddot{s}$ — its $\dddot{s}$ why pronounced with Kasr in $\ddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ — $\ddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ and $\dddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ — $\ddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ and $\dddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ or $\dddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ $\ddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ and $\dddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ — (3) converted $\dddot{s}$ like $\dddot{s}$, except in elision—not elided in *aor.*—
*exs.*—why not elided $\dddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ and $\dddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ — only instances of elision—conversion of $\dddot{s}$ — $\ddot{s}$ converted into Hamza, (1) necessarily, when initial and followed by a mobile $\dddot{s}$ — or rather by $\dddot{s}$; 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 $\ddot{s}\text{ذَد}$ — 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 $\ddot{s}$ why not converted into $\dddot{s}$ — (2) allowably in such as $\dddot{s}\text{ذَد}$
and, according to Mz, ٍةٍ(3) invariably in ٍةٍ—(4) irregularly in ِةٍ، أُلٍ، أُرٍ، أُرٍ، according to Mz, ٍةٍ، ٍةٍ، etc.— ٍةٍ—rarity of initial ٍةٍ pronounced with Kasr—initial ٍةٍ sometimes converted into ٍةٍ—substitution of ٍةٍ for ٍةٍ not regular, except in ٍةٍ and in ٍةٍ regularly converted into ٍةٍ, when not converted from Hamza—conversion of quiescent ٍةٍ and ٍةٍ into ٍةٍ and ٍةٍ, respectively.

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

§ 701. Conversion of ٍةٍ into ٍةٍ in aor. of ٍةٍ and ٍةٍ and their variations—this mode of conjugating universal among some Hijazis—and practised by Shf—ٍةٍ، ٍةٍ، ٍةٍ، ٍةٍ—four dial. vars. in aor. of ٍةٍ whose ٍةٍ is a ٍةٍ—three anomalous, and one chaste—Kasra in ٍةٍ distinguished from Kasra in ٍةٍ.
peculiar to dial. of Banû Asad—\textit{imp.} of \( \text{جِل} \) —indication that conversion of \( \text{ث} \) in \( \text{جِل} \) and \( \text{يُحَل} \) into \( \text{l} \) or \( \text{i} \) is regular—language of Sf, F, and others—of IH—\( \text{يَاْسُ} \) and \( \text{يَابَسْ} \) —this conversion of \( \text{ى} \) into \( \text{l} \) found only in \textit{aor.} whose \( \text{ج} \) is pronounced with \( \text{Fath} \), and said by S not to be regular—\textit{aoristic} \( \text{ى} \) not pronounced with \( \text{Kasr} \) here.

\textbf{§ 702. Substitution of} \( \text{ف} \) for \( \text{ي} \) of \( \text{ى} \) when a Hamza—this \( \text{ى} \) not converted into \( \text{ت} \)—\( \text{يَتُزَرْ} \) —wrong—\( \text{يَكُونُ} \) anomalous or rare—\( \text{ى} \) in \textit{act.}, or \( \text{و} \) in \textit{pass.}, not changed into \( \text{ت} \) in chaste \textit{dial.}—\( \text{يَكُدُ} \) not from \( \text{يَكُدُ} \) —but from \( \text{يَكُدُ} \) —so said by F—existence of \( \text{يَكُدُ} \) contested by Zj—F’s opinion verified—or from \( \text{يَكُدُ} \) —this derivation better—some Bdd reported to allow conversion of \( \text{ى} \) into \( \text{يَتُزَرْ} \) wrong—\( \text{يَتُزَرْ} \) and \( \text{زَاْيْ} \) vulgar.

\textbf{THE} \( \text{و} \) \textbf{AND} \( \text{ى} \) \textbf{AS} \( \text{ع} \) \textbf{S}.

\textbf{§ 703. Transformed, elided, or preserved—transformation—three modes of transformation in} \( \text{ع} \) —(1) conversion—into \( \text{l} \) —precluded in
and the reasons for conversion into 1 —its cause not very substantial—operative only on ج or ي، and easily restrained from action—principally effective in ج.—this transformation original in ج. ج. of unaugmented ج. —and conformable to original in ج. ج. or ج. of unaugmented ج. and in ج. ج. and ج. ج. of two augmented ج. ج. —but not found in ج. ج. whose ي is ج. pronounced with جا or كا—classification of ج. subjected to this transformation—conversion into 1 found in (a) ج. ج. — (b) ج. (a) ج. — (b) conformable to ج. — (c) ج. conformable to (b, a) or (b, b)—contrary to (a) ج. ج. and ج. ج. anomalous—or ج. ج. —regular, but weak— ج. ج. and ج. ج. — (a) ج. ج. and ج. ج. —conditions of conversion in two last — ج. ج. and ج. ج. — (b) ج. ج. and ج. ج. ج. and ج. ج. ج. and ج. ج. —these formations disqualified for conversion of ي into 1 —contrary to ج. ج. ج. and
and to qualification needed for such transformation in deriv.-additional disability in and and omission of conversion anomalous—its anomalousness disputed in and when they have no tril. v.—transformation also heard in most of these anomalies—(2) quiescence by transfer of vowel—reason for such transformation—this quiescence principally in v.—in unaugmented tril.—and augmented—treatment of , and after transfer of vowel—nature and extent of alteration—why not transformed in same way as their pret.—, and similar—classification of ns. conformable to v. in this respect—transfer adopted for observance of mode of formation—by mobilization of quiescent with vowel of —other exs.—confusion between cats. of and not heeded here—conditions of transfer—another added in Tashil—(3) elision, (a) necessary, (a) where quiescence of final is necessitated, by (∞) attachment of pron.—vowel of initial—(B) apocopation or quasi-apocopation—(b) in such as and —dispute as to ! elided here—this mention of
CONTENTS.

(b) allowable in such as (a) and —
(b) and elision necessary in latter cat.—mature 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. —opinion of S preferable—elision why necessary in latter cat.—
(c) rare in —preservation of and —reasons for it in such as (1) and — (2) and —additional reason in latter cat.—(3) and .

§ 701. *Tril. vs. whose * 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 \( \text{فعل} \), when its \( \\text{ه} \) is \( \\text{و} \) or \( \\text{ي} \), \( \\text{فعل} \) into \( \\text{فعل} \) on attachment of mobile \( \text{نام pron.} \) —

and \( \\text{فعل} \) not \( \text{ورig.} \) —but \( \\text{فعل} \) —dispute on manner of transition from \( \\text{فعل} \) to \( \\text{فعل} \) —

theory (1) of many that \( \\text{فعل} \) is transmuted into \( \\text{فعل} \) —this opinion adopted by \( \text{Z} \) and \( \text{I} \) (2) of \( \text{II} \) that \( \text{دمم} \) and \( \text{کسیر} \) are for explanation of the \( \text{v. as a} \) scion of \( \\text{و} \) and \( \\text{ى} \) respectively —meaning of "scion"—his argument —reason given by earlier authorities for suggesting transmutation —his argument in reply —(3) of \( \text{R} \) —alleged transmutation of \( \\text{زيمل} \) into \( \\text{فع} \) and \( \\text{قوم} \) —\( \\text{فیمن} \) and \( \\text{فیمن} \) —

no transmutation without mobile \( \text{نام pron.} \),

except in \( \\text{فيمن} \) and \( \\text{فيمن} \) —explanation of these two.

§. 706. Vocalization of letter preceding unsound \( \\text{ع} \) in \( \\text{pass. of pret., tril. or on measure of} \)

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

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

—opinion of \( \text{S} \) in §. 710 strengthened—

(b) \( \text{یشمم} \) —this \( \text{dial. var. chase} \) —(c) pure \( \\text{و} \) —evolution of \( \\text{تور} \) —and \( \\text{وج} \) —opinion of \( \text{AAC} \) in §. 710 strengthened —this \( \text{dial. var. of
no account—fuller explanations—pure \( \text{\textit{ي}} \) and
\( \text{\textit{}}} \) explained by IH—and by Jz—latter expla-
nation more probable—Ishmām—different
from Ishmām in pause—how pronounced—its
essence—so understood by Fr and GG—said
by some to be like Ishmām in pause—how
described by others—really Raum—its object
—(2) تَلْتُ and بَعْتُ —vocalization of their
ف —ambiguous forms avoided—and replaced
by unambiguous—but not disallowed by West-
terns—nor noticed by S—ambiguity disregar-
ed by him—and pardoned by Sf—possible
meaning of "avoided"—avoidance prefer-
able—but not necessary with distinctive con-
text—(3) إنْقِدَ —vocalization of their conj. Hamza.

§. 707. \( \text{\textit{ع}} \) sounded true in (1) v. of wonder—(2) إِنَّلَ
of superiority—two causes assigned by IH—
only second by S—no reason for first—(3)
إِنْتَالَ — نَفَاعُل — i. q. خَتَّار — إِنْتَالَ — نَفَايَل
إِنْفَالَ —(4) — إِنْفَالَ —(5) — إِنْفَالَ —(6) such vs. as سُرُد
— لِيْسَ — صِيدَ — لِسْتَ، etc.—its ع orig. pronounced with Kasr
—(7) variations of vs. whose ع is sounded

1434–1490
true—ع sometimes (1) transformed in فعل denoting defects—and in its derivs.—(2) anomalously sounded true in فعل and استفعل—to notify o. f. of conjug.

§. 708. Additional cause requisite for conversion of or ى into ِ in penultimate after aug. — nature of such cause—no conversion in ante-penultimate—Hamza in تأْلِلُ, كُسْأَرُ و دَأْرُ أَمَّأَرُ and كُبْرُ, نُبْعُ ِ and عِدْجَا نُزُزُ, ِبَأْرُ نُعُ and ِبَأْرُ نُعُ and ِبَأْرُ نُعُ — why substituted for —first —why not elided—Hamza in رَسْأَنُلُ, and ى, in act. part. of unaugmented tril., said to be converted into Hamza when transformed in v.—really converted into ِ, and from ِ into Hamza—elision of ِ impossible—cause of its conversion into ِ —and from ِ into Hamza—this Hamza written as undotted ِ —ع sounded true in act. part. when so sounded in v.—ع and ِ sometimes transposed in act. part. of hollow v.—and always by Khl when its ِ is Hamza —his argument—similar transposition by him in شُوْأَرُ, صَطْلَاياً and شُوْأَرُ —answer to his argument—شَأْكُ لَأَنَّ and شَأْكُ لَأَنَّ anomalous—its derivation—and forms—شَأْكُ.
etc., said to be (1) $\text{فعل}$, (a) abbreviated from $\text{فعل}$ — (b) intensive form of $\text{فعل}$ — (2) $\text{فعل}$ by elision of (a) its $\text{ح}$ — whether as $\text{ح}$ or $\text{ً}$ or Hamza — their measure in this case — (b) its aug. $\text{ٌ}$ — their measure in this case — A’s procedure — $\text{جاء}$ — of $\text{فاعل}$ sounded true.

§ 709. Pass. part. of tril. v. whose $\text{ح}$ is unsound—

1498—1505

evolution of $\text{فعل}$ and $\text{فعل}$ — why not $\text{فعل}$

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 $\text{فعل}$ — and

on alleviation of $\text{ي}$ — anomalies in cat. of $\text{ي}$ — and of $\text{ي}$ — cat. of $\text{ي}$ treated as sound by Banū Tamīm — exs. in poetry — $\text{ذيدون}$ and $\text{معيرون}$ anomalous according to H — his opinion controverted — $\text{معيرون}$ said — and $\text{مزيدون}$ —

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 $\text{ي}$ — and of $\text{ي}$ — 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 \( \text{ز} \) when a quiescent \( \text{ز} \) preceded by \( \text{ذ} \)amma—and of \( \text{آ} \)kh—reason for treatment advocated by \( \text{س} \)—and by \( \text{آ} \)kh—reply to letter—\( \text{ج} \)s.—measure of \( ^{3} \)دیکٍ—and of \( ^{3} \)معیدشةٍ—\( \text{آ} \)kh's rule (1) contravened by himself in pass. part.—measure of \( ^{3} \)میهعٍ or \( ^{3} \)تیعٍ—(2) inconsistent with hearsay—\( ^{3} \)مشروطهٍ—its measure and derivation—\( ^{3} \)مضاتنةٍ and \( ^{3} \)میهعٍ.

§ 711. Transformation a property of \( \text{د} \)—imparted to \( \text{د} \). only by conformity to \( \text{د} \)—unaugmented \( \text{تری} \). (1) transformed when modelled on \( \text{د} \), i.e. when on measure of \( ^{3} \)فعلٍ or \( ^{3} \)فعلٍ—conversion of \( \text{د} \) necessary here—but sometimes omitted—such forms anomalous—no \( ^{3} \)فعلٍ in hollow \( \text{د} \)—(2) treated as sound when not modelled on \( \text{د} \)—\( ^{3} \)تیمٍ—transformability of \( \text{د} \). \( \text{n} \). determined by that of \( ^{3} \)فعلٍ.

§ 712. Condition of transformation in augmented \( \text{تری} \). \( \text{n} \). not conformable to \( \text{د} \)—difference from \( \text{د} \). not prescribed in unaugmented \( \text{تری} \).—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 \( \text{بائع} \) and \( \text{تُبيّع} \) —exs. of augmented tril. with, and without, prescribed difference—rule as stated by A—two sorts of n. covered by it—(1) and

from \( \text{بيع} \) of feminization no obstacle to agreement with v. in measure—anomalies—their object—\( \text{مُرَمَّد} \) and \( \text{مُرَمَّد} \) and \( \text{تُبيّع} \) تُبيّع or \( \text{تُبيّع} \) or this sort of n. how distinguishable from v.—another condition prescribed by Mb—\( \text{تُبيّع} \) تُبيّع and \( \text{مُرَمَّد} \) and \( \text{مُرَمَّد} \) and \( \text{تُبيّع} \) تُبيّع —n. resembling, or differing from, aor. in both measure and augment—first sort like 

\( \text{أيْبُض} \) and \( \text{أَبِيع} \) and \( \text{أَبِيع} \) , and \( \text{أَبِيع} \) and \( \text{أَبِيع} \) and \( \text{أَبِيع} \) and 

\( \text{أَوْنَاء} \) —إِعْبَة \( \text{أَوْنَاء} \) —إِعْبَة and 

\( \text{إِبِيْنا} \) وَإِبِيْنا —transfer here anomalous—

\( \text{مُحْطِم} \) —second sort like 

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
§ 713. Non-final mobile and \( й \) generally impervious to conversion, by preceding Kasra and Damma, into \( й \) and \( й \), respectively—and still stronger when doubled—and sometimes so converted for conformity—but not \( й \)—such conversion found in (1) the inf. n. whose \( й \) is transformed in the v.—though not necessarily in this way—

contrasted with \( \text{ oblivious } \) with \( \text{ oblivious } \) and

— and \( \text{ with } \) — (2) the pl. whose

\( й \) is transformed in the sing.—

and of \( \text{ oblivious } \) — \( \text{ oblivious } \) — \( \text{ oblivious } \) — (3) the pl. whose \( й \) is quiescent in the sing.,

and followed by \( й \) in the pl.—

— \( \text{ oblivious } \) anomalous—\( й \) needed here—effective

as element in cause of conversion—and

powerful as auxiliary in (1) and (2)—

allowable for conformity—

— \( й \) said to be contracted from \( й ).

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

sometimes said— *إِسْتِقَامَة* — *إِنَّهَا* and *إِنَّهُ* — *إِنَّهَا* and *إِنَّهُ* | 1530—1537

transformed— (3) | *طَوِيلُْ سِيَالُْ نُوَالُْ* and *تَوْالُْ تَوْالُْ* and *تَسْيَارُْ تَسْيَارُْ* — ambiguity alleged as reason in — *مَقْوَالَْ* and *مَخْيَاطَْ* | 1537—1542

of this ambiguity — true reason — (4) and *عَلَّمَْ* and *مَخْيَاطَْ* (5) — *مَخْيَاطَْ* — cause of transformation present here — excuse for non-transformation — (6) and *صَبِيعَْ*  | 1542—1548

so far as regards conversion of their *لِْ* into — *أَحْيَانِْ* | 1548—1554

§. 715. Second of two unsound letters enclosing *لِْ* of ultimate *pl.* is converted into — and this into *هَمْزَة* — anomalous, like *ضَوْرَْ* — such conformity of *pl.* to *sing.* not universal — nor *ضَوْرَْ* to be taken as a precedent — conversion actually heard only
in case of two ꞌs as enclosing letters—but extended by Khl and S to case of two ꞌs or of ꞌ and ꞌ——this extension disallowed by Akh—pl. of act. part. from ꞌ and ꞌ —reason for Akh’s doubt—sound opinion that of S—further authority for it—second unsound letter not converted when far from end——so ꞌعابِل ꞌعوارِر and ꞌعابِل ꞌعوارِر, but ꞌقِام ꞌصِيَّة and ꞌقِام ꞌصِيَّة and anomalous—similar conflict of opinion on conversion of second of two unsound letters enclosing antepenultimate ꞌ in non-pl.

§. 716. Treatment of ꞌ and ꞌ combined, when their first is quiescent—cause of incorporation— ꞌ and ꞌ treated as likes—incorporation encouraged by quiescence of their first— ꞌ converted, whether first or second—no incorporation in ꞌ ꞌسِوَٰر and ꞌذِوُيع ꞌذِوُيع — nor ꞌإِجْلِيَّوَاذ and ꞌذِوُيع ꞌذِوُيع — ꞌقِوم and ꞌقِوم — ꞌدِیْوَان and ꞌدِیْوَان — ꞌروِیَات and ꞌروِیَات — ꞌدِیْوَان — measure of ꞌدِیْوَان — ꞌدِیْوَان — ꞌدِیْوَان — ꞌدِیْوَان — conversion and incorporation sometimes found in ꞌ — never allowable in ꞌ—— dispute about ꞌ — preceding Damma changed into ꞌ.
Kasra—either vowel allowable in \( ^{2} \) pl. of \( ^{2} \)

— and in some other forms—conversion anomalous—for want of

in their o. f.—or of finality in their double — reason of its conversion—(2) in more anomalous.

§ 717. Treatment of \( \mathfrak{d} \) and \( \mathfrak{a} \) after of ultimate pl.
not preceded by \( \mathfrak{d} \) or

— opinion of S on last—of Jh—regular form—of Zj—of IH—confirmation of his opinion—Hamza in all three pl. anomalous.

§ 718. \( \mathfrak{a} \), when \( \mathfrak{g} \) of substantive—virtually, when not actually, a substantive—
treated as substantives—ananthrous not a qual.—but treated as a substantive—
small sense of qualification in of superiority—(2) not converted in ep.—but \( \mathfrak{d} \) before it converted into Kasra—so in pl. —its \( \mathfrak{d} \) converted into Kasra—but sometimes left, and then converted into \( \mathfrak{d} \).
THE \( \) AND \( \) AS \( \) \( \) \( \) \( \) \\

§ 719. More unsound than as \( \) the nearer to the end, the more subject to transformation—transformation lighter than use of \( \)—predicament of \( \) and \( \) as finals—modes of transformation—these letters (1) converted into \( \) and \( \) and \( \) and \( \) and \( \) and \( \) —measure of last two \( \) and \( \) and \( \) and \( \) and \( \) —objection to IH's explanation of non-conversion in last—better opinion on last two—non-conversion of their \( \) not attributed to accidental character of its vowel—\( \) and \( \) and \( \) —one condition of conversion that vowel of \( \) or \( \) be permanent—conformability, or affinity, of \( \) to \( \) not a condition of conversion in its \( \) —con- version not prevented by \( \) of feminization after the \( \) —nor by \( \) aug. \( \) before it—restoration of \( \) to its \( \) —exs. in \( \) —and \( \) —\( \) elided in \( \) and \( \) how treated in \( \) rel. \( \) —
restored ٰ and ی not reconverted into ٰ — (b) for conformity—restoration of ل to its place—ی then not converted into ٰ in ترخیشٰ ی ی and elision of ی in sing. masc. after Kasra or Fatha—ی and ی in ترخیشٰ ی ی not converted—but ی sometimes elided—in absence of ambiguity, ٰ not restored [to its o.f.] for avoidance of elision on account of two quiescents—(2) made quiescent—آّلرایی یو یوٰٰ یو and یو (nom.)—similarly یو یو—یو (gen.) and یوٰٰ (3) elided—sometimes arbitrarily—from frequency of usage—ل ی not elided in یخٰ (4) preserved.

§ 720. Capacity of ی and ی for bearing inflectional vowels after (1) a quiescent—(2) a mobile—meaning of "mobile"—kind of vowel found before each—ی and ی sometimes quiescent in subj. and acc.—explanations of آن ندّنو—such quiescence found in prose—ی and ی quiescent in ind. and nom.—ی sometimes mobile—catalogue of anomalies in treatment of unsound letter as seat of 1568—1577
inflection—не found in gen.—predicament of ى—sometimes mobile—this pronunciation said to be a poetic license—opinion of R—، and ى elided in apoc.—sometimes retained—iator retained, except in apoc.—and sometimes even there.

§ 721. No decl. n. ending in ى preceded by a vowel—cause of that—treatment of ى when a ل, final or virtually final, after original دامما, in decl. n.—exs.—ى converted into ى، and then دامما into كسرة—، not so converted when (1) not a ل—تيللٍ—(2) followed by inseparable termination—exception when preceding دامما is upon another ى—(3) after accidental دامما—(4) in a v.—(5) in a n., but invariably pronounced with فت —ى sole instance—reasons for retention of ى here—corresponding predicament of ى after دامما as respects conversion of دامما into كسرة—فر and سف on ٌسن —instances of non-finality as preventive of conversion—analogous instances in other catg.—Khl on differentiation of س ٌسن and س ُسن from ٌسن and ُسن.
§ 722. Similar treatment of final ﺪ in spite of intervening letter of prolongation, in ۶ْ فُل—this ۶ converted into ی—and then preceding ِ—and ِّل of خ into Kasra—this process invariable in pl, but not in sing.—exs. of conversion and non-conversion in sing.—٠ on proper letter in sing. and pl.—final ِ strong when doubled—conversion then necessary, proper, or improper—ِ not converted if not final—extraordinary cases of conversion—

§ 723. Final ِ and ی after aug. ِ converted into ِ، and afterwards into ِّل— ِل و ِْل رَأَی—and ِّل رَأَی—cause of conversion into ِ،—and then into ِّل—preceding ِ to be aug.—reasons for this—and also, says Mz, third—٠ ِ ژَایه—coordinates with ِ ژَایه and ِ ژَایه—and ی not converted before inseparable ِ
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of femininization—inseparable termination a preventive of conversion into ل—exs.—

§ 724. Conversion of final ل after Kasra into ل—its cause—conditions requisite for conversion of mobile ل after Kasra into ل—treatment of mobile ل after Damma —تَنْيَةُ and دَنْيَا —reason of conversion in them—derivation of تَنْيَةُ of صَبِيَّةُ and دَنْيَا —conversion of ل in cat. of دَعْيَ ، دَعَيْنَى and رَقَبَتْ into ل —whether this ل be orig. ل or not—such conversion peculiar to ل.

§ 725. ل of قَلْعَى ، (1) when ل , preserved—no distinction here between substantive and ep.—cause of non-conversion—(2) if ل , preserved in ep., and converted into ل in substantive—substantive why selected for
transformation—moderation intended—this change made in most cases—alleged exceptions—change of ٰ into ٰ 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—ٰ of ٰٰٰٰ، (1) if ٰ، preserved—no distinction here between substantive and ep.—cause of non-conversion—(2) if ، preserved in substantive, and converted into ٰ in ep.—ٰٰٰٰٰ، or ٰٰٰٰٰ،—IM's opinion contrary to that of most Etymologists—opinion expressed by R—ٰٰٰٰٰٰ، and ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ، regarded by S as substantives— inconsistency of IH in treating ٰٰٰٰٰٰ، as a substantive, and ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ، and ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ، as eps. —S on ٰٰٰٰٰٰ،—conversion the rule, according to him, in every ٰٰٰٰٰٰ، fem. of ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ، whose ٰ is ،—unless it be [actually used as] an ep.—S's explanation of his meaning in latter case—ٰٰٰٰٰٰ، 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 alleviation—ی why converted into ِ—and Hamza into ی—Hamza mostly converted into ِ in du. of ۲—但不限于 ultimate pl.—حذفی anomalous—general rule contravened in (1) كداری (2) شوا—عالی and بدلیا (1) شواری (2) حذفی and خلایا (3) سقاتیا and درایا

exceptional—observations on (1) ِ third in all thesepls.—(2) Hamza after ِ in كداری and (3) ِ second in sings.-شواری and خلایا and (4) R after ِ in كداری—(5) ِ and in كداری—(6) ِ and ِ in خلایا—(7) ِ and Hamza—Khl on خلایا—remark by IH—conversion necessary in Hamza and its Kasra, after ِ of ultimate pl., when that Hamza is adventitious in pl., and ل of pl. is Hamza، ی، or، —no conversion (1) when Hamza is found in sing. as ۲—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 un-sound letters—conflicting opinions on its soundness or unsoundness—formation of (1) أدائيا—opinion of S and majority of BB—and of Khl—objection to latter—(2) أدائيا(3) مداوئي (4) جمادئي —Jj and ISd on pl. of د. 정도—right view—true explanation of ت in it—their language not justifiable by assuming its sing. to be د. اذة—assertion of IAmb—anomalies in this cat.—Akh on د. دادرى—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 أدائيا.

§ 727. Final، fourth or upwards converted into ى when letter before it is not pronounced with Damm—conditions of conversion when letter before it is pronounced with Fath—two reasons assigned for conversion— and—Akh on—weakness of second reason—object of proviso "when letter before it is not pronounced
with Ḍamm"—additional proviso requisite
—original proviso properly restricted to vs.
—amendment of it suggested by R.

§. 728. ِع in cat. of َنُونى and treated as sound—reason for not transforming it—and so in cat. of ُهَوَى َخَيَى and ُهَوَى َخَيَى —another reason in case of ُهَوَى and ُهَوَى َخَيَى, َخَيَى ُهَوَى, and—and in that of ُهَوَى َخَيَى —and another in that of ُهَوَى َخَيَى, َخَيَى ُهَوَى treated as sound in n. also— ُغَابَةٌ, etc., anomalous—why so called— ُغَابَةٌ how explained by Fr—and by Ks—anomalous according to all three accounts—last two explanations applicable to ُغَابَةٌ, etc.—incorporation in cat. of ُخَيَى—more frequent than display— ُخَيَى ُخَيَى and ُخَيَى ُخَيَى —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 حي is 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 حي.

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

Sf on لى for حي, and for حي—duc. and pl. of حي استُحُي and of حي استُحَي

dial. vars. of حي استُحُي—and of حي استُحَي

exs. of حي استُحُي, aor. حي استُحَي, aor. حي استُحُي or حي استُحُي pass. of حي استُحَي not said as aor. of حي or حي استُحَي

incorporation eschewed in aor. pass. of حي استُحَي and حي استُحَي—and in aor. act.—even in subj.—no incorporation in ext. of حي استُحَي—transformation preferred to incorporation—حي استُحَي

§ 729. Double ح peculiar to فعل—objection to forming فعل or فعل from cat. of فعل—especially this objection obviated in ظهَرُت فَعَلَ.
—double $\varepsilon$ avoided when $\varepsilon$ is orig. mobile—
but tolerated with incorporation—in $n.$, not
in $v.$

§. 730. Pret. and aor. of (1) $\varepsilon$ whose $\varepsilon$ and $l$
are $s$—(2) $\varepsilon$ whose $l$ is $\varepsilon$—reasons
for not incorporating—inf. $n.$ of
—
$\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$.
inf. $n.$ $\varepsilon$—pret. of $\varepsilon$ and whose
$\varepsilon$ and $l$ are $s$, or whose $\varepsilon$ is $\varepsilon$—their
aor., act. part., and inf. $n.$—$\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$.

§. 730A. Additions to this chapter—modes of com-
bining (1) two $s$—(2) three $s$—(3)
four $s$—all of this the predicament of
$\varepsilon$ $s$—(4) two $s$—(5) three $s$—(6) four
$s$—God knows best.

CHAPTER XI.—INCORPORATION.

§. 731. Definition—$\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon$—incorporation
as defined (1) by $\varepsilon$—why so named—two
letters requisite for it—quiescent and mobile
—first quiescent, and second mobile—both
proceeding from one outlet—without separa-
tion—modes of separation—(2) by $\varepsilon$ 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—\(\tilde{\alpha}^{'}\) and \(\tilde{\alpha}^{''} \tilde{\nu}^{\prime} \tilde{m}^{\prime}\)—(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 coordinate, whether in v. or n.—(b) where incorporation would lead to confusion of paradigms—no such confusion in rs.—(c) where homogeneous letters are separate, and first
is preceded by quiescent other than a letter of prolongation or softness—نَحْصَ نَقْصٍ —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 ؤ of silence—مَالِیَةُ هَلَکَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>a Hamza separated from the ف—treatment of two consecutive Hamzas in one word—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>a letter of prolongation,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) at end of word—یَسَرَأ and مَغَزُو —(b) substituted, not permanently, for another letter—اَب for أَلْب —IM's mention of these conditions—incorporation of likes, both of which are mobile, necessary on eleven conditions, (1) that both be in one word—reduplication extremely heavy—no concurrence of likes in rads. of quad. or quin.—nor in ف and ق. |
of tril., except extraordinarily—nor in beginning or middle of augmented tril. n. not commensurable with v.—concurrence of mobile likes in beginning or middle of augmented vs., and of augmented ns. commensurable with vs.—whether trils.—or quads.—treatment of likes in augmented quad.—and in augmented tril., (a) in beginning (α) of pret.—similar treatment of approximates when of tril. is approximate to its incorporation in pret. extended to aor., imp., inf. n., and act. and pass. parts.—(β) of aor.—(b) in middle—incorporation why allowable in inf. ns. of conjngs. mentioned—this the predicament of mobile likes combined in beginning or middle of word—their predicament at end, (a) if first have another letter incorporated into it—(b) if reduplication be co-ordinative—elision of l in —(c) if first be unsound—or sound, (aa) in v.—(bb) in tril. n., unaugmented or augmented—(α) فَعَلَ (γ) فَعَلَ —(β) فَعَلَ (δ) فَعَلَ —(ε) فَعَلَ (ζ) فَعَلَ —(η) فَعَلَ —(θ) فَعَلَ —(ι) فَعَلَ —(κ) فَعَلَ —(λ) فَعَلَ —(μ) فَعَلَ —(ν) فَعَلَ and رَدُّد , سُرُر (θ) and دَتْحُدُّ , سُرُر (δ) and نَعَلْنَ , نَعَلْنَ , نَعَلْنَ (γ) and أَدْقُ (η) — رَدِّد , مَرَّد , مُسْتَعَدُ and ءُظَلِّل — ءُشَد — these the predicaments
of mobile likes combined in one word—
elision or transfer of vowel from their first
when incorporation is intended—conditions
of incorporation if likes be in two words—
question whether "incorporation" attribut-
ed to 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 ُتُبَعُب
for ُتُتَابَعُب — condition of non-initiality not
mentioned here by IM—(3-6) that they be
not on measure of (a) ﻇَاءُ، (b) ﻫُمُّ، (c)
َنَعَلَ، (d) ﻇَعَلَ — incorporation disallowed in
all these measures—reason of its dtallow-
ance—and in n. commensurable, in its fore
part, with any of them—as also in ُنَعَلَ —
combination of two mobile likes possible in
four more measures of tril.— ُنَعَلِ not used
— ُنَعَلَ، ُفَعَل، ُفَعَل، ُفَعَل، ُفَعَل، ُفَعَل، ُفَعَل، ُفَعَل—incorporation
generally prescribed in ُنَعَلَ and ُنَعَلَ—and
dissolution in ُنَعَلَ—(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) and (a) and (b) exceptions to rule as to necessity for incorporating first of two mobile likes in one word—(11) that quiescence do not supervene upon their second either through its conjunction with a nom. pron., or through apocopation or quasi-apocopation—such formations of two kinds—meaning of "nom. pron."—no incorporation with it, according to majority of Arabs—dialectic variations—choice allowed, in apoc. and imp., between dissolution and incorporation—reason for the latter—meaning of "choice allowed"—effect of incorporation upon conj. Hamza in imp.—incorporation retained with of pl., of 2nd pers. sing. fem., or corrob.
connection of this question with condition (8)—proposed amendment of A's language—vowel of letter that has its like incorporated into it, (a) before ُهَلَل of 3rd pers. sing. fem. and ُهَلَل of 3rd pers. sing. masc.—لاهلاً and ُهَلَل allowed by KK, and ُهَلَل 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 ُهَلَل of wonder, and incorporation in ُهَلَل—this proviso a correction of preceding rule as to "choice allowed in . . . imp."—ُهَلَل of wonder regarded, by majority of BB, as a pret. v.—

and ُهَلَل, 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.—IX's definition—outlets of letters sixteen—(1) of Hamza, ُهَلَل, and ُهَلَل—(2) of ُهَلَل and ُهَلَل—(3) of ُهَلَل and ُهَلَل—outlets in the throat—relative positions of (a) Hamza, ُهَلَل, and ُهَلَل—opinion
of S—of Akh—disproof of latter—continuation of argument on his opinion—(b) ّ and ّ, and (c) ّ and ّ—Hamza, ّ and ّ said by Lth to be hollow—and by Khl to be airy—his opinion on relative positions of ّ, ّ, ّ, ّ, ّ, and ّ—these seven letters, from outlets (1-3), guttural—(4) of ّ—(5) of ّ—difference in their outlets how recognizable—both these letters uvular—ّ how articulated by Arabs of the desert—this articulation hereditary—way to account for it—(6) of ّ, ّ, and ّ—their relative positions—their outlet where placed by S—(7) of ّ—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 ّ in relation to tongue and teeth—from which side uttered—called "long"—(8) of ّ—no letter more extensive in outlet—its outlet where placed by S—(9, 10) of ّ and ّ—ّ farther out than ّ—ّ a little farther in than ّ—difference in positions of ّ and ّ demonstrated by language of IH—criticism of some of his commentators thus rebutted—
(11) of ط، 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، د، and ت—these eighteen letters, from outlets (4-13), lingual—(14) of ف—(15) of ب، م، and و—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—ل 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) ل of Imāla—named ا لَف
meaning of broad | — broad ل mentioned by IH—not broad | —
latter how pronounced—found in what *dial.* —how written in Codex and elsewhere—(4)
ل like ج —same as ج like ش —approved by S—(5) ص like j —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 second-
ary—(1) ك like ج —(2) ج like ج —
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) ص like س —approxi-
mation of ص to س not so good as substitu-
ton of for س —(6) ط like ت —(7) ط
like ن —often heard from
foreigners, and of two kinds—these 8
hybrids used by Arabs who have mixed
with foreigners—or by the progeny of Arab
fathers and foreign mothers—additional
secondaries—(1) ق between ق and ك —
(2) ج like j —(3) ش like j —(4) ع like
like ى —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 as compared with and —(b) "ascending" or "descending"—from alternative meanings of —
this letter also called "sonant"—(18)
gabbled—why so named—reason given by
IH—said in CHd to be 寤，not نَرَـد و—and نَرَـد و—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) inter-
change in rhyme—ءَلَا—cause of incor-
poration—pronunciation without it com-
parable 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—
and وَسِمَت .

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

1740—1744

1744—1748
(a) if both be mobile, incorporation disallowed if it produce confusion—allowed if it do not—(b) if first be quiescent, incorporation, (a) if it produce confusion, disallowed if approximation be incomplete—allowed if it be complete—

and no paradigm containing quiescent ن before أ or ل أ

and صنوان، ونما، etc.—(b) if it do not produce confusion, necessary—Khl on إباإس ورجل—S on رجل and another preventive of incorporation in دد

—pret. from مودة not ددت—but ددت.

§. 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 خشخش into approximates—special qualities of these letters—cause of disallowance—letters of خشخش not incorporated into approximates,
but approximates into them— and ی incorporated, one into the other— سید and لیة—IH's explanation of incorporation here—R's criticism on it—incorporation of ض into ش, of ی into ل, and of ب into ب, transmitted from Readers—meaning of "incorporation" here—practice of کس and فر—and of یا—(2) sibilants into other letters—what they are incorporated into—(3) covered letters into others, without covering—ب.ج. 4—(4) guttural letter into more guttural—incorporation of, and into, gutturals—of approximate gutturals—م.د. and د.د.م.ر.د.—criticism on statement of fourth case—incorporation of (1) ن into ض—(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 ی not incorporated—process more suited to Hamza—Hamza not incorporated into its like, except in two cases—nor into any other letter, except after alleviation—nor any other letter into it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 739.</th>
<th>not incorporated into like or approximate—reason for its incapacity—alternative reason—nor incorporated into.</th>
<th>PAGE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1759—1760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| § 740. | Letters that are incorporated into their approximates—$^\#$ into $\mathbb{H}$ after or before it—separation better, and incorporation good—but not $\mathbb{H}$ into $^\#$—separation better—nor $^\#$ into $\mathbb{H}$—only its like incorporated into it—no approximate. | 1760—1761 |

| § 741. | $\mathbb{H}$ incorporated into (1) its like—(2) $\mathbb{H}$ after or before it—incorporation or separation good in former case—conversion of $\mathbb{H}$ into $\mathbb{H}$ good in former case, allowable in latter—$\mathbb{H}$ not incorporated into $\mathbb{H}$, except after conversion of $\mathbb{H}$ into $\mathbb{H}$—instance transmitted with conversion of $\mathbb{H}$ into $\mathbb{H}$—(3) $^\#$, after conversion of both into $\mathbb{H}$ $^\#$, $\mathbb{H}$—dispute as to allowability of that when $\mathbb{H}$ is preceded by $^\#$—only its like incorporated into it—no approximate—treatment of $\mathbb{H}$ and $^\#$ when combined—frequent among Banû Tamîm. | 1761—1765 |

| § 742. | $\mathbb{H}$ incorporated into (1) its like—no difficulty in that—(2, 3) $^\#$ and $\mathbb{H}$—not into $\mathbb{H}$ or $\mathbb{H}$—but into $^\#$ and $\mathbb{H}$, by converting them | 1765—1766 |
### § 743. \(\ddot{\varepsilon}\) and \(\varepsilon\) incorporated, each into (1) its like—no difficulty in that—concurrence of \(\ddot{\varepsilon}\) s or \(\varepsilon\) s in Kur—(2) its fellow—why \(\ddot{\varepsilon}\) into \(\varepsilon\)—separation better, but incorporation good—and preferred by Mb—why \(\ddot{\varepsilon}\) into \(\varepsilon\)—separation better—incorporation good—superiority of separation proved—incorporation of higher into lower why allowable here—and not in \(\ddot{\varepsilon}\) and \(\varepsilon\)—dispute as to incorporation of \(\ddot{\varepsilon}\) and \(\varepsilon\) into \(\ddot{\varepsilon}\) and \(\varepsilon\).

### § 744. Letters of the mouth—\(\mathfrak{q}\) and \(\mathfrak{k}\)—like \(\ddot{\varepsilon}\) and \(\varepsilon\)—incorporation of (1) each into its like—no difficulty here—(2) \(\mathfrak{q}\) into \(\mathfrak{k}\)—incorporation or separation good—reasons for incorporation—(3) \(\mathfrak{k}\) into \(\mathfrak{q}\)—incorporation good, but separation better—why better.

### § 745. \(\mathfrak{s}\) incorporated into (1) its like—no difficulty in that—no concurrence of \(\mathfrak{s}\) s in Kur—(2) \(\varepsilon\) —incorporation or separation good—no other letter mentioned by \(\mathfrak{s}\)—but \(\mathfrak{s}\) by AlYazidi—letters incorporated into \(\mathfrak{s}\).
| §. 746. | incorporated only into its like—no concurrence of š  in Kur—not into any of its approximates—reported incorporation of š  into  and š into š  —not practised by BB—who disallow both—letters incorporated into it. |
| §. 747. | incorporated into its like, (1) attached—(2) quasi-attached—(3) detached, when first is preceded by Fatha—not Kasra—difference between the two cases—three letters incorporated into it—(1) its like—(2)  —, and  adjacent—incorporated, one into the other, whether  be first—or second—exs. of latter—(3) ن  —because treated like letters of prolongation and softness. |
| §. 748. | incorporated only into its like—incorporation into  reported—but not free from flaw—adversely criticized—why allowed—not followed in other passages of Kur—IV's opinion of it—letters incorporated into —why these—and not  . |
| §. 749. | incorporated, (1) if determinative, necessarily into (a) its like—(b) thirteen other letters—their characteristics—causes of its |
incorporation into them—(2) if not determinative, necessarily into —allowably into remaining twelve—or allowably into all thirteen, its incorporation being good into ، bad into ن، and middling into remainder —exs. in verse—and in readings of Kur—such incorporation how graduated by R—only its like and ن incorporated into it—not ر —ُبَل* and بُلَّ —why so written.

§. 750. not mentioned by IH—incorporated only into its like—not into any other letter—its incorporation into ل disputed—disallowed by S and his school—reported as practised by Ya'kūb and IA1—allowed by Ks and Fr —hardly known among Readers later than IA1—ل and ن incorporated into ر.

§. 751. Quiescent ن، including Tanwin, (1) incorporated into letters of —necessarily—with some exceptions—cause of incorporation— —or only preferably into all but ن —(a) with nasality into letters of —restriction on incorporation into م ، and ، —(b) without nasality into ل and ، — reason for removal, or retention, of nasality—IH's reply to objection against removal
of nasality—R's criticism on it—his analysis of ٛ's predicaments with (a) ل، ٛ، ٛ، and ٛ—(b) ب—(c) other non-gutturals—(d) gutturals—retention of nasality with ٛ and ٛ—chaster than removal—existence of nasality in ٛ itself—retention of nasality by some Arabs with ل and ٛ، and omission by some with ٛ and ٛ—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 ٛ and خ—(3) converted into ٛ before ب—in one word or two—motive for conversion—(4) stifled with fifteen remaining letters—reason for stifling—mnemonic phrase ٛ ٛ ٛ ٛ ٛ why omitted—states of ٛ with reference to approximateness, or remoteness, of following letter—separation with letters of mouth a solecism—necessity of display with gutturals deducible from IH's language—ٛ 's states reckoned as five—mobile ٛ allowably incorporated into letters of ٛ ٛ ٛ ٛ ٛ—one of its predicament before fifteen letters mentioned in case (4)—quiescent letter nearer to what follows it than mobile.
§ 752. Letters of tip of tongue and central incisors 
\( \text{ذ، ط، ث} \), and \( \text{س، ط، ث} \) incorporated, 
(1) one into another—(2) all into \( \text{ص، ز} \), and 
why mentioned 
before \( \text{ص، ز} \), and \( \text{س} \)—restriction on incor-
poration of sibilants—what \( \text{ت} \) meant 
here—incorporation of first six letters exem-
plified—covering more chastely retained on 
incorporation of covered into uncovered 
letter—IH’s wavering as to whether incor-
poration be then genuine—his argument— 
analysis of his language—his conclusion— 
icorporation into \( \text{ت} \) when an attached \( \text{nom.} \) 
pron.—(3) all into \( \text{ض} \) and \( \text{ش} \)—this incor-
poration why allowable—more valid into \( \text{ض} \) 
than into \( \text{ش} \)—(4) \( \text{ت} \) into \( \text{چ} \) in reading— 
\( \text{ص، ز} \), and \( \text{س} \) incorporated, one into 
another—more often than \( \text{ط، ذ} \), 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 \( \text{پ} \) ano-
malous—but \( \text{پ} \) incorporated into it.

§ 754. \( \text{پ} \) incorporated into (1) its like—(2) \( \text{ف} \) and 
\( \text{م} \)—IAI’s practice—his principle—allow-
ability 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—ن 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 —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 ف—but converse allowable with ت—incorporation omissible, except with ط and د — then ت (a) converted into ط after ض, and ط and ت — and into د after د and ض — (b) unaltered after س and ت — necessity for incorporation or conversion, except with ت and س—incorporation by conversion of ط into ط, and د into د — and even ض into ت of فُتَعَل converted after nine letters — into (1) ط after ض, 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 也在 reason for this substitution—then,
(a) after 、 incorporation necessary—(b)
after 、 display allowable—and incorpora-
tion by conversion of second into first—(c)
after 、 display allowable—and incorporation
in both its modes— 与 之 rare—(1) and (2)
the only changes of this က mentioned here
by IM—(3) က after က က or က converted
into က separation good—dispute about
separation—(4) က after က second why
converted into first—separation good—most
prevalent forms with က က က က and က
—(2) က and က, (3) က, and (4) က—
change of က into က after က—and of က into
—attached of က converted into (1)
က after က, က, and က—(2) က after က,
 cil, and က—of pron. here assimilated to
 က—reason for assimilation—con-
sequent conversion—incorporation with က,
 cil, and က—incorporation of က, က, and က—more frequent with attached than
with detached က—and separation better
with latter က than with former—conversion
more frequent in က of က က က than in က of
pron.—better not to convert the latter—its
conversion said to be anomalous—
not incorporated into—even if
be mobile—reason in latter case.

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

for 

d and not convertible one into the other—nor congrous in quality—each therefore converted into 

—incorporation the practice of Tamim—but not regular —

dial. vars.—

anomalous—

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 

with aoristic 

both 

elision of one—condition of this elision—

which 

elided—rule for elision—

, and 

—elision of 

—disposal of its vowel if 

be (a) quiescent—(b) mobile—object of Kasr or Damm of 

elision more frequent in pret. than in aor.

or imp.—

, and 

used—

elided variously said to be 

or 

vowel of 

—similarly 

, etc.—meaning of
dial. vars.—universality of this elision disputed—أَحْسَنْ، أَحْسَتْ، etc.—أَحْسَنْهُمْ
forms allowable in aor. and imp.—no elision when ع is pronounced with Fath—قُرْنَ rare—other expla-
nations of أَفْضَمْثُ عُفْضَ قُرْنَ for (3)
Aَفْضُمُثُ عُفْضَ، aor. يُسْطِعُ عُسْطَعَ، aor.
Eِسْطَعَ، aor. يُسْطِعُ عُسْطَعَ، aor.
Eِسْطَعَ، aor. يُسْطِعُ عُسْطَعَ
elision when approximates or likes are in separate words—exs.—بَذُو ن of cl elided
before ل of art.—after elision of unsound letter—regularly in names of clans where ل is not incorporated—لَمْ يَبْعَضْ، لَمْ يَبْعَضْ، لَمْ يَبْعَضْ، لَمْ يَبْعَضْ
and لَعَلَّهُ لَعَلَّهُ لَعَلَّهُ لَعَلَّهُ
here elided, after elision of ل، before ل of art.—exs.—foregoing elisions due to imposs-
ibility of incorporation—but all irregular—يَتَسَجَّعُ، يَتَسَجَّعُ، يَتَسَجَّعُ، يَتَسَجَّعُ
and anomalous—reason for elision here—تَتَسْخَدُ—تَتَسْخَدُ—تَتَسْخَدُ—تَتَسْخَدُ not of this class—first
celided in three words—from frequency of
usage—their act. parts.—and prets. — their — aor. — dispute about — and 
more anomalous—how explained 
by S—not orig. — but — why 
"more anomalous"—elision and retention 
of of protection.

APPENDIX.—Specimens of Parsing.

No. 1. — hypercatalectic Tanwin.

2. for pl. of 


4. Affixion of sign of pl. to v. when attribute of explicit n. in pl.

5. Prep. and gen. made pro-ag. notwithstanding presence of direct obj.

6. Allowability of for , and part particularity of in .

7. Suppression of pron. expressing obj. required by second of two ops. in case of contest in government.

8. Suppression of op. of unrestricted obj. necessary when inf. n. occurring as such obj. acts as substitute for its op.
**No. 9.** Government of *pron.* in *gen.* by حَقّي.

"10. Analysis of حَقّي in wonder. Proof that حَقّي is a *v.*, and حَقّي suppressible when indicated.

"11. Occurrence of *ag.* latent in نَعْم as vague *pron.* expounded by posterior *indet.* governed in *acc.* as *sp.*

"12. *s* of silence affixed, by poetic license, to lamented in continuity.

"13. Mood of *aor.* in *apod.* when *v.* of *prot.* is a *lit.* or *id.* *pret.*


"15. Transformation of َل into َل in نَمَاء (for نَمَاء) *pl.* of ُنَمَاء (for نَمَاء).

---

**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 إِنَّهُ تَقَدَّمَ [497, 623] and for قَدْ نَعَلَ and the I and L when trying to remember أَلْكَارِتُ and the like;" and he says, "We have heard a trustworthy person say حَدَّا سِيفْيَنِي, meaning This is a sword of such and such a quality, [when trying to remembers its ep.] (M). This augment is not followed by the s of silence, contrary to the augment of disapproval [622], because this is added only when pause is not intended (R).
PART THE FOURTH.

THE PROCESSES COMMON TO TWO OR THREE PARTS OF SPEECH.

CHAPTER I.

THE COMMON PROCESSES IN GENERAL.

§ 625. This Fourth Part is the last part of the book. And Z names it "Common" because it is common to the three kinds [of word], i.e., the n., the v., and the p.; or to two of them (IY). The common [processes] are such as Imāla, pause, alleviation of the Hamza, concurrence of two quiescents, and the like, in which the three kinds [of word], or two of them, appear together (M). For Imāla is found in the n. and v. [626], and sometimes in the p. also [639]; and similarly pause is found in the n., v., and p. [640]; and so are alleviation of the Hamza and concurrence of two quiescents, as will be related in its place [658, 663] (IY). Etymology is one of the elements of grammar, without dispute. The moderns hold that etymology is the science of the formations of words; and of the properties of their letters, such as radicalness or augmentativeness, elision, soundness or unsoundness, incorporation and Imāla; and of the accidents, not being inflection or uninflectedness
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 "ety-mology" (A). The clause "not being inflection [or uninfl.]" excludes the science of syntax in [all] its parts, i. e., the investigation of the *inf.* and *uninf.* (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 uninfl. (R).
§. 626. It is common to the n. and v. [625, 639] (M). It is the inf. n. of اَمَالَ الْشَّيْءُ deflected the thing, inf. n. إِمَالٌ 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 ḫ, the latter is taken towards ẓ, [becoming intermediate between ẓ and ẓ (Tsr),] as in َََألْفَتَيِ [below] (Aud), with Imāla of the Fatha and ẓ (Tsr); and if [the Fatha be (Tsr)] not [followed by an ḫ (Tsr)], what is pronounced with Imāla is the Fatha alone, [whether the Fatha be before the s of feminization, or not (Tsr),] as in لِفْمَة [638] and بِسُكِّرَ LIV. 34. [64] (Aud). Imāla is of three sorts, deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra before (1) the ḫ, which is then deflected towards ẓ [626-637]; (2) the s, as in رَحْمَة [638]; (3) the r, as in كِبَرِ [638]: so that "deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra" includes the three sorts; while the deflection of
the † towards ی is necessitated by the deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra, because the pure † is found only after the pure Fatha, and the † is necessarily deflected towards ی in proportion to the deflection of the Fatha towards Kasra. Imāla is not the dial. of all the Arabs (R). The people of AlḤijāz [below] do not practise Imāla (R, Tsr), except in a few cases. Those who practise it are Tamīm, Kais, Asad, and the generality of Najd (Tsr); while the tribe most addicted to it are the Banū Tamīm (R). It is also named َكُسْر pronunciation with Kasr, َبَطْح flattening, and َإِصْحَابَة lowering, depressing (A).
The utility of it is consonance of sounds (Tsr). But everything pronounced with Imāla may be sounded full, because this is the o. f., since the original pronunciation of a letter is that its sound should not be blended with the sound of any other (Jrb, Tsr): so says Jrb (Tsr). Imāla has causes [below] that exact it, preventives [632] that counteract those causes, and a preventive of these preventives [634], that intervenes between it and prevention (Aud). Its causes are of two kinds, (1) lit., vid. the ی and Kasra; (2) id., vid. indication of a ی or Kasra (A). The causes are eight, (1) the †’s being substituted for a final ی, as in آَلْهَدِی [629] and اِلْفَتْی among ns., and یَشْتَرِی among vs.; while such as َنَأْ [630], though its † is [substituted (Tsr)] for a ی, as
is proved by [its broken pl. (Tsr) Ṭa‘ībāb] [242], is not pronounced with Imāla, for lack of finality: whereas such as [fem. of qatā‘a (Tsr)] is pronounced with Imāla, because the s of feminization is constructively separate [266] (Aud); so that the f, if not literally, is constructively final (Tsr): (2) the f's being replaced by ی in some variations [of the word], like the f of مَلْهَي م, [where the f is a subst. for ٖ (Tsr)]; of أَرْطَيَّ, [where ی is an aug. added for co-ordination (Tsr)]; of حُبْلَى, [where it is an aug. added for feminization (Tsr)]; and of عُرَا, [where it is a subst. for a ی in vs. (Tsr)]: so that these [exs. (Tsr)] and the like are pronounced with Imāla, [because the f in them is replaced by ی in some variations, like the du. and pl. among ns., and the pass. among vs. (Tsr),] as in the du. أَرْطَيْيَّ, [629] مَلْهَي م, and حُبْلَى [229]; the pl. [أَرْطَيْيَّات , مَلْهَي مات, and (Tsr)] حُبْلَات [234]; and the pass. غَرِي [629, 719]: (a) according to this [last (Tsr)], the saying of IM [in the Alfiya and elsewhere (Tsr)] that the Imāla in the f of تَلَا XCI. 2. [538] is for correspondence with the Imāla in the f of جَلَّهَا 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 f of سَبِّي XCIII. 2. is for
correspondence with the Imāla in the١ ٢٩[3. ٥٣] are dubious; may, the Imāla in both cases is because of [the pass. (Tsr)] and سَيْكَي ١ ٢٩[and (b) those [words] in which the conversion of the ١ into ی is (a) peculiar to an anomalous dial., like the conversion of the ١ of عضًا and تَفْعَّل١[6٥٩] into ی in the saying of Hudhail, when they prefix these ١٦. to the ی of the ١st pers., عضًا and تَفْعَّل١[1٦٩٩], or (b) caused by amalgamation of the ١ with an aug. letter, like the conversion of the ١ of عضًا and تَفْعَّل١ into ی in the dim., as عضًا and تَفْعَّل١[2٥٠], or in the pl. on the measure of عضًا and تَفْعَّل١[2٦٦], are excepted from [the operation of] that [cause] (Aud) mentioned, vid. “the ١’s being replaced by ی in some variations”; so that none of those [words] is pronounced with Imāla (Tsr): (3) the ١’s being substituted for the ع of that تَفْعَّل١ which, on being attributed to the ت [of the pron. (Tsr)], is reduced to ١ ٥٢[بَعْل] with Kasr of the ف [and elision of the ع (Tsr)], whether that ١ be converted from (a) ی [pronounced with Fath or Kasr, the first (Tsr)] as in لَب and ١ ٥٢[بَعْل], and [the second as in (Tsr)] ١ ٥٢[بَعْل] ; or (b) ی pronounced with Kasr, as in ٥٢[خاف١[6٦٠] and ١ ٥٢[بَعْل] in the dial. of all (Tsr),] and ١ ٥٢[بَعْل] in the dial. of those who say ١ ٥٢[بَعْل] with Kasr [٤٨٢]: contrary to [the ١ converted
from a, pronounced with Fath or Damm, as in (Tsr)] such as [in the dial. of all (Tsr),] and مَلاّ in the dial. of Damm (Aud); so that these are not pronounced with Imāla, because you say طلَّتُ and مُتَّ, with Damm of the 퐪, by transfer in طلَّتُ, and according to the o. f. in طلَّتُ [403, 482, 484] (Tsr): (4) the 's occurring [immediately (Tsr)] before a ی [pronounced with Fath (Tsr)], as in بَيَعَتُهُ 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 ی" (Tsr): (5) the 's occurring after a ی, (a) adjoining [it, with no barrier between them (Tsr)], as in بُيَانُ [with a single ی, and بَيَّاعُ with a double ی], except that the Imāla with the double ی is stronger, because of the repetition of the cause (Tsr): (b) separated [from it (Tsr)] by (a) one letter, as in جَادَتُ يِداهُ شَيبانُ [628] and His two hands were bountiful [the Imāla in the first being stronger, because the lowness of the sound is more apparent in the quiescent ی than in the mobile, on account of the nearness of the former to the letter of prolongation (Tsr): (b) two letters, one, [or, in the language of the Tashil, the second (Tsr),] of which is a س, as in دَحَّكَتُ بيتهُا She entered her house (Aud), provided that the ی and س be
not separated by a letter pronounced with Damm, as in
Her house was wide: so says the author of
the Aud in the Glosses (Tsr): separation by the s is
pardon because the s, by reason of its faintness, is
not reckoned a barrier: but IM here, and likewise in
the Kāfiya, does not impose the restriction that the s
should be second; and apparently Imāla is allowable in
These are thy two little sheep, because separation by the s is like no separation, and, when the
s is dropped out of consideration, šabītan is equal to
(A): (6) the i's occurring [immediately (Tsr)]
before a [letter pronounced with] Kasra as in عالِيم [628]
and كَبْر: (7) the i's occurring after a Kasra [627]: (8)
desire for correspondence, [when no other cause exists
(Tsr),] as in (a) رَأَيَت عِبَادًا {631} (Aud), where the first i
is pronounced with Imāla because it occurs after a Kasra
separated from it by one letter, vid. the م; and the
second i, converted from the Tanwīn, is pronounced
with Imāla for correspondence with the first (Tsr):
and (b) the reading رَأَيَت سَكَيْي XCIII. 1. By the forenoon,
where the i, though [converted (Tsr)] from the of
فَكْرَة, is pronounced with Imāla for correspondence
with سَكَيْي XCIII. 2., تَلِي XCIII. 3. [above], and what
follows them (Aud'), because observance of correspondence
70 a
in the terminations of the versicles is an important object, according to them (Tsr): (a) such Imāla is named "Imāla on account of Imāla", and "Imāla on account of the vicinity of the [i (Sn)] pronounced with Imāla"; and is mentioned last because of its weakness in comparison with the preceding causes: (b) the Imāla of the i on account of correspondence has two phases, (a) that it should be on account of the vicinity of an i so pronounced, like the Imāla of the second i in رَأِيَتُ عَمَادًا [above], which is for correspondence with the first i; (b) that it should be on account of the i's being the final of a phrase adjacent to a phrase whose final is pronounced with Imāla, like the Imāla of the i of تَلا in XCI. 2. [above], which is for correspondence with what follows it, i.e., جَلاَها XCI. 3. [538] and يَغَشَاهَا XCI. 4. [637], according to the opinion of others than S, vid. Mb and a party (A); (c) the i that has no cause [of Imāla] in it, (a) if preceded by the i pronounced with Imāla on account of one of the causes aforesaid, is pronounced with Imāla, as in عَمَادًا [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 رَأِيَتُ عَمَادًا [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 ٰ with Imāla on account of Kasra, while they and many of the Arabs do not pronounce [the ٰ] with Imāla on account of the ی; [so that those who pronounce the ٰ 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 ٰ [626] takes effect only when it precedes the ٰ by (1) one letter, as in عَمَدْ tent-pole: (2) two letters, the first of which is quiescent, as in شِمَالْ [385] (M), because the quiescent is not minded, and is not a strong barrier, so that شِمَالْ becomes like شِمَالْ; and similarly in إِنَّا لِلّهِ وَإِنَّا إِلَيْهِ راجِعُونَ 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 ٰ] by two mobile letters, as in ُأَكِلْتُ عَبْنَا I ate grapes, or by three letters, as in تُتْلِتْ قَنَبَا 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 

\[ \text{He means to strike her} \] \hfill \text{He is with her} \hfill \text{He has two dirhams} \hfill \text{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, \( y\text{ضریبْها} \) becomes like \( y\text{ضریب} \) (IY). For, when the \( s \) drops out of consideration, \( y\text{ضریبْها} \) is equal to such as \( \text{كتاب} \) and \( \text{عند} \) and \( \text{شمال} \) or \( \text{شمال} \) \hfill \text{to such as} \] \hfill \text{above} \] (A). But the exemplification by such as \( y\text{ضریب} \) requires consideration, because its Imāla may be on account of the \( n \) 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 \text{pre. to the} \( n \). IH and others mention that the Imāla of such as \( y\text{ضریب} \) is anomalous; but F, in the Ḳdāḥ, does not mention that the Imāla of \( y\text{ضریب} \) is anomalous, notwithstanding his explicit attribution of the Imāla to the preceding Kasra, not to the Kasra of the \( n \) of the \( d\text{u.} \) (Tsr). When the letter before the \( s \) that is immediately followed by the \( I \) is pronounced with Damma, as in \( y\text{ضریبْها} \), 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 łamm (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. [639], as in أَدُّرْ مِنْهَا and لَمْ يَصِبْهَا, 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 لِدَيْدِ 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 ما with Imāla on account of a detached ى”, the Kasra being excluded because it is stronger, as before mentioned, than the ى [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 درَسْتُ عِلْمًا I studied science and رَأَىْتُ زِيدًا I saw Zaid (M), with Imāla, like ٢٣٥ [627]
and ُشِيبان [626] respectively (IY); and the accidental Kasra [of inflection after the (IY)] like the original [Kasra of the ع of فاعل (IY)], as مرتُ بِباية I passed by his door and أخذت من ماله I took of his goods or camels (M): except that the Imāla in such as [عالُ or] سالم [626] and عيان [627] is stronger than the Imāla here, because the Kasra there is inseparable; while in ماله and باية it is accidental, disappearing in the nom. and acc., where there is no Imāla, as there is none in آجر تَابَل [247] (IY).

§. 629. The final ل 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 ی, as in ۹مي and تضِي: and allowable, though inelegant, if it be converted from a ی and دُعا غِرا, because, when this formation is transported by the Hamza to فَعَل [488], its ی becomes a ی, as ۹غمَيت ۹غميِت and ۹دميِت and ۹دميت with Imāla; and also because, when it is turned into a pass., its ی becomes a ی, as غَرِي و دُعِي [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 ی, is pronounced
with Imāla, which is good, as in [626] and ^حَلَّى (IY), if not recognized as converted from a ی, is not pronounced with Imāla when third (M), as in ُعَصَّا and ُقَفَا [626] (IY); but is [preferably (IY)] pronounced with Imāla when fourth (M), whether it be (1) ُل, as in *لَهُوتُ مَلْهَى, where the ی appears in the du. ُهَيِّرَى [626, 727]; or (2) an aug., added (a) for feminization, as in حُبْلَى, where the ی is converted into ی in the du. حُبْلِيَّاتٍ [626]; or (b) for co-ordination, as in أَرْطَيْانِ [626] (IY). But أَرْطَيْانِ [626] (IY), [which is a n. of three letters, from the , ُو (IY),] is pronounced with Imāla only because of their saying [in the sing.] أَلْعَلِيَّا [725] (M): for the ی in أَلْعَلِيَّا is that very ی which is in أَلْعَلِيَّا, but is converted into ی in the pl. on the measure of أَلْفُ وَأَلْفُ on the measure of أَلْكُبَرْى from أَلْكُبَرْى [248] (IY).

§. 630. The intermediate [ُل (IY)], if it be [an (IY)] in a v. wherein ُفَعَّلْت is said, like طَابَ مَلَّا, aor. يِمَاتَ (IY), is pronounced with Imāla [626] (M), as in the reading لِمَّن حَافَ مَقَامِي XIV. 17. For him that feareth My judgment-seat, because the letter before the ی [in طَابَ and حَافَ and مَلَّا] is pronounced with Kasr in
and \( \hat{\text{IY}} \): and what the \( \hat{\text{I}} \) is converted from is not regarded (M), except that \( \text{Imāla} \) is better in that [v.] which belongs to the cat. of the \( \text{i} \), [like \( \text{tāb} \) and \( \text{bāq} \),] because it contains two causes, its being of the cat. of the \( \text{i} \), and its [\( \text{f} \)'s] being pronounced with Kasr in [\( \text{tāb} \) and \( \text{bāq} \)]; whereas those [\( \text{v}s. \)] which belong to the cat. of the \( \text{i} \) contain only one cause, the Kasr alone (IY). Opinions differ as to the cause of the \( \text{Imāla} \) in such as \( \text{hiāf} \) and \( \text{tāb} \): Sf and others say that it is because of the accidental Kasra of the \( \text{f} \) [in some variations (Sn)] of the word; and this is apparently the language of F, who says "They pronounce \( \text{hiāf} \) and \( \text{tāb} \) with \( \text{Imāla} \), notwithstanding the elevated [letter, i.e. the \( \text{i} \) and the \( \hat{\text{x}} \) (632) (Sn)], from desire for [indication of (Sn)] the Kasra in \( \text{hiāf} \) [and \( \text{tāb} \) (Sn)]: but IHKh says "The better opinion is that the \( \text{Imāla} \) in \( \text{tāb} \) is because the \( \text{i} \) in it is converted from a \( \text{i} \), and in \( \text{hiāf} \) because the \( \text{i} \) is pronounced with Kasr: they wish for indication of the \( \text{i} \) and Kasra, respectively" (A). But, if the intermediate \( \hat{\text{i}} \) be in a n., what it is converted from is regarded: so that \( \text{dab} \) [626] is said, [and \( \text{uāb} \) i.q. \( \text{ūyīb} \), because they belong to the cat. of the \( \text{i} \) (IY)]; but not \( \text{dab} \)
[635] (M), nor ٌکُر, since the ٌع is a (IY). The language of IM implies that the ٌ substituted for the ٌع of the ِن. is not pronounced with Imāla, unrestrictedly, [i.e., whether it be converted from ٌس or ٌس (Sn)]: but the author of the M distinguishes between what is converted from ٌس, as in ٌبٌع ٌعاب and ٌعاب ٌعاب i. q. ٌعَبٌِبٌب, where he allows Imāla; and what is converted from ٌس, as in ٌبٌع ٌعاب and ٌدْر, where he does not allow it: while some distinctly declare that Imāla of the ٌ converted from ٌس, when an ٌع in a tril. ِن., is anomalous; and this is apparently the language of S (A).

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

§. 632. The letter of elevation [734], as likewise the ٌ (not pronounced with Kasr (IA)), restrains [the cause of (A) Imāla (IA, A) from taking effect (A), when the cause is (IA, A)] an expressed Kasra or [an existing (IA)] ٌس [below] (IM). For the letters of elevation are elevated towards the palate; so that, with them, the ٌ is not pronounced with Imāla, from desire for homogeneity [of sound (Tsr)]: while the ٌع, [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 ق, and the (Aud), which are the initials of these [mnemonic] words تُدْ صَادَ تصَادْ غَلَامُ حَالِيَ ُطُلُحَةُ 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 ى, 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 "عَرْبِيَانِ" and ٰطَغِبانِ, [where the letter of elevation and the
These are thy wells, where the letter of elevation and the ج, follow the ل (Sn) : and AH says "We have not found that", meaning, restraint of the ج by the letter of elevation or the ج ; "but it prevents with the Kasra alone" (A). This necessarily implies that the ج is stronger than the Kasra; whereas the preferable opinion, as before stated [626], is the converse; and possibly it is this that induces IM to add the ج (Sn). The condition of the Imāla restrained by the preventive is that its cause should not be a supplied Kasra, [as in جاف, the ل of which is converted from a ج, pronounced with Kasr (Tsr)]; or a supplied ج, [as in طاب, the ل of which is converted from a ج (Tsr)]: for here the supplied cause, being present in the ل itself, is stronger than the expressed [cause (Tsr)], which either precedes the ل, [as in بایع كتِاب (Tsr)]; or follows it, [as in جالِم جاف and طاب (Tsr)]: and for this reason such as جاف and طاب and لغ are pronounced with Imāla (Aud), notwithstanding that the letter of elevation precedes [the ل ] in جاف and طاب, and follows [it] in حاف and لغ (Tsr). The elevated [letter] restrains the Imāla of only the ن., exclusively: Jz says "The elevated [letter] prevents Imāla of the ل in the ن.; but not in the و, as طاب and
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as in خبَلٌ طلَبٌ; unless the letter of elevation be (a) pronounced with Kasr, as in خبَلٌ طلَبٌ, which they pronounce with Imāla (Aud), because the Kasra is constructively after the letter [of elevation], so that consonance of the sound of the ی with the Kasra is more appropriate, [since it avoids a rise in pitch after a fall] (Tsr); (b) quiescent after a Kasra, as in مُصَبَّحٍ , [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 ی is that it should be (1) contiguous to the ی, as in سَفَحٍ قَصِّدٍ [633]: (2) separated [from it (Tsr)] by (a) one letter, as in [633]; (b) two letters, as in مَنَاسِبَةٍ [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 ی is stronger than prevention by the [letter of elevation] preceding [the ی]; and, for that reason, the [letter of elevation] preceding [the ی] 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
\[\text{by two letters; while the [letter of elevation] following [the !] is unrestricted [in these respects]. That is because a rise [in pitch] after a fall is more difficult, in their estimation, than a fall after a rise (Tsr).}\]

§ 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 مَرَتُ بِفَاصِلٍ Kāsim is one of us, like I passed by a learned man [632]: (2) separated from it by (a) one letter, as in دَمَالُ تَأْسِمُ by the camels of Kāsim [below], like بِنَاعِيِّ In her hand is a whip, like مَنَاشِيطُ [632] (Tsr). S says (M), We have heard them say أُرَابُ أَن يُضْرِبَهَا زِيَدُ Zaid meant to strike her [627], pronouncing [the ! in ] with Imāla [because of the Kasra before it (IY)]; but أُرَابُ أَن يُضْرِبَهَا زِيَدُ He desired to strike her before, pronouncing with Fath, [notwithstanding the Kasra of the ] because of [the preventive, vid. (IY)] the ق (S, M) in تَّبْلُ (IY); and [similarly (M)] مَرَتُ بِمَالُ تَأْسِمُ [above] and بِمَالٍ مَلِقُ by the camels of Malik (S, M) and بِمَالٍ يَنْقُلُ by the camels of Yankul, all with Fath, because of the ق, being assimilated to تَأْسِمُ [632] (S). But some distinguish
between the attached and detached, saying َٰٓأَتْئَنَّ قَاسِم ُبِهِمْلَ تَأْسِيْم ُبِهِمْلَ with Imāla (S, IY), as though they did not mind the elevated [letter], since it belongs to another word (IY). The preventive of Imāla takes effect [even (Tsr)] if it be detached; but the cause of Imāla does not take effect except when attached (Aud), the distinction being that the preventive is stronger than the cause (Tsr). Therefore such as َٰٓأَتْئَنَّ قَاسِم Kasim came is not pronounced with Imāla, because of the presence of the ق, [even though it is in another word (Tsr)]; nor لِرَبْنَى مَال Zaid has camels, because of the detachment of the cause (Aud), since the ل is in one word, and the Kasra in another (Tsr). This is a summary of the language of IM [in the CK (Tsr)], and of his son (Aud) in the C (Tsr). But they are subject to objection in two respects, (1) that they exemplify [the first rule] by َٰٓأَتْئَنَّ قَاسِم [above], notwithstanding their acknowledgment that the preventive does not take effect on the supplied ى [632], on which sort [of cause] the [letter of] elevation, if attached, would have no effect, [and à fortiori when detached (Tsr)]; while the good, [irreproachable (Tsr),] ex. is كِتَابُ قَاسِم the book of Kasim, [since the cause of Imāla is the expressed Kasra, which is restrained by the preventive, even though it is detached (Tsr)]: (2) that the precepts of the GG are opposed to both the rules
mentioned by these two [authors]:—IU says in his Mukarrab [fi-nNaḥw (HKh)], after mentioning the causes of Imāla, what is to this effect "whether the Kasra be attached or detached, as in لَزِيدٌ مال" [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 لَمَّالُ قَاسِمَ [above]; or in such of the ِs appended to the prons. as are pronounced with Imāla [639], as in أَرَادَ أَنْ يَعْرَفَهَا قَبْلَ He meant to know her before" (Aud), where Imāla of the ِ [in حَا] is prevented by the ق of يَعْرَفَهَا قَبْلَ after it, though the ق is detached [from يَعْرَفَهَا] (Tsr).

§ 634. The condition of prevention by the ر [632] consists of two matters, (1) its not being pronounced with Kasr [below]: (2) its being contiguous to the ِ, either before the ِ, [being then pronounced only with Fath (Tsr),] as in فَرَّشَ and رَأِشَ (Aud), where the ر prevents [the operation of] the cause preceding [the ِ] in the first [ex.], and following [it] in the second (Tsr); or after it, [being then pronounced with Damm or Fath (Tsr),] as in هَا جِبَارَ This is a he-ass and رَأَيْتُ جِبَارًا I saw a he-ass. But some treat the ر posterior [to the
This is an unbeliever, like the contiguous (Aud) in prevention of Imāla (Tsr). The preventive of the preventive [626] is the Ṣ pronounced with Kasr [above], in the immediate vicinity of the ʿ : for this prevents the elevated [letter (Tsr)] and the Ṣ from preventing (Aud) Imāla, because one characteristic of the Ṣ 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 ʿالَّي أَبْصَارُ يُمِينُ

II. 6. And upon their eyes and إِنَّ مَنْ عَمِّي فِي الْغَارِ 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 يَكُنْ أَلْدَّبْرَار LXXXIII. 18. [236, 598], notwithstanding the presence of the Ṣ pronounced with Fath [before the ʿ (Tsr)]; and دَارُ الْقَرَار XL. 42. The abode of stability, notwithstanding the presence of both (Aud) preventives, the elevated ʿ and the Ṣ pronounced with Fath. In all of that, the Ṣ pronounced with Kasr is contiguous [to the ʿ] (Tsr). But some treat the Ṣ [when] separated [from the ʿ (Tsr)] by one letter, like the contiguous [in prevention of the preventive (Tsr)]: S heard Imāla [of √تَأَدَّر (Tsr)] in the saying [of Hudba Ibn Khashram (S)]
May be God will compensate me for the lands of Ibn Kadir with pouring rain, black in clouds, running over the surface of the ground (Aud), notwithstanding that the primitive pronounced with Kasr is separated from the  by the  by the  by the Kasr. But those who say  are more numerous than those who say  because the  is a letter of elevation [632] (S). It is understood from the language of IM [and IHsh] that Imāla is [à fortiori (A)] allowable in such as  ; for, since the  is pronounced with Imāla, on account of the  pronounced with Kasr, notwithstanding that the requirer of abandonment of Imāla, vid. the letter of elevation or the  , not pronounced with Kasr, is present, with more reason should it be pronounced with Imāla when the requirer of such abandonment is absent (IA, A).

§ 635. Some mention two causes, other than the foregoing [626], for Imāla of the 1, (1) difference between the n. and the p. [639]; and that is in the 1 and similar letters in the initial monograms of the chapters [of the Kur]: S says "And they say  and  and  ", i.e., with Imāla, "because they are names of what is uttered", [i. e., the letters (Sn)]; so that they are not like  and  and  and other ps. uninfl. upon quiescence: (a) the
letters of the alphabet, that are at the beginnings of the chapters [of the Kur], if an I be at their end, are pronounced by some with Fath, [i.e., not with Imāla (Sn)], and by others with Imāla; but, if an I be in their middle, as in كَانَ صَادٌ, are pronounced with Fath, without dispute: (2) frequency of usage; and that is in (a) AlHajjāj [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 Kašra (Sn)]; and similarly Al‘Ajjāj, in the nom. and acc.: so some of the GG mention: (b) الدّالٌ السّال، in the nom. and acc.: IB says "‘Abd Allāh Ibn Dā‘ūd transmits from IA1 the Imāla of الدّالٌ السّال 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 AlHajjāj 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 بابُ a door are transmitted
from some of the Arabs (M), whose Arabic, says S, is to be trusted; as though they assimilated the ٓ in مال and باب to the ٓ of عبرا and دنا, treating the ع like the ل: but such pronunciation of مال and باب in the nom. and acc. is rare (IY). And they say ظالعشا [blindness by night (IY)], ظالبكا [hole of the fox or hare (IY)], and ظالابا [sweepings of the house (IY)], though these are from the ظ (M): the Imāla being introduced into them by assimilation to what is from the ى, because the ٓ is a ل; for alteration gains access to the ل, since you pronounce عبرا with Imāla [629], but not ظال [626] (IY). But, as for their saying ظالبا gain [in selling, though it is from the ظ, since they say in the du. ٓنوان (IY)], it is on account of [their saying ظيبان, treating it as from the ى, together with the Kasra of (IY)] the ر (M).

§. 636. Properly ظالعُ from the reduplicated, such as ظئاد serious and ظئار passer, pl. ضئر and ضئار, 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 ظئاد جئاد and ظئار جئار, [because the Kasra is supplied (IY),] from regard to the o. ٓ and جئار جئاد, as they pronounce جئاد with Imāla.
because it is constructively جَفْتُ, or because it is reducible to جَفْتُ, though there is no Kasra in the actual expression; and similarly (IY)] as they pronounce عندِكَ مَاتُ 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 وَأَلْشَمِس وَضَحَامًا XCI. 1. [538], where [analogy forbids Imāla, because (IY)] the ] in الضْحَكُ (IY)] is [converted] from the ، is pronounced with Imāla for conformity with جَلَامًا XCI. 3. [538] and يَغْشَامًا XCI. 4. It covereth it [626] (M), both of which are so pronounced because the ] in them is [converted] from the ی, since you say جَلِينَة I displayed it and, in the du., يَغْشَيْنِ. They two cover (IY).

§. 638. The Fatḥa is pronounced with Imāla before one of three letters, (1) the ] , which has been already discussed [626-637]: (2) the ُ , on condition that it be pronounced with Kasr, that the Fatḥa be on a letter other than ی , and that they, [ i. e., the Fatḥa and the ُ (Tsr),] be (a) contiguous, [with no barrier between the letter pronounced with Fatḥ and the ُ (Tsr),] as in XIX. 9. Of old age (Aud): (a) there is no difference between the Fatḥa’s being on a letter of
elevation, as in لمن الْبَقْر VI. 145. And of kine; or on a ر, as in بِضْر LXXVII. 32. With sparks; or on any other letter, as in XIX. 9. [above] (A, Tsr): (b) separated by a quiescent other than ى, as in مِنْ عَمَّر from 'Amr; [or, adds IUK, by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in أَعْرُ بَلَّلَهِ insolent (Tsr): contrary to such as مِنْ أَلْغيِرِ مِنْ تُبْحَ آلْسَيْرِ 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 خَبْرَك 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 رِمْم decayed bones; and that is positively stated by others than IM (A): (b) it is stipulated that the ر should not be followed by a letter of elevation, as in مِنْ آلْشَرِي 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

*from loss* is pronounced with *Imāla* (A, Tsr):

IUK says "Accuracy requires one to say that every
Fatha on a letter other than Ą is pronounced with *Imāla*
before a ſ pronounced with Kasr contiguous to it, or
separated [from it] by a letter pronounced with Kasr,
or by a quiescent other than Ą, when the ſ is not
followed by a letter of elevation" (Tsr): (d) IM's stipula-
tion of finality in the ſ is refuted by the positive
statement of S that they pronounce the Fatha of the Ï
in I saw leaves blown off by winds with
*Imāla* (Aud); while others mention that the Fatha of
the Ą in *hard* may be pronounced with *Imāla*, though
the ſ in that is not (A, Tsr) a ſ (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'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 Fatha on
account of the Kasra of a ſ after it, that they should be
in one word (Sn): (f) IM makes no restriction in his
saying "Pronounce ............. with *Imāla*" [above]; and
therefore it is known that the *Imāla* here is [used] in
continuity and pause, contrary to the *Imāla* mentioned.
below, which is peculiar to pause; and that is distinctly declared by him in the CK: (g) this Imāla is regular, as IM mentions in the CK: (h) S mentions that Imāla of the ِ in such as مِنْ الْبَكَاذِرِ from the feared is forbidden when the Fathā of the ُ is pronounced with Imāla: he says "But it is not strong enough to cause Imāla of the ِ", meaning that the Imāla of the Fathā is not strong enough to cause Imāla of the ِ on account of its Imāla [i. e., of the Imāla of the Fathā (Sn)]: but IKh asserts that those who pronounce the [second] ِ of عباد ِ with Imāla on account of the Imāla of the ِ before it [631] pronounce the ِ of الْبَكَاذِرِ here with Imāla on account of the Imāla of the Fathā of the ُ; which [assertion] is invalidated by the fact that Imāla on account of Imāla is one of the weak causes, so that none of it ought to be copied, except in the case of what has been heard, vid. Imāla of the ِ on account of Imāla of the ِ before or after it [631, 637] (A): (3) the ِ of feminization: but this [Imāla (Tsr)] is only in pause [646], exclusively, as in رَحْمَة mercy and نِعْمَة favor, because they assimilate the ِ to the [abbreviated (Tsr)] ِ 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 رَحْمَة, [where the Fathā is neither on a
nor on an elevated letter (Jrb)]: and bad [when the Fatḥa is] on a Ɂ, as in ܙې Corrections, [because the Imāla of its Fatḥa is like Imāla of two Fatḥas, on account of the reiteration of the Ɂ, so that the labour in pronouncing it with Imāla is more (R)]: and middling [when the Fatḥa is (MASH)] on a [letter of (MASH)] elevation, as in شخ casket (SH), because, though the Ɂ is treated like the Ɂ, 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 Ɂ of femininization here includes the Ɂ of intensiveness (A), because it is orig. the Ɂ of femininization [265] (Sn), as in ٴعلاقمة [294, 312], which may be pronounced with Imāla; but excludes the Ɂ of silence [615], as in LXIX. 19. [below], the Fatḥa before which is not pronounced with Imāla, according to the correct [opinion]: (c) when there is an Ɂ before the Ɂ, it is not pronounced with Imāla, as in ڪپلا prayer and ڪیبلا life: what is pronounced with Imāla, however, is the Fatḥa, not the consonant, that is immediately followed by the Ɂ of feminization; and, that being so, there is no reason for IM's excepting the Ɂ, since the Ɂ is not included in the Fatḥ; but he does it here in order to dispel the notion that the Ɂ of feminization makes Imāla of the Ɂ permissible, as it makes Imāla of the Fatḥa: (d) "the Ɂ", and not "the Ɂ", " of 73 a
feminization" is said, in order that the ت which is not converted into 8 may be excluded, because the Fatha is not pronounced with Imala before it (A): this comprises the 8 of such as فاطمة and رحمة [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 بائعت she sold (Sn) : (e) Imala of [the Fatha before (Tsr)] the 8 of silence also, as in كتيبتة LXIX. 19. [22, 647, 648, 679], is transmitted from Ks, [because of its resemblance to the 8 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 ع. and decl. us.: and therefore Imala of the indecl. [n.], as إذا [204] and ما [180], is not regular; except in the case of مَرَّ بِهَا and نَظَرَ إِلَيْهَا [628, 633], as in He passed by her and نَظَرَ إِلَيْهَا He looked towards her, مَرَّ بِهَا He passed by ns and نَظَرَ إِلَيْهَا 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. دا [171, 293], and of [the advs.] مَثِي.
And some ps. are pronounced with Imāla, vid. ُبْلِي [556], the voc. ُپَا [554], and [the neg.] َلا in their saying ُلا َيَا َلا [1, 565], because these ps. act as substitutes for props., and therefore acquire a superiority over others. And ḫtb 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 ُحْتَي [501] is reported by S and those who agree with him, and is transmitted from Ḥamza and Ks. Imāla is not forbidden in what is accidentally uninfl., as in ُيَا ُحْبُلي O youth and ُيَا ُحْبُلي 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 ُعَسَي [403, 459] is excellent" (M, A) because it is a v., and its َي is converted from a َي [629], as is shown by ُعَسَيْت ُعَسَيْت [462] (IY). The reason why the ps. are not pronounced with Imāla is only that their َي is not [converted] from a َي; nor is in the vicinity of a Kasra (A), in most cases, since the َي of ُلَيَأ [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 (TY). If, however, they are used as [proper] names, they are pronounced with Imāla (A), when the cause of Imāla exists, as in ḥañi used as a name, because the fourth in the n. is converted into ی in the du. [229]; contrary to إل ی used as a name, because you say in the du. إلرواٍن (Sn). And, according to this, the ٢٠ of آمٍ and آمٍ، and the طا٣ and ح٣ (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 ٣[546] and ی [in being ps. (Sn)], the Imāla in them is intended to notify that they have become annexe 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 طیَان two ṭā’s and حیْان two ḥā’s. And similar is the Imāla of the letters of the alphabet,
[which are not in the initial monograms of the chapters (Sn),] as بث and تأ and ثث (A), according to the dial. of those who abbreviate these ns. [234, 321] (Sn).
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 ٢َ٢َ١٢١٢ [181] (Sn, MKh), ٢َ٢َ١١٠١٨١ (Sn), and إِقْتِصَاءٌ مُّ، فيم (Sn), and فيم (Sn), in the mode hereafter mentioned [648]; and upon such as XXVII. 25. [2,59, 574] and أَمَّا اقْتِصَاءُ عَلَيْهِ أَرْحَامُ الْأَنْثَيْينِ 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 أَمَّا in the last [ex.] is not the cond. أَمَّا [593]; but is [compounded of] the copulative أَمِم [541] and the conjunct ما [180], so that one pauses upon مِمَّا disjoined from ما. And, as for لَا in XXVII. 25., according to the reading of Ks, with a single لَا, it is an inceptive and premonitory لَا [551]; while لَا is premonitory, or is a voc. لَا whose voc. is suppressed [59]; and لَا is an imp. لَا; so that one pauses upon لَا لَا disjoined from لَا لَا: 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 لَا, it is the subjunctival لَا [571] incorporated into the red. لَا [566], for which reason the لَا of the aor. is dropped [405]; while the resultant inf. لَا [497, 551] is the obj. of بُعْثَتْ لَا, by suppression of the prep. لَا بُعْثَتْ لَا, the sense being لَا بُعْثَتْ لَا إِلَّا أَلسْكِجْرُود 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 لَا لَا, or upon لَا لَا; not upon the لَا, 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 [774][Tالى][623] تنقُّولُو، and (Sn); (2) quavering (A, Tsr, YS) as in [608] أَيِّبِنِي أَلْخَمَعُ أَعْلَى (YS, Sn); (3) demanding precise information (A, YS); and asking for specification of a vague [indet.] (Sn), as in [185] (YS, Sn), quiescent in the ن (Jh), and أَيِّبِنِي; and in مَفْوَى [183, 497], مَّمَا, and مُنِى (Sn); (4) disapproba-
tion (A, Tsr), as in أَرْبَدَنَاهُ (Sn). The pausal letter differs in predicament from the initial, the pausal being quiescent, while the initial is only mobile: except that beginning with the mobile is quasi-compulsory, since it is impossible to begin with a quiescent [667]; while pause upon the quiescent is artistic and approvable, when the mind is wearied by the succession of words, consonants and vowels (IY). And from the [primary] object of resting, in pause, three [secondary] objects are derived; for it serves to denote completion of the purport of the speech, completion of the metre in poetry, and completion of the rhythm in prose (Tsr). It is common to the three kinds [625] (M), the n., as هَدَا رُبَى This is Zaid; the v., as ضَرَبْ رُبَى يَضَرِّبَ Zaid strikes or struck; and the p., as جِرَي Yes [556] (IX). It has [eleven (Jrb, Tsr, Fk), or rather thirteen,] modes, [i.e., sorts of predicaments
(775)

(R).] (1) [bare (SH, Fk)] quiescence [below]: (2) Raum [below]: (3) Ishmām [below]: (4) substitution of the I [640, 649]: (5) change of the [nominal (SH, Fk)] š of femininization into s [646]: (6) addition of the I [648]: (7) affixion of the s of silence [644, 648]: (8) [expression or (Tsr, Fk)] elision of the ] and (R, Tsr, Fk)] ی [643, 645, 648]: (9) change of the Hamza [into a letter homogeneous with its vowel (642) (SH)]: (10) reduplication [below]: (11) transfer of the vowel [640, 641] (SH, Tsr, Fk): (12) conversion of the Tanwin into ی or [below]: (13) conversion of the ü into ی 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 š of silence [No. 7], it is [only] to make the vowel plain
(776)

(Tsr). Pause is mostly attended by alterations, which are reducible to seven things, quiescence [No. 1], Ishmām [No. 3], Raum [No. 2], substitution [No. 4, and possibly Nos. 5, 9, 12, and 13], addition [No. 6 and possibly Nos. 7 and 10], elision [No. 8], and transfer [No. 11] (A). Reduplication [No. 10] is not [explicitly] mentioned, because it is an addition of a letter, together with quiescence; so that it is not excluded from the seven, as is indicated by A's expression "reducible" (Sn). Pause is [said by MKh to be] mostly reducible to six sorts of alteration, collected in the saying

Addition [No. 6, and possibly No. 7], elision [No. 8], quiescence [No. 1], and transfer [No. 11], and similarly reduplication [No. 10], and Raum [No. 2], and Ishmām [No. 3], and substitution [No. 4, and possibly Nos. 5, 9, 12, and 13]. But sometimes it makes no alteration at all (MKh): [for] the saying of A [and MKh] "mostly" is intended to except the abbreviated not pronounced with Tanwīn (Sn), as the youth and pregnant; and [the defective not pronounced with Tanwīn (Sn),] as the judge (Sn, MKh); since there is no alteration in them [643] (Sn). These modes vary in goodness [of effect], and in place [of application] (SH, A). For some of them are better than
others, conversion of the ٣ or ٤ 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 ٥ of femininization into ٥ [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 كَمْ [217] and مَنْ [182], you are relieved from the task of providing quiescence; and, with it, none of the modes of pause is employed; but you pause with the [existing] quiescence only; though, if the quiescence of pause were said to be different from the quiescence of continuity, it would not be improbable, as [the vowels and aug. consonant in the pl. are said to be different from those] in [the sing.] ١٠ ٣٠٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٣٤٢٣٤٢ [234, 246] and ٤٣٥٤٣٥٤٣٥٤٣٥٤٣٥٤٣٥٤٣٥٤٣٥٤٣٥٤٢٣٤ [234] (R). When you pause upon a [n.] pronounced with Tanwin [below] (Aud) and not made fem. with the ٥ [646], the Arabs have three dials., (1) elision of the Tanwin unrestrictedly, [i.e., in all three
cases,] which is the dial. of Rabi'ā [below] (Tsr); though apparently, says IA, this is not necessary in the dial. of Rabi'ā, since, in their poems, pause upon the acc. pronounced with Tanwīn is often with สำรวจ (Sn): (2) change of the Tanwīn unrestrictedly, into สำรวจ after Fatha, สำรวจ after Damma, and สำรวจ after Kasra, which is the dial. of AlAzd [below]: (3) making a distinction between the [final] pronounced with Fathā and [the final pronounced with] any other [vowel] (Tsr). The most preponderant and frequent of the [three (Tsr)] dials is that its Tanwīn should be (1) elided after Damma and Kasra, [the letter before the Tanwīn being made quiescent (Tsr),] as Ứ People This is Zaid and Ứ People I passed by Zaid, [with quiescence of the  nội in the two exs. (Tsr)]: and (2) changed into สำรวจ after Fatha, whether the Fathā be (a) inflectional, as in Ứ People I saw Zaid; or (b) un-inflectional, as in Ứ People [i.q. يغفِف Desist (Tsr),] and Ứ People [187, 198] (Aud), i.q. يغفِف I marvel (Tsr). And they assimilate Ứ People [594], with the  nội, to the acc. pronounced with Tanwīn, changing its  nội into สำรวจ in pause. This is the saying of the majority: while some assert that pause upon it is with the  nội, 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 Ứ معْن تُقُلْحُوا
XVIII. 19. And ye shall not ever prosper then with the l (Tsr). When mobile, the final of the n. paused upon is either a ą of femininization [646], or not (IA). In pause upon the mobile [final], that is not the ą 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 predication of the quiescent [above]; so that it is paused upon with mere quiescence, like the ą of femininization in the u. in لـِسْتِ نَسَاءَةٌ LIV. 1. The hour hath drawn nigh [607], and the ą of ِبَيْنِي ِبْلِدَ 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 l [above], since in it not one of the five [modes] is practicable; though this is disputed in the case of transfer, as will be mentioned [641]: so in the Hamʿ and elsewhere (Sn): (c) quiescence is absence of the vowel (Jrb, A) altogether, without any indication thereof (Jrb): (d) it is equally applicable to the [n.] pronounced, and the [n.] not pronounced, with 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 هَذَا حَكْم. This is Ha-kam (M), and is made by S like this, ٗ ح (Tsr), meaning خفيف light (IY, R, A, Tsr), or حَفَتُ It has become light (A, Tsr), or خفاف 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 ١, either of which is abbreviated from إِجْزَم. Cut off [the vowel], or Make quiescent; and apparently it is the head of a ٛ abbreviated from إِسْتَرْحَ يَ رَمَيَّخَ Rest, because pause is rest (Tsr): (g) some of the scribes make it a circle, [which, in my opinion, is (IY)] because the circle, [in the conventional language of the arithmeticians (IY),] is a cipher, which is what has no number in it (IY, Tsr); so that they make it a sign of the quiescent, because the latter is devoid of vowel (IY): and some of them make it a [pure (IY)] ٛ, as though, when they saw it without any explanation, they thought it to be a ٛ (IY, Tsr): (h) quiescence is allowable in every mobile, except [the final of] the acc. pronounced with Tanwīn, where the common dial. is conversion of the Tanwīn into ٛ; though Rābi'a
treat the acc. like the nom. and gen., as

[above] [by Al'A'sha Maimūn, praising kais Ibn Ma'dikarib, Unto the perfect man, Kais, I prolong the nightly journeys; and I take from every tribe ties, i.e., safe-conducts to another tribe, because in every tribe the poet had enemies whom he had satirized, or who hated the subject of his eulogy, properly عُصْمًا (A KB)]: and it is necessary in pause upon the َّ 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 َّ [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 Tanwīn, vid., by its conversion into ِ, since the ِ is the lightest of the consonants: (k) similarly in the du. and sound pl. masc. the
lightness is realized by elision of the vowel of the \( \mathfrak{n} \) 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 Fat\( \check{\text{h}} \)a, 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 Tan\( \text{\check{\text{w}}} \), as in رِبَّدَا and رَجَالِا, there is no dispute that Raum is not allowable in it, except according to the rare *dialect* of Rab\( \check{\text{r}} \)a, i.e., elision of the Tan\( \text{\check{\text{w}}} \), as in رَأْخَدُ مِنْ الْأَهْمِ [above]: but, when it has no Tan\( \text{\check{\text{w}}} \), as in رَأْخَدُ بِالْأَهْمِ and رَأْخَدُ بِالْرَّجَالِ, the opinion of the Readers, and of Fr among the GG, is that Raum of the Fath\( \check{\text{a}} \) 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 رَأْخَدُ خَالِدَ.
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 Fath 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 (Tsər): (b) it is really the indication of the vowel by the lips, after quiescence, without emission of any [audible (Tsər)] 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 (Tsər); 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 (Tsər): (d) some attribute to the KK the allowance of Ishmām in the gen., and also in the [final] pronounced with Kāsr; but apparently they are mistaken, since not one of the
GG allows it, except in the nom., and in the [final] pronounced with Ḍamm: for the instrument of Ḍamm 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 Ḍamm] is perceptible by his vision: whereas the Kasra is part of the ی, the outlet of which is the middle of the tongue [732]; and the Fatha is part of the ِ, the outlet of which is the throat [732]; and both these [outlets] are hidden by the lips and the teeth, so that it is not possible for the person address to perceive the preparation of the two outlets for [the utterance of] these vowels (R); (e) the sign of Ishmām is a dot (S, M, R, A, Tsr) in front of [below] the letter (IY, A, R, A, Tsr), like this, • (A, Tsr), as بِهْدًا جَعَفْر. 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 ٥], to dispel the notion that it is a جَرَّة sign of quiescence; as the sign of Raum [above] is not above it, to dispel the notion that is a ٥٧٣ نُصْبَة 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 م 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 م of the pl., and an accidental vowel, say, they (the pron. referring to Raum and Ishmām) are not to be applied. And, in 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 الْيَاهَا،]
while, if *were said, it would be plainer) is Damm
or Kasr formed, or their bases, أ and أ, as in
II.70. They have understood it, ئ or XII.20. And
they sold him, and II.108. His Name, and in
II.1. About it, م II.26. Unto Him, and م من
II.35. From his Lord (AAK), adds

[While some of them, like AdDānī 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 م of the pl., and the accidental vowel, and the s of
the [attached sing.] masc. [pron.]"; as some of the Com-
mentators also have misunderstoned his language, [fancying
that its meaning is "in every case of the letter paused
upon" (AAK)]; whereas Sht only means "in every case
of the s of the [attached sing.] masc. [pron.] alone", as
will be seen [648]: (i) the reason why Raum and Ishmām
are not allowable in the s of feminization [642] is that
on the s there is no vowel to be notified by Raum or
Ishmām, the vowel being only on the s for which the s is
a subst.; and, on that account, they are allowable accord-
ing to those who pause upon the َ without conversion,
as in م [183, 646]: (j) as for the م of the
the majority hold that it should be made quiescent in continuity [161], as َمُلْكِيَّمَ وَعَلِيْكُمَّ; while Raum and Ishmām do not occur in the quiescent [above]: and, as for those who mobilize it in continuity, conjoining it with ا or ُ, the reason why they do not employ Raum or Ishmām, after elision of the ا or ُ [in pause], as Raum of the Kasra in ُالقائي is employed after elision of its ُ[643], is that this Kasra does sometimes occur at the end of the word in continuity, as in ِيَبُّوُمُ يَزْدَعُ َالدَّعُ  لIV.6. On the day when the summoner [Isrāfil (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 َةُلْيْكُمَّ and َعَلِيْكُمَّ, when you conjoin them with a mobile after them, do not occur with َلاَمِ [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 َإِلَيْكُمْ أَكْتَبَ VI.114. [77] and َإِلَيْكُمْ َالْمَلَاتِكَة VI.111. [585], the final of the word in their case is the ا and ُ respectively, which is elided on account of the two quiescents; and what is elided on account of two quiescents is in the predicament of the expressed: this is if we say that, before their conjunction with the quiescent, they were َلَكُنْمُو and َعِلِيْهَيْ, according to the reading of Ibn Kathir [161]:
while, if we say that, before that, they were ِمَّنْ يَشَأُ الَّهُ يُضِلْ لَهُ VI. 39. Whomsoever God willeth [to lead astray (B)], him doth He lead astray, and َلَكَد يَسْتَهْرَيْنِ ِبْسُلْمِ مِنْ قَبْلَكَ 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], IV. 45. And disobeyed the Apostle, and ُفَلَيَنْظِرُ ِالْإِنْسَانَ LXXX. 24. Then let man look; and in ُخَوْصَى أَلْسُوْل [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 ِخَالِدِ This is
Khalid and He makes (Aud), with reduplication of the ح in حَالَدُ جَمَعَلُ and of the ل in لِجَمَعَلُ (Tsr): (a) reduplication is the strengthening of the letter paused upon: (b) the object of it is to make known that this letter is orig. mobile: (c) the letter added for pause is the quiescent that precedes, and is incorporated into, the letter paused upon (A): (d) the sign of reduplication is ش (S, M, R, A) above the letter (IY, R, A), as شَدِيدُ It has become strong (IY), or شَدِيدُ 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 LIV. 53. Recorded [in the Tablet (K, B)], in the Chapter of the Moon (Tsr); (f) it is a Sa'di dial.; (g) its conditions are five matters, vid. that the [letter (Tsr)] paused upon should not be (a) a Hamza [642], as in حَطَا fault and رَضاَ young gazelle (Aud), because the Hamza in the position of the J is not incorporated, nor incorporated into [737] (Tsr); (b-d) a ي, as in the judge, a ر, as in يُدُعُّr calls, or an ل.
as in 

\( \text{dreads} \) (Aud), because of the heaviness of the unsound letter [642] (Tsr); (e) immediately after quiescence, as in 

\( \text{Zaid} \) and 

\( \text{Amr} \) (Aud), lest three quiescents be combined, the penultimate, the incorporated, and the [letter] paused upon (Tsr): (h) reduplication occurs in the nom. and gen., unrestrictedly: and, as for the acc., if it be pronounced with Tanwîn, the only [mode] allowable in it is conversion of the Tanwîn into I [above], except according to the 'dial. of Râbi'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 

\( \text{I saw the man,} \quad \text{I saw Ahmad,} \) 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 

\( \text{in the saying of the poet.} \) (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 ل, ل, and ى, are particularly appropriated out of [all] the letters, to repetition and reiteration [of sound]; for which reason they are affixed in poetry, for the purpose of unbinding, to words that they are not affixed to in prose, as in

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

آَذَنْتَا يَبِينَهَا أَسْمَأَوُ # رَبَّ تَكُوِّنُ مِنْهُ آخَرَوُ (R), by [Al Ḥarīth (EM)] Ibn Ḥillīza [a] Yashkūrī (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 چَلََّتْنِي أَسْمَأَوُ Asmā has come to
me [642]; and you say in poetry أَرْجُلُو and أَرْجُلَيُّ, 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 s of the conj. after the s of the pron., whereas in prose that is not allowable when the s of the pron. is paused upon, as جَاَءَنِي ُعَلَّامَةَ 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 ج to be mobilized in such as

[by a man of the Banû Asad (S),] With a nine-year-old she-camel, robust or swift [647], although it ought to be quiescent; and similarly the doubled ب in such as أَوْ كَالْخَرْبِيقَاتِ الْحَيّْ [below] is orig. quiescent, but is mobilized for the sake of the letter of unbinding, as the ي of أَلْدَكْرِيْبََنَّ in the saying [of 'Amr Ibn Kulthûm at Taghlabî (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. خُمْرَ الآلَانْدَرِينَ, 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 مَّرْتُ بَالْمَسْلِمِينَ 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 الشَّكْرَتَيْنِ the tree, with the followed by the conj. ; but the الشَّكْرَتَيْنِ occurs, with the quiescent $ [646] ; while the الشَّكْرَتَيْنِ is frequent only in the poems of post-classical [poets]: and, according to this theory, the saying القَصَبَا [below] is not “an anomalous poetic license” [above]; as the mobilization of the ن in [above] and the mobilization of the ر in the saying لَعَبَ الآلَانْدَرَينَ يِنَا وَغَيْرَهَا $ بَعْلِيِّ سَوْابِيَ السَّبْئِ القَطْرُ [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

لَقَدْ خَسِبْتُ أَنَّ أَرْيَ جَذَبًا في عَامِيَتَا ذَا بُعْدَمَا أَخْصَبَا
إِنَّ الْجَذَبَا فَوْقَ الْمُتَرَّس دَبَا وَهُبَتُ الأَرْيَ مُبْرِقَبَا
تَتَرْكُ مَا أَقَامَ أَلْدَبَا سَبْسَبَا كَانَهَا أَسْيَبَلْ إِذَا أَسْلَكَبَا
أَوْ كَالْجَرْيِقٍ فَأَقَقَ الْقَصَبَا وَأَلْتَبَنَّ وَأَلْحَلْفَاء فَالْهَبَا

[647] (R) Assuredly I have dreaded that I may see a drought in this our year, after it has been fertile in herbage. Verily the young locusts have crawled over the ridges of the ground, and the wind has blown up dust continually, leaving what the locusts have spared a desert, as though it were the flood where it spreads abroad, or like the flame when it has met the reeds and the straw and the long coarse grass, and has then blazed up (MN): nor is there anything in the language of S to indicate that the like [mobilization] is anomalous or a poetic license; nay, the only reason why the like [mobilization] is not extremely frequent is that reduplication [itself] is rare in pause, because the property of pause is to lighten, not to make heavy; so that
the rarity of such as جُفَّاً جُفَّةٍ and جَعْلُ يُجْعَلُ Jafar came to me, and of جَأْءَنِي جُفَّرُ [above]: (R): but [Jib contends that] even those who say that the rhymes are mobilized because a letter of prolongation, that is paused upon, has been added to them, which is what is named [letter of unbinding], not because they are meant to be understood as continuous [with what follows them], do not take it out of the cat. of the anomalous: except that the anomaly, according to the first [theory], consists in continuity's being treated like pause [647]; while, according to the second, it consists in the vowel's being combined with reduplication, whereas the condition of the one is the non-existence of the other (Jrb): (1) reduplication should properly not be applied to the acc. pronounced with Tanwin in such as تَمْرُكْ مَا أَبْقَى أَلْدُّبَا سَبْسَبَا [above], because the letter of its inflection ought to be mobile in pause, its Tanwin being converted into !, and nothing else; while the letter of inflection, when mobile in pause, not for the sake of putting the letter of unbinding, is not doubled: but the poet makes the acc. accord with; and follow the analogy of, the nom. and gen., as in the dial. of Rabî'a [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)] تَنَاشَرْوَا بِالصِّبْرِ CIII. 3.
And enjoined, one upon another, patience, [with transfer of the Kasra to the ب (Tsr)]; and the saying أَنَا أُبْنِ مَارِيَّةٍ آخِرُ [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 concurrency of two quiescents is allowable in pause (MKh): (c) its sign is the absence of sign (A).

§. 641. Its conditions are five [or rather six (Tsr)] matters, (1) that the penultimate should be quiescent, [in order that it may receive the vowel transferred, because the mobile does not receive another vowel (Tsr)]: (2-3) that mobilization of that quiescent should not be impracticable, [as in the case of the f and the incorporated letter, which do not receive a vowel (Tsr)]; and should not sound heavy, [as in the case of the c and ی, 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 Fatha was [orig.] accompanied by Tanwin, the transfer [of its Fatha] would entail elision of the rove [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 is hard, because the [in (Tsr)] and the incorporated letter [in (Tsr)] do not receive a vowel, [since they are necessarily quiescent, except that the quiescence of the 1 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 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 Tanwım, according to the dial. of those who say رَأَيْتُ بَكْر I saw Bakr (A), vid. Rabī’ā [640], because the preceding objection [as to its entailing elision of the I substituted for the Tanwım] is absent, according to the dial. of these (Sn): (5) This is knowledge, because in Arabic there is no Ḥadā’ [368], with Kasr of its first [letter], and Ḍamm of its second (Aud): (6) غُزُر and طَبَّى [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) الَّذِي يُخْرِجُ الْخَبَثَ. XXVII. 25. Who bringeth forth the hidden, [where you say عُكْبَة (Tsr),] though the vowel is Fatḥa, [because, if you said الْخَبَثُ with quiescence, without transfer, you
would find it sound manifestly heavy \( \text{(Tsr)} \): (2) 

This is a buttress, [where you say \( \text{ُدُرُ } \) with Kasr of the \( \text{ر} \), and Damm of the \( \text{ٰ} \) \( \text{ـر} \) (Tsr).] although the transfer leads to the formation \( \text{ُعُلُ } \) [above] \( \text{(Aud)} \), because the Hamza is heavy; and, when the preceding \( \text{[letter]} \) is quiescent, the utterance of the \( \text{[quiescent (A)]} \) Hamza is difficult \( \text{(Tsr)} \). The opinion of the KK [above] is that pause with transfer is allowable, whether the vowel be Fatḥa, Damma, or Kasra, and whether the final be Hamza or any other letter; so that, according to them, you say \( \text{رَأِيَتْ أَلْضَرَبُ I saw the striking and } \text{رَأِيَتْ أَلَرِداً I saw the buttress}; \) while the opinion of the BB is that transfer is not allowable when the vowel is Fatḥa, except when the final is Hamza; so that, according to them, \( \text{رَأِيَتْ أَلْرِداً } \) is allowable, while \( \text{رَأِيَتْ أَلْضَرَبُ } \) is disallowed: but the opinion of the KK is better, because they have transmitted it from the Arabs (IA). Those who do not authorize \( \text{ُعُلُ } \) [368], with Damma \( \text{[on its first (Tsr)]}, \) and then Kasra \( \text{[on its second (Tsr)]}, \) but assert that \( \text{ُذِلُ } \) \( \text{سِلُ } \) \( \text{بُقَعْلُ by a lock}, \) because, after the transfer, it becomes \( \text{بُقَعْلُ with Damm of the } \text{ق}, \) and Kasr of the \( \text{ف} \): but allow it in such as \( \text{بُطَطُ with slowness}, \) because the final is Hamza \( \text{(Aud)} \); while 77 a
unprecedentedness [of formation] in transfer from the Hamza is pardonable, because of the heaviness of the Hamza (Tsr). This is the *dial.* of many of the Arabs, among them Asad and [most of] Tamīm (IY, A), who, in the case of [the n. whose final is] Hamza, make no distinction between Fatha, and Ḍamm or Kasr, of the initial; but say This is slowness and من البطي from slowness [642], This is the buttress [642] and I passed by the buttress, as they say This is the hidden [and I passed by the hidden (M)]: and do not avoid reduction to the formation فعِل, which has no precedent in the language, or فعِل, 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 خ to [that of] the ف (A), [i.e.,] of the transferred Ḍamma to the Kasra of the ف, and of the transferred Kasra to the Ḍamma of the ف (MASH), making Kasra follow Kasra, and Ḍamma follow Ḍamma (IY, Jrb), as هَدَا أَرْدُودُ with two Kasras,
and with two Ġammas \[642\] (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 

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 Ḥijāzīs 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 

This is the hidden, [with transfer and elision (Tsr),] pronouncing [the \( \mathfrak{b} \) (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 Ḥijāzīs,
[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

\[\text{النَّقَرُ (Mb); [and] the poet says} \]

\[\text{أَرْنِي حَبِيلَةٍ عَلَى سَانِيَّةِيُ فَهَشُمُ الْفِوَادُ لِدَأَنَّ أَلْحَيْلُ} \]

\[\text{فَقَلَتْ وَمَآ أَحْفَفْ عَنْ صَاحِبِيَّيُ أَلَا بَيَّنَ أَخْلُكَ أَلْحَيْلُ} \]

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

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

\[\text{تَحْفِعُهَا الأَرْتُحُرُ إِلَّا الْشَّعْرُ} \]

\[\text{وَالْفِلَبُ سِنَّيْنَ كَانَتَهَا الْمُجَرُّ} \]

The strings of the bows and the hairy hands drove them, the arrows being sixty, as though they were live coals, meaning

\[\text{الْجُحْرُ} \text{الْشَّعْرُ} \text{(M). As for the acc., (1) if the n. be pronounced with Tanwin, transfer is not authorized in it, except in the dial. of Rabra [above], because of their eliding the Fatha also: (2) if it be not pronounced with Tanwin, transfer is (a) disallowed by S, who says "They do not say رَأَيْتُ الْمُكَرَّرٍ," ["because it is in the position of Tanwin" (S), which is} \]
understood by R to mean] "on the ground that the *art.* is accidental, the *o. f.* being Tanwin, so that the [n.] made *det.* by the *art.* is in the predicament of the [n.] pronounced with Tanwin"; [and by IUK and others to mean that the *acc.* not pronounced with Tanwin is made to accord with the *acc.* pronounced with Tanwin, for the sake of uniformity]; (b) allowed by others than S, because the *acc.* not pronounced with Tanwin is exactly like the *nom.* and *gen.* in the necessity for quiescence of the J. If, however, the final of the *acc.* not pronounced with Tanwin be Hamza, transfer is authorized in it, by common consent, because the Hamza [below], when quiescent, is imperceptible after the quiescent (R): and the *acc.* pronounced with Tanwin is like the *acc.* not pronounced with Tanwin in allowability of transferring the vowel of its Hamza, although it is not exemplified by [R and] A (Sn). The majority hold that transfer is peculiar to the vowel of inflection; so that [201] is not said, nor [206], because their eagerness for knowledge of the vowel of uninflectedness is not like their eagerness for knowledge of the vowel of inflection, [on account of the 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
Ḍamma to that quiescent is allowable, [as] in مُنَةَّةٍ and
عَنْةٍ, for the sake of making the Ḍamma 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 ‘Anazi that
reviled me, while I smote him not (N), meaning
لَمْ أَضْرَبْ (Mb, A, N), with quiescence of the ب, and
Ḍamm of the s (N); and Abu -nNajm says
ٍفَقَرْتُ هَذَا وَهُدَا زِحْلَةٌ
Then bring this near, and remove this far (S, Mb,
M), meaning زِحْلَةٌ (Mb, IY); and Ṭarafa says
حَابِيْسِي رَبِيعٌ وَقَفَتْ بِهِ ُلَوْ أُطِيِّعْ أَنْفَسَ لَمْ أَرْضِه
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 ٌأَرْمَّ], when the מ becomes mobile, because
its vowel does not really belong to it, but is only the
vowel of the s (Mb). And some of the Banū ‘Adī, of
Tamīm, mobilize the letter before the s with Kasr, on
account of the two quiescents, saying ضَرْبَتْ She struck
him and َقَالَتْهُ. She said it; but the first [mode, vid. transfer of the Damma from the َسَ to the quiescent before it, as َقَالَتْهُ َضَرَبَتْهُ,] is more frequent (R). Pause with transfer of the vowel to a mobile is [allowable in (A)] the dial. of Lakhm [above] (A, Tsr), as in

من يَأْتِبْ لِلتَّخَيْرِ َفِيمَا َقَصْدَهُ َتَحْمُدُ مَسَاعِيِّهِ وَيَعْلَمُ رَشَدَهُ (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 َسَ to the َدَلَلَةَ which was mobile (MN, Sn) before (Sn), orig. ُقَصْدَةَ (MN): and, as an instance of this dial., Jh cites the saying of some Rājiz

ما رَأَى شَيْبَانُ شَدِيدَا وَقَصْدَةَ # حَتَّى آتِهَا تَرَنُّهُ فَقَصْدَةً Shaibān ceased not to be strong in his throwing down, until his match came to him, and broke his neck, saying "He means ُقَصْدَةَ; but, when he pauses upon the َسَ, he transfers its [vowel, vid. the (Jh)] Damma to the preceding َصَ, which he then mobilizes (Tsr) with the vowel of the َسَ" (Jh). And another peculiarity of this dial. is pause upon the َسَ of the 3rd pers. fem. by elision of the ِلَ, and transfer of the Fatha of the َسَ to the mobile before it, as in the saying

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

\[ \text{باً} \text{الْحَمْزَةَ خَيْرَاتُ} \quad \text{وَإِنَّ} \text{شَرًا} \quad \text{عَا} \quad \text{لَا} \quad \text{أَرْبِدَ} \text{الْحَمْزَةَ} \quad \text{إِلَّا} \quad \text{أَنَّ} \quad \text{تَأَبَّ} \]

[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., ُوَإِنَّ شَرًا فَعَا and ُنَا إِلَّا أَنْ تُشَاءُ: and it is sometimes related ُوَإِنَّ and ُمَا إِلَّا أَنْ تُشَاءُ, as though another ْ were added to the ْ, like the impletion of Fatha; and then the first, being mobilized because of the two quiescents, were converted into Hamza, as in ُمَا [665] (R).

§. 642. The Hamza is the remotest and faintest of the letters, because it proceeds from the farthest part of the throat [732]; while pause causes the letter paused upon to become fainter than it is in continuity, because pause involves elision of the vowel that immediately follows the letter, making its sound plain; so that, when Hamza is paused upon, it needs to be made plain. The Hamza paused upon is either lightened by conversion or
elision, which is the method of those who alleviate, [vid. the people of AlḤijāz (MAR)]; or sounded true, which is the method of others [641, 658]. The Hamza sounded true needs something to make it plain, because it remains, and is therefore faint, contrary to the lightened. The [Hamza] sounded true is preceded either by a quiescent [letter], or by a mobile. If the preceding [letter] be quiescent, you pause upon the Hamza with elision of its vowel in the nom. and gen., as you pause upon [the  in ] Ḩmr and Ṣkr  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, Ḑamma 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 Ḑamma of the Hamza in the case of the tril. pronounced with Kasr of the 78a
[641]; and its Kasra in the case of the *tril.* pronounced with Ḍamm of the ف, as ﯽَ ﯽ ﯽ, [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 ﯽ ﯽ. *This is a counterpoise,* nor ﯽ ﯽ 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 Banu Tamīm avoid the two discarded measures, notwithstanding their being accidental; and therefore abandon transfer of the vowel in what leads to them, i.e., the *tril.* pronounced with Kasr or Ḍamm of the ف; but, in both [formations], make [the vowel of] the ء imitate [that of] the ف, in the three cases, [nom., acc., and gen.,] saying ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ, ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ, and ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ, and ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ [641]. For, since they see that, in the gen. of ﯽ ﯽ ﯽ, and the nom. of ﯽ ﯽ, transfer leads
to the two discarded measures, they make [the vowel of] the \( \varepsilon \) imitate [that of] the \( \mathfrak{b} \) in the *gen.* of \( \mathfrak{b} \), and in the *nom.* of \( \mathfrak{d} \); 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 \( \varepsilon \) imitate [that of] the \( \mathfrak{b} \) in the three cases. And, besides quiescence, in these two [formations], where [the vowel of] the \( \varepsilon \) is made to imitate [that of] the \( \mathfrak{f} \), Raum and Ishmān 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 \( \varepsilon \) to [that of] the \( \mathfrak{f} \); 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 

\[ \text{هذَا الرَّطبُوٍٍ} \]

\[ \text{This is the bruise and slowness and the buttress, and} \]

\[ \text{مَرْتُ بِالْبُطُوٍٍ} \]

\[ \text{and بَّا لِلْبُطُوٍٍ and بَّا لِلْبُطُوٍٍ} \]

\[ \text{with quiescence of the \( \varepsilon \) in the whole [of them]} \]; while, in the acc., quiescence of the letter before the \( \mathfrak{l} \) not being possible, since the \( \mathfrak{l} \) occurs only after Fatha, they say 

\[ \text{الْرِّدَا and الْبِطَا and رَآيتُ الْعُنَا} \]

[below], with transfer and conversion; so that here the
Hamza is made plain by its conversion into ٍ, as some make the ٍ in حبلٍ plain by its conversion into Hamza [643], because [here] the ٍ 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 ٍ: (2) some transfer the vowels to the َ in the whole [of these formations]; and afterwards regulate the Hamza, in respect of conversion, by the vowel of what precedes it, saying َ and َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ [above]. This conversion, however, is not an alleviation of the Hamza, as in بِير ُ َwell, رَ َhead, and مُ َ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 َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ and َ ِ making the َ inseparable from the first [formation], and the َ from the second. And, in the case of these [formations], whose ِ 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 ә of feminization [640]. All of this is when the letter preceding the Hamza is quiescent. But, if it be mobile, as in әә young gazelle, әәә mushroom, and [below], you pause upon such a formation as you pause upon әәә جمل he-camel, әә جِلَّ man, and әә كبد liver, without conversion of the Hamza, because it is made plain by the vowel of the letter before it: so that here all the modes of pause [upon the mobile] occur, except reduplication [640]; and except transfer, because of the mobility of the penultimate [641]. When the letter before the Hamza is pronounced with Fath, some of the Arabs, I mean, of those who sound [the Hamza] true, regulate it [in respect of conversion] by its own vowel, from eagerness to make [the Hamza] plain, because they account the Fatḥa [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 әә جُلُّ This is fresh herbage, I saw fresh herbage, әә مررتِ بِالْكَلْدَيْ I passed by fresh herbage, [with Fath of the ج, and quiescence of the ә, and ә (Sn),] converting the Hamza pronounced with Damm into әәә, the Hamza pronounced with Fath into әәә, and the Hamza pronounced with Kasr into әәә, because, after Fatḥa, the unsound letters are not considered heavy, when quiescent.
But, when the letter before the Hamza is pronounced with Damm, as in َأُمْوَهُ, or Kasr, as in َأُمّْيَنیِّ [below], it is not possible to regulate the Hamza [in respect of conversion] by its own vowel, because the \( \text{'} \) does not occur after Damm or Kasr, nor the quiescent \( \text{'} \) after Damm, nor the quiescent \( \text{'} \) after Kasr; and moreover the Damm and Kasr [on the penultimate] manage to make [the Hamza] properly plain: so that they retain the two Hamzas in their [original] state, [saying َأُمْوَهُ and َأُمّْيَنیِّ ]; and do not convert them, as they convert the Hamza when the letter before it is pronounced with Fath. All of this is according to the method of those who sound the Hamza true. But, as for those who alleviate [it, vid. the Hijazis], they lighten it in the proper way [658]: so that, (1) if the preceding letter be quiescent, they transfer the vowel of the Hamza to the preceding [quiescent] and elide the Hamza; and afterwards elide the [transferred] vowel, on account of the pause, as \( \text{'} \) and \( \text{'} \); and here quiescence, Raum, Ishmām, and reduplication [641] occur: while, in the acc. pronounced with Tanwin, the Tanwin is converted into \( \text{'} \) as \( \text{'} \) and \( \text{'} \) and \( \text{'} \); and here quiescence, Raum, Ishmām, and reduplication [641] occur: while, in the acc. pronounced with Tanwin, the Tanwin is converted into \( \text{'} \) as \( \text{'} \) and \( \text{'} \) and \( \text{'} \); (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 \( \text{'} \) in َأُلمْتَخَا, in the three cases; a, in
and a in: and here only quiescence occurs; not Raum or Ishmām, as we said in the case of the ʿ of feminization [640]; while reduplication is impossible, because it occurs only in the sound [640] (R). The people of AlḤijāz say ʿaṣka the fresh herbage [and ʿaṣkhā 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 ʿ (IY),] like [the Hamza in] ʿaris head [658] (M) and ʿans 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 ʾ or ʿ, respectively; so that (IY)] they say ʿaṣṣ for ʿaṣṣ [above] (M, A); and for ʿaṣṣ I give (M), from ʿaṣṣ al-rājul gave to the man, aor. ʿaṣṣ (IY); and ʿaṣṣ full (A); ʿaṣṣ being (IY) like ʿaṣṣ pounce-box, and [like (IY)] ʿaṣṣ wolf [658] (M).

§. 643. The unsound ʾn. is that which has for its final an unsound letter, vid. ʾ or ʿ or ʿ [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 \( ^{1}\) or \( ^{3}\) (IY),] like the final of \(^{2}\) gazelle [and \(^{2}\) boy (IY), and of \(^{2}\) bucket [and \(^{2}\) 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 Banû Sa'd substitute a \(^{3}\) for the double \( ^{1}\) in pause, because the \( ^{1}\) is faint: while it proceeds from the same outlet as the \(^{3}\) [732]; so that the \(^{3}\), but for its hardness, would be a \( ^{1}\); and the \( ^{1}\), but for its softness, would be a \(^{3}\): and therefore they say \(^{3}\) for \(^{1}\) Fukaimi [311], \(^{3}\) for \(^{1}\) Tamimi, and \(^{3}\) for \(^{1}\) Ali: the poet says \(^{3}\) Alî (IY). [When the penultimate of the unsound \( n. \) is mobile, the \( n. \) is defective or abbreviated.] When the defective [16] is paused upon, its \( ^{1}\) must be expressed in three cases, (1) when it is curtailed of the \( ^{3}\), as when you use the aor. of \(^{3}\) fulfilled or \(^{1}\) stored up as a [proper] name, in which case you say [in the nom. (Tsr)] \(^{3}\) This is Ya'fî and \(^{1}\) This is Ya'\( i\). [and in the gen. \(^{3}\) I passed by
Yajl and ُلاَعَبَيى by Yar (Tsr),] with expression [of the ُي in the nom. and gen. of both (Tsr)], because their o. f. is ُلَجَعَيى and ُلَجَعَيى [482, 644, 699]; and then their ّى is elided, [on account of its occurrence between a ُي pronounced with Fath and a Kasra (Tsr)]; so that, if their ّى 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 curtained of the ُي, as in ُّلَجَعَت act. part. of ُّلَجَعَت shewed: for its o. f. is ُّلَجَعَت, on the measure of ُّلَجَعَت; and then the vowel of its ُي, vid. the Hamza, is transferred to the ّى [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 ُلَجَعَت (Tsr), its ُي being elided, because of its concurrence, when quiescent, with Tanwin (Sn); and the ُي, [which is its ّى (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 ُي and its ّى, and [from] its being left with a single quiescent rad. (Tsr); so that you say ُّلَجَعَتٌ This is a shewer (IA, A): (3) when it is an acc., whether it be pronounced with Tanwin, as in ُّلَجَعَتٌ َبَلَغَت III. 190. Our Lord, verily, we have heard a summoner; or not, as in ُّلَجَعَتٌ َإِذَا بَلَغَت 79 a
LXXV. 26. Not so, when it, [i.e., the soul (K, B),] reaches the highest parts of the breast (Aud); so that, in pause, the ی must be expressed in both [exs., as الْبَرَآئِيَّ and الْبَرَآئِيَّ], because it is fortified [against elision] in the first by the ی of the Tanwin, and in the second by علی (Tsr). As for the acc., in it the defective is like the sound [640], because the vowel [of inflection] is affixed to it in the acc.: so that, if it be not pronounced with Tanwin, its ی is made quiescent, as رَآیَتُ أَلْفَارِضُ I saw the judge; and, if it be pronounced with Tanwin, an ی is substituted for its Tanwin, as رَآیَتُ قَاطِبَا I saw a judge (Jrb). If, however, the defective be a nom. or gen., its ی may be expressed [in pause because it is expressed in continuity, and nothing has arisen to necessitate its elision (Tsr)]; or elided (Aud), to distinguish between continuity and pause (Tsr). But, in the [defective] pronounced with Tanwin, [there is a dispute as to which of the two modes is preferable: and, according to S (Tsr),] the preferable [mode] is elision, as هَذَا قَاضٍ This is a judge and مَرَرْتُ بَقَاضٍ I passed by a judge (Aud): This is the opinion of S and the moderns, because the ی is not expressed in continuity; so that, when pause upon the defective is intended, its vowel and its Tanwin are elided, by analogy to the sound: and because, pause being the place of rest, it is not fitting that what is not
found in continuity should be put in it: so says YS (Sn): [or] because the Tanwin, which is the necessitating cause of elision [16], is constructively remaining (Jrb, Fk). But [مَرْرُتْ ِبَالْقَاضِيِّ], and هُذَا َقَاضِيِّ are allowable, with expression of the ي, which is preferred by Y; and, in accordance therewith (Tsr),] Ibn Kathir reads XIII. 8. And every people hath a guide, وَمَا عَنْدَ َاللَّهِ ُبَالْقَاضِيِّ XIII. 12. Nor have they, beside Him, any protector (Aud), and وَمَا عَنْدَ َاللَّهِ ُبَالْقَاضِيِّ XVI. 98. [2], with expression of the ي in [all of] them (Tsr); [for] some do not elide it, from regard to the fact that Tanwin is not in the word (Jrb). And in the [defective] not pronounced with Tanwin, [vid. the synarthrous (Tsr),] the preferable [mode] is expression [of the ي (Tsr)], as مَرْرُتْ ِبَالْقَاضِيِّ This is the judge and عَلَّقَ ِبَالْقَاضِيِّ I passed by the judge (Aud). But pause with elision is allowable, as مَرْرُتْ ِبَالْقَاضِيِّ هُذَا َقَاضِيِّ; and, in accordance therewith is the pause of the majority [of the Readers] upon ْبَالْقَاضِيِّ in the َالْتَلَاقِ and ْبَالْقَاضِيِّ XIII. 10. The Great, the High [645] and ْبَالْقَاضِيِّ in the َالْتَلَاقِ XL. 15. That He, [or it, or he (K, B),] may give warning of the day of meeting, [i. e., of resurrection (K, B),] where Ibn Kathir pauses with [expression of] the ي; according to the preferable mode. The argument of
those who, in the state of pause, express the ین in the defective pronounced with Tanwin is that its elision is allowable only on account of the Tanwin [16]; while in pause there is no Tanwin, so that the ین must return. And the argument of those who elide it in the defective not pronounced with Tanwin is that the pause is assumed to be upon the indet., with elision of the ین and Tanwin; and the art. to be then prefixed to it, after elision of the ین. But the argument of the first is stronger (Tsr). The defective (Tsr) not pronounced with Tanwin is of four sorts (A, Tsr), (1) that whose Tanwin falls off because of the prefixion of یل [609] (Tsr), [i. e.] the synarthrous (A), which has been mentioned above (Tsr): (2) that whose Tanwin falls off because of its being put into the voc. [48], as in یَا قَاضِی O judge, in which case expression [of the ین] is adopted by ḫl, [whose opinion is preferred by others than S (A),] because elision is allowed [by the GG (Sn)], but is not frequent (A, Tsr), so that it is outweighed by the frequency [of the alternative mode, i. e., expression] (A); while elision is adopted by Y, [whose opinion is preferred by S (A),] because the voc. is the place of elision (A, Tsr) and alteration (Fk), for which reason curtailment is introduced into it [58] (A), while there is no mutilation of the word here (Fk): (3) that whose Tanwin falls off because of diptote declension [17], in which case, if it be an acc., as رَأَیتَ جَوَارِی I saw maidens [18], it is paused upon with expression of the
[necessarily (Sn),] as above mentioned, in [the
discussion of pause upon] the [defective when it is an]
acc. (A, Tsr); while, if it be a nom. or gen., it is said
in the Ham‘ that expression and elision are allowable,
but that the chaster [mode] is expression (Sn): (4) that
whose Tanwin falls off because of prothesis [110, 609],
as in the judge of Makka, in which case,
[when it is paused upon (A),] the two modes allowable
in the case of the [defective] pronounced with Tanwin
are allowable, because, say they, when the prothesis
ceases by reason of the pause upon the defective, then
what went away [from it] because of the prothesis, vid.
the Tanwin, returns to it; so that what is allowable in
the case of the [defective] pronounced with Tanwin is
allowable in its case (A, Tsr). As for the abbreviated
[16, 326], which is that [infl. n.] whose final is an ٠، it
is of two kinds, triptote and diptote. The ٠ of the
triptote [pronounced with Tanwin] falls off in continuity,
because of its quiescence and the quiescence of the
Tanwin after it, as ٥٦٧ This is a staff
and a mill-stone, O youth: but, when you pause, the ٠
returns; and the pause is upon it, contrary to the ٥
above], as ٥٦٧ This is a staff, ٥٦٧ I saw
a staff, and ٥٦٧ I passed by a staff, because of
the lightness of the ٠ (IY). The abbreviated pronounced
with Tanwin is paused upon with the ٠ (Jrb, MN, A,
Tsrt), which must be expressed, in the three cases (Tsrt),
as لْتَنًُوت عَأَيَت I saw a youth [below] (MN, A). The GGT 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, Tsrt), the elision of the converted I [326, 684, 719] in continuity being adopted as a concomitant of pause (A, Tsrt) : this is the opinion of Akh, Fr, and Mz [below] (MN, A, Tsrt); 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, Tsrt), and reported by IBsh to be held by S [below] and Khl (A, Tsrt); 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 سدی 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 Rājiz [Ash Shammākh (MN)]
Verily thou, O Ibn Ja'far art one of whom it is said "Most excellent is the youth!", and the best of them for a nightly visitor, when he comes. And many a guest, that has visited the tribe in (the time of) journeying by night, has found provisions and tidings, what he has desired!, or and some tidings that he has desired! (MN, A), where the evidence is in سری (MN, Sn), because the evidence is pronounced with Tanwīn (MN); not in سری جفتی [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 ی 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 ین that goes away in continuity, it is not elided in pause, because the Fatha and the ین are lighter. Do you not see them flee to the ین from the ی, or ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684]?
And sometimes they flee to it from the [٦ or ی] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as َرْضًا َدُعَا and َرْضًا َدُعَا (R) and َنِهَا (S, IY), for [٦ and] َرْضًا َدُعَا and َنِهَا (IY).

And he also says that they lighten ْعُضْدَ [368, 408] and ْنَبَأ [368, 468, 482] by eliding the vowel of their َعِس; but do not elide the vowel of the َعِس in ِجُمْلَة he-camel (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 ِل, 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 ُهَدَا ْتَاَضَ and ُمَرْتُ َبَقَأَضَ [above], you elide in pause the ِل 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 ِل 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 ِل, in every state, is lighter than Tanwin: but (2) that, in the abbreviated, you restore in pause, in the three cases, the ِل elided on account of the two quiescents, because the last quiescent, vid. the Tanwin, has disappeared, [such restoration being] because the ِل 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-Idāḥ (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 [ or ] ی, 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 

\[ \text{وقَبِيلَ مِنْ لَكِينَةِ شَاهِدٍ} \text{ رَّمْعُ مَرْجُومٍ وَرَمْعُ أَبِي الْمَعَلَّ} \]
When a clan of Lukaiz was present, the kinsfolk of Marjum, and the kinsfolk of Ibn Al Mu'allâ, where he elides the doubling and the \( \text{I} \) in pause (MN, MAR); [for] IM goes on to say [in the CK] "There is no dispute that, in pause, the form of the abbreviated not pronounced with Tanwin is like its form in continuity; and that its \( \text{I} \) is not elided, except in poetic license, as in [above], meaning ُبٌبٌ ٌلُمٌلَٕلٌي " (A). As for the diptote, like حُبَّلٌ ٌسَكَرٌ [18, 272], and what has no Tanwin affixed to it, like جَعَلٌ and جَعَـلٌ [16, 326], its \( \text{I} \), vid. the original \( \text{I} \), which was [sounded] in continuity, is retained, because there is no Tanwin in it, for which the \( \text{I} \) might be a subst. (IY). The \( \text{I} \) paused upon has [four] dial. vars., (1) retention of its form; which is the best known dial.; (2) conversion into \( \text{I} \), because \( \text{I} \) is plainer than \( \text{I} \); which is the dial. of Fazâra and some of Kais: (3) conversion into ج, because ج is plainer than \( \text{I} \); which is the dial. of some of Tayyi: (4) conversion into حمزة [642], because Hamza is the sister of the \( \text{I} \) [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 \( \text{I} \), or from the \( \text{I} \) substituted for the Tanwin, according to the different opinions before mentioned
This is a pregnant (female), with the Hamza, meaning حِبْلٌ.

I saw a man [below], meaning رَأَيْتُ 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 رَأَيْتُ حِبْلًا I saw a pregnant (female), pronouncing with Hamza, although there is no Tanwin in it; and for that reason هُوَ يَصِبِّهَا He strikes her [below] is transmitted (IY). Conversion of the I [substituted for the Tanwin (Jrb)] into Hamza, [as in رَأَيْتُ رَجُلًا (Jrb).] is [of] weak [authority]: as [likewise (Jrb)] is conversion of every [other (R)] I (SH) into Hamza (Jrb), whether it be for feminization, as in حِبْلٌ (R, Jrb); or co-ordination, as in مُعْرَى [273, 375] (R); or anything else (R, Jrb), as in عَمَّا (Jrb), [and] as in يَصِبِّهَا [above], where some of the Arabs convert it into Hamza (R). And so is conversion of the I of [feminization in (Jrb)] such as حِبْلٌ into Hamza, or ٰ, 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 ُوَ يَصِبِّهَا 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 ج is unsound, is with retention of its finals [without elision (IY)], as, [in the ind. (IY)]، يَغَزُّو رَأْيَت حَبْلَي آمِس He raids, يَرْميُ مَرَّى He throws [645] (M), and يَتَخَشَّى لَنْ يَغَزُّو He dreads; and similarly, in the subj., لَنْ يَرْميُ لَنْ يَغَزُّو، لَنْ يَتخَشَّى He shall not raid, and He shall not throw, and لَنْ يَرْمِيْ مَرَّى لَنْ يَتخَشَّى He shall not dread: (a) the v. has no Tanwīn 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., هُوُو يَغَزُّو يَا فَتْنِي and يَرْمِيْ مَرَّى يَا فَتْنِي and He raids, and throws, and dreads, O youth; and, in the subj., لَنْ يَغَزُّو يَا فَتْنِي and لَنْ يَرْمِيْ مَرَّى فَتْنِي and لَنْ يَتخَشَّى فَتْنِي and لَنْ يَرْمِيْ مَرَّى فَتْنِي 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 ب, [which is the better mode (IY),] as, [in the apoc. (IY),] لَنْ يَغَزُّو He did not raid [below],
He did not throw, and He did not dread (M), orig. [404] 

and [similarly, in the imp. (IV),] Raid thou [below], Throw thou, and Dread thou (M), orig. [431], and Dread (IV), and (a) the s are elided [in the apoc.] because of the apocopation; while the vowels before them remain, indicating the elided [letter]; the Damma, Fatha, and Kasra being an indication of the elided , , , and  , respectively: and similarly in the imp.: but, when the v. is paused upon, elision of the vowels is entailed, since pause is only with quiescence, not upon a vowel; so that, grudging that pause should take away the vowels, and thus the indicator and the indicated should [both] be removed, they affix the s of silence [below] to them, in order that the pause may fall upon it with quiescence, and the vowels be preserved [648] (IV): (b) [with quiescence (IV),] without a s, as [below], [and ] [below], [and (IV)]; except in what is reduced, by omission of the s, to a single letter; for here affixion [of the s (IV)] is necessary, as Guard thou, [imp. of ] , aor. , and See thou [615] (M), in order that the quiescence may fall upon it, and the vowel be preserved (IV). One peculiarity of pause is the importation of the s 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 apocopation, as in لَمْ يَخْشَى, and لَمْ يَخْشَى: (a) hence II. 261. [647] (Aud), according to the saying that it is from سَنَةَ year, sing. of سَنْوُنَ [284], and that its ل is an elided ل; the o. f. being يَخْشُى; but the ل being converted into ل because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 719]; and the ل elided on account of the apocopative [404]; and then the s of silence affixed in pause: which is the opinion adopted by Mb (Tsr): or (2) on account of uninflected-ness (Aud), as in the *imp. v.*, according to the saying of the BB [431] (Tsr), as أَخَذَهُ [above], and أَخَذَهُ فِيْهِذَاءٍ أَتَتَدْهُ VI. 90. [647] (Aud), *imp.* of يَقْتُدَى, 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 neces-
sary (Aud): you [may] say in pause لَمْ يَخْرُ [above], لَمْ يَخْرُ, and لَمْ يَخْشَى, and لَمْ يَخْشَى, 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 *dialect* is the rarer of the two *dialects*. [615] (S). And the *s* is not necessary (*Tsr*), except in one case, *vid.* when the *v.* [*subjected to elision (*Tsr*)] remains with one letter, like the *imp.* of وَعَى, *aor.* یَعَى [482, 643, 699], where you say عَ (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)*,] َلَمْ يَعْدُ 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 وَلَمْ آنْ XIX. 20. [450] and رَمَّسَ تَقِيَ 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 لَم governed in the *gen.* by a *p.*, because the *p.* becomes like part of the لَم, 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 وَاللَّيْلِ إِذًا يَسْرُ LXXIX. 3. [below], مَا كُنَا نَبِّيٌْ XVIII. 63. What we were desiring, يَوْمَ الْمَزْجَانِ 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 الْكَبْرِ الْمَتَاعِلِ XIII. 10. [643] (S); and in rhymes (S, R), as in the saying of Zuhair وَأَرَأَكَ تَفْرَى [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 جِيِّبَ in [the ind. of] the defective v., as يَغْزِرُ [644], which are not elided in pause, because their elision is not authorized in continuity, lest the ind. be confounded with the apoc. [below], except as a poetic license; or as a quasi-anomaly, like their saying لا أُدرُ I shall not know, [transmitted by Khl
and S (K on XI. 107),] and the texts XVIII. 63. [above] and يَوْمُ بَيْتِ لا تَكَلَّمْ نَفْسٍ XI. 107. On the day, when it shall come, no soul shall speak (R), the latter being read by Ibn 'Amir, 'Asim, and Hamza with elision of the ی, because the Kasra is considered sufficient without it (B); [or as a dialectic peculiarity, since Z says that] elision of the ی, because the Kasra is considered sufficient without it, is frequent in the dial. of Hudhail (K on XI. 107): while [in most dials.] they do not say لَا أَرْمِ يَا ثُمَّ یَدُ رَبِّی زَیْدُ یَا یَا یَهْزَی , I shall not throw. This is as they say یَا یَهْزَی Zaid was not [450]; but not لَا یَا یَهْزَی , in the sense of یَا یَهْزَی was not mean. When, however, the ی and ی mentioned occur in terminations of versicles, in continuity, it is allowable to elide them, contenting oneself with the vowel of the preceding [letter], as in یَا یَسِّرِی یَا یَسِّرِی LXXIX. 3. [319], for observance of homogeneity and conformity (R) with what precedes and follows them (MAR). And it is necessary to elide them, when you pause upon those terminations of versicles, whose ی's are elided in continuity. And similarly, in rhymes, they are often elided, for conformity, not for pause; although they are not elided [in poetry] for pause otherwise than in rhymes. It is therefore established that what is not elided otherwise than in terminations of versicles, and in rhymes, is elided in them. The
poet [Zuhair, praising Harim Ibn Sinān alMurrī (IY, AKB, MAR) for decision, and execution of his resolve (IY),] says

(832)

And assuredly thou cuttest out what thou hast measured; while some people measure, and then cut not out (AKB, MAR); or, in another version, assuredly thou cuttest 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 the [643], the of which is sometimes, though rarely, elided in continuity, otherwise than in terminations of verses and in rhymes [above], as [below] (R), fragments of two separate texts, XL. 34. [above] and XL. 16. [1], which R, as appears from his language, supposes to be one sentence (MAR), and [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 ٓ in continuity is better than elision of the ی of such as بِرَمِی [above], because the ٓ of such as الْرَآمِی the thrower is elided in continuity, otherwise than in terminations of versicles, without anomalousness, as بِیوَمَ أَنْنَادِ وَیوَمَ بَیْرَمَزُونَ [above]; while the ی of such as یَرَمِی is not elided, in the like [position], except anomalously, as we have mentioned. And, when you pause upon the defective n. whose ٓ is elided in continuity, elision of the ٓ is necessary. But, when you pause upon the defective n. whose ٓ is retained in continuity, elision of its ٓ is allowable, not necessary: S says (R), Retention of the ۶ and ی [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 ۶, however, is not elided, either in terminations of versicles, or in rhymes [below], except by poetic license, as in رَخْطُ مَرْجَمِی آلْح [643], because of the lightness of the ۶, and the heaviness of the ۶ and ی. S uses language whose meaning is that, in rhymes, you elide the rad. ۶, and ی in imitation [of the elision] of the aug. ۶, and ی following دَامْمَا and كَسْرا, and resembling the ۶, and ی in the pause of the Azd of AsSarat [640]. He means that you elide the ی from بِیِقْرَی [above] in imitation of the elision of the ی in the preceding verse, vid. ۱۲۱ لَذَاتُ أَسْکِمْ
al-durar [193]; so that, since elision of the ی of the ید is allowed, because it is like [the ی in] the pause of the Azd of AsSarat in مَرْتُ يَعْمِرُ [640], the rad. ی imitates it in elision, since the rhymes must proceed uniformly: and similarly with the ۤ، as in the saying [of Zuhair (Jh, MAR)]

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

صَبَحَا القَلْبُ عَن سَلَمَى وَقُدْ كَانَ لَا عُسُلُ
ۡوُ أَفْتَرِصَ مِن سَلَمَى الْكَعَانِيَّاتِ ۡوُ أَلْقَتْ

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

دَائِنَتِ امْرَى وَالدَيْونَ تَقَضَى ۡمُطْلَتُ بَعْصَا وَآدَتْ بَعْصَا (S, R), by Ru’ba Ibn Al‘Ajja—so says IBr (MN),
I lent to Arwa, 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 زيداً, is not elided in the best-known [dial.], as the ى and ى arising, in pause, in the dial. of the Azd of Assarat [640], are elided by most of the Arabs (R); and therefore, as the I of بعصاً is not elided, so the I of below] is not elided (S). S says (R), The elision of the ى of [such as (R)] يدعرُ, [and of the ى of such as يدعرُ, in rhymes (R),] induces many of Kais and Asad to elide the ى and ى that are [the sign of (S)] the pron.: though neither of them is so often elided as the ى of (S, R), and the ى of يدعرُ, 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 ى in

\[
\text{يا عجبًا لِلدَّعَرُ شَتَى طَرِبُّتُهُ}
\]

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

لا یُبَعِدِ اللَّهُ إِخوَانًا تَرَكَتْهُم ۖ لَا أَدْرَكُ بَعْدَ غَدَادَةِ الْبَيْنِ مَا صَنَعَ

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

\[
\text{يا دار عبلة با لتجزاء تكذب } * \text{ ومضى صباحا دار عبلة راسلم.}
\]

\( (S, R) \) O home of 'Abla in AlJiwá, speak, and tell me of thine inmates, what they have done. And be thou pleasant at morn, home of 'Abla, and be safe! (EM), meaning [and \( \text{'أسلم } \) (S), [which] also is recited with [elision of the \( \iota \) and (MAR)] quiescence of the \( \mu \) (R); and AlKhuzaz Ibn Laudhán says

\[
	ext{كذب الاعتبق وماه شين باردا } * \text{ إن كنت سائبتي عبوتي فأدهب.}
\]

[187], meaning \( \text{'نأدهب } \) (S). But the \( \iota \) [of the pron. (R)] in [such as (R)]

\[
	ext{حليمه طيِرا باليسفين أو تعا.}
\]

[recited to us by Khl (S), My two friends, fly with separation, or fall, or, in one MS, \( \text{'فنا stop (MAR).} \)]

is not elided (S, R), as it is not elided from \( \text{تقصى } \) [above] (S), because of what we have mentioned (R), vid. that the \( \iota \) paused upon, in such as \( \text{زيدا} \), is not elided in the best-known [\text{\text{dial.}}] (MAR). I do not know any instance where the \( \iota \) of the pron. is elided in terminations of verses, as it is in rhymes; but the \( \iota \) of the pron. is elided in terminations of verses, as XXIX. 56. [420] (R).
§ 646. When the \( \textit{\textbf{c}} \) of feminization is paused upon, the \( \textit{\textbf{t}} \) is kept, [being preserved from conversion here (Tsr),] if it be attached to (1) a p. [263, 402], as in \( \textit{\textbf{t}\textit{\textbf{n}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) [263, 402, 540] (Aud), \( \textit{\textbf{r}\textit{\textbf{t}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) [505], and \( \textit{\textbf{t}\textit{\textbf{l}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) [537] (Tsr): (a) \( \textit{\textbf{l}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) [109] is paused upon, by Ks [alone (Tsr)], with the s (A, Tsr), irregularly (Tsr); and, by the remainder [of the Seven Readers], with the \( \textit{\textbf{t}} \) : (b) IM says in the CK “In my opinion, it is allowable to pause with the s upon \( \textit{\textbf{t}\textit{\textbf{n}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) and \( \textit{\textbf{r}\textit{\textbf{t}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \), by analogy to their saying \( \textit{\textbf{l}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) in the case of \( \textit{\textbf{l}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \)” (A); but this is open to the objection that (Sn) the [similar] saying of AH “As for \( \textit{\textbf{t}\textit{\textbf{n}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \), \( \textit{\textbf{r}\textit{\textbf{t}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \), and \( \textit{\textbf{t}\textit{\textbf{l}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \), they are commonly regarded as analogous to \( \textit{\textbf{l}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \), so that they are paused upon in both modes,” is refuted, because (Tsr) pause upon \( \textit{\textbf{l}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) with the s is not regular, and (Sn) what is irregular is not to be copied (Tsr, Sn): (2) a v. [263, 402, 607], as in \( \textit{\textbf{t}\textit{\textbf{m}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) She stood (Aud) and \( \textit{\textbf{t}\textit{\textbf{m}}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) She sat: (a) the \( \textit{\textbf{t}} \) is kept, in the p. and v., from fear of confusion with the pron. in \( \textit{\textbf{r}\textit{\textbf{t}}} \) [168, 505] and \( \textit{\textbf{h} \textit{\textbf{r}}\textit{\textbf{b}}} \) 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 \( \textit{\textbf{h} \textit{\textbf{r}}\textit{\textbf{b}}} \) \textit{Darabat}, and then made it a \( \textit{\textbf{m}} \), saying \( \textit{\textbf{h} \textit{\textbf{r}}\textit{\textbf{b}}} \) \textit{Duraiba}, you would pause upon it with the s, because it would have been transferred from the [the cat. of] the v. to [that of] the n.” (Tsr): (3) a n., when
the ب is preceded by a sound quiescent, as in غنَّى and بَنَّى [263] (Aud), because the ب in them, being preceded by a quiescent, becomes, as it were, not for feminization, but put only to coordinate the مات. with أئْل, being for co-ordination with قُل [368] and اذْخَر [307, 689] (Tsr). And it may be retained [in its own form (Tsr)], or be changed [into َ (Tsr)], if it be [attached to a ْ, when the ب is] preceded by (1) a vowel, [which is only Fatha (Tsr),] as in تَرْبَة date and شَجَرَة tree (Aud), to distinguish it from the مات. ب, as in وقت time [below] and بَيْت tent (Tsr): (2) an unsound quiescent, [which is only an َ (Tsr),] as in صَلَاة prayer (Aud), رَأْي poor-rate, alms, and دَات [below] (Tsr); and [as] مَسْلَمَات female Muslims (Aud) and أُلَّات [below]: because the unsound quiescent [in صَلَاة, etc.,] is constructively like the mobile, since it is in the position of the latter, and is converted from it [684, 719]; and because the َ in مَسْلَمَات etc.,] proceeds from Fatha, and is on a par with the mobile letter, for which reason, with it, two quiescents [may] concur [663], as in دَوَابُ beasts [256], contrary to what is the case when the quiescent is sound (Tsr). There is no dispute that the verbal ب of feminization is a ب in pause, and also that its o. f. is ب [607]. But, as for the nominal [263], its o. f. is disputed.
For S, Fr, IK, and most of the GG hold that the ﺭ is the o. f., as in the v.: but that, in pause, it is converted into ﺱ, to distinguish the nominal from the verbal ﺭ; or the nominal [ ﺭ ], which is for feminization, as in ﺭ ﻌ [385], from that which is not so, as in ﻌ ﺭ. 

malignant and ﺭ ﻌ [399, 678]: while the reason why it is converted into ﺱ is that, in the ﺱ, there are more faintness and softness than in the ﺭ; so that, in the state of pause, which is the position of rest [640], the ﺱ is more appropriate, for which reason, in pause, the ﺱ is added to what does not contain it, I mean the ﺱ of silence [615, 644], as in ﺱ ﻆ and ﻆ ﻌ [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 ﺱ, in the feminization of the n., is the o. f.; and that, in continuity, it is converted into ﺭ, because, if it were left in its state, as a ﺱ, one would say ﺭ ﺯ ﺱ ﻆ I saw a tree, with Tanwin; and, in pause, the Tanwin would be converted into ﺱ, as in ﺱ ﺯ [640]; so that, in pause, it would be liable to be mistaken for the [attached gen.] fem. [pron.] ﻆ [161]: and therefore, in continuity, the ﺱ is converted into 82 ﺱ.
and afterwards, when one comes to pause, it returns to its o.f., vid. the ُه. And, according to S also, the reason why the Tanwīn [in the acc. of the n. made fem. by the ُه] is not converted into ُه, after conversion of the ُه [into ُه], is fear of confusion (R) with the fem. ُهَ (M.A.R). But the preferable mode is pause with the ُه in (1) the sound pl., like مُسْلِمٌاتٌ (Aud) and ُهَنَذَاتٌ [17] (Tsr): (2) what resembles it, vid. (a) the quasi-pl. n., [which has no sing. of its own crude-form (Tsr),] like ُهُلَاتٌ [17] (Aud), which has no sing. of its own crude-form [257], but only a sing. of its sense, vid. ُهَاتٍ [below] (Tsr): (b) the pl. used as a name, (a) actually, like عُرَفَاتٌ and أَدْرَعَاتٌ [17] (Aud), which are actually pl.s. of عَرَبَةٌ 'Arāfa, the halting-place of the pilgrims, and أَدْرَعَةٌ Adhria, a town of Syria (Tsr): (b) constructively, like هَيْهَاتٌ [below], which is constructively pl. of هَيْهَةٌ, [its o. f. being هَيْهَاتٍ, the ل of which, vid. the ی, is elided; and its measure being ُتْلَاتٍ, orig. ُتْلَاتٍ (Tsr)], and is afterwards used as a [verbal n., literally] name of a v. (Aud); so that its sense becomes بَعْدَ Far off is! [187]: though هَيْهَاتٍ is said [by some] to be a sing., its o. f. being هَيْهَةٌ, on the measure of ُتْلَاتٍ, reduplicated, like ُتْلَاتٍ [332] (Tsr). The reason why the [well-known, usual (Jrb), preferable (Tsr),] mode is
pause with the َوَاء, [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 َمَثَلْ or َلَم with the َبَكْرَ, because, if added [with the َبَكْرَ], it would be converted into Hamza [683], therefore they add the َوَاء with the َبَكْرَ, because the َوَاء [sometimes] becomes a subst. for the َمَثَلْ, as in [ْوَفِتْ َوَأْنَانَى (Jrb)] ْوَفِتْ َوَأْنَانَى [689]; and it then becomes the sign of feminization, and does away with the necessity for saying مُسَلِّبَتُ as pl. of مُسَلِّبَتُ; so that, since this َوَاء imports pluralization and feminization [234], and does away with the necessity for the sign of feminization affixed to the sing., it is [preferably] retained in pause, and is not changed into ُمَثَلْ (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 َوَاء (A) into ُمَثَلْ (A, Tsr)] has been heard in the sayings [of some of them (A), transmitted by Ktb from Tayyi (Tsr), َكَيْفَ َلَبْنَٰنَ ْوَلَبْنَٰنَ ] َكَيْفَ َلَبْنَٰنَ ْوَلَبْنَٰنَ How are the sons and the daughters? (R, Jrb, Fk), َكَيْفَ َلَمْ أَخْوَٰنَ ْوَلَلَمْ أَخْوَٰنَ َلَمْ أَخْوَٰنَ ْوَلَلَمْ أَخْوَٰنَ How are the brothers and the sisters? [690], and ُدَفْنُ َلِبْنَٰنَ ْوَلِلْبَنَٰنَ ُدَفْنُ َلِبْنَٰنَ ْوَلِلْبَنَٰنَ The burial of daughters is one of the noble deeds (Aud, A), with change of the َوَاء of the pl. into ُمَثَلْ.
[in pause (Jrb),] by assimilation to the pure َه of feminization (Jrb, Tsr): while َه and have been heard (A); and َه XXIII. 38. [187, 195, 504] is read by Ks and Bz (Aud), with change of the َه into َه (B, Tsr). Some report that this is the dial. of Tayyi; but [IHKh (HKh),] the author of the Ifsâh [bi Fawâ'id alIdâh (HKh),] says that it is anomalous, not to be copied (A).

As for َه [above], it has two dial. vars., Fath and Kasr of the َه [195]. Those who pronounce [the َه] with Fath make ُه a sing., and pause upon it with the َه; while those who pronounce the َه with Kasr make ُه a pl., and pause upon it with the َه (IY). The [statement] reported from Ks is that those who pronounce the َه with Kasr pause upon ُه with the َه; while those who pronounce the َه with Fath pause upon ُه with the َه or َه (Tsr). But [the GG say that (Jrb)] ُه, if held to be a pl., is paused upon with the َه; and, if held to be a sing., is paused upon with the َه (M, Jrb, Tsr): so in the [M and] Jrb (Tsr).

IH, however, says, in the CM, that [this is matter of assumption, since (Jrb)] ُه, being a verbal n., cannot be truly said to be sing. or pl.; while that [pause upon it with the َه or َه] is only because of its resemblance in form, not in number, to [a n. ending in] the َه 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 ُ، Fath, or Kasr of the ت، its *f. may be قَيَّةٌ; but that pause upon it with the ُ is rare, because it is co-ordinated with vs., on account of its being a verbal n.; while conversion of its ت into ُ is nevertheless allowed, because it is assimilated, in form, to such as *تَّوَاَتْ clucking (R). When a man is named ُهُ، according to the dial. of those who change [the ت into ُ in pause], it is like كَلْتَكْهُ [18], being diptote because of the quality of proper name together with feminization; but, when ُهُ is used as a name, according to dial. of those who do not change, it is like عَرَنَاتْ [17], being infl. like the perf. pl. fem. when used as a name (A). And apparently أَوْلَتْ [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)] إِسْتَأْصَلَ أَلَّهَ عَرْقَاتُهُم God extirpate their roots! or عَرْقَاتُهُم their root! (M). For عَرْقَة root, pronounced with Fath [of its ت in the acc. (R, Jrb)], is [held to be (IY)] a sing. (IY, R, Jrb), co-ordinated with ٍدَرْهَمْ [392] (R), like سَعْلَة [248, 272] (Jrb), the ُ in it being for co-ordination with ٍدَرْهَمْ [392] (IY), as is the case in مُعْرِي (IY, R) and دُنْرَى [272, 375], according to those who pronounce them with Tanwin
(IY); and pause upon it is with the s: while عَرَقُتْ roots, pronounced with Kasr [of its ت (R, Jrb) in the acc. (R)], is [held to be (IY)] a pl. (IY, R, Jrb), the I in it being the one accompanying the ت of the pl. fem., as though it were pl. (IY) of عَرَقُتْ root (IY, R), the masc. being pluralized with the I and ت, notwithstanding the occurrence of a broken pl. for it, i. e., عُرَوقُتْ, as is said, notwithstanding بُرُون, in the pl. of بُرُون [261] (R); [or] of عَرَقُتْ (Md, KF); and pause upon it is more properly with the ت, as in the case of مُسْلِمُاتْ [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 8, for distinction between the ت of femininization and the rad. ت, as in عَقْتْ [above] and مَوتُ death, this being the reason assigned by S: or, as is said (Tsr), for distinction between it and the ت of femininization affixed to the v. (Jrb, Tsr, Fk), as in ضَرَبَتْ [607] (Tsr); while they do not reverse [the distinction, assigning the ت to the n., and the 8 to the v.], because, if they said ضَرَبَتْ for ضَرَبَتْ, the 8 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 [Akh asserts that (R), in the less chaste mode (Fk),] some [of the Arabs (M, R, Jrb)] pause [upon such as ُحَبْتْ]
(Fk)] with the ت (M, R, Jrb, Fk), without change, as رَحْمَتُ (Fk), which is a wide-spread dial., transmitted by Akh (IY), whence [their saying وَعَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ وَالْرَحْمَتُ and upon him be peace and mercy!], and (IY, Jrb)] the saying of the poet بَل جُوَّرَ تَشَهَا آلَعَم [183, 640, 690] (M, Jrb): while an [additional] instance of pause with omission of change [into ٍ (Tsr)] is the reading of نَافِي، Ibn ’Āmir, and ِحَمْزَة إِنَّ شَكْرَتْ XXIV. 43. [below] (Aud), with the ت (Tsr); and the [other (IY, Jrb)] poet [Abu-nNajm (Tsr, YS)] says وَاللَّهُ نَجَّالٍ ِبِكَيْفُ مَسْلَمَت مِنْ بَعْدَهَا وَبَعْدَهَا وَبَعْدَهَا صَارَتْ نَفْسُ الْقَوْمِ عِندَ الْغُلُصَّات مِثْلَ الْحُـرَةَ أَنْ تَدْعَى أَمَّة (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 بَعْدَهَا, a ٍ being supposed to be substituted for the ٰ (IY, Jrb, MN, Tsr, YS), so that it becomes بَعْدَهَا, since the ٍ is sometimes substituted for the ٰ, as in [175, 181, 690], meaning هُنَا (IY) and نِمَا (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 I is changed into s; and the s then changed into ⽬, by assimilation to the ⽬ of femininization; so that it is paused upon with the ⽬ (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)]

Verily the tree of AzZahkûm [above] (A, Fk), َلِهيِّتَيَسْمُونَ رَحْمَتَ رَبِّكَ XLIIV. 43. َنَتَّبَعُونَ ُرَحْمَةَ ٍرَبِّكَ XLIII.

31. What! shall they part out the mercy of thy Lord? (Fk), ِأَمْرَتَ نُوحٍ َتَأَمْرَتَ لُوطٍ LXVI. 10. The wife of Noah and the wife of Lot, and the like (A), are written in the Codex (A, Fk) with the ⽬ (Fk). Our master, the Sayyid, relates that every َأَمْرَتْ, mentioned in the Kur with her husband, is written with the extended ⽬ (Sn). Therefore Nafi', Ibn 'Amir, 'Asim, and Hamza pause upon them with the ⽬; while Ibn Kathir, IAl, and Ks pause upon them with the s (A).

The ⽬, if written as a s [in the Codex], is paused upon by all the [Seven] Readers with the s: but, if written as a ⽬, is paused upon by some with the s, for observance of the o.f.; and by others with the ⽬, for observance of the 'Uthmâni orthography: so says our master, the Sayyid (Sn). Most of those [Arabs] who pause [upon such as ُرَحْمَة] with the ⽬ 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., I saw a handmaid, like رَأَيتُ آمَتا [640], with the ا ; but رَأَيتُ آمَتُ , as in زِتَا [above], because it is made to accord with آمَتٍ with the s, which is the o. f. in pause (R). But some of them pause upon the [n.] made fem. by the ë, when it is an acc. pronounced with Tanwin, as they pause upon the [n.] bare [of the ë ], when it is an acc. pronounced with Tanwin [640] (Sn).

There is a dispute about دَانُ [above] in such as عَلَيْهِ بِدَاتٍ الصَّدْورِ 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 ت , because, being pre. [115], it is always intermediate; while Ks and Jr say that it is paused upon with the s, because [the ت in] it is a ت of femininization, so that you say دَا : so says Hf (Tsr). The ت not for femininization is not altered [in pause], the saying of some تَعْدَنَا عَلَيْ آلْفَرَا 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 [Manzûr Ibn Ḥabba al-Asadî (MN, Jsh)] says

\[
\text{لَمَّا رَأَى أَنَّ لَا دَعَةَ وَلَا شَبَيعٌ مَّالٌ إِلَى أَرَاطَةٍ حَقِّ فَنَطَعَ [691]} (IY, R),
\]
describing a wolf that meant to catch a gazelle (Jsh). When he (the wolf) saw that there was no ease, and no gluttion of his appetite, [in the pursuit of the gazelle (MN),] he turned aside to an Arṭà tree of a curving tract of sand, and lay down (MN, Jsh) to sleep (Jsh), where he substitutes a ʾālam for the ʾālam of ʾālam, and retains it in continuity (IY); [and] hence ʾālam (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) ُلَّيْنَةٍ [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., ُلَّيْنَةٍ [321, 648], where they substitute a ʾālam for the ʾālam [of ُلَّيْنَةٍ ] in pause, and then throw the vowel of the Hamza [of ] upon the ʾālam, and elide the Hamza, on the principle of the reading تَدَ أَفْلَحَ الْوُلْدُونَ [XXIII. 1. The believers have prospered [16], which occurs only in continuity (IY): (2) XVIII. 36. [521] (M, R), in the reading of Ibn Āmlr (IY, R), with retention of the ʾālam [ُلَّيْنَةٍ (K, B)], the vowel of the Hamza...
being thrown upon the ن of لَكُنَّ, the Hamza elided, and the ن incorporated into the ن; whereas analogy requires the َل of أَنَا to be elided in continuity, because it is put to make the vowel plain in pause [161], like the َل in كتابِي LXIX. 19. and حِسَابيَّة LXIX. 20. [below]: Zj says “Retention of the َل [of أَنَا] is excellent here, because, the Hamza being elided, the َل becomes a compensation for it”, meaning in لَكُنَّ (IY): (3) [similarly (IY)] II. 260. [166] (IY, R), with retention of the َل of أَنَا [161]: (4) كتابِي LXIX. 19. [22, 638, 648, 679] and حِسَابيَّة 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 َل 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 يَتَسَسْطَرَ، وَأَنْظُرَ II. 261. It hath not been altered by the lapse of years: and look [644] (IA, Aud, A) and Then by their guidance
suffer thou thyself to be led: say (Aud, A), with expression of the _SOUND of silence in continuous speech (Aud):
(b) _قَلْتَهُمْ نَبِيٌّ لَهُمُ الْمَلَأُ_.
(c) عَنَى سُلْطَانِيَّةٍ خُذْرٌ
LXIX. 28–30. My wealth hath not availed me: my power etc. [615, 648]: (d) the saying of some of Tayyi _هُذِهُ حَبَلٌ يَا فَتَا_. This is a pregnant female, O youth, because it is only in pause that this ل is changed into ل، [643] (A): (2) in poetry, (a) [640] (IA, Aud, A), where the ل is doubled, notwithstanding that it is conjoined with the letter of unbinding (IA, A): (a) it is _أَوْ كَأَلْكَرِدقِ آللُم_ , with a single ل; but, being assumed to be paused upon, the ل is doubled, on the principle of their saying in pause, [640], with reduplication; and then the letter of unbinding is put, vid. the ل; while the reduplication of the ل remains (Aud) in continuity, by assimilation of continuity to pause in respect of reduplication (Tsr): (b) _آَتَا نَادِيَةَ آللُم_ [183] (A), where there are two anomalies, (a) affixion of the ل and مَنَ to in continuity (MN); whereas analogy requires مَنْ أَنْتَمْ , because, in continuity, the form of مَنْ does not vary [in number or gender] (Sn): and (b) mobilization of the [affixed] ل, which is [properly] quiescent (MN). The GG say that the poet, in such as عَيْهِلَ and _الْقَصَبَ_ [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 أَعْطِني أُبيضَةَ Give me a white one, meaning أبيضَة (S, R); but affixing the س as he affixes it in أَعْطَى, when he means أَعْطَى [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 أ or a , or ي (Sn),] as in

أَتَلِيَ اللَّهُمَّ عَازِلَ وَأَعْتَابُ [608]. But the Hijāzis retain the letter of prolongation, unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether they intend to quaver or not (Sn),] saying أَعْتَابُ : while the Tamīmīs, if they [intend to (Sn)] quaver, do likewise, [i. e., retain the letter of prolongation (Sn)]; and, if not, put ثانِٰب as a compensation for it, [in order to discontinue the
quavering (Sn),] unrestrictedly, [i. e., after a Ğamma, Fatha, or Kasra (Sn),] as in

سُقِيبْ عَفْيَتَ أَيِّتْهَا ِلَحْيَامَنَ

[1],

يَا صَاحِبَةَ هَاجَ عَفْيَتَ الْعُبْرَانَ الْمُرْتَبَنَ

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

لَمْ تَرْسُ عِرْقَائِيْنَ وَكَأَنَّ قَدْ دَيْنَ

[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 َذا (Tsr),] as in َعَمْ and َقَيْمِ, [where it is governed in the gen. by a p. (Tsr),] and in ِمَكْتِبََِّمَ َجُنُّتَ 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 َما must be elided, to distinguish it from the enunciatory, [which is the conjunct and the cond. (Tsr),] َسَأَلْتُ عَنَّا َسَأَلْتَ عَنَّهُ َذا I asked about what thou askedst about [or َعَنْ مَثَلِ مَا َلَحْ ِبِنَا تَفْرَحْ َأَفْرَحِ At whatever thou rejoicest, I will rejoice and
Whenever thou comest to me, I will honor thee, where ما is cond. (Tsr)] : so that, when you pause upon it, you affix the s, for preservation of the Fatha indicative of the [elided (Tsr)] । [below]. And the s is necessary if the genitival op. [of the interrog. مَا (Tsr)] be a n., as in من بصحة آلح How did he exact? [640], where you say من بصحة and وثمة ； and preferable if it be a p., as in عم يُنساء لون LXXVIII. 1. [181], where [it is reported (K) by] Bz [that Ibn Kathīr (K)] reads من عمة (K), with the s (Aud) of silence (K, Tsr), either because he treats continuity like pause [647]; or because he pauses [upon عمة Of what (question they among themselves) ？], and begins afresh with يُنساء لون عن أَلْبَى َالْعَظِيم LXXVIII. 1, 2. They question among themselves of the great tidings, a [previous] من عمة لون, [on which عمة depends,] being understood, because expounded by what follows it (K). The difference is that the ما governed in the gen. by a p. is conjoined with it [181]; while the prep. is not independent in its meaning [497], so that it is like part of the ما [644]; for which reason the s 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. n. 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 \( y \) of the 1st pers. [161], \( ه \), and \( ِه \), according to those who pronounce them with Fath [below] (Aud) in continuity; and like the \( ل \) of the 2nd pers. [below] (Tsr). The Revelation has \( مَائِلْٰٓ يَهَيْٰٓ ْلَهُ مَنْ هَوَّةٍ \) CI. 7. What it is, and LXIX. 28. and ُستُلطُنِيَّةٰ LXIX. 29. [below]; and the poet [Hassan (MN, Tsr) Ibn Thabit al Anṣārī (MN) aš-Šahābī (Tsr)] says

إِذَا مَا نَزَعَ فِي نَا الْعَلَامُ ﻧُفَّمَا إِنْ يُقَالُ لَهُ مَنْ هَوَّةٍ [below] (Aud) When the lad grows up among us, it is not said of him “Who is he?”, َِّٰٓ ْلِنْ يُتَّبِعُ ْلَهُ مَنْ هَوَّةٍ [563] (MN). But the \( s \) is not affixed to such as \( جَآءَ ُزَيْدٰٓ (1) Zaid came, because ُزَيْدٰٓ 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 ُلِمْ يُضْرِبُ He struck not, because the \( v \). is quiescent; [and the \( s \) is affixed only to make the vowel plain (Tsr)]: (3) [99] (Aud), with فَثِى (Tsr), and ُيَأْ ُزَيْدٰٓ [48] and ُمِنْ بَعْدٰٓ and ُمِنْ بَعْدٰٓ [201] (Aud), with ُدَامّ (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 s being affixed to what is accidentally uninfl., since عُلْلُ is the vowel in them, the vowel in عُلْلُ resembles the vowel of inflection, because it supervenes on account of something resembling the op. (Tsr): so say F and IM; but as to this there is a dispute [before] mentioned [201] (Aud); and some say that the s in عُلْلُ is a subst. for the s, the o.f. being عُلْلُ (Tsr): (4) the pret. v. [403], like [the trans. (Tsr)] ضَرَبَ struck [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 لُ [99], the aprot. voc. [48], the advs. cut off from prothesis [201], and the pret. v. [403]: and as to [affixion of the s of silence to] it there are three opinions, (1) disallowance, unrestrictedly, which is the opinion of S: (2) allowance, unrestrictedly, because the vowel is inseparable: (3) [allowance of] affixion when there is no fear of ambiguity, as in عُلْلُ He sat; and disallowance if ambiguity result, as in ضَرَبَ [below], because the s is liable to be mistaken for the obj. (Tsr). In pause upon the uninfl. [ns. (IY)], you say (1) أَنَا 81a
with the [161, 497]; or أَمَّنَ with the s [690] (M), in place of the I, because their outlet [732] is one, whence: the saying of Hātim "هَذَا نَزْدِي أَمَّنَ This is my way of bleeding, mine [696]: (a) this I, in its being imported, in pause, to make the vowel [of the final] plain, is like the s in LXIX. 19. [22, 638, 647, 679] and LXIX. 20. [647]: (b) hence, their saying; in pause، حَيِّيَّ مُكَّا [with the I], or حَيِّيَّ عَلَي [with quiescence]; but, when they continue، حَيِّيَّ مُكَّا [191] with Fath of the I, without an I: (c) the Arabs do not pause, upon any thing in their language, with the I, to make the vowel plain, except in these two positions, I mean عَلَكَ and أَمَّنَا [615] (IV): (2) حَيِّيَّ عَلَي with quiescence, or حَيِّيَّ مُكَّا with affixion of the s (M): (a) pause upon the pron. هُوَ he [161] is mostly with the s, to make the vowel of the, plain; and so is pause upon. أَمَّنَ she: you say هِيَةٌ, not eliding anything from it, as you elide in the case of the decl. [643]; and the poet says إِذَا مَا تَرَّعَعَ أَلَعَ above, cited by S: but some of the Arabs pause with quiescence, saying هُوَ and هِيَ, contrary to أَمَّنَ, which is not paused upon with quiescence; so that, in answer to "who did?", one does not say أَمَّنَ I, as one says هُوَ he or هِيَ she: for أَمَّنَ, in addition to the paucity of its letters, has: for its final أَمَّنَ, which is faint, and is not a letter of inflection here, like the final of أَمَّنَ.
hand and َذَمُّ blood; so that, on account of the faintness of the ن, the paucity of the letters, and the fact that the final of َأَنُّ is not a letter of inflection, an ﴾ is imported in pause, and is inseparable from that [expression], contrary to َعُو and َعَي, 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 َعَا and َعَي [above]; while those who make [the ﴾ and ﴾] quiescent [below] pause only with quiescence, not otherwise (IY): (3) َعُيِّنَا [175]; and these or َعُولَا [174], when it, [i. e., َعُولَا (IY),] is abbreviated (M): (a) this ﴾ in َعُيِّنَا and َعُولَا is affixed, with the ﴾, in pause, because of the faintness and lowness of the ﴾; but the better [mode] is to pause without a ﴾:

(6) those who prolong [the final ﴾ of َعُولَا], and add a Hamza, [saying َعُولَا],] pause upon the Hamza with quiescence: (c) this ﴾ does not follow any of the quiescents, except the ﴾, because of its faintness; so that you do not say َعُو for َعُو, nor َعَي for َعَي [above], according to the dial. of those who make the ﴾ and ﴾ quiescent [above], because the ﴾, being faint, on account of its remoteness [732], is more in need of being made plain (IY): (4) I honored thee or َأَكْرَمْتُكَ [below] (M):

(a) in the case of the ﴾ of the pron. [161], as in َأَكْرَمْتُكَ I honored thee [masc.] and َأَكْرَمْتُكَ I gave thee [fem.]
there are two modes, pause with quiescence, as أَكْرَمْتُكَ [above] and أَعْطَيْتُكَ; and pause with the s, as أَكْرَمْتَكَ [above] and أَعْطَيْتَكَ, 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 ل in the masc., and a ی in the fem.; and then affix the s of silence [to the ل or ی], saying أَكْرَمْتُكَا in the masc., and أَكْرَمْتُكَا 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 ضَرْبَنِى He struck me [below], with quiescence, or غَلَامِيه and ضَرْبَنِى غَلَامِيه, with affixion of the s [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 أَفْنَى عَنِّي مَالِيَةٌ هَذِهِ عَنِّي سُلْطَانِيَةٌ LXIX. 28, 29. [615, 647] (IY): and ضَرْبَنِى غَلَامُ and ضَرْبَنِى, according to those who make [the ی] quiescent in continuity, whence the readings of IAl زَبَى أَكْرَمْنَ LXXXIX. 15. My Lord hath honored me
and LXXXIX. 17. My Lord hath degraded me, [with pause (IY)]; and the saying of Al Aʿshā [Maimūn Ibn Kāis (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,

[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 يَأْتِيُّيَنَىِ أَنْ أَنْكِرُنَى and أَنْسَأْنَى: (a) those also who make the ي quiescent pause in two modes, the better being retention of the [quiescent] ي; while the other is elision of it, as هُذَا غَلَامُمُ. This is my manservant and ضَرَبْنُ [above], meaning and غَلَامْيُ: (b) elision of the ي in the case of [the pron. attached to] the v. is good, because the ي, being always preceded by a ن [170], is indicated by the ن; so that there is no ambiguity, for which reason such elision is frequent in the Kur: whereas, when you say هُذَا غَلَامُ.
[above], pausing upon it with quiescence, one does not know whether ُعَلَمْ is meant to be pre. to the ى, 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): (e) Ibn 'Āmir and the KK read أَكْرَمْنِ, without a ى, in continuity and pause; and the like is reported from IAl [above]; while Nāfi’ agrees with them in pause (B): and [Z says in the K that] أَكْرَمْنَ and أَهْلَانِز [above], with quiescence of the َن, are read in pause, according to those who omit the ى in continuous speech, deeming the Kasra sufficient without it (K): (6) He struck you, ِبِهْمَ ُعَلَيْهِمْ ُضَرْبَبِهِمْ upon them, and ُضَرَبْبِهِمْ by them; and ُضَرَبْبُهُمْ from him and ُضَرَبْبَهُهُ He struck him [above]: with quiescence, according to those who, in continuity, affix [the conj. to the م or َس], or [simply] mobilize [the م or َس with ِذَمَم or ِكَسْر] (M): (a) as for ُضَرَبْبُهُمْ and ُعَلَيْهِمْ and ِبِهْمَا ُضَرَبْبُهُمْ, you pause upon them with quiescence of the م, not otherwise; and elide the َس or ى from it [161], because they are َعَضْع., and are often elided in continuity [161], as ُضَرَبْبُمْ ُقَبُّلَ He struck you before, ُضَرَبْبُهُمْ يَا ُقَنِيَّ He struck them, O youth, ُعَلَيْهِمْ دَآَيْكَرَةً أَلسْوَمْ IX. 99. May misfortune fall upon them!, and ِبِهْمَ يُسْتَعْنَانَ 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 سَرَّابَاتُ [below], and of two Kasras with the ی in یِمُهَی [below] and the like (IY): [for,] according to those who do not affix the conj., in continuity, to the م 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 ی and ی, must be elided in pause, as in مَلِیعَة [below] (R): (b) they differ in opinion about the ی in such as سَرَّابَاتُ [above], and the ی in such as یِمُهَی [above], some saying that they are part of the ی itself, and others that they are aug.; though they are agreed that, in the fem. [sing.], the ی is part of the ی itself: and they differ about the opinion of S on that [matter]; but the [opinion] apparent from his language is that the ی and ی are not part of the ی. [161]: (c) similarly pause upon مَلِیعَة and also is with quiescence [of the ی] (IY): (d) we have mentioned [161] that the 3rd pers. [sing., masc. or fem.] of the attached acc. or gen. pron. is abridged from the 3rd pers. [sing., masc. or fem.] of the detached nom., by elision of the vowel from the ی of مُهَر [and the ی of یمَی, and by conversion of the ی of مَی into ی] (R); [so that] the o. f. of مَلِیعَة and ضَرِبَة is conjunction of [the ی in] them with a letter of
prolongation, as ضَرْبُهُ مَنِئُ and ضَرْبُهُ مَنِئُ, that being proved by
the existence of [the letter of prolongation correspond-
ing with] it in the fem., as مَنِئَا and ضَرْبِهَا (IV): the s
occurs, [says S (IV),] with what follows it, here in the
masc., as it occurs, with the l following it, in the fem.
(S, IV): (e) Zj holds that the conj. after the s is not
part of the o. f. of the word; and this appears to be the
opinion of S: and Zj adduces, as an argument for it, the
elision of the conj. in pause; but this is not strong,
because the letters of softness, that form part of the
word itself, are sometimes elided, as in [643]; and,
as for the necessity for elision of the conj. in pause, and
not of the ى of الْتَّقَاضِي, it is because the conj. is one of
those things that, in the state of continuity, have a share
in elision, as in مَنِئَ III. 5. and مَنِئَ III. 91. [below]: (f)
since they intend to lighten the attached [pron.], on
account of its being like part of the preceding word,
they consider; and, if the ى be preceded by a quiescent,
as in عَلَيْهِ and عَلَيْهِ مَنِئُ, they do not put the quiescent ى
in continuity: so that they do not say, according to the
most frequent [dial.], عَلَيْهِ مَنِئُ and عَلَيْهِ مَنِئُ, because the ى
and ى are heavy; and because the s, on account of its
faintness, is like the non-existent, so that, if they said
that, two quiescents would, as it were, concur (R):
[thus even] in [continuous] speech they often elide the ى,
or ی [conjoined with the ٍ]: and, when the ٍ is preceded by a letter of prolongation and softness, elision of the ی, or ی is [held by S to be] better than retention, because the ٍ proceeds from the same outlet as the ٍ [732], and the ی resembles the ی and ی, so that it is as though they fled from the combination of likes, and therefore elided the ی or ی; and, for that reason, وْدَنِّيْنَا ۡتَمَّتْلَا لْيُلْعَتْ VII. 107. And We have revealed it, part by part, [according to the measure of events (K, B),] إِنَّ تَحْبِيلَ عَلَيْهِ يَلُعِّتْ VII. 175. If thou bear down upon him, he will loll out his tongue [from breathing hard (B)]. وَقَرْبَةً بَشَمِين، بَخْسُی XII. 20. And they sold him [640] for a mean price, and حُذْرُهُ فَغَلْوُهُ 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 مَنْهُ عَنْتَهُ مَنْهُ are more appropriate than مَنْهُ عَنْتَهُ مَنْهُ [and یبِيَدُ ۡعَنْتَهُ عَنْتَهُ with] elision; so that مَنْهُ آیَاتُ مُطْعَمَاتُ 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 مَنْهُ آیَاتُ III. 5. [below] and أَصَابَتْهُ جَابِحَتْهُ A calamity afflicted him; and this [opinion] is adopted by Mb and Sf; and, according to me, is correct, because, the ٍ being faint, عَنْتَهُ عَنْتَهُ مَنْهُ and virtually contain [a combination of (Jh on ٍ)}
the pron. s)] two quiescents, like كيف (IY): S prefers retention of the conj. after the s, when the preceding quiescent is a sound letter, as in مثه and أصابته; and elision of it, when the preceding quiescent is an unsound letter, as in فذوتة VIII. 14. Then taste ye it, عصا VII. 104. His rod, and فيه II. 1. About it: but Mb [followed by Sf and IY] makes no distinction between the sound and unsound quiescents before the s; 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 منه آيات III. 5. and فيه آيات بيمات 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 l] from علیها upon her and منه from her, though they also contain a quasi-combination of two quiescents, because of the lightness of the l; 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 l in the acc. [640]: (h) if the s be preceded by a mobile, as in ب and غلامة [161], the conj. is indispensable, except when a poet is constrained
to elide it, as in the saying [of Hānzala Ibn Fātik (S)]

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

[In the mouths their tongues faltered with it, and the couriers on the roads, and the pens in the writings, where he does not affix the ی to the ی in یپ, 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

And I drink water, when there is not in me any thirst for it, except because its springs are the sources of the torrent of her valley; and this is like the reading [of Ḥamza, Abū Bakr, and IAIII. 68. Will render it unto thee and (B)] III. 68. Will not render it unto thee, with quiescence of the ی (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 لُهُرُْٰ[ٰٰ] and [ٰلُهُرُْٰٰٰ] by common consent, and in عَلَيْهِ and مِنْهُ [ٰٰٰ] , [ٰٰٰ], according to some; or not, as in عَلَيْهِ and مِنْهُ [ٰٰٰ], 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 غَلَامِي and ضَرِّبَنِي [above]; so that they invariably elide this letter, whose elision is often authorized in continuity, as in عَلَيْهِ and مِنْهُ : 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 دَامَم or كَسْر, as in II. 273. **Knoweth it** and بُعَلاَمِهِ by his manservant; and similarly when it is preceded by a مَمْحِي, or ی, as in II. 70. [640] and مَمْحِي, 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 دَامَم or ٰ, it is as though you pronounced the final, pausal, letter with دَامَم, or put a ٰ at the end, since the s is like the non-existent, on account of its faintness; and if, immediately after the دَامَم 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 Rauni after the s preceded by a Kasra or ی: and also (b) because Rauni 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 ِإنَّ غَلَامَةُ verily his manservant, or a sound quiescent, as in ِمَنَّهَ [above], Rauni 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) َعَلِيُّ، [even] according to those who say َهُذِئْبُي أُمَّةٌ أَلَّهُ This is the handmaid of God
(M): (a) the $s$ in [تئی and (R)] $هذى$ is [not an aug.; but only (IY)] a subst. [690] for the $ی$ [263] in [تئی and (R)] $هذى$ [171, 174] (IY, R), the proof of which is that you say $ذٰی$ in the $dim.$ of $ذٰی$ [293], as you say in the $dim.$ of $ذٰی$: nor is the $s$ in $هذى$ for femininization, like the $s$ in $طلْلْحَة$ and $حَمْرَة$ [265], because the $s$ in $طلْلْحَة$ and $حَمْرَة$ 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 $ع$ of the word: (b) the reason why it is pronounced with Kasr, and conjoined with the $ی$, is that, being in a vague $ind.~n.$, it is assimilated to the $s$ of the $pron.$, which [like this $s$] is preceded by a Kasra, as in $مُرَتْ بِهِ$ $I passed by him$ and $نظَرْتَ إلَى عُلَامَيْ}$ $I looked at his manservant (IY)$: [thus] the $ی$ 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 $ی$ is engendered,] as in $عَلَّمَيْ یَبِي$ and $عَلَّمَيْ یَبِي$, in the most prevalent [dial.], as before explained [161]; except that the $s$ of the $pron.$, notwithstanding its being preceded by a Kasra or $ی$, is sometimes conjoined, according to the people of AlHijaz, with the $ی$, as $یَبِتْ$ and $عَلَّمَهُ یَبِتْ$ [161], because the [attached] $gen.~pron.$ is $orig.$ the detached $nom.~[pron.]$, as above mentioned; whereas [the $s$ in] $هذى$ or $تئی$ is not conjoined with a $ی$ 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 pronunciation, which is Kasr of the s, when preceded [like this s] by a Kasra" (IY): (c) some of the Arabs assimilate it to the m of the pl. [161]; and therefore do not put the conj., saying 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 s 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 s 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 s [in continuity] elide it in pause, as they elide it from and [above]; and, since elision of the s is permissible in and the like, notwithstanding that its augmentativeness is disputed [above], the elision here is more appropriate, because the augmentativeness is certain (IY): (8) and [and عَلَامَة (IY)], with quiescence; or [and عَلَامَة (IY)], with the s (M): (a) the
is preferable in the case of these ps., because the  in ḍā is elided, while the Fatha remains as an indication of the elided; and therefore, grudging that pause should elide the Fatha, and thus the indication and the indicated should [both] be removed, they affix the  of silence, upon which the pause falls, while the Fatha is preserved [above], as is done in  and  [644]: but some of the Arabs pause with quiescence, without a ; while it is argued [on their behalf] that pause is accidental, and that the vowel is restored in continuity, [so that the removal of the indication is only temporary]: (b) some of them make the  quiescent in continuity, as in  [181]; but that belongs to the cat. of treating continuity like pause, by poetic license, as in  and  [640, 647] (IY), as  [321, 647, 663] has been heard (K on LXI. 2): (9) and  in the case of  [above] and  Like what art thou?, [pause being (IY)] with the , not otherwise (M): (a) and  are ns., detached from what follows them; while  , after elision of the , becomes  ; and therefore, disliking that, they affix the , in order that the pause may fall upon it, and the  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 Fathā, it (IY)] is changed, in pause, into ا [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 فَأَيْنَكَ for فَأَيْنَكَ in XCVI. 15. [153, 497, 610, 684] (M); and, in the imp., إِضْرَّا for إِضْرَّبَ [614, 684] (IY). Al Aʿshā [Maimūn Ibn Kais (Jsh)] says, [in an ode praising the Prophet (IY, Jsh),]

فَأَيْنَكَ وَالْمَبْتَأَ لَا تَقُرِّبِنَّهَا ولا تَأْخُذَنَّ سَهْمًا حَدِيدًا لِتُفْسِدَا

وَذَا النَّصْبِ المُنْصُوبِ لَا تَتَسْكَنَّهَا ولا تَعْبِدُ الْشِّيْطَانَ وَاللهُ تَعَالَى

[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 نصَب)] 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 فَأَعْبَدُنَّ (Jh, IY), but pausing with the ا, as you say [640] (Jh); and hence the saying of the other

أَبُو جَرِيَدٍ وَالْوَلِيدُ وَمُسْتَيِّنٌ ﻪَمَا آدِوْا لَا يَدُلُّ وَيَكْرُما

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 وَيَكْرُمُنَّ: and it is said, on the saying of Imra alKais
that the meaning is Do thou tarry, because, say they, the address is to one, that being proved by his saying

DO MY companion, thou seest, meaning look thou at, lightning, whose gleam I show thee, like the waving of the hands, in a pile of cloud surmounted by a crown, its upper part being like a crown for its lower part (Em); but that he pauses with the I, treating the state of continuity like pause [647]: while some explain L. 23. [193, 233] as orig. Do thou cast, arguing that the address, in that, is to an Angel, the Keeper of the Fire (IY). And, [if what precedes this н be pronounced with Damm or Kasr, as (IY)] in үүҮ үүү үүү Wilt thou surely strike, O woman?, then, if you pause (IY), you say үүҮ үүү үүү үүү (IY), by restoring the ү of the pl. [and the ү of the 2nd pers. sing. fem.] (M). For the predicament of this н is [like] that of the Tanwin [above]: therefore, as you substitute an й for the Tanwin in the acc. [497, 640], so you substitute an й for this н, when what precedes it is pronounced with Fath; and, as the Tanwin is suppressed in the nom. and gen. [640], so
this د is suppressed, when what precedes it is pronounced with دام or كسر. And, when the د is suppressed, the ی, which is the pron. of the pl., is restored [614], because of the removal of the quiescent after it, vid. the د of corroboration. And the د also, which is the sign of the ind., is restored [614], because, it was elided only on account of the uninflectedness of the ی., [consequent] upon the attachment of the د of corroboration to it [402, 406, 610]: and, since the cause of uninflectedness is removed, inflection is restored, because of the removal of its preventive, and the presence of its requirer [404], vid. resemblance [of the aor. to the n.]; and then the د, which is the sign of [inflection in the 2nd pers., pl. masc. and sing. fem., of] the ind. [405], is restored. ی used to substitute ә or ی for the single د [of corroboration], when preceded by a letter pronounced with دام or كسر, respectively, by analogy to the د [preceded by a letter] pronounced with فاث, saying یخشود for یخشود Do ye dread, and یخشوبی for یخشوبی Do thou [fem.] dread, which is analogous to [the practice of] those who substitute [ә, or ی] for the تانون [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 حَلَفْتُ بِاللهِ I have sworn by God or عَلِمَ اللَّهُ or أَقَسَمْتُ [below], and God has known or يَعْلَمُ اللَّهُ God knows, or nominal, as لَعْمَرُ اللَّهِ [27, 29] or لَعْمَرُ أَبِي لَهْ Assuredly thy father's life or Assuredly God's life, and يَعْلَمُ اللَّهِ God's oath [29] or لَعْمَرُ اللَّهِ [below] or لَعْمَرُ اللَّهِ [651], and أَعْلَمَ اللَّهُ God's trust [below], and عَلَى عَهْدِ اللَّهِ [29], whereby a prop., aff., as لَعْمَرُ اللَّهِ Assuredly I will do, or neg., as لَأَ أَفْعَلُ I will not do [652], is corroborated [654] (M). The verbal prop. in the oath is أَحْلَفُ بِاللهِ I swear by God or أَقَسَمْ بِاللهِ, 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] (IX): 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] مَرِرتُ (S, IX) to Zaid in your saying مَرِرتُ (IY), except that the v. [sometimes]
occurs understood in this cat. [651, 653], and that the oath is a corroboration" (S). There are some vs., such as [Jh, KF] ُأَلْفَٰحُ I testify, [meaning I swear, by such a thing (Jh, KF)], ُأَلْفُوَٰحُ I know, and ُأَلْفَٰحُ I have sworn [above], that contain the sense of the oath, and are therefore treated like ُأَلْفَٰحُ, the v. occurring [as a correl.] after them, as after ُوُلُّدَلِلْ By God. The nominal prop. is ُلَعْبَرُ أُبيِكَ and ُلَعْبَرُ َوُلُّدَلِلْ, where is an inch., the J in it being the J of inception [604]; while the enunc. is suppressed [29, 651], constructively ُقُسِّئى mine oath or ُحَلِفِى, 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 ] [29], because of the length of the sentence, by reason of the correl. (IY).

The meaning of ُيَمِينُ َاللَّهِ is what God has sworn by, vid. XCI. 1. [538], ُوُلُّدَلِلْ XCI. 1. [498, 657], ُوُلُّدَلِلْ XCIII. 1. By the forenoon [657], and the like; or the oath that is [sworn] by His Names, as [below], ُرَبُّ َالْعَمْاِلِىَّ By the Lord of the Ka'ba, ُوُلُّدَلِلْ By the Creator, and the like: and the sense is ُيَمِينُ َاللَّهِ يَمِيني God's oath (is mine oath) [29] (R).
And hence أَيْمَنُ اللَّهِ (IY). According to S (R), أَيْمَنُ اللَّهِ (IY, R), which is peculiar to the oath (ML), inasmuch as it is not used elsewhere, being thus distinguished from أَيْمَنُ اللَّهِ occurring in the like of The oaths of the people are true, or faithful, about which there is no dispute at all, since it is a n., pl. of أَيْمَنَ oath, by common consent (DM),] is a sing. (IY, R, ML) n. (IY, ML), applied to denote the oath (IY); not a p., contrary to the opinion of Zj and Rm (ML), who say that it is a prep. (DM); and not pl. of أَيْمَنَ, contrary to the opinion of the KK [below] (ML): derived from أَيْمَنَ (IY, R, ML), i. q. بِرَكَةُ God's blessing (IY, R, DM), as though they swore by God's blessing (IY): always (ML) (a) governed in the nom. [653, 655], by inchoation, its enunc. being [necessarily (DM)] suppressed (IY, ML), because known, as in the case of لَعْبَرَ اللَّهِ [above], constructively بِشَنْيَانِ or بِشَنْيَانِ, and the like (IY), i. e., بِرَكَةُ اللهِ أَيْمَنَ God's blessing (is mine oath) (R); and (b) pre. to the name of God: contrary to the opinion of (a) IDh, who allows it to be governed in the gen. by the jurative p., [vid. the , as أَيْمَنُ اللَّهِ By the oath of God (DM)]; (b) IM, who allows it to be pre. to the الكَعْبَةِ [653] and the لِّ of the pron. [651]; and (c) IU, who allows it to be an enunc., the suppressed being the
inch., i. e., قَسَمَتُ آيَتُ اللَّهِ (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 إنُعُلَ with Kasr of the Hamza among ns. or vs.; and it also seems improbable that إنُعُلَ should be an original sing. (R). According to the KK [651], آيَسُ is pl. of ۚيَسِينَ oath (R, DM), so that آيَسُ is like يَسِينَ [above] (R): and its Hamza is disj. (R, DM); but is made conj. for lightness, from frequency of usage, as Khl says of the Hamza in the determinative *لَ [below] (R). Their argument is that this measure is peculiar to the pl., like أَكْلَبُ and أَنْسُ [237] (DM), which is refuted by the fact that Kasr of the Hamza [below], and Fath of the م, are allowable, [so that ۚيَسِينَ is said (DM)]; whereas the like [pronunciation] is not allowable in the pl., such as أَكْلَبُ and أَنْسُ [above] (ML), so that أَنْسُ is not said (DM): and by the saying of [Abù Miḥjan (ITB, Syt)] Nuṣaib [Ibn Rabāh alBalawi (Jsh)]
(878)

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 J [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  عب ] in  لع ب  لله  [above]; and hence  فقال  فديق  القوم  الله  [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  إيم الله  [651] with Kasr of the Hamza [above]. As for  أمانة  الله  [above], it also is governed in the nom. by incohesion, the enunc. being suppressed [651, 655] (IY). What is meant by  أمانة  الله  is what He has enjoined upon His creatures, vid. obedience to Him, as though it were a trust committed by Him to them, that it was necessary for them to render entire unto Him: the Kur has  إنما عرضنا الأمانة على السموات  و على الأرض و على الجبال فأتيِن أن يعملنها و أเศقن منهن و حملنها.
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 ۖ أَلِلَّهِ ۖ عَهْدٍ [below] is governed in the nom. by inchoation, while ۖ عَلَى is its enunc.; the form being like ۖ نِعْرَ أَلِلَّهُ ۖ زَيْدُ [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 ۖ أَحْلِفُ ۖ بِۚ إِلَّهِ [above], without the other, it is like your saying ۞ 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 ۖ سَلَّكْنَتْ ۖ أَلِلَّهُ Thou hast perished, by God,
(assuredly thou hast perished), meaning assuredly thou hast perished (IY),] as it was there (M), e. g., in

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

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

\[ Zaid, by God, stood, and, in the Nahj alBalagha, \]

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

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

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

\[ I shall honor thee, if thou come to me, \]

as before mentioned [419] (R). But the prop. mentioned, though, according to the sense, a correl. of the oath, is, according to the form, named
only the indicator of the correl., not the correl., for which reason the sign of the correl. of the oath [652] is not necessary in it (Jm). Sometimes the jurative prop. is followed by a context indicative of the correl., which is therefore suppressed [333], although this context is not, like the two [indicators above] mentioned, a correl. in respect of the sense, as لَا فَتْحُ مِّنْ لِيْمَالِ عَشْرٍ 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 عَفْوٌ مَّنْ لَيْيَعُاقِبُنِّي assuredly they shall be taken, and shall be punished, because indicated by LXXXIX. 5. [207] (B). 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 زَيْنُ وَاللَّهُ قَاتِمٌ [above] : (a) if you say زَيْنُ وَاللَّهُ قَاتِمٌ or لَفِي قَاتِمٍ زَيْنُ وَاللَّهُ إنَّهُ قَاتِمٌ 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 وَأَلْلَّهُ يُعَاطِكُنَا 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., كَتْبَعْتُ، 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 لَتْبَعْتَ فَعَلَ or لَتْبَعْتُ فَعَلَ or لَتْبَعْتُ فَعَلَ or لَتْبَعْتَ فَعَلَ or لَتْبَعْتُ فَعَلَ or لَتْبَعْتُ فَعَلَ occurs, when not preceded by a jurative prop., there a jurative prop. is supplied, as لَتْبَعْتَ عَذَابًا شَدِيدًا 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 إِنَّ زَيَدًا جَالَّةً [below] and لَتْبَعْتَ قَانَّاتٍ or لَتْبَعْتَ قَانَّاتٍ 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 عَرْضٌ أَلْعَانِيَّةٌ and لا أَنْفَلِعُ عَرْضُ [206], from the frequency of the usage of عَرْضُ with the oath, together with the fact that its sense is أَبَدًا ever [206] and decisive, 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 عَرْضُ لا أَتْيَنَلَكَ
Never indeed will I come to thee and َعَوْضَ مَا آتَيْكَ
Never will I come to thee, the object being that َعَوْضَ should supply the place of the oath. But sometimes it it used otherwise than in the oath, as

(883)

هَذَا تَنَافِيَ بِمَا أُولِيتْ مِن حَسَنٍ
لا َرَتَ عَوْضَ قَرْيرَ ٱلْعُيْيِنِ مَتْسُودًا

(R), by Rabʿa Ibn Makrūm al-Dabbī, *This is my praise, because of that good which I have conferred—May I never cease to be cool in eye, envied!* (AKB).

One of the ps. of assent also stands in the place of the jurative prop., vid. َجَيْرِ [556], the connecting link being that assent is a corroboration and confirmation, like the oath: you say َجَيْرِ لَا تُعْلِنَ َيَا, assuredly I will do, as though you said َنَعَمَ وَأَلْلَهُ لَا تُعْلِنَ َيَا, Yes, by God, assuredly I will do. But sometimes َجَيْرِ is put without any oath, as in َتُقَلِّسَ عَلَى َٱلْفَرْدَوْسِ َٱلْحُجِّ [556]. It is uninfl. upon Kasr, but is sometimes pronounced with Fath; and sometimes it is pronounced with Tanwin, by poetic license, as in َوَقَائِلَةَ أَسْبَتْ َٱلْحُجِّ [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

فَأَقْسِمْ لَوْ شَيْئًا أَتَأَا رَسُولُهُ َسَوَّالٌ َوَلَكِنَّ لَمْ نَجِدَ لَّهَ مَدْفَعًا
[651, 652] (R), by Imra al Kais, Then I swear, if any thing, meaning any man, but thou were such that his messenger had come to us, (we would have repulsed him). But we did not find any way of repulse for thee (AKB), i. e., Then I swear (by what is sworn by). And often the correl. of the oath, if corroborated by the [611, 613], is deemed sufficient without the oath, as Assuredly I will strike thee, because the has [certain specified] positions, and does not occur in pure enunciation, as [612]; but, as for such [phrases] as Assuredly God hath heard and [above], there exists no evidence that they are correls. of the oath, contrary to the opinion of the KK [652]. And sometimes Truly, certainly decided, and what resembles them, stand in the place of the oath, as Truly, I will assuredly do. And so does [598], when not [denoting] reprehension, as assuredly I will do; or of a covenant, as Such a thing is a vow to God, binding upon me, assuredly I will do; and I have covenanted with God, assuredly I will do, and [above] (R). The object
of the oath is corroboration of what is sworn to, whether aff. or neg., as ِوَأَلْلَّهُ يَا أَقْوَمِنَ By God, assuredly I will stand and ِوَأَلْلَّهُ لَا أَقْوَمِنَ 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. أَحْلَفُ بِاللَّهِ لِتَنْطَلِقَنَّ 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 ِوَأَلْلَّهُ إِنْ زَيَدَةَ لِتَنْطَلِقَنَّ By God, verily Zaid is departing and ِوَأَلْلَّهُ لَرِيَتْ نَآيَمَ 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
[652] (IY), by Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulmà Rabì‘a alMuzanî, 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], وَآلدَارَیْتْ ۖ کَرُواً LI. 1. By the winds scattering the dust about (K, B)]، وَآلسَّمَاہ ذَاتِ الْعَكِیْلِ 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 ِۖبَيْلَلِهِ (I swear) by God, the jurative v. being often suppressed [650], because it is known, and can be dispensed with, as بَيْلَلِهِ إِنَّ السَّرِیْعَ لْلَّهِ إِیْمَآمَ عَظِیْمَ 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 أَنْفَسَ لَا يَتَعَلَّقُ I swear (by God), assuredly I will do, meaning أَنْفَسَ ۖ بَيْلَلِهِ
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 Whoso is about to swear, let him swear by God, or let him hold his peace [650] (IY): (c) the enunc. [of the inchoatal prop., as (IY)] in لعمرُ \[29, 650\] and its congeners (M), ليمنك \[650\], [the pre. ns. in] all of which are inchs., whose enuncs. are suppressed, for abbreviation, because of the length of the sentence, by reason of the correl. (IY), the sense being Assuredly thy life (is what I swear by) (M), \[or\] (is part of what I swear by) (K on XV. 72), \[or\] (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 inch., be specifically assigned to the oath, as in اَيُّسُ عَلَلٍ [650] and لَعْبُرٍك [29], suppression of the enunc. is necessary, as before explained in the cat. of the inch. [29], because that expression indicates the particular enunc., vid. مَا أَقْسِمُ يَهُودُ عَلَيْ أَمَانَةِ اللَّهِ, while the correl. supplies the place of the enunc.: but, if it be not specifically assigned to the oath, as in يَبْنُ عَلَيْ أَمَانَةِ اللَّهِ and عَهْدُ اللَّهِ [29, 650], you may suppress the enunc., as عَلَى أَمَانَةِ اللَّهِ لَنَفَعِلَنَّ God's trust (is what I swear by), assuredly I will do and عَهْدُ اللَّهِ God's covenant etc., and يَبْنُ عَلَيْ أَمَانَةِ اللَّهِ God's oath etc.; or express it, as عَلَى أَمَانَةِ اللَّهِ God’s trust is binding upon me, [assuredly I will do,] and عَهْدُ اللَّهِ God’s covenant is etc., and يَبْنُ عَلَيْ أَمَانَةِ اللَّهِ God's oath is etc.: and similarly you say The Ka’ba (is what I swear by), assuredly etc., and The Holy Book (etc.), or The Ka’ba is mine oath, assuredly etc. [and The Holy Book is mine oath, etc.]: (b) Fr says that, if inch. be an abstract n. [3], as in أَيُّسُ عَلَلٍ, then the correl. of the oath is its enunc.; and there is no need to supply another enunc., because لَعْبُرٍك 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 أَمَانَةُ ﷺ and أيَّمُ ﷺ and the like (R): (d) the ن of أيَّمُ [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 أيَّمُ 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 أَيَّمُ ﷺ and أيَّمُ ﷺ, with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza, together with Damm of the م, they are contracted from أيَّمُ, with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza [650]; and sometimes كَيْمُ ﷺ is said, with conversion of the Hamza pronounced with Fath into س [690]; and sometimes the ي is elided, together with the ن, so that, أَمَانَةُ ﷺ and أَمَانَةُ ﷺ, with Fath and Kasr of the Hamza, are said: (c) what is contracted from أيَّمُ is
used only with the word ٌلاَّ; not with ٌلاَّ، as is used therewith [650] (R): (d) Y asserts that the ꞌ of ꞌأٍ ꞌأٍ is conj.; and so the Arabs treat it, pronouncing the ꞌ with Fath, as they pronounce the ꞌ in ٌعلاجٌ with Fath [668]: and similarly [the Hamza of] ꞌأٍ: the poet says فقال فريق القروم الحم [650], which we have heard from the Arabs thus [recited] (S): (e) the ꞌ of ꞌ and ꞌ[653]: (f) the jurative ꞌ, without compensation, in للاَّ and للاَّ [503, 514, 515, 655]; and, with compensation, in للاَّ and للاَّ [552], للاَّ، and للاَّ [656]: (2) substitution of ꞌ for the jurative ꞌ, [i. e., the ꞌ (IX),] in للاَّ [506, 653] (M), as XII. 85. [454] and XII. 91. [575] (IY): (3) their preference for Fathā over Damma, which is better known in عمر (M), whence your saying in the oath لعمر كأطلع [29, 650]: (a) عمر continuance, life, has three dial. vars., (a) عمر with Fath of the ꞌ، and quiescence of the ꞌ؛ (b) عمر with Damm of the ꞌ، and quiescence of the ꞌ؛ and (c) عمر with Damm of both [ع and م] : (b) you say اطالا للاَّ عَمِرَ God prolong, or lengthen, thy life! or or عَمِرَ: but, when you come to the oath, you use only the [dial. var.] pronounced with Fath of the ꞌ، because it is the lightest of the three dial. vars.; while, the oath being frequent, they adopt the lightest [form] for it (IY).
§ 652. The oath is of two kinds, either an adjuration [654], as

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

\[\text{[below], and \; \text{I adjure thee by God's eternity,} \]

[41] and \[\text{[Part I, Notes, p. 42 A], and sometimes \; \text{I adjure thee by thy faith, hast thou drawn Laila close to thee, a little before dawn, or hath thou kissed her mouth? (Jsh). It is [sometimes] headed by \text{wil}\ or \text{im}, as \; \text{I have adjured thee by God [above], etc. [95] or \text{will} \; \text{I have adjured 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 \text{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 \text{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 \text{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 \text{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 \text{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 \text{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 adjura}
By God, assuredly I will do and verily thou art going and I have not done and I will not do (M). Since the oath and the correl. are, each of them, a prop. [650], which is an expression for every independent phrase, standing by itself; but each of them has some dependence upon the other; therefore cops. are unavoidable, to connect one of them with the other, as the cond. p. connects the prot. with the apod. [419]: so that two ps. are assigned to affirmation, vid. the ل [600] and إن [517]; and two to negation, vid. م [546] and ل [547]. The reason why these [four] ps. [below] must occur as [cops. for] a correl. of the oath is that the sentence is begun with them. And, on that account, the ف [540] does not occur as [a cop. for] a correl. of the oath, because the sentence is not begun with it (IY). The correl. [of the oath (R)] is either a nominal, or a verbal (WIH, R) prop. (WIH); and is either aff. or neg. (R). If it be a nominal prop., then, (1) if aff., it is attended by إنَّ اللَّهُ يَزِيدُ ﴿ە۰﴾ [427]; or the ل، as ﴿۰۰﴾ [650]; and sometimes by both combined, as إنَّ اللَّهُ يَزِيدُ ﴿۰۰﴾، for corroboration, and for connection of the correl. with the oath (WIH): the Kur has ﴿۰۰﴾.
XLIV. 1, 2. Hā-Mīm. By the clear Scripture, verily We revealed it in a blessed night [518], CIII. 1, 2...[518, 469, 650], and 

C. 6. Verily man to his Lord is ungrateful after C. 1. [246, 650]; and [the corroboration in] the correl. [headed] by ʾūn falls upon the pred. [650], because it is in the sense of the v. (IY) : (a) the aff. nominal [prop.] is headed by ʾūn, 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 ʾūn, 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 ʾūn [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 ʾūn is prefixed to: (d) the opinion of the KK is that the J in the like of ُكَرَيْضُ ُقَاتِئِم [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 ُكَرَيْضُ ُقَاتِئِم 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 وَأَللَّهُ مَا زَيْدَ قَآمِمَ By God, Zaid is not standing or فَآمَّا By God, Zaid is not in the house [107], and لَا زِيَدُ فِي أَلدَارِ وَلَا عَمَرُ nor 'Amr [100] (WIH): the Kur has أَوَلَمْ تَكُونُوا أُقْسِمَتْ مِنْ فَُبِلْ مَا لَمْ مِنْ زَوالِ 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) مَا [38, 107, 546], op. according to the people of AlHijäz, and inop. according to others; (b) the ل of exemption [36, 99, 547], in its various states; (c) إنَّ [550], as وَأَللَّهُ إِنْ زَيْدُ قَآمِمَ 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 وَأَللَّهُ لَقَامَ [427]; or without it, as أَلْلَهَ لَقَامَ [below]; and sometimes by فَدَ alone, as XCl. 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 فَدَ [577], as وَأَللَّهِ لَقَامَ خَرَجَ [600] (R): [for,] when the ل is prefixed to the pret., the phrase is not good unless فَدَ be with it, as وَأَللَّهِ لَقَامَ [above], because فَدَ 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 بَيْسَسّ نَعَمُ تَدُودً is not prefixed to them, because of their aplasticity [575], as

بيِينًا لَنَعِمَ الْسَّيِّدَانِ وَجَدُّتُمَا عَلَى كُلِّ حَالٍ مِنْ سَحَبُهُمْ وَمَبْرُوِمَ (R), by Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulmâ, An oath, بَيِينًا being [governed in the acc. as (EM)] an inf. n. [corrob. (AKB)] of أَقَسِسْتُ [39, 40] in the preceding verse [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" AlHârith Ibn ‘Auf and Harim Ibn Sinân (EM): (c) [above] is allowable, but not frequent, whence إِذَا أَقَامَ بِنْصُرِيَ الْحَجِّ [23] (IY), the ل in لَقَامَ being [the ل of] the correl. of an oath understood, constructively حَلَفْتُ لَهَا الْحَجِّ (T); and حَلَفْتُ لَهَا الْحَجِّ [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 الْحَجِّ [575, 577, 600] (R), where the connection is effected by the ل, without تَدُودٌ, because of the exigency of the
metre (AKB): but [the suppressed] must be supplied after the , because the of inception is not prefixed to the bare pret. [577, 604]; and restriction to the 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 [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 stoodest, assuredly I would honor thee (AKB); so that, in , 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 , with the of corroboration, as [613]; and, extraordinarily, without it, as (WIH): (a) the aff. aor. is mostly headed by the ; and terminated by the , as By God, assuredly I will strike; unless the be prefixed to a prepos. reg. of the aor., as in III.
152. [75, 613], which contains the ج alone; or to a م. of amplification [578], as in XIX. 67. [600], in which case likewise you do not put the م, contenting yourself with one of the two signs of futurity, and dispensing with the other: (b) it seldom happens that the م is devoid of the ج, the م 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 م, 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 م to be interchangeable; the poet [Zaid alFawāris Ibn Ḥusain Ibn Dirār adDabbī (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 م. 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)] لَتَنَّ تَدْنِى فَنَّ [613] (R), where the sense is assuredly my Lord (now) knows (AKB); and you say وَلَهُ لَيْصَلِى By God, assuredly Zaid is praying, where you must content yourself with the J, and do not put the ن, because it is the sign of the future (R): (e) BD says "If the aor. be in the sense of the present, it is corroborated by the J, without the ن, because the latter is peculiar to the future, as وَلَهُ لَيْفَعِلُ زَدَ أَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّاَلَّa By God, assuredly Zaid now does, or is now doing: this usage is disallowed by the BB, who, in its stead, avail themselves of the [nominal] prop. headed by the corrob. [p.], as وَلَهُ إنْ زَدَا لَيْفَعِلُ أَلَّاَلَّاَلَّa By God, verily Zaid now does, or is now doing; but is allowed by the KK, whose opinion is attested by the reading of Ibn Kathir لَأَقْسِمُ ْبِبُعْوَمُ أَلْقَيَامَةِ LXXVI. 1. Assuredly I swear etc. [566] and the saying of the poet cited by Fr لِيَبْنُ تَدْنِى أَلَّاَلَّa [above]” (AKB): (2) if neg., (a) when its v. is a pret., it is attended by مَّا [546] or لا [547], as وَاللَّهُ مَا قَامَ زَدَ وَاللَّهُ مَا قَامَ By God, Zaid has not stood or will not stand (WIH): (a) the neg. pret. is [headed] by مَّا, as وَاللَّهُ رَبُنَا مَا كُنَا مُشْرِكِينَ [above] (R): the Kur has وَاللَّهُ رَبُنَا مَا كُنَا مُشْرِكِينَ
VI. 23. By God, our Lord, we have not been polytheists and by *الله* ما قالوا IX. 75. They swear by God, they have not said (IV): (b) if negatived by لَا or لَا إن [550], the pret. is converted to the sense of the future, [being then pret. in form, future in sense (AKB),] as in the saying [of AlMu’ammal Ibn Umail alMuḥāribi (AKB)] لَا نُعْدِدُ بِهِمْ حسب آلھِيئين ألس [547, 615], i.e., لَا رَحْمَةُ آلِهِلْلَّهُ so that repetition of the لَا is not obligatory, as also it is not obligatory when لَا is prefixed to the deprecatory pret., as in لَا رَحْمَةُ آلِهِلْلَّهُ May God not have mercy upon him!, because, in both positions, the pret. is in the sense of the future; whereas, in any other [position], لَا must be repeated, as in LXXV. 31. [547]; though, in poetry, it sometimes occurs not repeated, as in فَأَيَّ أَمِّي لَا أَنزَحُ العَقْبَة سِبَّيْلُ اللَّهِ [547]; while in XC. 11. Yet he hath not attempted the mountain-road it is not repeated because of the repetition in the exposition of دَلَّ رَقَبَةٌ أَوْ إِطْعَامٍ فِي يَوْمٍ ذِي مَسْقَةٍ يَنْبِيذًا ذَا مَقْرَبَةٍ العَقْبَة XC. 13-16., [i. e., (It is) (K)] freeing of a captive, or feeding, on a day of hunger, an orphan [339] near of kin, or a needy man cleaving to dust, [the occurrence of لَا, in XC. 11., in place of لَمْ being good, on account of the multiplicity of what is meant by العَقْبَة (B),] as though لَا نُذِكَّ رَقَبَةٌ لَا أَطْعَمُ العَقْبَة
Yet he hath not freed a captive, nor fed [an orphan or (B)] a needy man were said (R), so that ל is repeated in sense (K) : (b) when its v. is an aor., it is attended by מ or לא, [the latter] with the נ of corroborating [612], as By God, assuredly I will not do; or without it, as לא אנעל I will not do (WIH): (a) the aor. is negatived by מ or לא or לא (R): an instance of the correl. [headed] by לא, in the Kur, is LIX. 12. [599, 650], where לא יתקירון and לא ינשرونthem are the correl. of a suppressed oath, not the correl. of the condition, as is proved by the existence of the נ [of the ind.]: whereas, if they were the correl. of the condition, they would be apocopated [405] (IV): but מ and לא, when not restricted by [something indicative of] future time, apparently denote negation of the present [546, 550]; so that Mb [above] does not allow לא אנעל מ Anthem [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 לא or לא 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 لَمْ or لَنُّ is very rare, as in the saying of Abū Taʿlib وَاللهِ لَنُّ يَصِلُوا أَلْحَمْنَمْ وَخَالِقِهِمْ لَمْ تَقْمُ عَنِ مَثَلِهِمْ مَمْسَكَةَ 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., إنْ لَيْ بُيْنَ (Verily I have sons), the neg. prop. being afterwards begun (ML on لَنُّ). If the sworn-to be the correl. of a future condition preceded by an oath, the cond. instrument is often conjoined with a ُpronounced with Fath, named subsidiary [599, 601], i. e., subordinating, and specifically assigning, the correl. to the oath, not to the condition [427], as وَاللهِ لَنْ أَتَيْنِي لَآَتَيْنِي By God, if thou come to me, assuredly I will come to thee, where إنْ أَتَيْنِي without a ُis allowable. If, however, the oath be suppressed, and supplied, the subsidiary ُ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) ُ(IY)] is [allowably (WIH, R)] suppressed (M, WIH, R), because indicated by the circumstances of the case (WIH), from the [neg. (WIH)] aor. [above] (WIH, R), not from the pret. or
nominal *prop.* [below] (R), in the *correl.* of the oath (IY, R), as XII. 85. [447, 454, 547], i. e., "لَا تَفَعَّلِ" (IY, WIH); whether the *aor.* be لَا يَرَالُ and its sisters [447, 454], as in *فَتَفَقِّلُ بِبِينِيِّ اللَّهِ أَلْحَمْ" [454, 547, 655] (R), *orig.* لَا أَبْرَحُ (AKB); or any other, as in لَا يَبْقَى أَلْحَمْ [504, 653] (R), constructively لَا يَبْقَى (AKB), [and] in the saying of the [Hudhalī (IY)] poet

(902)

\[
	ext{By God, a pasturer upon herbs, intensely black in the back, rising five in his age, hoarse in braying, will (not) outlast the days!}, \text{ meaning a wild he-ass (IY). It is not suppressed from (1) the nominal *prop.* [above], because the nominal is less used in the *correl.* of the oath than the verbal, and suppression is for the sake of lightening; (2) the *pret.* [547], because the *aor.* is more used than the *pret.*, while the form of the *aor.* is heavier. And hence suppression of the neg. *p.*, otherwise than in [the *correl.* of (AKB)] the oath, is allowable from لَا يَرَالُ and its sisters, as *فَتَفَقِّلُ تَسْعُعُ أَلْحَمْ* [454] (R), constructively لَا تَفَقِّلُ (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 "دَأ*"
will (not) find him”; and Dm says that apparently his opinion is more probable (AKB). As for the saying, however,

\[\text{ فلا وَأَبِي دَعْمَاء رَأَتْ عَزْبُرَةً مَّعَ قَرْبِهَا مَا فَتَّلَ اِلْزَنْدُ قَالَهُ} \]

[Then she (Dahmá, the name of a woman) shall not, by Abú Dahmá, cease to be exalted, above her people, so long as a striker of fire shall twist a fire-stick! (AKB)], the neg. [p. in it (AKB)] is not suppressed; but is separated from the v. (R), by the prep. and gen., i. e., the jurative prop. 

\[\text{ولَأَبِي دَعْمَاء} \]

(AMB). Properly \(\text{لَا} \) or \(\text{ما} \) should not be separated from 

\(\text{ثِلَ} \) and its sisters by an adv. or its like, though that is allowable in the case of other vs., as 

\[\text{لا أَلْيَمْ جَمِينِي وَلا أَمْمِس} \]

Not to-day didst thou come to me, nor yesterday, because the neg. p. is compounded with 

\(\text{ثِلَ} \) and its sisters to import affirmation; and 

\[\text{فَلَا وَأَبِي دَعْمَاء} \]

[above] is anomalous (R on the Non-attributive Verbs). The same opinion is adopted by IHsh in the ML, except that he does not restrict this separation as anomalous, or even rare; but, seemingly, according to him, it is regular: he says, in the discussion on the parenthetic prop., “It occurs between 

\[\text{ولا أَرَأَيْنَا تُرَّالَ} \]

[1] and 

\[\text{فَلَا وَأَبِي دَعْمَاء} \]

[above]”. His Commentator IMH says that \(\text{لَا} \) 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 رَأَيْتُ ذُهْباً لَا رَآَتْ. Then no, by Abū Dāhmā 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 وَأَوْيَيْرَيْنَذَهْباً لَا رَآَتْ [above] and فَقُلْنَ تَبْيِسَنَآ إِلَّهَنَآ َالْحَمْل (AKB). The sign of affirmation may not be suppressed in the aor., because it is mostly two signs, the ُو 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 مَا, because لَا is used more than مَا in negation of the aor. (R). IU holds the verse [last cited] to be a case of suppression of the neg. مَا; but quotes its first hemistich differently, saying "And hence the suppression of the neg. مَا, which is very rare, as in لَعْبَرَ أَبِي ذُهْباً رَآَتْ َالْحَمْل By the life of Abū Dāhmā, she has (not) ceased to be exalted above her people, so long as a striker of fire has twisted a fire-stick!" and so is it quoted, and explained, by IUUK in
Commentary on the Tashil, except that he says "i.e., 

she shall (not) cease", [which involves "shall twist"] (AKB). None of these [four] ps. [above] may be suppressed, except ل alone, because (1) ل is op.; and may not govern, when understood, on account of its weakness: (2) also is op., in the idiom of the people of AlHijaz: (3) suppression of the ل would necessitate suppression of the ل with it (IY).

§. 653. The oath and the sworn-by have certain instruments among the preps. (S). The jurative instruments are five ps., vid. the ب [503], the ر [506], the ت [506], the ل [504], and مين [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 p. [503, 654], because it is a prep., meaning adhesion; which attaches the idea of swearing, and makes it adhere, to the sworn-by, in أَلْفَ بَاللَّهِ [650], as the ب conveys the [idea of] passing to the passed-by in مَرَّتُ بِرَيْبٍ [503]. The ب, then, is one of the preps. [498], on a par with مين [499] and في [502]; and, for that reason, we say that it is "the original jurative p.", the others being only made to accord with it. The v. is sometimes suppressed [651], for abbreviation, because of the frequency of the oath, and because they content themselves with the indication of it by the
prep., as *بَلَى ضَلْعَيْنِ لَا نَفَعَلَنَّ (I swear) by God, etc. [654] (IY). And, after suppression of the v., which you have made to adhere to the sworn-by, they sometimes put, in place of the ب, four ps., the ُبَ, and the ت, and two preps., vid. the ل and مَنٌ in your saying لِلَّهِ لَا يُؤَخَّرُ الَّذِي أَجَلُ By God, the end shall not be delayed! [498] and مَنَّ رَبّي لَا نَفَعَلَنَّ By my Lord, assuredly etc. [499], from desire for peculiarity [654] (M). The ُبَ is a subst. for the ب [506], because they mean to allow themselves some latitude [in the choice of a p.], on account of the frequency of oaths [651]; while the مَنَّ 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 مَنَّ 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 مَنَّ 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 مَنَّ is a subst. for the ب; and is op. with the government of the latter, unlike the rest of the cons., because the cons. مَنَّ is itself inop., being only indicative of the suppressed op. [131, 538], for which reason, instead of قَامَ رَبِّي وَعَمَّرَ Zaid and '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 \( \) ; so that, when you say, \( \) and by Zaid, this \( \) is not the jurative \( \) (IY). The \( \) and the \( \) contain the sense of wonder (M), as XII. 91. [575, 651] and \( \) [508, 652] (IY): and sometimes the \( \) occurs otherwise than in wonder (M), as XXI. 58. [498, 611] (IY); but not the \( \) : S cites \( \) [above], by 'Abd Manāt alHudhalī (M). The \( \) is a subst. for the \( \) [506, 651], being often substituted for it, as in \( \) and \( \) [689], which [substitution] is so frequent as to be almost regular (IY). The \( \) occurs in the sense of the \( \), being peculiar to the word \( \) [504], in great matters. And so does \( \) , pronounced with Kasr, and sometimes with Damm, of the \( \), Kasr being more frequent; and peculiar to the expression \( \) my Lord [499]. It is held (1) by S to be a prep., standing in the place of the \( \) ; the Damm of the \( \) being to indicate the alteration of its meaning, and its exclusion from its cat., as you say of the proper name \( \) Shums Ibn Malik, with Damm of the \( \) : (2) by some of the KK to be contracted from \( \) when
pronounced with Դառ, and from Եին when pronounced with Խար of the م: but this requires consideration, because Այիս is peculiar to Քեր [650], and مین to Եի in [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 Յին [or Եին], because contraction of the inf., and its reduction to two letters, do not necessitate uninflectedness, as [we see] in Յո hand and Դամ blood. And one should rather say that مین in their sayings مِن Քեր with Դառ, and مِن Քեր with Խար, of the م and ن, [used] with the word Քեր alone, is [identical with] the prep. مین used with Եի; the ن being made to imitate the م in Դառ and Խար, because of the two quiescents [664, 666]: and that مِن Քեր [مِن Քեր in] with two Fathas is [identical with Մِն Քեր in] [499], with Խար of the م and Քառ of the ن, the م being made to imitate the ن [in Քառ], from desire for lightening; although the Fatḥa of the ن arises accidentally, because of the two quiescents. It is said, however, that all three [ vars.], i. e., with Դառ, Խար, and Քառ of both م and ن, [used] with the word Քեր, are contracted from Այիس. As for the abridgment of مِن Քեր, with
two Dammas, from اِیْسَ, 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 اِیْسَ, 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, اِیْسُ اللُهَ اَلْلَهَ occurs in the three cases,
nom., acc., and gen., as يِبِينَ اللُهَ 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 مِنَ اللُهِ with two Fathas may be contracted from يِبِينَ اللُهَ, by
making the م imitate the ن [in Fath] after the contra-
tion; but not مِنَ اللُهِ with two Kasras, by making the
ن imitate the م [in Kasr], because the vowel of inflection
is not removable for the sake of alliteration. Sometimes
مِللُهِ with Damm, and مِلِلُهِ with Kasr, of the م are
said, being contracted from مِنْ and مِنْ [651], according
to what S says. It is said [by others] (1) that they
are contracted from اِیْسَ, in which case there is a
difficulty in [accounting for] the Kasr of the م: (2) that
the one with Kasr is contracted from يِبِينَ: (3) that
both are subs. for the م [687], like the م [above],
because the م and م are labial [732], for which reason
they are peculiar to the word \( \text{الله} \), like the \( \text{ب} \) \([506]\); but this requires consideration, because the word of one letter does not occur, in their language, pronounced with \( \text{Damm} \) (R).

§. 654. The \( \text{ب} \), because of its originality \([503, 653]\), enjoys three privileges, not shared by any other [jurative \( p. \) (IY)], (1) prefixion to [the explicit \( n. \), as \( \text{بَاللَّهُ} \ لَا تَعَلَكَ \ By God, assuredly I will do; and (IY)] the pron., as \( \text{بَيْنَ لَا رُوْنَ بُيِّنَ} \ By Him, assuredly I will worship Him and \( \text{بَيْنَ لَا رُوْنَ بُيِّنَ} \ 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 \( \text{وَلَا لَعْبَكَ} \ is not allowable, nor \( تَكَ} \ (IY): the poet says

\[
\text{أَلَا نَادَتْ أَمَامَةٌ يَأْحَبَّمَالٍِ لِلَّدُّكُرِيْنَيْ فَلا بِكَ ما أُبَالِي}
\]

Now Umāma has proclaimed her departure, that she may grieve me. Yet no, by thee, I care not (M), cited by AZ (IY): (2) expression of the \( v. \) with it, as \( \text{أَقْسِمُ بِاللَّهِ} \ حَلَّفْتُ بِاللَّهِ \ [650] (M), \( \text{أَحْلِفُ بِاللَّهِ} \) and \( \text{أَقْسِمُ بِاللَّهِ} \ حَلَّفْتُ بِاللَّهِ \); whereas you do not say \( \text{أَقْسِمُ تَالِلَّهِ} \) \( \text{أَحْلِفُ وَاللَّهِ} \), nor \( \text{أَقْسِمُ بِاللَّهِ} \) \( \text{أَحْلِفُ بِاللَّهِ} \), and the like (IY): (3) [that you apply it to denote (IY)] conciliatory [and propitiatory (IY)] adjuration of the man [addressed (IY)], as \( \text{بِاللَّهِ} لَمَا زَرْتِي} \ (I adjure thee) by God, only that thou visit me \([95, 559, 652]\)
and by thy life, inform me (M); whereas you do not say 

أَطُلُبُكُمُ أَخْبَرُنِي

nor تَأَلَّمْ, 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 the 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

[below], which is suppressed because indicated by the circumstances of the case; and the sense is

أَسَلْتَ يَقِدْرَة

(IIY), and the [other (IY)] poet says

[652] (M), i. e., 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

أَيَّا خَيْرَ حِيٍّ فِي الْأْلَّامٍ كُلُّهَا أَيَّا لَهُ هَدَى لِي فِي يَمَينِي مِنْ عَفُولٍ

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 هَدَى لِي فِي يَمَينِي آلَح, 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 عَمْرُك [652], عَمِرتُك, and تَعَدَّن, and تُعِيدُك [Part I, p. 44 A] have been mentioned, there is a declaration to the effect that some of the GG assert these [expressions] to be oaths; so that IM agrees with those who say that: whereas, according to our school, the juratory prop. is only enunciatory [below]". And this [declaration] is confirmed by the
fact that IJ says "The oath is an originative prop., whereby another prop. is corroborated [650]: then, if the latter be enunciatory, the oath is non-adjuratory; and, if it be requisite, the oath is adjuratory". IU expresses himself strangely, saying, in the small Commentary on the Jumal, "The oath is every prop., whereby another prop. is corroborated, both of them being enunciatory"; whereas the correct doctrine is that the jurative prop., [though] not its correl., is originative, as IJ [above] and others say: but it is urged, in his excuse, that his meaning is that, when the two props. are combined, they constitute a sentence admitting of being [pronounced] true or false. Then, after his definition, he says "When there occurs what is in the form of the oath, but [is followed by a prop. that] does not admit of being [pronounced] true or false, it is to be explained as not being an oath, as ٰبٰللهٰ رَبِّكَ آلِهُ [above] and ٰبٰللهٰ ٰبِيدِينَكَ رَبِّكَ آلِهُ ٰبِيدِينَكَ [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 ٰلٰلٰهِ, "As for these two verses, they are not oaths, because the two props. ٰلٰلٰهِ ٰسَأَلَّكَ ٰبِيدِينَكَ [above] and ٰلٰلٰهِ ٰسَأَلَّكَ ٰسَأَلَّكَ [above],
except that they understand the v., because it is indicated by the sense". "And", says he, "three things will prove to you that [πάσης οὐκ εἰς ζυγὸν Ζήκα] By God, has Zaid stood? or [πάσης εἰς ζυγὸν Ζήκα] By God, if Zaid stand, then honor him, or the like, is not an oath:—(1) that the p. peculiar [653] to the oath does not occur, in place of the ب, in the language of the Arabs, who do not say رَبَّنَا أَنتَ الَّذِي قَامَتْ قَالَهُمْ, nor ; (2) that, when they express the v. whereon the ب depends, it is not one of the jurative v.s., أَقُسِّمُ رَبَّنَا قَامَتْ لَا يُقَامُ, not being said; (3) that the oath is not devoid of faithlessness or faithfulness, and that is not suitable except in what is qualifiable as true or false". His saying that the like of this is conciliation [above], not an oath, is obviously correct; and there is no doubt that [the notion of] its being an oath is distasteful. But the language of IHsh apparently imports that it is an oath, because he names it قَسَمَ آسِتُعْطَافٍ conciliatory [or adjuratory] oath (A.K.B). The correl. of the non-adjuratory oath must be enunciatory [above]; and the correl. of the adjuratory oath originative, as in پَعْبَى هَلُوَّت صَمَتَ الْإِنْس (I adjure thee) by thy Lord, hast thou drawn etc? and

يعِشْكَ يَا سَلَمَى أَرْحَمِي دَا صَبَابَةً

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

§. 655. The jurative p. is sometimes suppressed, for abbreviation, because strongly indicated. In that respect it is of two kinds, [inop. and op.]:—(1) they suppress it, and make the jurative v. govern the sworn-by in the acc.; (2) they suppress the prep., but maintain its government, taking it into account when suppressed, as they take it into account when expressed, in order to notify that the suppressed [prep.] is meant [to be understood]: so that \( \text{اللهِ لَا تَعْمَسِنَ} \) (By) God, assuredly I will stand is said, transmitted by S, meaning \( \text{وَاللهِ} \) 

and \( \text{فِي الْقُلُوبِ} \) (IY on §. 656). The [jurative p. (IY)] is

(1) [often (IY)] suppressed [514, 651] (M), as \( \text{اللهِ لَا تَعْمَسِنَ} \) with the acc. [651]: (a) they hardly ever suppress this p. in the oath with [expression of] the v.; and do not say \( \text{أَغْسِمُ} \) \( \text{اللهِ} \), nor \( \text{أَحْلِفُ} \) \( \text{الله} \); 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, أَقِسْمُ, and the like; for, when they suppress the p., either by poetic license, or for a kind of abbreviation, they make that v. self-trans., as [they make the v.] in VII. 154. and [514] (IY); the poet [Dhur-Rumma (IY, N)] says

وَمَنْ قُلْبُهُ لَيْنَ فِي أَظِباءَ الْسُّوَانُحٍ

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

إِذَآ أَلْكُنْ تَأْدِمُهُ بِلَكَمْ * فَذَلَالَ آمَنَا اللَّهُ أَنْتِهِدُ

[below] (M) Whenever thou seasonest the bread with meat, then that, (I swear by) God's trust, is the dish called أَحْلَفُ بِآمَانُةِ اللَّهِ (N), which [last verse], they say, is spurious: (d) if you wish, you understand a trans. v., such as أَذْكُرُ I mention, أَشْهِدُ I call to witness, or the like: IS says that only a trans. v. is understood;
but the proper way is the first, because, when you understand a *trans. v.*, it is not of this *cat.*, [i. e., jurative] (IY): (e) the *يَبِينَ [here] are also related in the nom., [َنَقُولُ تَبِينُ اللهِ الْمَعَالَ] Then said I, *God's oath* (is mine oath, or what I swear by) and *فَذَالِكَ أَمَانَةُ اللهِ الْمَعَالَ* then that, *God's trust* (is binding upon me) (IY),] as *inches. whose enunc. is suppressed [29, 650, 651] (M), the full phrase being *ما أَقَسِمُ يَا بِيَبِينُ اللهِ تَسْبِيْحُ*, and similarly *أَمَانَةُ اللهِ الْمَعَالَةَ لِي* (IY): (2) understood [503, 515, 651] (M), for a kind of abbreviation, because frequently used (IY), like the لَّا أَبُولُ (M) and لَّا أَبُنْ عَيْبَكَ, meaning لَّا أَبُنْ عَيْبَكَ لَا أَلْحَم*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 لَّا أَبُنْ عَيْبَكَ [206] (IY). 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], الَلّهُ (By) God, without prolongation, is transmitted from AshSha'bi (K, B), according to what S mentions, that some of them suppress the jurative p., and do not put the interrog. Hamza as a compensation for it (K). And the KK allow the gen. in every sworn-by [653], wherefrom the prep. is suppressed, even though it be without compensation, as الْكَعْبَةُ لَا تَعْلَمْ (By) the Ka'ba, assuredly etc., and الْمُصَّحَفَ لَا تَعْلَمْ (By) the Holy Book, assuredly I will come. The inch. whose enunc. is suppressed, if conjoined with the ج of inception, as in لَعْمَرْ [650], must be in the nom.; and so, says Jz, must [ أَيْمُ الْلَّهِ [650, 653], even if not conjoined with the ج, because of hearsay from them. But every [sworn-by], except the [inch.] conjoined with the ج, and except [ أَيْمُ الْلَّهِ [أَيْمُ [650, 653], may be governed in the acc. by the jurative v. understood, as عَهْدُ الْلَّهِ (I swear by) God's covenant and الْمُصَّحَفَ (by) the Ka'ba and الْكَعْبَةُ (by) the Holy Book, and similarly إِيَّاَлَ لَا فَعَلَسْ (I swear by) Thee, assuredly etc.; and, in such expressions, the acc. is more frequent than the nom.; while قُلْتُ يَيِسُنَّ الْلَّهُ is related with the nom. and acc. [above]. Jz says that,
in the word الَّلَّهُ [above], only the acc. and gen. have been heard; but An allows the nom. also, in accordance with analogy (R). In XXXVIII. 85. [27], is read with (1) the two حقownik生命力 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 ﷺ It is incumbent upon thee, (I swear by) God, is that etc. (K), or, in another version, أَمَانَةٌ [154]; and like أَلاَّ رَبِّ مَنْ [اللَّهُ] in [above], and [اللَّهُ] [above], and [اللَّهُ] [above] (N): (b) the nom., the first being an inch. whose enunc. is suppressed like لَعْمَرُ [above], i.e., أَلاَّ لَعْمَرُ ﷺ [27]; (c) the gen., Then, (by) the truth, etc., the first being a sworn-by whose jurative p. is understood, like ﷺ وَالْحَقِيْقَ أُفْرِدُ [503,515,651]; while i.e., And I say (not aught save) الْحَقِيْقَ, is a lit. imitation of the sworn-by, its sense being corroboration and strengthening: (a) this construction, [by which the second حقنى is treated as a lit. imitation of the first,] is allowable in the acc. and nom. also; and is a fine,
beautiful construction: (2) the first in the nom. or gen., with the second in the acc., the explanation of which is according to what we have mentioned (K).

§. 656. The ی is [sometimes] suppressed; while the premonitory ی in ۰ لا لا الله ۰ [552], the interrog. Hamza in ۰ لا لا الله [below], or the disjunction of the conj. Hamza in ۰ لا لا الله [651] is put as a compensation for it (M). And they say ۰ لا ل الله ۰ [556] (IY). The word ۰ لله is exclusively distinguished by receiving [the premonitory (AKB)] ۰ or the interrog. Hamza as a compensation for the [suppressed] prep. (R). The language of Kh in the CAj, [where he says “The ۰ is sometimes, though rarely, changed into ۰ , as ۰ لله , with the disj. or conj. Hamza, and, in both cases, with retention or elision of the ! ”], apparently means that the ۰ here is [not a premonitory, but] a jurative ی [653]; and that it is a subst. for the ۰ [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 ۰ ). And similarly, in ۰ لله , 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 в in] the interior [669], and were afterwards restored as a compensation for the [jurative] п. [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 م as a subst. [for the jurative п. (AKB)], you must put the word د after the sworn-by, [whether الله be governed in the gen. by the supplied п. (AKB),] as in لَا عَا الَّلَّهُ دَا [552] and لَا عَا الَّلَّهُ دَا [556] (R), meaning (by) God in both [exs.] (AKB); or [by لعمر pre. to it (AKB),] as in تَعَلَّمَ ۚ مَعْلُومٍ اللهٍ دَا قَسَمًا ﷺ تَأَقَّدُ بِذُرَّبًكَ وَأَنْظُرْ أَيْنَ تَنْسَكِكُ (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 (قَسَمًا being, says Am, governed in the acc. as an inf. n. corrob. of what precedes it, because the sense thereof is أَمِن أَقْسِمَ I swear): then measure (thy steps) by thy stride, and look where thou enterest (AKB). Apparently the premonitory п. belongs to the dem. [174, 552]; but is made to precede the sworn-by, upon suppression of the п., in order to be a compensation for it. When م is prefixed to الله, there are four modes [of pronunciation]. The
most frequent of them is retention of its I, and elision of the conj. Hamza from اللط; so that two quiescents meet together, the I of حا, and the first 3 of اللط(R); and therefore you say حلال (IY). Analogy requires elision of the I [of حا], because such [a concurrence of two quiescents] as that is pardonable only in a single word, like الصالين I. 7. [539, 663]; while in two words, elision is necessary, as مَآ اللط and مَآ اللط [pronounced دآ اللط and مآ اللط]: but here the I is mostly not elided, in order that it may be a quasi-premonition that the حا belongs to دا, since ا للط ذا [below], with elision of the I of حا, suggests the notion that the 5 is a subst. for the Hamza of اللط, as in ا للط ذا for حيال and للط ذا [690]. The second [mode], which is intermediate in rarity and frequency, is حا اللط ذا [pronounced حا اللط ذا], with elision of the I of حا, because of the two quiescents, as in حا اللط ذا and حا اللط ذا [above]. The third, which is below the second in frequency, is حا اللط ذا [pronounced حا اللط ذا], with retention of the I of حا, and disjunction of the Hamza of اللط [669], notwithstanding its being in the interior [of the phrase], as a premonition that حا ought to be with دا, after اللط, 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 حا اللط ذا with elision of the conj. Hamza [from اللط], and Fath of the I of حا,
after conversion of it into Hamza, as in [665]. Khl says that َذَا is part of the correl. of the oath; and is enunc. of a suppressed inch., i.e., لَلَّمَّرُ ُذَا (assuredly the matter is) this; or an ag. [of a suppressed v.], i.e., لَيْكُونَ ُذَا (assuredly) this (shall be the case) or لَا لَيْكُونَ ُذَا this (shall not be the case); while the correl. that comes after it, whether aff. or neg., as وَاللَّهُ ُذَا لَا تُعَلَّنَ Now, (by) God, (assuredly the matter is) this, or (assuredly) this (shall be the case), assuredly I will do or لَا أَنْعَلَ [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 لَنَا أَحْرُكَ, meaning حَيَا وَاللَّهُ أَحْرُكَ (assuredly I am) thy brother. But Akh says that َذَا is part of the oath, either an ep. of اللَّهُ الْعَلِيمُ الْحَكِيمُ (by) This, i.e., the Present, the Overlooking, God; or an inch., whose enunc. is suppressed, i.e., ُذَا قَسَّمَى 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 وَاللَّهُ لَيْقَوْمُ عَبدُ مِنْ عِبْدِي لَيْقَوْنَ 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 Allāh Ibn Mas'ūd, when the latter said "This is the head of Abū Jahl"; Is it, (by) God, than Whom there is no other god? When the interrog. Hamza is prefixed to اللّه, the Hamza of اللّه is either changed into a pure ٰ, which is the more frequent mode [of pronunciation]; or softened, as is the rule in هل Is the man? and the like [661, 663, 669]: and is not elided, because of the ambiguity; nor preserved, because of the heaviness (R). There is a reading [transmitted from AshSha'bi (K, B)] ولا تن سم شهادة اللّه إنما إذا لم يأت من آمنين V. 105. [655] Nor will we hide testimony. What! (By) God, verily then are we sinners (IY), i.e., if we hide (B), with pause upon شهادة, and prolongation [of the Hamza] in اللّه (K, B). And, as for disjunction of the Hamza of اللّه, 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 أَيَبْلِغَ اللّه لَقَدْ كَانَ كَذَا What! then, (by) God, assuredly such a thing has taken place; and the ف may be prefixed without [a Hamza of] interrogation, as فأَبْلِغَ اللّه لَقَدْ كَانَ كَذَا Then, (by) God, assuredly, etc. (R). As you prolong the ٰ in اللّه 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 ٰ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 

الله

by the *con.* ف . But, according to Akh, the ف in أَفاَلَاللهِ is red. [540]. The proof that these three [things, the عا, the *interrog.* Hamza, and the disjunction of the *conj.* Hamza in الله] are *subs.* is (1) their interchangeability with the jurative *p.* (R): (a) the ب [or ب] and the عا may not be combined; so that one does not say إى عا و آلللهِ , nor إى عا ب آلللهِ: 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 ب in such as بَالْصَّلَاةِ وَآللَّيْلِ XCIii. 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 ب in the beginnings of Chapters LXXVII. and LXXIX. (ML), because, the ب there being necessarily a copulative *p.*, the ب here must be so (DM). When the ب is repeated
after the jurative, as in

\[ \text{after the jurative} \]

\[ \text{ما حَلَقَ الْدَّارِ} \]

\[ \text{What hath created the male and the female, verily your strivings are diverse, the opinion of S and Khl is that the repeated is the copulative } \]

\[ \text{ما حَلَقَ الْدَّارِ} \]

\[ \text{is that the repeated is the copulative } \]

\[ \text{I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created} \]

\[ \text{I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created} \]

\[ \text{I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created} \]

\[ \text{I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created} \]

\[ \text{I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created} \]

\[ \text{I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created} \]

\[ \text{I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created} \]

\[ \text{I swear by the night, I swear by the day, I swear by That Which hath created} \]
swear by the night, and the day, and That Which hath created, verily etc., were said: and (2) because you say, displaying the coupling, بِاللَّهِ ﺇِلَّاءٍ ﻻَنَعْلَمَ By God, then God, assuredly I will do and بِحَيْوَتِكَ ﻓِيمْ ﺡِيْروُتْكَ ﻻَنَعْلَمَ By Thy life, again Thy life, assuredly etc. [134, 540]; but do not say أَنْسُمُ ﻓِيَاللَّهِ أَنْسُمُ ﻓِيَالْنَبِيِّ ﻻَنَعْلَمَ 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 يَا 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 الْيَلِيْلَةِ, and إِذَا يَغْشَى إِذَا تَجَلَّى, while the con. is one [538] (R), by means of which [131] you govern the acc. and the gen., as in مَرَرْتُ أَمْسِيَ بِيزْبِيِّ وَأَلِيْمِمَ عُمْرَوْ 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 يَا 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 إِذَا تَجَلَّى is, as it were, coupled to [two regs. of] a single op., vid. the يَا [in رَالْلَّهِ إِذَا يَغْشَى]. But, according to this, says IH, he must
disallow *ُحِبَّتْ أُنْسِمْ إِذًا يَغْشَى وَالْيَهُرُ إِذًا تَحْجَلَى Is wear
by the night when it covereth, and the day when it
becometh clear; whereas the Kur has LXXXI. 15-17.
[538], where, though the passage does not involve
[a coupling to] two regs., still the in جَلَّ إِذَا يَغْسَعْ،
being a subst. for أَقْسِمُ ٌلَّيْلٍ إِذًا يَغْشَى, does, as it were,
govern the gen. and the acc., which is the [contingency]
f feared: and, says he, the reason why this [construction]
is allowable [in XCII. 1—3.] is only that it is like إِنْ
فِي الْدَّارِ زَبْدًا وَالْخَلْقُ عِمْراً Verily in the house etc.
[1, 538]. According to our suggestion [below], however,
that the full phrase is وَغَطْسَةٌ إِلَّي إِذَا يَغْشَى By (the
greatness of) the night when it covereth, the op. of
الْيَلْيُلٍ, and likewise of إِذَا يَغْشَى, is really the supplied
[inf. n.] عَطْسَتْ[331], for which the, acts as a subst.; and
this is a single op., the phrase being constructively بِغَطْسَةِ
َلَّيْلٍ وَقَتَ غَشْبىَنِ إِذَا يَغْشَى by (the greatness of) the night
at the time of its retiring [or rather غَشْبىَاَنَى at the
time of its covering], so that the op. of the gen. and acc.
is one (R). It is said that the لَّيْلٍ [that follows the oath]
in such as XCII. 1, [204, 498] does not contain the sense
of condition, since the correl. of the condition either
comes after it, or is indicated by what precedes it [419];
while the لَّيْلٍ here is not followed by anything, expressed
or supplied, suitable for being a correl.; nor preceded by anything indicative of a correl. of a condition, except the oath: so that, if ِّإِّلَيْلُ were cond., the phrase would be constructively when it covereth, (I swear), the oath not being absolute, but dependent upon the covering of the night, which is the opp. of what is intended. If one says "Then, since ِّإِّلَيْلُ is a bare adv., what governs it in the acc.?", I reply that ِّإِّلَيْلُ may be said, not improbably, to be an adv. to the sense of greatness and ِّجلال majesty indicated by the oath, because one does not swear by any thing except because of its great state [650]; so that ِّإِّلَيْلُ 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 ِّعَظَمَهُ أَلْلَهُ إِذَا أَلْحَى [above], like عَظَبَةٌ مِّنْ زَيْدٍ إِذَا رَكَبَ I marvel at Zaid, when he rides, i. e., مِّنْ عَظَمَهُ at his greatness, where greatness is understood, because one does not marvel except at what is great in some sense, as one does not swear except by what is great in some sense or other (R on the Uninflected Adverbs).
CHAPTER V.

THE ALLEVIATION OF THE HAMZA.

§. 658. The Hamza is a hard, heavy letter, uttered from the farthest [part] of the throat (IY, Jrb). It is a rising in the chest, produced with an effort, being the farthest letter in outlet [732]; and that is heavy upon them, because it is like vomiting (S). Since the Hamza is the innermost letter in the throat, [and has a disagreeable rising, that acts like vomiting (R),] its pronunciation is [deemed (IY)] heavy (IY, R) upon the tongue (R), since its utterance is like retching (IY); and therefore, [because of that heaviness (IY, Jrb),] alleviation of it is permitted (IY, R, Jrb) by some people (R), for a sort of improvement (Jrb). Alleviation is the dial. of most of the inhabitants of AlHijaz [641, 642], and [especially (R)] of Kurais (IY, R, Jrb). The Commander of the Believers, 'Ali (God honor his face!), is reported to have said: "The Kur'an came down in the language of Kurais, 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 Tamim and Kais (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 ى, according to its vowel, or the vowel of what precedes it. And, for that reason, Mb used to omit it from the letters of the alphabet, and not reckon it with them, but make the first of them the ب, saying "The Hamza does not remain uniform, nor do I reckon it with the letters whose ways are known, remembered." Elision is 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 ؛ when it is pronounced with Fath, between Hamza and ى when it is pronounced with Damm, and between Hamza and ى 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 سَلْكُ was asked, between Hamza and ا (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 سَلْكُ was asked, between Hamza and ج (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 مَسْتَهِهَٰ تَوْنَ and سَلْكُ [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 ١, as in مَرْحَبٖ [690], and which is then ١; 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 I read (IY), and did not read, and was not bad, and did not teach reading: (2) not [in the same word], as in VI. 70. To guidance, [saying to him (K, B),] "Come thou unto us," II. 283. [Then let] him that hath been entrusted [repay], and I. 49. That saith "Give me leave" (R). Th quiescent [Hamza] is changed into the consonant of the vowel of what precedes it, [i. e., is converted into if precedes by Fatḥa, into if preceded by Kasra, and into, if preceded by Damma (Jrb, MASH),] as in [and سوت I was evil; [and, لم يقرأ, ولم يردو, and لم يقرأ, ولم يردو;] and ] to VI. 70. [below], II. 283., and IX. 49. (SH): whether the quiescent Hamza and the preceding mobile be in one word, as in [and سوت I was evil, 1st pers. pret. of ساء, aor. يسعو; or in two words, as in VI. 70., II. 283., and IX. 49. (Jrb): [and] whether the Hamza be in the middle, as in [and سوت I was evil, and لم يقرأ, ولم يردو; or at the end, as in لم يقرأ, ولم يردو: 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 ٰ of ٰٰ is elided [663]; so that the expression becomes ٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ with a quiescent Hamza after the د; and then the Hamza is converted into ل: [similarly,] in II. 283., the conj. Hamza is elided [669], and then the ی of یٰٰ is elided [663]; so that the expression becomes لیٰٰٰٰٰٰٰ, with a quiescent Hamza after the د; and then the Hamza is converted into ی: and, in IX. 49., the conj. Hamza is elided [669], so that the expression becomes یُقَلُوْذُنُ; and then the Hamza is converted into ی. 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 94a
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 ى, or an َ; and, if a, or ى, 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 ى, is converted into a, or ى, respectively; and, [when so converted (Jrb),] has the preceding, or ى incorporated into it, as خَطِّيَّة, [orig. خَطِّيَّة fault (Jrb)]; خَطِّيَّة مَقْرِرَة, [orig. مَقْرِرَة read (Jrb)]; and خَطِّيَّة أَنْيِس (SH), orig. خَطِّيَّة أَنْيِس (Jrb), dim. of أَنْوَس, pl. of خَيْس 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 فَي
prophet and ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ creation [278] is incorrect, [because ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ with Hamza is read by نَفَّي in the whole of the Kur, and ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ with Hamza by نَفَّي 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 ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ and ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ; 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 ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ prophecy, prophetic office: but IH, seeing that ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ and ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ with Hamza are authorized among the Seven, decides that alleviation of them is not obligatory; and similarly ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ 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 ٍبَٰرِثَةٌ, is alleviated by the well-known betwixt-and-between
(SH) so that you put it between Hamza and ٰ, if the Hamza be pronounced with Fath, as in سَأْلُ questioned and قِرَأَتُ reading; between Hamza and ٰ, if it be pronounced with Damm, as in تَسَأَلُ asking one of another and تَلْمِيذُ reconciliation; and between Hamza and ٰ, if it be pronounced with Kasr, as in قَابِلُ sayer [below] and بَائعُ seller: (a) elision by transfer of the vowel to the ٰ is disallowed, because ٰ does not receive a vowel; and conversion with incorporation is disallowed, because ٰ is not incorporated, nor incorporated into [739] (Jrb); while the strange betwixt-and-between is not possible, since what precedes the Hamza has no vowel: so that no mode remains but the well-known betwixt-and-between, [which is allowable,] because its Hamza, though it approximates to the quiescent, is in every ease 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 سَأْلُ question and حَبُّ [641, 642] (Jrb), or an unsound letter other than that [ٰ or non-coordinative aug. ٰ or ٰ, vid. a rad. ٰ or ٰ, as in سُرُ evil and شَيٍّ thing, or a coordinative aug. ٰ or ٰ, as in جَوَابُ Jau'aba, name of a water, and جِيَالٌ the she-hyena, where the ٰ and ٰ are for coordination with جُعَفْرُ (392) (Jrb)], has its vowel transferred
thereunto, and is elided, as حُبّ [663] and [below], سُو [below], and جَيَل [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 1 alone, as in قَابِل [above], as we have mentioned, because of the compulsion [before noted]; nor do they change it into an unsound letter, without, or after, transfer of its vowel, because, says S, they dislike to include these words among the formations having َ and ى [for their ْس (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 سَفَرْتُ for سُفَرْتُ َ I darned, as they say, in the case of the quiescent Hamza preceded by a mobile, نَشُرْتُ and رَنْوَتُ for نَشُرتُ َ and رَنْوَتُ َ I grew up, and حَبْتُ and قَرَيتُ for حَبَيْتُ and قَرَيتُ َ I hid and قَرَأْتُ 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 ُ, after transfer of its vowel to the preceding
quiescent, as كَمِّاءة for woman and *مَرأة truffles (S)]; and S transmits that, but says that it is rare: (d) transfer of the vowel is not allowable in the *بَنَٰتْرٌ * was bent, or *كَرْعَد, because they require the ن of إِذْنَعْلَ [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 آيُوبَ for the father of Job (Jrb), ذُو مَهْمٍ for أَبُو آيُوبَ the author of their matter (Jrb), قَأَضُو بِبُكَ for I seek for his matter (Jrb), and (SH) for the judges of thy father; and similarly مُن أَبُوكَ for مُن أَبُوكَ Who is thy father?, مُن أَمُوكَ for مُن أَمُوكَ Who is thy mother?, كُمّ يُلَكَ for كُمّ يُلَكَ How many are thy camels? (Jrb): (f) the cat. of سُوُء and شََیٰ [above] also occurs incorporated (SH), as and سُوُء (MASH), the non-aug, and being assimilated to the aug., as in مَقْتَرَة and خَطْيَة [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 يُرَى
sees, [orig. يَرَاي، like يَرُبَّى grazes (Jrb)], and of يَرَاى shows, from frequency (SH) of usage (Jrb), since يَرَاى, according to the o. f., is hardly ever used as aor. of saw, or and يَرَاى as pret. and aor. in the conj. of (MASH); contrary to يَنَأى which goes far away, [aor. of تَنَأى (Jrb)] and to sent far away and يَنَأى sends far away (SH), which are treated like other words as regards allowability of alleviation, because they are not so frequent as يَرَاى, etc. (Jrb): (α) every word composed of رَأى, whether from رُؤِى sight, رَأى knowledge, opinion, or رُؤٰى vision, dream, when you prefix another letter to it, for the formation of its paradigm, and its رَأى is quiescent, must have its Hamza elided, after transfer of the vowel thereof [to the quiescent ر] , from frequency of usage, except رَأى aspect, رَأى outward appearance, and رَأى mirror; but in poetry such as

اوَيَ عَيْنِيَّ مَا لَمْ تَرَيْيَا # كَلَّا وَالْبَرَّهَايِ

(by Surāka Ibn Mirdās alAzdī alBāriki, I make mine eyes see what they have not seen: each of us is knowing in falsehoods (SM),) sometimes occurs: (β) the Hamza [of رَأَيَّ, when conjoined] with the interrog. Hamza, is often elided, notwithstanding the mobility of what precedes it, in such as رَأَيَّ [below], as [will be]
mentioned (R) : (b) frequent in the cat. of لدُ asِ ك, [orig. إِسْأَلِ (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 جَبِّ (Jrb): (β) إِسْأَلِ being used more frequently than such as إِجَآرِ, 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 إِجَآرِ; but, if the alleviation were frequent, [as IH suggests,] because of the two Hamzas only, إِجَآرِ 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 إِسْأَلِ is the combination of two Hamzas; while the [second] Hamza [of إِسْأَلِ] is [constructively] remaining [in إِسْلِ], 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 إِسْلِ, like [660]; but states that what he transmits is vitiated by [the fact] that no one says إِنَّكُلَمْ. They fought together.
[756] or ḍ or .SEVERE Reject thou [664]: and he distinguishes between ḍ and ṣā by [saying] that the ṣ in the latter is orig. mobile, as in ṣāl asked; whereas the determinative ḍ [in the former] is orig. quiescent: while S says that the distinction between them is that the Hamza of the determinative ḍ resembles the disj. Hamza of ḍ in being pronounced with Fatḥa when inceptive [668]; and in being retained in interrogation, as ṣā[669], and in [the voc.] ḍa[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 ], is either transfer and elision, as in ٍحَبّ [above]; or conversion and incorporation, as in ٍبَرَى مَقْرُوْ ب [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 مَقْرُوْ remain, [with the ى or و ] doubled; and are then paused upon with quiescence, Raum, or Ishmām: while the alleviation of ٍشُيّ and سُو [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 ۱: but, if the final Hamza be preceded by an ۱, 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 й; so that nothing remains but conversion of the quiescent Hamza into й, because the preceding й is like Fatḥa; and thus it becomes like [the й in] كَمْ يُقَرُّ [above]: but, in addition to quiescence, neither Raum nor Ishmām is allowable, because the vowel was upon the letter for which this й is a subst., not upon the й [itself], so that the latter should be pronounceable with Raum or Ishmām, as we said of pause upon the й of feminization [640]; and also because Raum is [achieved] by retaining part of the vowel, whereas the pure й does not admit of that. This [second] mode, I mean pause with quiescence, and [with] conversion of the Hamza into й, 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 Tanwín, the Hamza is not final; so that these varieties are not found in it; but the Tanwín is converted into ′, as ′ دُعَاء prayer and ′ عَشَاء nightfall [640] (R). The discussion is [still] upon the mobile Hamza (Jrb). If it be preceded by a mobile, it is [of (Jrb)] nine [kinds (Jrb)], being pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or Damm, and, in each case, preceded by [any of] the three [vowels], as (1) سَأَل asked, (2) مَائَة hundred, (3) مُّرْجَع limited [661], (4) وَسُمَّى was disgusted [661], (5) مُسْتَهْرِثَان scoffers, (6) سُتْل was asked, (7) رُف pitiful, (8) مُسْتَهْرِثAN scoffers, (9) رُوس heads (SH). And the predicament mentioned in the case of the [Hamza] attached [to the preceding mobile] holds equally good in the case of the detached, the exs. of which are (1) قَالَ أَحَمَّد Ahmad said, (2) بُعَلْكَ أَبِيَّك by the manservant of thy father, (3) إِن هَذَا غُلَامُ أَبِيَّك Verily this is the manservant of thy father, (4) قَالَ إِبْرَاهِيم Ibrāḥīm said,
by the manservant of Ibrāhim, (6) This is the property of Ibrāhim, (7) verily the manservant of thy sister, (8) This is the property of thy sister, (9) 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 مَرْجَعْلٍ; or Kasr, as in مَانِثُةٍ: because, in the well-known betwixt-and-between, the Hamza would approximate to an ! preceded by Damma or Kasra, which is disliked (Jrb). When you intend to alleviate the Hamza, whether it be attached [to the preceding mobile] or detached, then, (1) if pronounced with Fath, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in مَانِثُةٍ, it is converted into a pure ى, because of the impracticability of eliding it, since it is elided only after transfer of the vowel, whereas no vowel is transferred to a mobile: while softening [below] also is impracticable, since the Hamza would become [intermediate] between Hamza and !; so that, as the occurrence of ! after Kasra is impossible,
they do not allow the similitude of the Ḳ also to occur after it: (2) if pronounced with Fath, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, as in مَرَّ، it is converted into a pure ۷, for a reason like what we have mentioned in the case of ۸۸ [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 Ḳ [above], because the remaining modes of alleviation are [then] impracticable, as we have mentioned; and because the Ḳ [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‘shā

اَيْنَ رَأَى رَجُلًا أَعْشَى أَضْرَى بِهِ رَبِّ الْمَنْوَى وَ ذَكْرُ مُتِبَلْ حِيْلٍ

(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 مُسْتَهْرِئُونَ II. 13. '661]; and the one pronounced with Kasr, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, as in سَئِلَ [661]: the first, says he, being converted into a pure ی, [as مُسْتَهْرِئُونَ]; and the second into a pure ی, [as سُوَلَ]: since, if they were softened, the first would be like the quiescent ی, which does not occur after Kasra; and the second like the quiescent ی, which does not occur after Damma; as the ی does not occur after Damma or Kasra. And some, in the case of such as
and ُمُسْتَهْلِكَتُونَ سَيْلَ, have recourse to the strange betwixt-and-between, [saying ُسُوْلَ and ُمُسْتَهْلِكَتُونَ, 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 ِّس in the well known betwixt-and-between, [vid. the occurrence of the similitude of a quiescent َهَلَلَلَّ after Kasra, and of the similitude of a quiescent ُهَلَلَلَّ after ُذَلَل,] as before mentioned; and from the charge incurred by Akh, vid. the occurrence of the pure ُهَلَلَلَّ mobilized by Kasr after ُذَلَل in ُسُوْلَ, and of the pure ُهَلَلَلَّ mobilized by ُذَلَل after Kasra in ُمُسْتَهْلِكَتُونَ: 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 ُهَلَل, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Fath, as سَال asked; into a quiescent ُهَلَلَل, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with ُذَلَل, as ُهَلَل heads; and into a quiescent ُهَلَلَل, when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Kasr, as ُمُسْتَهْلِكَتُونَ scoffers [below]. This, says ِّس, is not an undeviating rule: but is confined to hearsay, [being only remembered from the Arabs, as one remembers the word for whose ِّه is substituted
like [689]; whereas you do not say I rendered cager (R). And hence [659], orig. staff (S). In metric exigency, however, says he, that is regular, as

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

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

(S),] like for [689]; whereas you do not say I rendered cager (R). And hence [659], orig. staff (S). In metric exigency, however, says he, that is regular, as

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

[by Zaid Ibn 'Amr Ibn Nufail alKurashi al'Adawi, They (his two wives) have asked me for divorce, because they have seen me to be such that my wealth has become small. Ye (an enallage from the 3rd pers. to the 2nd) have brought to me an unseemly matter (AKB)],
another (Mb). It has reached me that 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 سَئَتْ, aor. هُمَا تَسَالُ, and يَتَسَأَلُانِ They two ask, one of another (K),] in accordance with which is the reading [of Nāfi' and Ibn 'Amir (B)] سَأَلَ سَأَطِلَ الْأَلِحَةُ LXX. 1. [503] (AKB); and [the author of the KF says that] يُسَأَلَ سَأَلَ, aor. يَخَافُ, is said, and هُمَا يَتَسَأَلُانِ [above] (KF). S cites, among [the exs. of] what is not allowable out of poetry, except by hearsay, the saying of the poet ['Abd ArRahmān Ibn Ḥassān (S, N)]

وَكُنتَ أَذَلُ مِنْ وَتَتِ لِهِ يَقَاعُ يُشَجَّعُ رَأْسَهُ بَأْلِفْهِ رَأْجِيَ (R) And thou wouldst be viler than a tent-peg in a plain, whose head a hammerer batters with the stone, meaning رَأْجِيَ (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 يَأْجِيَ 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 لَمْ يَقْرِيَ [above], the rule of which is to be alleviated by being made into یّ, in, or out of, poetry. When, indeed,
such as \( \text{مَرْتُ دَبْ أَلْوَاجِي} \) occurs in continuity, as \( \text{I passed by the hammerer, O youth} \), the Hamza being made a quiescent \( \text{ى} \), [as in \( \text{مُسْتَهْزِي} \) 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 \( \text{ى} \) when the letter preceding it is pronounced with Fath, into \( \text{ى} \) when the letter preceding it is pronounced with Kasr, and into \( \text{ى} \) when the letter preceding it is pronounced with Damm: but the truth is that one should restrict this, as \( \text{IY} \) does, by saying "The Hamza is [sometimes] converted into \( \text{ى} \) when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Fath, into \( \text{ى} \) when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Kasr, and into \( \text{ى} \) when it and the letter preceding it are pronounced with Damm", as above expressed. \( \text{IY} \), however, does not restrict the \( \text{ى} \) and \( \text{ى} \), that the Hamza is converted into, by quiescence; but it is more proper to say "a quiescent \( \text{ى} \)" and "a quiescent \( \text{ى} \)", as we have done above. According to this, then, [the Hamza in] such as \( \text{كِ} \) \( \text{مَبْسَم} \) \( \text{was base or} \) \( \text{مَبْسُوم} \) [above] is not converted into \( \text{ى} \), either in, or out of, poetic exigency; nor [the Hamza in] such as \( \text{مُسْتَهْزِي} \) \( \text{ى} \) or \( \text{ى} \) into a quiescent \( \text{ى} \); nor [the Hamza in] such as \( \text{سُمْجَل} \) or \( \text{سُمْجَلاً} \) with a quiescent \( \text{ى} \). \( S \) 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 سامة Ishâk said and قال سكانى Usâma said: whereas, if the vowel [of the preceding final] be inflectional, the vowel of the Hamza is not transferred; so that you do not say يقول سكانى Ishâk says or لئن يقول سامة Usâma shall not say, from respect for the vowel of inflection: (2) some elide the [detached] Hamza [below], without transfer of its vowel to the final of the [preceding] word, saying قال سكانى and قال سامة: 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 l at the end of the [preceding] word: and then, if the Hamza be followed by a quiescent, as in ما أحسن How good is! and ما أمرك What is thine affair?, the l is dropped, [as حسن and م مرن ]; but, if it be followed by a mobile, as in ما أشد How hard is!, the l remains, as ما شد, whence ما شد أنفسهم و أعلمهم بما يحبه ال آلهماري به الكريم المصلم

(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 أناس ناس for "(52) in رأيت, (a) [often] with the interrog. Hamza,
as أَرِيتْ (above) for أَرَأَيْتَ; and this is the reading of كس in the whole of the formations of رَأَيَ and having the *interrog.* Hamza at their beginning (R): Abu-lAswad [adDu’alî (KA)] says

أَرِيتَ أَمرًا كَتَبْتُ لِمَآ أَبْلَهُ أَتْنَى فَقَالَ أَنْتَذْنِي خَليِكَأ

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

أَرِيتَْ كَلَامَ لِبَلَى أَنْمُعِنَى عَلَى لِبَلَى أَبْكَأْا

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 رَأَيَ and its congener is only frequency of usage, as elision is necessary in أَرَيَ [above], أُرَيَ, and يُرَيَ; but unnecessary in such as يُسْأَل اَسْأَل [above]: for, when you prefix the *interrog.* Hamza to رَأَيَ, then, [by reason of the frequency of such prefixion,] it is assimilated to the Hamza of vs. [433, 488]; so that the Hamza of أَرَيَ is allowably elided: (b) seldom with حَلَلْ, as

صَاحَ حَلَلْ رَأَيْتَ أَوْ سَمَعْتَ بِرَأَيْ رَدَّ في الْضَّرْعَ مَا فَرَى فِي الْحُلَكَ (R), by Ismā’îl Ibn Yasār (KA, Jh) anNisā’î (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 الطلب 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 يَسَالُونَ for They ask, because its alleviation is then by conversion, not by elision: the poet says

\[
\text{إذا قَالَ قُومُ يَسَالُونَ مَلِيكَهُمُ} \quad \text{عَطَاهُ فَدَهْسَا أَلِيَ} \quad \text{أَنَا سَأَتَلْهُ}
\]

*When people arise, asking of their king a gift, then Dahmâ is that gift which I shall be asking;* and like it is يَبْيَسُ يَسَالَs despairs (R).

§. 659. In the *imp.* of the v. whose ب is a Hamza quiescent in the aor., as in أتى came, aor. يَأْتِي, and sinned, aor. ] the Hamza is changed into a pure ى if the conj. Hamza be pronounced with Kasr [428], as إِبَِتُ come иبتُ [661] иبتُ and is converted into a pure أً if the conj. Hamza be pronounced with Damm, as أُوسُ الْجَرْحُ Dress the wound, orig. أُوسُ: 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, eat, and 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 ف (IY), in above, and, 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 in خ, the ل in ك, and the م in مَعَالَ (IY). Thus the measure of the v. is خُذَل, with the ف elided (IY). Then they make this elision obligatory in خُذَت and كَل; but not in مَرْ (M, R), where elision, though chaster than conversion, is not obligatory (R). Therefore they do not say أَوْكَلْ and أُخْذُ; but [you say أَوْكَلْ and أُخْذُ; and (IY)] the Kur has XX. 132. [428] (M). The regular form is أَوْكَلْ, أُخْذُ (IY, Jrb), and أُمَرْ (IY), in the imp. from taking, eating, [and آَمِرْ commanding,] like بَيِّسَرْ [in the imp.] from أَصَرَ exulted, i. q. بَطَرَ (Jrb). But they keep to خُذَت and كَل, irregularly, from frequency (SH) of usage (MASH). As for the imp. from آَمِرْ commanding, it does not reach the same extent of frequency as the [other] two;
so that they assign to it an intermediate predicament, allowing and in it (Jrb). This is when it is inceptive. When, however, it occurs in the interior of the sentence, as in And command, Then command, and 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 and , 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] [658], and in continuity, inasmuch as their alleviation [also] is irregular (Jrb).

§. 660. It [is known, from what (Jrb)] has been previously mentioned [658], that the [mobile (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 for (IY); and here [Z followed by] IH shows whether, when the vowel is transferred to the determinative , that vowel is taken into account, or
not (Jrb). One instance of that is ٠٠٠ (668), when its Hamza is alleviated (IY). If the vowel be not taken into account, as is the method of most, ٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠ must be said, with expression of the conj. Hamza, because the J is virtually quiescent (Jrb). [For,] when the vowel of the Hamza, which is the initial of a word, is transferred to the preceding J of determination, that J is constructively quiescent for [three] reasons:—(1) that the J is orig. quiescent, contrary to such as the ق of تل [below]:

(2) that the J, being another word (599), not [part of] the one whose initial is the Hamza, is on the verge of departure; so that it is [regarded] as though it had departed, and the vowel of the [second] Hamza were transferred to the [conj.] Hamza, the J remaining quiescent; contrary to the ق of لُ، which belongs to the same word as the [elided].

(3) that transfer of the vowel of the Hamza to the preceding [quiescent] is not constant, so that it is as though the vowel were not transferred; contrary to the transfer of the vowel of the ظ [in the o. f.] of لُ to the preceding [quiescent] (R). But, if the vowel be taken into account, لُ٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠ must be said, with elision of the [conj.] Hamza, because the vowel of the J renders it unnecessary. For the J becomes like part of the n., literally, because it consists of one letter; and ideally, because it alters the signification of the n. from indeterminateness to determinateness:
and, since it becomes like part [of the ㅇ], the vowel transferred to it [in 자] resembles the vowel [transferred to the ㅅ] in 선 [below], orig. سَأَل [658] (Jrb). When [therefore] the cat. of أَلْ жمُرُ is alleviated, the Hamza of the ㄴ more often remains (SH); while some elide it (MASH): so that is said (SH), the second Hamza [only] being elided, according to the more frequent [method] (MASH); or لَحْمُرُ (SH), the conj. Hamza also being elided, according to the rarer [method] (MASH). And apparently the cat. of أَلْ لاَتْنِدَارُ ability and أَلْ لاَسْتَغْفَأُ asking pardon is like that, as respects the allowability of [أَلْ لاَتْنِدَارُ and ِأَلْ لاَسْتَغْفَأُ] لَسْتَغْفَأُ (Jrb). And, [when 민 or is conjoined with the cat. of أَلْ حُمُرُ, then (Jrb)] one says, (1) according to the more frequent [method, من أَلْ حُمُرُ pronounced from the red, with Fath of the ㄴ (SH), because, the ㄴ being quasi-quiescent [above], if the ㄴ were not mobilized, two quiescents would come together (Jrb); and [من أَلْ حُمُرُ pronounced في أَلْ حُمُرِ in the red, with elision of the ین (SH), lest two quiescents come together, because the ㄴ is virtually quiescent [above]: (2) according to the rarer [method], من أَلْ حُمُرُ, with quiescence of the ㄴ; and في أَلْ حُمُرِ, with expression of the ی (Jrb). As for من لاَن from now, henceforward
it is treated according to both methods:—(1) if you say لأُلْحَمْر, taking the vowel [of the J] into account, you say مِن لَن, with quiescence of the ن in مِن, because what follows it is mobile; and, according to that, قَالُوا لَن II. 66. [149, 206] is read, with expression of the , because the J is mobile, so that two quiescents do not come together: (2) if you say لأُلْحَمْر, with expression of the conj. Hamza, not taking the vowel of the J into account, but treating the J as quiescent, you say مِن لَن, with Fath of the ن, because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and, according to that, you say مِلَان, on the principle of the poet's saying

Convey thou to Abu Dukhtanās a message, not that which is sometimes said, consisting of falsehood, the ن [of مِن (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] (IX). But Ks and Fr relate that some of the Arabs convert the Hamza into J in such [formations] as this, [i.e., where an initial Hamza is preceded by a determinative J,] saying لأُلْحَمْر for لأُلْحَمْر the red, and لأُلْحَمْر for لأُلْحَمْر the earth (IX, R); and, in order to preserve the quiescence of the determinative J, 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 , homogeneous with the . And [مِنْ آلٍ الرَّضٍ] and [مِنْ آلٍ الرَّضٍ] from the earth and مِنْ آلٍ الرَّضٍ 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 ُثْحَرُمْ, expressing the [conj.] Hamza, ought to say ُسْأَلْ [658] for ُسْأَلْ, when alleviated; and he that says ُثْحَرُمْ ought to say ُسْلَ [above]: except that the conj. I is more often retained with the determinative ج, and elided with any other [letter]; because this ج 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 اَفْلِلُ إِسْلَ or إِسْلَ [above], 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 سَلْ, the vowel of the س is not so constant as the vowel of the ق in ُتْلِ [below], nor so transient as the vowel of the ج in ُذَلَّتْ [above], because سَلْ is like ُتْلِ in respect of all the [three] reasons [above]
assigned for the constructive quiescence of the ج in 
[below], except the third, since transfer of the vowel [of the Hamza] in it is not so constant as transfer of the vowel of the ج in [below]; but, though not so constant [as that], it is more frequent than transfer of the vowel of the Hamza in [below]: so that in retention of the [conj.] Hamza is more frequent; but in 
الْعَمْر₁ elision of the [conj.] Hamza is necessary: while in 
الْعَمْر₂ a dispute occurs, IH holding elision [of the conj. Hamza] to be necessary, as you see [from his words “they do not say إسْل” above], which is the opinion of 
S; whereas Akh allows إسْل, as before mentioned [658].

All of this about قُل Say thou [above] is based on the theory that its o.f. is جُنُوْنل before transfer of the vowel of the ج to the ق ; but, if we say that قُل is derived from قُنُوْن pronounced with Damm of the ق , then there is no conj. Hamza here [423], to be elided because of the vowel of the ق , or retained because of the vowel’s being accidental (R).

§. 661. Having finished the single Hamza [658, 660] in the word, [Z followed by] IH begins the explanation of the two Hamzās [659, 661, 662] (Jrb). They are [combined (R)] either in one word, or in two words (R, Jrb). When two Hamzās 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 ء, as ٌس and ُرُءْس [below] (IA). It is always the second of them, not the first, which is changed, because the excess of heaviness is produced by the second. The two Hamzas mentioned [as combined in one word (Tsr)] must be [in one of three states (Tsr)]:—(1) the first mobile, and the second quiescent; (2) the converse, [the first quiescent, and the second mobile (Tsr)]; (3) both mobile (Aud): it being impossible for both to be quiescent together [663] (Tsr). If the first [Hamza] be mobile, and the second quiescent, the second is changed into an unsound letter [697], homogeneous with the vowel of the first, [from dislike to the combination of two Hamzas, together with the difficulty of pronouncing the quiescent second (Tsr)]: so that it is changed into (1) an ٌ after Fatha, as أَمنْتُ I believed, [orig. أَمْنَتْ (Tsr)]: (a) hence the saying of Ḥ'isha رَأَيْنِي أَنْ أَنْتُرُ And he, [meaning the Prophet (Tsr),] was wont to enjoin upon me, [when I menstruated (Tsr),] that I should wear a waist-wrappber, with a Hamza [pronounced with Fath (Tsr)], and then an ٌ: (b) [MM says that (Tsr)] the generality of Traditionists mispronounce it, reading it with an ٌ [pronounced with Hamza (Tsr)] and a double ُث: but for this [pronunciation] there is no reason [in Arabic (Tsr)], because it is [an aor. v., whose measure is (Tsr)] أُنْتَعِلَ [with Kasr of the ء, derived.
from waist-wrappers; 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 to trust and trusted from trust, and took a wife from wife, family, by conversion of the second Hamza into ت and incorporation of it into the ت [of trust]; and Z transmits with incorporation; while IM says that it is confined to hearsay, like َتَكُل [689]: and, since it is allowable in the pret., it is allowable in the aor.; and in another tradition is And, if it be short, let him gird himself therewith, transmitted in this form by MIAn (Tsr); (c) [the author of the KF, however, agrees with IHsh, saying] "Do not say َتَرَ: though it occurs in some traditions, being perhaps a mispronunciation of the reporters" (KF): (2) a ِ after Kasra, as belief, [orig. َتَمُّن (Tsr)]; (a) the reading [of Al A'mash, reported by Abu Bakr, the disciple of 'Asim (Tsr),] CVI. 2. Their keeping to, [with the second Hamza] sounded true, is anomalous (Aud): (b) Ks allows [659] to begin with two Hamzas [below], this being transmitted from him by IAmb, who says that it is hideous, because the Arabs do not combine two Hamzas, whose second is quiescent (Tsr): (3) a ،
after Damma, as was trusted, [in the pass., orig. (Tsr)]: (a) Ks allows to begin with two Hamzas, this being transmitted from him by IAmb, who refutes it (Aud) by [the argument] that the Arabs do not combine two Hamzas, whose second is quiescent: but IAmb mentions this refutation of Ks in connection with his allowing X. 16. Bring thou a Kur'an to begin with two Hamzas [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 , from the impossibility of beginning with a quiescent, but are in the position of the or (Tsr),] then, (1) if they be in the position of the , 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] [343], denoting the frequent asker (Tsr); and and (Aud), with their second [rad.] doubled, on the measure of the rel. n. [312], denoting the seller of pearls and of heads (Tsr): (2) if they be in the position of the , 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 read, you say, (a) in the paradigm of [245, 392],
Is \( ^{301, \ 302} \) (Aud), \( ^{291} \) (Aud), orig. \( ^{302} \) (Aud), \( ^{302} \) (Aud), Ji, 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 \( ^{359} \), as they incorporate in \( ^{361} \) [above]: and he replied [firstly] that the two \( ^{365} \) are only homogeneous [369], contrary to the two \( ^{367} \), as is proved by \( ^{392} \) and \( ^{392} \) [253, 375, 731], meaning that the two \( ^{392} \) are therefore more fit for incorporation than the two \( ^{392} \); and [secondly] that what is not allowable at the extremity is [sometimes] allowable in the middle, as is proved by the succession of two \( ^{392} \) in \( ^{392} \), which is disallowed in the \( ^{392} \). of \( ^{392} \) [683] (Sn): (b) in the paradigm of \( ^{392} \), with two Hamzas, having between them a \( ^{392} \) substituted for a Hamza (Aud), which is not a final, orig. \( ^{392} \), with three Hamzas, the second of which is changed into \( ^{392} \), 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 \( ^{392} \), 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 ūdmm, it is changed into , unrestrainedly, [i. e., whether the first be pronounced with ūdmm, Fāth, or Kasr (Tsr)] : (3) if the second [be not final, but] be pronounced with Fāth, it is changed (a) into , if the first be pronounced with Fāth or ūdmm ; (b) into ē if the first be pronounced with Kasr (Aud). In short, the two mobile Hamzas are either at the end [of the word], or not. In the first case, they are of three sorts, because the first Hamza is pronounced with Fāth, Kasr, or ūdmm : 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 ē in all of its [three] sorts : and the non-final is changed into ē in four of its [nine] sorts, vid. the [one] pronounced with Fāth after Kasra, and the [three] pronounced with Kasr after Fātha, Kasra, or ūdmm ; and into ē, in five, vid. the [two] pronounced with Fāth after Fātha or ūdmm and the [three] pronounced with ūdmm after Fātha, Kasra, or ūdmm (Tsr). The exs. of the final Hamza [after one pronounced with Fāth, Kasr, or ūdmm (Tsr) are that you should form, from جَعَفَر [392], or جَرَّ جَرَّ جَرَّ (Aud), in which case you say جَرَّ جَرَّ جَرَّ, or جَرَّ جَرَّ جَرَّ, with two Hamzas ; and then change the second Hamza into ē, because the ē does not occur as a final in what exceeds three letters [685, 727] ; so that the word
becomes &l, or &l, and then, (1) if the &l be preceded by Fatha, as in the first ex., it is converted into [684, 719], and the word becomes abbreviated (Tsr), &l (R, A), upon the measure of Salma (A), [du.], &l, [pl.]; and [fem.] &l [du.]

(2) if the &l 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 &l [16], becoming defective (Tsr), &l upon the measure of &l [18] (A), [but with Kasr of the Hamza, because it is defective, as also is the third [below] (Sn)):

(3) if the &l be preceded by Damma as in the third ex., the Damma is converted into Kasra, in order that the &l may be preserved from conversion into &l, and the word is subjected to the same alteration as &l [16] (Tsr), [or rather] as &l [243, 290] (A), orig. &l, like &l [237] (Sn), it also becoming defective (Tsr), &l, upon the measure of &l [18] (A); [and, with the art.,] &l (MKh), like &l (IA): (a) this [third ex.] and that which precedes it are defective, each of them upon this measure [ &l or &l (Sn)], in the nom. and gen.; while in the acc. the &l returns, as &l (A); (b) the Hamza of &l is
pronounced with Kasr, like the Hamza of تِرْذَبَّا; not, as is fancied, with ِهَمْمُ : this is proved by A's confining himself to the return of the أَيْهَا to the Kasr of the أَيْهَا كَفَ أَيْهَا أَلَّا عَنْكُمْ XLVIII. 20. And restrained from you the hands of the men (ٍسَنِ), of Khaibar and their confederates, (the Banū (ٍسِ) أُسَاد) and Ghatafan (ٍسَّيِ, ٍسِ). The *e* of the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr [after one pronounced with Fath, Kasr, or ِهَمْمُ (ٍسِ)] are that you should form, from ٍسَّيِ [i. g. ٍسَّيِ َفْصَدَ] directed his course towards (ٍسِ), a word like ٍسَّيِ ٌصَعِب [372, 672] with Fath, Kasr, or ِهَمْمُ of the Hamza, and Kasr of the ِهَمْمُ in [all three of] them, in which case you say, in the first [ex.], ٍسَّيِ ٌفْمَلْأَيْ up with two Hamzas, [the first] pronounced with Fath, and [the second] quiescent; and then transfer the vowel of the first ٍسَّيِ [vid. Kasra (ٍسِ)] to the [quiescent (ٍسِ)] second Hamza before it, in order that you may secure an opportunity of incorporating it into the second ٍسَّيِ; and afterwards you change the [second (ٍسِ)] Hamza, [to which the Kasra of the ٍسَّيِ has been transferred (ٍسِ),] into ِهَمْمُ (ٍسِ), because of the preceding [rule] that the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr after one pronounced with Fath, [Kasr, or ِهَمْمُ] is converted into ِهَمْمُ (ٍسِ); and thus you do in the [two] remaining [exs.] also (ٍسِ), saying ٍسَّيِ ٌفْمَلْأَيْ and ٍسَّيِ ٗأُهُمْمُ; and then transferring the
vowel of the first \( \ddot{m} \), [vid. Kasra,] to the quiescent Hamza, in order to secure incorporation; and afterwards changing the second Hamza into \( \dddot{i} \) (Tsr): so that the word becomes \( \dddot{i} \ddot{a} \ddot{m} \ddot{i} , \dddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{m} \ddot{i} \), or \( \dddot{i} \ddot{a} \ddot{m} \ddot{i} \) (A). That [action (Tsr)] is necessary [below] (Aud). The regular pl. of leader is \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{i} \ddot{y} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) (Tsr), orig. \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{w} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \), like \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) pl. of \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{m} \ddot{a} \ddot{r} \ddot{a} \ddot{m} \) ass [246] (Jrb), by conversion of the [second] Hamza into \( \dddot{i} \). If you say that analogy requires conversion of the second [Hamza] into \( \dddot{i} \), because it is quiescent, and what precedes it is pronounced with Fath, [the o. f. being \( \dddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) (Jh),] like \( \dddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) pl. of \( \dddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) vessel, and \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) pl. of \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) god (Jh),] I say that, since two likes occur after it, and they intend incorporation, they transfer the vowel of the first \( \ddot{m} \), vid. Kasra, to the preceding Hamza, and incorporate the \( \ddot{m} \) into the \( \ddot{m} \), so that it becomes \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \); and then they convert the second Hamza into a pure \( \dddot{i} \) (Tsr). And [accordingly] \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) 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, Hamza, Ks, KhA, and Al A'mash (Tsr), and of Rauḥ on the authority of Ya'kūb (B),] \( \dddot{a} \ddot{y} \ddot{a} \ddot{n} \ddot{e} \ddot{m} \) 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
(And, A). Akh says "The [second] Hamza is made a ٰ because it is in the position of [a Hamza pronounced with] Kasr, while what precedes it is pronounced with Fath; and it is not pronounced as a Hamza, because of the combination of two Hamzas: but", says he, "those who hold with the combination of two Hamzas pronounce it as a Hamza" (Jh). [And Z observes] "If you say 'How should ٰۧ be pronounced?', I say 'With a Hamza followed by a Hamza betwixt and between, i.e., between the outlets of Hamza and ٰ [732]; and sounding the two Hamzas true is a well known reading, though it is not acceptable to the BB: but, as for making the ٰ pure, it is not a reading, nor may it be; and he that makes the ٰ pure is committing a solecism, and mispronouncing'" (K): [while B also declares that] to make the ٰ pure is a solecism (B). IH too says that both softening and sounding true are correct in such as ٰۧ (SH), in reading [the Kur] (R), an objection to the saying of the GG that the second Hamza must be converted into ٰ [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 ٰۧ; and also to sound the two Hamzas true (Jrb): and, in reading [the KUR], conversion of the second Hamza into a pure ٰ, as, in the opinion of the GG, is the best-known [pronunciation],
does not occur; but only sounding [the two Hamzas] true, and softening the second. And we have mentioned [below] that, according to some, these two predicaments are not peculiar to [such as] \( \text{ذ} \ \text{ذ} \) but occur in every [case of] two mobile [Hamzazs in one word]. According to the GG, however, the best-known [pronunciation] is conversion of the second [Hamza] into a pure \( \text{ی} \) (R). The exs. of the [Hamza] pronounced with \( \text{ذ} \) after one pronounced with \( \text{ف} \), \( \text{ک} \), or \( \text{ذ} \) (Tsr)] are (1) \( \text{ذ} \ \text{ذ} \) pl. of \( \text{ذ} \ \text{ذ} \) [255]: (2, 3) that there should be formed from \( \text{ذ} \) with Kasr of the Hamza, and \( \text{ذ} \) of the \( \text{ب} \), or like \( \text{ذ} \) [372], in which case you say \( \text{ذ} \) [below], with a Hamza pronounced with Kasr or \( \text{ذ} \), and a \( \text{ذ} \) pronounced with \( \text{ذ} \). The o. f. of the first is \( \text{ذ} \ \text{ذ} \), upon the measure of \( \text{ذ} \) [237]; and the o. fs. of the second and third are \( \text{ذ} \) and \( \text{ذ} \) : 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 \( \text{ذ} \), [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 \( \text{ف} \), (1) after one pronounced with \( \text{ف} \), is \( \text{ذ} \) [247, 278, 686], pl. of \( \text{ذ} \) (Aud), orig.
(974)

1. After one pronounced with Damm, is [278, 686], *dim.* of *دايَمُ (Aud)*, *orig.*: (a) the second Hamzsa is converted into *،* when pronounced with Fath, and not final, whether what precedes it be pronounced with Fath, as in the broken *pl.* of *دَأَيَأَ (Tsr)*; or with Damm, as in its *dim.*: (b) the exemplification by the *pl.* and *dim.* of *دَأَيَأَ [above]* is based upon [the supposition] that *دَأَيَأَ* 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 *لَا عَلَى , like ٌْلَا آذَرَ, [the name of Abraham’s father (Jk, K on VI. 74)]; and in the M [661, 684] that it is Arabic, [*orig.* *دايَمُ* with two Hamzases (IY),] upon the measure of *لَعَنْ (Tsr)*, meaning *tawny* (Jh, KF). The *ex.* of the [Hamzsa] pronounced with Fath after one pronounced with Kasr is that you should form from *ئَيَمُ [an *ex* (Tsr)]* upon the measure of *صَبَعَُ [372]*, with Kasr of the Hamzsa, and Fath of the *ب (Aud)*, in which case you say *ئِيمُ*, with a Hamzsa pronounced with Kasr, and a *ي* pronounced with Fath, *orig.* *ئَيَمُ*; the vowel of the first *م*, *vid.* Fatha, being transferred to the preceding quiescent, as a means for attaining incorporation of the two likes; and the second Hamzsa being afterwards changed into *ى* (Tsr). Akh differs about two of these nine sorts, *vid.*
the [Hamza] pronounced with Kasr after Damm, which he changes into \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \) [instead of \( \varepsilon \)]; and the one pronounced with Damm after Kasr, which he changes into \( \varepsilon \) [instead of \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \)]; but the correct [mode] is what has been mentioned above (A). If you formed a word like \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \) from \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \) moaning, you would say \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \); but, according to Akh, \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \), the dispute being like what we mentioned on such as \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \) [658]. A [Hamza] pronounced with Damm after one pronounced with Kasr is not found in their language, but, if such \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \) as \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \) \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \), with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm of the \( \varepsilon \), occurred from \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \), you would say \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \) [above], according to S; and \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \), according to Akh, as we mentioned on \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \tilde{\varepsilon} \) 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 \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \) I directed my course towards and \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \) I moaned, the second may be [changed, as \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \) and \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \); or (A)] sounded true, as \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \) and \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \): [firstly] because of the assimilation of the Hamza of the 1st pers. sing. to the interrog. Hamza [below], as in \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \tilde{\varepsilon} \) 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, 99 a
Sn) ; and secondly (Sn), because of its interchangeability with [the rest of the aoristic letters (Sn)], the ن , the
t, and the ى [404] (A), after which the two modes are:
allowable in the Hamza, as in [ َبُوْمَمْ or َبُوْمُمْ believes
from َبِمَّعْن ] َبِمَّعْن , and [ َبٰوْمَمْ or َبٰوْمُمْ makes safe from
تَأْمِيْن [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 ٓلَّنَأ or. of
عَاوْن اسْتَدَّاءّ His teeth decayed, and َوْمَن aor. from َوْمَن
[above]; nor have I seen it expressly mentioned by any
one : but it is covered by the saying of the Aud and the
A " when the first of the two [mobile] Hamzas is [an]
aoristic [Hamza] "; and so it is covered by the two
causes above assigned: and from that the necessary
conclusion is that it may be sounded true; or changed
into , because of IM's saying " If pronounced with
Fath after Damm or Fath, it is converted into ,", as
أَوْمُن and َأُوْمُن (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 , ], 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 ٓاٰى [above] and ىٰجَا [below]; and into ى [below] in other cases, as ٓاٰٰوٓاٰدٰٓمٰٓ and ىٰجَاٰدٰٓمٰٓ [above] (SH). The o. f. of ىٰجَا [708], according to the opinion of others than Khl, is ىٰجَاٰئٓيٓثٰٓثٓ, with two mobile Hamzas, the first being converted, as in ىٰجَاٰئٓيٓثٓ [683], from the ى of the word, which is a 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 ىٰجَاٰئٓيٓثٰٓثٰٓثٓ, which is afterwards subjected to the same alteration as ىٰجَاٰئٓيٓثٰٓثٰٓثٓ [16]. They do not put the second Hamza betwixt and between, because that would involve some regard to the Hamza; so that it would entail a combination of two Hamzas. But, according to the opinion of Khl, that the o. f. is ىٰجَاٰئٓيٓثٰٓثٓ by transposition, ىٰجَا does not belong to this cat., [because it contains only one Hamza] (Jrb). And hence حطأيا, [which is an instance of the combination of two Hamzas in one word (R)], on the well-founded hypothesis, contrary to the opinion of Khl [below] (SH), because it is pl. of حطأٓيٓثٰٓثٓ fault, sin; and the ى of حطأٓيٓثٰٓثٓ is converted into Hamza in the ultimate pl. [246], as in حطأٓيٓثٰٓثٰٓثٓ crime, pl. كٓبٓآٓئٓثٓثٓ: so that it becomes حطأٓيٓثٰٓثٰٓثٓ.
according to S; and then the second [Hamza] is converted into ی, as the rule for two [mobile] Hamzas in one word is conversion of the second into ی, when it is final [above]; so that the word becomes حَفَاظَٰی [below]. The object of IH here is only [to indicate] the combination of two Hamzas in the o. f. of حَفَاظَٰی [283], according to S, and the conversion of the second into ی: but, as for the conversion of the first into a ی pronounced with Fath [below], it will shortly be mentioned. Khal [above] also says that its o. f. is حَفَاظَٰی [above], with a ی after a Hamza; but [in order to arrive at this] he transposes, putting the ی into the position of the Hamza, and the Hamza into the position of the ی (R). The opinion of S is more agreeable with analogy, and more sound, because of what has been transmitted [by AZ] from Arabs whose Arabic is trustworthy, Алلّهُمَّ أَغْفِرْ لَنِّي حَفَاظَٰتٍ [below], for which, if ی were transposed, as Khal 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 Аллّهُمَّ أَغْفِرْ لِنِّي حَفَاظَٰتٍ O God, forgive me my sins [above], like حَفَاظَٰتٍ دُرِّينَةٍ pl. of دُرِّةٍ "; and similar is حَفَاظَٰتٍ tilting-ring; and many, vid. the KK and [among the
Syrians (IY)] Ibn 'Amir [alYahsabi (IY)], read \\
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 َيِهَّةٍ [above], you say َيِهَّةٍ, putting it between Hamza and ی, as in ُسَمُّ [658]; and similar are such as أُمِكَ 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 أُوِصَلَ [357, 683] and أُرِصِلَ [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 ْبَثْيَنَا [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 ٰٰ [with a Hamza pronounced with Fath, then a quiescent
1, and then a Hamza, the name of a sort of tree, as in
the Dm (Sn), or [its n. un. (Sn)] ۰۷۱۱, has no effect
(A). And, as for the fact that the [first] Hamza of
[246, 278], [orig. دَوْإَبْ (Jh),] must be converted
into ۰۷۱۱, it is because دَوْإَبْ is one of the ultimate pls.;
and because its sing., i. e., دَوْأَبْ [lock of hair (MAR)],
has its Hamza, in most cases, converted into ۰۷۱۱, as is the
rule of alleviation [658] in the like thereof, [such as
مَرْجَعْ] (R). Elision of the second [Hamza (Jrb)] is
obligatory in the cat. of ۷۰۴۰ I honor [428] (SH), i. e.,
the 1st pers. sing. [of the aor.] from ۷۵۲۷ [332]
(MASH), another objection to what they say, vid. that
conversion of the second Hamza into ۰۷۱۱, [above] is
necessary, if neither it, nor the one before it, be
pronounced with Kasr. The o. f. of ۷۰۴۰ أَكْرَمْ, 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 أَكْرَمْ, the aor.
[in the 1st pers. sing.] must be أَكْرَمْ (Jrb). By rule,
the second [Hamza] in it should be converted into ۰۷۱۱,
as in ۷۰۴۰ [above]: but the word is lightened by elision
of the second [Hamza], from frequency of usage, as it is
lightened in دُخُل and ۰۷۱۱ [659] by elision; though, by
rule, the Hamza [in them] should be converted into
And its congers, [\(\text{\textcircled{R}}\) and \(\text{\textcircled{R}}\)], are made to accord with it (SH), as [\(\text{\textcircled{R}}\) and \(\text{\textcircled{R}}\)] (Jrb), although two Hamzas are not combined in them (R). They make conversion of the Hamza, when single, into a \(\text{\textcircled{R}}\) pronounced with Fath [above], obligatory in the cat. of مطايا [283, 726]. And hence [above], according to the two sayings (SH) of Khl and others (MASH). This predicament is common to (1) what contains two Hamzas, like حطابا، according to the opinion of S: and (2) what contains a single Hamza, like (a) مطايا، by common consent; and (b) حطابا، 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 أئريج ُة citron, you would say أئريج ُة، [with a Hamza pronounced with دامم, then a quiescent، then a Hamza pronounced with دامم, then a quiescent، then a Hamza pronounced with فاتح, and then a ؤ of feminization (Sn)], orig. أئريج ُة (A), with five Hamzas, the second and fourth quiescent, the first and third pronounced with دامم, and the fifth pronounced with فاتح (Sn). If the two Hamzas
be combined in two words, then, if the first [Hamza] be inceptive, like the *interrog.* Hamza, their predicament is [the same as] that of two Hamzas in one word, when the first is initial, as in "أَرْتِينَ" and "أَيَبَة" [above]. The first is not alleviated, by common consent: while the second is alleviated in exactly the same way as when they are in one word; except that here the second is sounded true more frequently than when they are in one word, because the *interrog.* Hamza is an independent word; though, as respects its being *unil.,* it is like a part of what follows it. Then those who separate the two mobile Hamzas there by an ٝ, whether both be sounded true, or the second of them be softened, as in "أَيَبَة" [above or "أَيَبَة"], separate them here; and those who do not separate there do not separate here also (R). The poet (R) Dhu-r-Runma (M, MAR) says قَيْبَا طَبَبَةٌ آلُوْعَمْسَاءَ آلَعَج [29]; and another says حَرْقُ إِذَا مَا أَلْقَوْمُ أَبْكَوا فَكَاهَةٌ تُفَكَّرُ آيَاتُ يَعْمُونَ أَمْ نَرَدَا (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 "آَنْدَرْتُهُمْ II. 5. [497, 28], and similarly XII. 90. [581]. Then,
after the entry of the 1 of separation, some, vid. the Banû Tamîm, sound the two Hamzas true: while others, vid. the people of AlHijâz, 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 أَصْطَفَى XXXVII. 153. [669] and أَصْطَفَى Was he chosen?; and, if not, is converted into 1, 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 AlHijâz, alleviate one of them, deeming it heavy to sound both of them true, as the people of AlHijâz 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, فَقَدْ جَآءَ أَمْرًا أَعْمَّرَهَا XLVII. 20. For already its signs have come [below] and يَا ذَكَّرِيَّاهُ إِنّا نَبْشَرُنَّ XIX. 7. O Zachariah, verily we bring thee glad tidings (IY): (2) some of them alleviate 100a
the second (IY, R), not the first, because the heaviness comes from the second, as they do in the case of two Hamzās in one word; and this is the saying of Khūl [below] (R): S says (IY), We have heard that from the Arabs, vid. in XLI. 20. and XIX. 7. [above] (S, IY), where he alleviates the second Hamzā, putting it betwixt and between (IY); and the poet says

\[
\textit{كُلُّ غَرَآءٍ إِذَا مَا دَرَزُتُ تَرَهَبْ بِالْعَيْنِ عَلَيْهَا وَالْحَسَدُ}
\]

For every fair woman, when she comes forth, the evil eye is dreads, and envy (S, IY), which is cited by S with the second [Hamzā] softened, and put betwixt and between, because it is pronounced with Kasr after Fathā, [like the Hamzā in سَمَّ] (IY), [and] which we have heard so recited by trustworthy Arabs: (a) Khūl [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 Hamzās, which meet together in one word, change the last, as in ُجُبَدُ and ُجُبُدُ [above]; and I have seen IAl take the Hamzās in يَا وَيَلْتَى أَأَلَدُ وَأَأَنا

\[
\text{984} \]

XI. 75. O my wonder, shall I bear a child, when I am an old woman?, and sound the first true: and all [of this] is [good] Arabic" (S): (3) sounding both of them true (IY, R) together (R) is allowable (IY); [and] is preferred by many, vid. the Readers of AlKūfa and Ibn 'Āmīr, as in the case of two Hamzās 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

\[\text{He guideth whom} \]
\[\text{He willeth unto} \]
\[\text{[a right way]} \]
three modes occur in the second [Hamza,
as in the Hamza of \(سُلَّ\), 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 \(اَوْلِيَّا \text{ or } لَتْنَكَ\) XLVI. 31. \([\text{Nor have}] \text{ protectors [against Him]}\): those [are in manifest error],

\[جَا أُشْرَاطُهَا\]

XLVII. 20. \([\text{above}], \text{and } مِّن آلِسْمَا إِلَى\]

XXXII. 4. \([\text{From the heaven to [the earth]} \]
: (2)
conversion of the second into a pure letter of prolonga-
tion, i. e., into an \(،\) if the first be pronounced with Fath,
a \(،\) if it be pronounced with Damm, and a \(ى\) if it be
pronounced with Kasr, is transmitted from Warsh and Kumbul. And those who alleviate both Hamzas together, vid. the people of AlHijaz, combine the two modes of alleviation now mentioned [for alleviation of the first alone, and of the second alone] (R).

§. 662. If the first [Hamza] be quiescent [661], as in ُاءِ RSA. *Read thou a verse, أُتْرِی آبّان السَّلَامَ* Make thy father read the salutation, [i. e., Deliver to thy father the (written) salutation (KF),] and ُلَمْ يَرَدْ أَبُوَنَ Thou father was not bad, then, in this case also, there are four methods:—(1) the people of AlHijaz alleviate them both; (2, 3) others alleviate either the first alone, or the second alone; (4) many, vid. the KK, sound both of them true: as we mentioned in the case of the two mobiles [661]. And AZ transmits from the Arabs a fifth method, vid. incorporation of the first into the second [738], as in the rest of the letters. Those who alleviate the first alone convert it into ی, if the preceding letter be pronounced with Fath; into َی, if it be pronounced with Damm; and into ی if it be pronounced with Kasr. Those who alleviate the second alone transfer its vowel to the quiescent first, and elide it. The people of AlHijaz, who alleviate both together, convert the first into ٰ, َی, or ی: and soften the second betwixt and between, when it follows the ی, because transfer [of its vowel] to the ی is impossible; but elide it,
after transfer of its vowel to the preceding letter, when it follows the ك or the ك, because that [transfer] is possible: so that they say إِنْ تَرَا أَيْةً with the ل in the first, and softening in the second; أَتَرِيكُ بَالَٰٓ with the ك pronounced with Fath, i.e., with the Fatha of the elided Hamza; and كَلْمَ يَرْدَوْ بُولَكَ with the ك pronounced with Fath: and, on the analogy of this, you form لُمْ تُرُدُّ مُكَّلٌ Thy mother was not bad, and لُمْ يَرْدُوْ بُلُكَ Thy camels were not bad, et cetera. Similarly, if the second alone be quiescent, as in مَنْ يَشَأَ أُتْيَنَ 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 أُتْيَنَ 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 زید ُالطَریف the smart Zaid; the v., as خذِّ ُالعفو VII. 198. [428]; and the p., as ُنِلِ ُآرِجْل فِنِي آلدَار*Is the man [666] in the house? The concurrence of two quiescents is not allowable: nay, is impossible, inasmuch as the quiescent letter is quasi-pausal, and what follows it is quasi-inceptive; while it is impossible to begin with a quiescent [667] (IY). When the first of two quiescent letters is a sound letter, it is not possible for them to concur, unless you put a Kasra slurred, not impled, upon the first of them. The listener then reckons that the two quiescents concur, and even the speaker shares with him in this notion. But, when either of them is sensitive, he knows that there is a faint Kasra on the first [letter], as in بَکْر Bakr [below], بَشْر Bishr, and نَسْر full-grown unripe dates, where the ؤ 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 شتَابُ سُتَانَ Hasten and بِشَتَابُ سُتَانَ place, the initial of which is quiescent, as is proved by بِشَتَابُ Make haste and flow*er~garden, except that they are pronounced with a slurred Kasra (MAR),] you find that, of your own accord, you accomplish the articulation of that quiescent by means of a Hamza pronounced with Kasr, so extremely faint as to be like part of a soliloquy, which the hearer does not catch; and that afterwards you sound aloud the quiescent letter at the beginning of the word. You therefore realize that the employment of Kasra as the means for removing the difficulty of articulating the quiescent, whether that quiescent be at the beginning, end, or middle of the word, proceeds from your own constitution and nature [664], when you leave it to its own devices. And thus appears the reason why they pronounce the ccnj. 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 لَمْ يَكُنَّ آَلِدِينَ [below] and إِضْرَبْ آَضْرِبَ 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 ٌ [646, 658], because of the prolongation contained in the ٌ, since it is a [letter of] prolongation only; and, for that reason, such [formations] as مَلْكَ contended in pulling and تَمْوَدَ stopping up are more frequent than such as أَلْوَدَ [below]. Next after that [in degree of lightness] is when the first of the two [quiescents] is a ََ or ِ preceded by a vowel homogeneous with it, as in تُمْوَدَ أَلْوَدَ [below]: but no similar ex. with the ٌ, as سَأَرَ سُورَ سَيَرَ [for was privily spoken to, pass. of سَأَرَ سُورَ spoke privily to him], occurs in their language; [though إِلَى أَلْلَهَ will be found below]. And the last degree [of lightness] is when the first of the two quiescents is a ََ or ِ preceded by Fatha, because of the smallness of the prolongation contained therein: but such [a combination] occurs only in the دَمَمَ, as خُوَصَتَ [below]; so that, in يُنْلِلَ فَمَنَ [shortness of the upper teeth (MAR)] and ْعُوِّفَ, affection, you do not say ْأَيْلَ and ْأَوْلَ, with elision of the vowel of the first ََ [and ِ], as in أَصْبَحَ ْأَيْلَ and ْأَوْلَ [below]; but transfer the vowel of the first of the two similar letters, when incorporation is intended, to the ََ and ِ, as having short upper teeth and أَرَ ْأَيْلَ more
affectionate, as you do in such as *sūd* harder and bitterer: the ی 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 *fadhi Allāh* Fear ye two God, *fadhi Allāh* Fear ye God, and *fadhi Allāh* 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; 101 a
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., *Alif*, pausing a little, just enough to separate it from the others; and then says بَا Bā, 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 كَأَلْ جَهِمْ نُونُ Dāl-Jim-Nūn: (b) similarly in the ejs., as used in *chiding a dog* (MAR) and طَبِيخَ [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 آلْمَعْنَى and المُعْمِنَى [below],
food and the dead; (b) similarly in ns. enumerated [159], as for they are constituted to be spoken in syntactical construction; and then the user pauses upon them, either in construction with their op., as the believers came to me; or not in construction therewith, as Thamûd-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, the female believers [above] (R); or not (R, Jrb), as in Amr [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 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 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 III (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

The garment, or cloth, was pulled out, or stretched [above] (SH), pass. of ُتَبَادَّدَنَا ُأَلْتُوبٌ We pulled the garment, or cloth, one against the other (R, Jrb), i.e., each of us pulled it from the other (R), and نَأَتْحَاجُوْتِي VI. 80. [170] (M), read with a single [405] by Nāfi' and Ibn 'Āmir, though, as regards the latter, this is disputed on the authority of [his Reporter] Hishām (B); contrary to what happens when they are in two words (Jrb, MASH), as ُوَإِذْ قَالُوا أَلْلَهَمْ VIII. 32.
And when they said "O God", VIII. 65. 

Nor hath He laid upon you any hardship in the faith, where the letter of softness must be elided (MASH), as will be explained [below]: (a) the unsound letter [697], when quiescent, is named "letter of softness"; and this, when the vowel of what precedes it is homogeneous with it, is [named] "letter of prolongation" [below]: (b) the ِ is always a letter of prolongation: while the ى and ِ are sometimes letters of softness, as in ِ تُولَ saying and ِ بِي بَعْلَ selling; and sometimes letters of prolongation, as in ِ يُقُولَ says and ِ بِي بَعْلَ 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 ِ عَدَا promised and ِ يُسِرَ was gentle: (c) thus is it mentioned in one commentary on the M; but they often loosely apply the term "letters of prolongation and softness" to these letters, either because it is attributable to this analysis, or because the thing is named after what it is reducible to: (d) the concurrence of two quiescents is allowable in this case because the letters of prolongation and softness contain that prolongation by means whereof the articulation of the quiescent after it is accomplished: and also because the incorporated [letter], together with the [letter that it is]
incorporated into, is equivalent to one letter, since the tongue is removed from them by one impulse; and, the [letter] incorporated into being mobile [731], the second of the two quiescents, [i. e., the incorporated letter,] is like the non-quiescent, so that a concurrence of two genuine quiescents is not realized: (e) the concurrence of three quiescents is allowable (Jrb), as [اصِمُ] دواب and مَدِيقٌ (K on III 1.), when these two matters are combined, i. e., in pause upon a word like دواب [256, 646] and *اصِمُ rather deaf [274, 281], dim. of اصِمُ deaf (Jrb), and مَدِيقٌ [274], dim. of مَدِيقٌ [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 عين, قاف، ميم، 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 requirer of inflection, vid. construction [159, 321], from what is
uninfl. on account of the existence of the preventive [of inflection], vid. resemblance to the orig. uninfl. [159]: (a) they do not reverse [the process of distinction, by allowing the concurrence of two quiescents in the latter class of uninfl. ns., instead of the former], because those which are uninfl. for want of the requirer are few, while those which are uninfl. on account of the existence of the preventive are many; [and the concurrence of two quiescents, being abnormal, ought to be confined to the few] (MASH): (b) some assert that, in continuity also (Jrb, MASH), the concurrence of two quiescents is on account of pause (Jrb), [because] the quiescence [of the final] in these ns. is on the ground that pause is meant to be understood (MASH): (c) by "such [ns.] as عين, تاء, ميم, 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 تاء لام Kif-Lam; or something else, as in مُرْصَدُ ثُمُودُ ambush-Thamūd-chief: and whether the first [quiescent] letter be a letter of softness, as in what we have mentioned; or not, as in، عمير بكر، 'Amr-Bakr [159]; though we have mentioned that this last, while resembling a concurrence of two quiescents, is not really one: (d) the reason why the concurrence of two quiescents is allowable in such words is that they are treated like the
paused upon, as will be explained, even if they be not [actually] paused upon: (e) the quiescence of their finals is not because the latter are [orig.] mobile, and afterwards have their vowel cut off on account of pause, but because these words are uninfl. upon quiescence [below]: (f) Z says that they are [orig.] infl.; yet are not [actually] infl., because they are denuded of the cause of inflection: but this [assertion] of his is marvellous, for how can the n. be infl. without a requirer of inflection? and we say that they are not mobile with any vowel, because the vowel is either inflectional—and how can the inflectional vowel exist without the cause of inflection, vid. construction with the op.?—or uninflectional, which is not allowable, because the uninflectedness of that [n.] in which the cause of inflection does not exist is stronger than the uninflectedness of that [n.] in which a preventive of inflection accidentally arises; and the stronger of the two kinds of uninflectedness ought to be accompanied by the o. f. of uninflectedness, vid. quiescence [159], because the o. f. of inflection is mobility, and the o. f. of uninflectedness is quiescence: (g) we say of these words, whether names of letters of the alphabet [321, 635], or nums., like جد [159, 321, 647], or anything else, like المبين [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 اينان, when you enumerate the *nums.*; and the conversion of the *s* of such as اربعة and ثلاث *الثلاثة* into *سُونِيَّة* One-two-three-four, by common consent; whereas the *conj.* is elided [669] in the interior [of the sentence], and the *س* is not converted into *س* 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 كم [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] Bismi اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ In the Name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful has no [syntactical] concern with the beginning of the chapter after it, like فَذَٰلِكَ نَعْلَمُ اللّٰهُ أَحَدً CXII. 1, [160], so that you pause upon الرَّحِيمِ; 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 102a
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 8 of and is converted into ُأَرْبَعَةُ 646]; but, since you join them to what follows them, and do not pause upon them, the vowel of the Hamza in ُأَرْبَعَةُ is transferred to the ُأَرْبَعَةُ [of ], according to what is transmitted by S [321, 647, 648], as it is transferred in مَسْلِةٌ [658] and قَدْ أَتَلَغْ XXIII. 1. [16], and similarly in the saying of the poet [Abu-nNajm al'Ijlî (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) لا (AKB)], where the vowel of the Hamza of Alif is transferred to the مَلَامْ: (i) Mb transmits from Mz that transfer of the vowel of the Hamza in ُأَرْبَعَةُ to the [preceding] ُأَرْبَعَةُ 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 ٌوٌاجِدَ إِنَّنَا تَلَّتْهُ [159], saying that, in what is orig. infl., the nom. may be pronounced with Ishmām [640], as ٌوٌاجِدَ إِنَّنَا with Ishmām of the Ĥamm [on the of د of ٌوٌاجِدَ ], the nom. being pronounced with Ishmām because it is the strongest and earliest inflection [24]; whereas in ٌأَلْفُ كَلِمَ مَمَ 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 ٌعَلَّمَ مَمَ زِيَّدَ the manservant of Zaid, when not constructed with its op. (R): (m) one ought to pause upon the ُمَمَ ٰ آَلِلَّهَ III. 1. [321], as one pauses upon ُأَلْفَ and ُلَّمَ; and to begin with what follows it, as you say ٌوٌاجِدَ إِنَّنَا [above]: and this is the reading of Ḥāsim: (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 ُآَلِلَّهَ III. 1. [321, 664]:—those who assert that, in continuity also, the concurrence of two
quiescents [in such as مٍمِمٍ] is on account of pause hold the vowel on the م to be transferred from the Hamza, because, in that case, [i.e., when the م is paused upon,] the Hamza is not [necessarily] elided [669], since it is not in the interior [of the sentence]; so that the vowel [of the Hamza (B)] is transferred (Jrb) to the م, to indicate that the Hamza is virtually expressed, because it is elided for alleviation [658], not on account of [its being in] the interior [669], since the م is in the predicament of pause; [and thus this reading of the text is] like their saying ٠٠١٠١٠١٠٢ One-two, by throwing the vowel of the Hamza upon the د (B); and for that reason the م is pronounced with Fath [above]: whereas those who say that, in continuity, the concurrence of two quiescents [in such as مٍمِمٍ] is not on account of pause say that the Hamza is elided [because of its being] in the interior [of the sentence]; and, two quiescents [then] concurring, vid. the م and the ی, they mobilize the first, because of what will be mentioned [below]; while they do not pronounce it with Kasr [664], but with Fath, from regard to the solemnity of the Name of God, and because, if they pronounced the م with Kasr, two Kasras and a ی 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 accepted’ [664] (K); but Akh allows Kasr also in ُاَلْحَكْسُ عِندَكَ, 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 ُاَلْحَكْسُ عِندَكَ Is AlHasan with thee? and ُاَيْمُ ُاَلْلَّهِ َيَبِينُكَ 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 ُاَلْلَّهِ [599, 667], and secondly with ُاَيْمُ ُاَلْلَّهِ or ُاَيْمُ ُاَلْلَّهِ [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 ُاَيْمُ ُاَلْلَّهِ َيَبِينُكَ and ُاَلْحَكْسُ عِندَكَ, one would not know whether it was an enunciation or an interrogation; so that they change the [conj.] Hamza into ِّا (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 I [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 [AlMuthakkib 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 َالْخَيْرٌ 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 َالْذَّكْرِ ِّلِّنَ‍ِّمَّ X. 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 ٰلَّٰهُسُنَّ [above], the second [quiescent] is neither incorporated, nor paused upon, as we prescribed [above]; while, in your saying ٰلَّٰهُ 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 ٰ 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 ٰلا لَّٰهُسُنَّ [552, 656](SH), where the concurrence of two quiescents appears, from their being in two words, not to be allowable; but is allowed (MASH), because ٰ is equivalent to part of the word [ٰالله ], by reason of its being a compensation
for the jurative \textit{p.}, which is like part of the word [that it is prefixed to] (Jrb, MASH) : and [similarly in such as (Jrb, MASH)] \textit{إِيَّ أَلْلَّهُ} [556, 558] (SH), from dislike that the expression \textit{إِيَّ أَلْلَّهُ} [52, 262] should occur pronounced with Kasr of its Hamza, so that its meaning should not be recognized: (a) elision of the \textit{ل} [of \textit{هَا}] in [such as (Jrb)] \textit{لَا هَا أَلْلَّهُ} [552], and elision or Fath of the \textit{ي} in \textit{إِيَّ أَلْلَّهُ} [558] are allowable (Jrb, MASH), in which case two quiescents do not concur (MASH); so that in \textit{إِيَّ أَلْلَّهُ} \textit{لَا هَا أَلْلَّهُ} and you are allowed the option of combining, or not combining, two quiescents: and for this reason IH separates them from the preceding cases, in which there is no option, as is obvious in all but \textit{أَيْنُسُ أَلْلَّهُ} \textit{أَلْكَسْنُ}; and [is] likewise [affirmable] in these two, either upon the ground of the well-known method, [vid. conversion of the \textit{conj.} Hamza into \textit{ل}, ] 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)] \textit{إِيَّنَتِقَتْ} [حَلْقُتَا أَلْبِطَانِ} with expression of the \textit{ل} (Jrb)] is anomalous [228, 610] (SH), analogy requiring elision, as in غَلَامًا أَلْأَمِيرُ \textit{the two menservants of the governor} and دُرَّابَا أَبْنِكَ \textit{the two garments of thy son}, where you
do not pronounce the ٰ: 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 
\[\text{التقت ألبطان}\] true in pronunciation (Jrb). [since] 

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 ٰلقت ألبطان is anomalous” ought to come after “and 

\[\text{يرمي الغرض} \]” [below], because the ought to be elided, as in 

\[\text{يغشى القروم}\] [below]. If the concurrence of two quiescents be [in any case] other than the mentioned, it is of two kinds, the first [quiescent] being either a letter of prolongation or not. And by “letter of prolongation” [above] we mean a quiescent letter of softness, when the vowel of what precedes it is homogeneous with it. If it be [a letter of prolongation], then, (1) if elision of the letter of prolongation would lead to confusion, the second [quiescent] is mobilized, since the [first, being a] letter of prolongation, is not movable, as in Two Muslims and Muslims, where the 

\[16, 228, 234] is 103a
orig. quiescent; and, if the \( \text{ل} \) and \( \text{ُ} \) were elided because of the two quiescents, the two [formations] would be confounded with the acc. and nom., sing, when pronounced with Tanwīn: (a) similarly in \( \text{يُسْلِمْكُانِ} \) They two become Muslims, \( \text{يُسْلِمُونَ} \) They become Muslims, and \( \text{تُسْلِمْبِينَ} \) 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 

\[
\text{كُفُّ} \quad \text{فَأَخَافُكُونَ} \quad \text{قَدْ خَافَا} \\
\text{سَأَخْفَتُكُونَ} \quad \text{يَمْرِهَا} \\
\text{وَيَكُونُ} \quad \text{فَأَخَافُكُونَ} \\
\text{قَدْ خَافَا} \\
\]

\( \text{فَأَخَافُكُونَ} \) Fear thou, \( \text{قَدْ خَافَا} \) Say thou, and \( \text{قَدْ خَافَا} \) Sell thou [671, 703]: (b) like part of that word, as being (a) an attached nom. pron., as in 

\[
\text{تُخْشِبِينَ} \quad \text{يَمْرِهَا} \\
\text{تُخْشِبِينَ} \quad \text{يَمْرِهَا} \quad \text{يَمْرِهَا} \\
\text{يَمْرِهَا} \\
\]

\( \text{يَقُرْرُونَ} \) Thou [fem.] dreadest, \( \text{يَقُرْرُونَ} \) Ye [masc.] raid, and \( \text{تَرُمِينَ} \) Thou [fem.] shootest: (a) their o. f. is 

\[
\text{تُخْشِبِينَ} \\
\text{تَرُمِينَ} \\
\text{تَخْرُوْزَ} \\
\text{مُخْشِبِينَ} \\
\]

but, when the quiescent [nom.] prons., [i. e., the \( \text{و} \) of the pl. masc. and the \( \text{ى} \) of the sing. fem.,] are attached to them, the \( \text{s} \) s are elided because of the two quiescents: (b) the first of the two corrob. \( \text{ن} \) s, one of which is incorporated into the other, as 

\[
\text{أَغْزَنَ} \\
\text{وَأَغْزَنَ} \\
\text{أَغْزَنَ} \\
\text{وَأَغْزَنَ} \\
\]

\( \text{أَغْزَنَ} \) Do ye surely raid and \( \text{إِرْمِينَ} \) Do thou [fem.] surely shoot [below], where the two prons. [\( \text{و} \) and \( \text{ى} \)] are elided, because the quiescent \( \text{ن} \) is attached to them [610]: or (c) the initial of a separate word, as in
The people dread [above], *The army raids*, and *He shoots at the mark* [above]. The reason why the first [quiescent] is elided when it is a letter of prolongation, in the absence of confusion [above], and is mobilized when it is anything else, as in *strike, strike*, [like *اذْعَبُ آذْعَبُ* below,] except with a preventive, as in *لَمْ يُلْدَعَ* [below], as will be explained, while the second, in all the positions [just mentioned], is neither elided, nor mobilized, is only that the second of the two quiescents is the one whose pronunciation becomes impracticable when the first is sound, and heavy when the first is a letter of softness; and, the cause of the impracticability and the heaviness being the quiescence of the first, that bar is removed, either by elision of the first, when a vowel upon it would be heavy, vid. when it is a letter of prolongation [below], or by mobilization of it when that would not be so: whereas you begin with the first of the two quiescents, before the occurrence of the second; so that its quiescence is neither impracticable, nor heavy. Mobilization of the letter of prolongation [above], which is *أ, ى*, would be heavy, because the [effect] sought from prolongation is alleviation, by making the letter of softness quiescent, and [the vowel of] what precedes it homogeneous with it, in order to soften its pronunciation: while mobilization of it would be
destructive of this object. But, as for the I, there is no question about it, because mobilization of it is impossible, since, in that case, it would not remain an I [683]. And the reason why the و is elided from أَمْرُكَ, and the ي from إِرْمِسَ [above], though the corrob. ن is like part of the preceding word, so that, if the or ي were left intact, it would be like [the I in] الفضَّالِئين I. 7. [above] and [the of تَمْوَدُ نَلْتَوبُ in] تَمْوَدُ نَلْتَوبُ [above], is that this ن is, in every case, another word; and is not inseparable, so as, by reason of inseparability, to be given the predicament of part of the word. If any one say "Then wherefore is it reckoned like part of the word in إِضْرِبَابَي De ye two surely strike [below], so that the I is not elided?", I say "The object is to distinguish between the sing. and the du.: for the ن, as not being heavy, can have the predicament of part of the word; but, as being bil., and not inseparable from the word, is not like part thereof: so that, where they have an object in giving it the predicament of part [of the word], i. e., in such as إِضْرِبَابَي [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 أَخْرَزا Raid ye and لَمْ تَغْرِزا Ye did not raid, أَخْرَزا Raid thou [fem.] and لَمْ تَغْرِزا Thou [fem.] didst not raid, لَمْ تَزْرَمِيًا Shoot ye two and لَمْ تَزْرَمِيًا
Ye two did not shoot, لَمْ تَرْمَوا Ye
did not shoot, لَمْ تَرْمَى Shoot thou [fem.] and
Thou didst not shoot, لَمْ تَرْمَى اَرْمُي Be ye two pleased and
Ye two were not pleased, لَمْ تَرْضَوا Be ye pleased and
Ye were not pleased, لَمْ تَرْضَى Be thou [fem.]
pleased and لَمْ تَرْضَى Thou [fem.] was not pleased, are
affixed to the v. after the elision of the ل for formation
of the apoc. [404] or imp. [428], as they are affixed in
Strike ye two and تَرْحُلْوا Say ye [below], لَمْ تَضْرِبَā
Ye two did not strike and لَمْ تَرْحُلْوا Ye did not say
[below], after the apocopation [404] or quiescence [431];
then the ل's are restored on account of their affixion,
because with them the apocopation and quiescence are
not upon the ل; and then the ل's are elided with the
, or ى, on account of the concurrence of two quiescents,
after elision of the vowel of the ل; but are not elided
with the َل, as غُزرُوا [below], اَرْمُيَة, and اَرْمُيَة [above],
لَمْ تَعْزِرُوا Ye two did not raid, لَمْ تَرْمَيْا, and لَمْ تَرْمَيْا
[above], because of the absence of two quiescents. And
the ل is not converted into َل in اَرْمُيَة above] and
إِخْسَيَا Dread ye two, because they are made to accord with
Ye two are pleased and تَخْشَيَاي Ye two dread,
as will be explained [719] (R). And, [should one say

( 1011 )
that the ع of حَفَّ, vid. the ل converted from the ع, and the ل of إِحْشَيْنَ and إِحْشَيْنَ, vid. the ل converted from the ي, are elided only because of the concurrence of two quiescents, while this cause is absent (Jrb) in such as إِحْشَيْنَ إِنَّ لُهَّ Fear thou God, إِحْشَيْنَ إِنَّ لُهَّ Dread ye God and إِحْشَيْنَ إِنَّ لُهَّ Dread thou [fem.] God [below], إِحْشَيْنَ إِنَّ لُهَّ Do ye surely dread and إِحْشَيْنَ 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 ج, and the ج، (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. إِنَّ لُهَّ, [which is obvious (Jrb)] ; and [similarly (R)] the [corrob. (Jrb)] نن, which, when attached to the [prominent (Jrb)] pron., is like a separate (R, Jrb) word, according to what IH lays down at the end of the Kāfiya: so that the ل elided on account of the quiescence of the ج, and of the ج, [and the ج,], does not return (R), contrary to [the ل of] such as Fear ye two and خَافِن 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 خَابَة is obvious; and in خَابَة is [equally true,] because, with the pron. latent, the ن is quasi-attached [to the v.] (Jrb). If, then, it be said "Grant that the ن [of
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 \( ل \) in َحَافَنَّ? and therefore, since the vowel of the \( ل \) in َحَافَنَّ is quasi-originial, because of what is attached to it, i. e., the \( ن \), and for this reason the \( ل \) elided in َحَافَنَّ returns [in َحَافَنَّ], so ought the vowel of the \( ل \) and \( ي \) in َحَافَنَّ and َحَافَنَّ to be [quasi-originial], so that the \( ل \) elided in them, on account of the quiescence of the \( ن \) and \( و \) attached to them, ought to return"), we say (1) that, between the attachment of the \( ن \) to the \( ل \) 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 corroborate \[610\] of the \( v. \), not corroborate of the \( pron. \): and (2) that the \( ل \) of the word is radically mobile, so that [even] its accidental vowel is taken into account; contrary to the \( ن \) and \( و \) of the \( pron. \), which are radically quiescent. If you say "Is not the \( ن \) in such as َفَرَ بَانَ [above] after the [prominent] \( pron. \)? Then why is not the \( ل \) elided, as in َفَرَ بَانَ رَجُلَ 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 \( ل \) in َحَافَنَّ [above], َحَافَنَّ, َحَافَنَّ, and in َحَافَنَّ, 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 لیخانًا Let them two fear and لیخانوُا Let them fear. Moreover, in the words mentioned, the vowels of the ل, although accidental, caused by affixion of the pron.s. and the ن, are still permanent, on account of the exclusion of the ل from being constructively quiescent, as it is in قَمْ آللَّیل لـXIII. 2. Rise thou [to pray (B)] at night [below] and لکم يَقُوم آللَّیل He did not rise to pray at night, since, with the corrob. ن attached to the ل of the word, the apocopation [404] and quiescence [431] are totally removed, because, with it, the apoc. and imp. become uninfl. upon the vowel [402, 406, 610, 664], according to the soundest [opinion]; while, with attachment of the prominent pron.s., as in كَلْمَ تَکُونَا Say ye two and كَلْمَ تَکُونَا Ye two did not say, كَلْمَ تَکُونُوا Say ye and كَلْمَ تَکُونُوا Ye did not say [above], كَلْمَ تَکُونُلیا Say thou [fem.] and كَلْمَ تَکُونُلیا Thou [fem.] didst not say, without a corrob. ن, the [indica-
tion of the mood, which in كَلْمَ تَکُونُلیا Say thou and كَلْمَ تَکُونُلیا Thou didst not say is effected by] apocopation [404] or quiescence [431], is shifted from the ل to the ن [405, 431], which is after the ل [and the attached nom. pron., in “the five paradigms”, and by elision of which
the indication of the mood is therein effected] : so that in neither case does the \( J \) remain constructively quiescent. Inevitably, therefore, the \( E \) s return. And, on account of the cessation of the apocope or quiescence, the \( J \) s are retained in \( \text{أَخَذَوْنَ} \) *Do thou surely raid, \* لِيُبْقِيْنَ \( \text{أَخَذَوا} \) \*Let him surely raid, and \( \text{أَخَذَوْنَ} \) *Raid ye two [above].* The reason why the first of the two quiescents, i.e., the \( I \) in \( \text{عَرْأَتْ} \) and \( \text{عَرَاتُ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) and \( \text{حُبْلِيَانٍ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) is not elided upon attachment of the \( I \) of the \( d u. \) in \( \text{أَخَذَوْنَ} \) *They two raided* and \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) *They two shot* [719], but is converted into \( \text{يُ} \) or \( \text{ى} \), as you see, and mobilized, is fear of confounding the \( d u. \) with the \( s i n g. \), i.e., \( \text{عَرَاتُ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) \( \text{حُبْلِيَانٍ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) *He raided* and \( \text{رَمَيَ} \) *He shot*, and \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) \( \text{زَيْدُ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) *the higher part of Zaid* and \( \text{حُبْلِيَانٍ} \) *the pregnant female of 'Amr* [684]. But the \( J \) elided in the like of \( \text{عَرَاتُ} \) \( \text{شَيْتُ} \) \( \text{عَرَاتُ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) *she shot* and \( \text{عَرَاتُ} \) \( \text{شَيْتُ} \) \( \text{عَرَاتُ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) *She raided* is not restored, although the \( \text{ت} \) is mobilized, in \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) \( \text{عَرَاتُ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) *They two* [fem.] *shot* [607] and \( \text{عَرَاتُ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) \( \text{أَعْلِئَيْنَ} \) *They two* [fem.] *raided*, because, although its vowel is on account of the \( I \), which is like a part [of the \( v. \)], still the verbal \( \text{ت} \) of feminization is radically quiescent; contrary to the \( J \) of [the \( v. \) in] \( \text{فُوْمَا} \) \( \text{فُوْمَا} \) \( \text{فُوْمَا} \) *Stand ye two*, [which is radically mobile,] as above mentioned: and also because the \( \text{ت} \), which ought to come after the \( a g. \), because it is the sign of feminization of 101 a
the ag., not of the v., debar the l from complete attachment, as we said of [the prominent nom. pron. in] إِخْشَيْنَ إِخْشَوْنَ [which debars the ن from complete attachment to the v.]. Some, however, allow restoration of the l in the like thereof, citing as evidence the saying [of Imra al-Kais, describing his mare (Jsh)]

لَهَا مَنْتَنَايِ خَطَايَاً كَمَا أَكْبَ عَلَى سَاعِداً يَعْيُ أَللِّهَ 

(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 حَطَّنَا (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 إِذْهَبْ أَذْهَبْ Go, go [above], لَمْ أُبْلِهْ [below], and III. 1. [above]; and [as] إِخْشَيْلِلْهَ إِخْشَوْلِلْهَ and [above] (SH): except when its mobilization would lead to destruction of the object, as in إِنْطَلْقَ لَمْ يَلْدَهُ [below], as will be explained. The reason why, in the absence of this preventive, the first must be mobilized, is that, its quiescence being, as we mentioned, the bar to the pronunciation of the second quiescent, that bar is removed by mobilizing the first, since the mobilization does not lead to heaviness, as mobilization of the letter of prolongation would, according to what we have mentioned. But from this cat. are excepted (1) the
single corrob. 

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 

although it shares with the \( \text{ذ} \) in what we have said about resemblance to the \( \text{ذ} \), and allowability of elision without [a concurrence of] two quiescents, is not treated analogously to it, because elision of the \( \text{ذ} \) 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 \( \text{إِبْن} \) 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 \( \text{حَاتِمُ الْأَطْرَافِ} \) [234], and in the reading of CXII. 1, 2. [609, 160],
it is anomalous (R), the approved [course] being to sound the Tanwîn, and pronounce it with Kasr [609, 664] (K). The o.f. of [the v. in] لَمْ أَبْلِهُ I did not care [above] is لَمْ أَبْلِهِ: the ی is elided because of the prefixion of the apocopative [لَمْ ] ; then, لَمْ أَبْلِهِ being frequently used, abbreviation is required; and therefore a second apocopation of the word by the apocopative is allowed, through assimilation of لَمْ أَبْلِهِ, on account of the mobility of its final, to what has nothing elided from it, like يَقْرُل says and يَخَافُ fears; so that the vowel of the ج is elided; and then the ل, on account of the two quiescents: and then the س of silence is affixed, as in لَمْ يَرَهُ He did not see and لَمْ يَخْشَا He did not dread [615], because the ج 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 إِخْشَيْنِ and إِخْشَوْنِ [above] are said, because, [says IH,] the [corrob. (Jrb)] ن [here (Jrb)] is quasi-separate (SH): but the vice of this [argument] is not hidden (Jrb), [since] there is absolutely no reason for his bringing in this clause here, because the first quiescent, when not a letter of prolongation, is mobilized, whether the second be attached, like the س in لَمْ أَبْلِهُ [above]; or separate, like
and or quasi-separate, like then what sense has his saying "because the is quasi-separate", when the predicament of the attached also is the same? The mobilization of the of determination prefixed to the conj. Hamza, as in the son and the name, the departure and the extraction, belongs to the cat. of mobilization of the first of two quiescents with Kasr [664], in order that pronunciation of the second may be possible, as in He has already extracted and Has he been peculiarly distinguished?, because the conj. Hamza with its vowel is elided [669] in the interior [of the sentence]; so that two quiescents, the determinative and the quiescent that follows the conj. Hamza, concur. But Ks transmits from some of the Arabs that, when you mean to elide the Hamza in the interior [of the sentence], its vowel may be transferred to what precedes it: so that In-the Name etc. [141], praise etc. [141] is transmitted with Fath of the in the , when you conjoin it with the initial of I. 1.; and similarly LXXIII. 2. [above] is anomalously read with Fath of the (R), by alleviation [658] (B). And,
according to this, the Kasːa of the َ in ُ[above] and ُ[above] may be transferred from the conj. Hamza. And similarly the Damm in such as ُ[above] VI. 10. [540] and ُ[above] XII. 31. [664]. But [the authority for] this [transfer] is weak: and, if it were allowable, ُ[above] XCVIII. 1. [above] and ُ[above] Who is he that?, with Fath of the two ُs, would be allowable (R). The first is mobilized in all cases (Jrb), except (1) when mobilization of the first is avoided for the sake of alleviation, in which case the second is mobilized, as in ُ[with quiescence of the َ], and Fath of the ُ[with quiescence of the َ], and Fath of the ُ[with quiescence of the َ]; and as in ُ and ُ in [the dial. of] Tamīm [664, 731] (SH): i.e., in every position where two quiescents are combined by making the first to be quiescent for an object; so that, if the first were mobilized, the object, for which it was made quiescent, [vid. alleviation (MASH),] would come to nought (Jrb): (a) IH means that, if the first be not a letter of prolongation, the second is mobilized when destruction of the object would be produced from mobilization of the first: and this is [found] in the v. alone, as ُ Depart thou, orig. ُ, an imp. from ُ departure, where, ُ
being assimilated to َکَنَفَ 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 ُلَمْ يَلْدَهُ (R), and
[according to Z] َرَبَتْكَهُ XXIV. 51. [below] (M): the
poet says ُذَي وَلَدَ َلَمْ يَلْدَهُ آخُرِ, which [also (IY)] is assimilated to َکَنَفَ; so
that the َل is made quiescent; and, [two quiescents then
concurring (Jrb),] the َذ is mobilized with Fath [below]:
and hence, [as some assert (Jrb),] the reading of Ḥafs
َرَبَتْ آخُرِ َوَبَتَقَ 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 َو of support
[170]: (c) as for Ḍamm, one is not reduced to it, in
averting [a concurrence of] two quiescents, except for
alliteration, as in ُمَنْذُ [203, 664]; or because the quies-
cent [to be mobilized] is the َس of the pl., as in َيَحَشَوْنَ
[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 J is quiescent on account of the apoc. or imp., as اُرُدُنَ ُیَرِدُنَّ. He did not restore, because the condition of incorporation [731] is mobilization of the second [letter]: but the Banū Tamīm [664, 731] and many others, seeing this quiescence to be accidental, caused by the formation of the apoc. and imp., and to be sometimes replaced by mobility, although the vowel is accidental, asrestore thou the people [664], do not take this quiescence into account, but treat the second [letter] like the mobile; and therefore make the first quiescent, in order that it may be incorporated, and the word be thus lightened by incorporation: so that two quiescents concur; and, if the first were mobilized, that would be destructive of the object [of the incorporation, vid. alleviation (Jrb)]: and this [mobilization of the second] occurs in the Kur, as ولا يُضاَرِ كَادِتْ أَوْ شَهِيدٌ II. 282. And let not a scribe or witness do harm, or be harmed (R), either [act. or pass. (K)] voice being admissible, as is proved by [the fact] that ولا يُضاَرُ is read with Kasr [by 'Umar (K)], and Fath (K, B) by Ibn 'Abbās (K): (f) all agree upon omitting incorporation in فعل when a [v. of] wonder [477], as أَحْبَبْ يَه  How dear he is!, because it is aplastic: (2) sometimes also when the second is the final of an uninfl. word, in which case it is.
mobilized, since, the two quiescents being, upon this hypothesis, inseparable one from the other, [because the measure is supposed to be ] if the first were mobilized, one measure would be confounded with another, as in [206] and [above], where the ַַוָּעַל a. d ַַוָּעַל quiescent in the ַַָָוָּעַל would be mistaken for the ַַוָּעַל and ַַוָּעַל mobile therein : (a) [the mobilization of the second quiescent in] ַַוָּעַל [206, 321, 666], ַַוָּעַל [207, 321, 666], and ַַוָּעַל [202, 664, 666] may be attributed to [fear of] the like [confusion], and to [dislike of] the heanness 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 ַַוָּעַל, XXIV. 51. And fear eth Him [above] does not belong to this [cat. (Jrb)], according to the soundest (SH) saying, because the ַַָָוָּעַל 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 ַַוָּעַל [above] (MASH). This is a refutation of Z, who says that ַַוָּעַל is orig. ַַוָּעַל, with the ַַָָוָּעַל of silence [615] affixed thereto; so that [the termination of] it becomes ַַוָּעַל like ַַוָּעַל [above]; and then the vowel of [the medial, i. e.,] the ַַָָוָּעַל is elided, as is [the practice in] the dial. of Tamim (R), like [the vowel of the ַַָָוָּעַל in] 105 a
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 \$ 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 \$ 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 \$ here is [an objective pron. (Jrb)] relating to \\
\begin{align*}
\text{\&} \&
\end{align*}

[above]; and that  tamp`3, being like \\
\begin{align*}
\text{\&} \&
\end{align*}

, is lightened by elision of the Kasr of the \& ; and then the conj., i. e., the \& , which follows the \$ of the pron., is elided, because it is elided when the \$ follows a quiescent, as in
\begin{align*}
\text{\&} \&
\end{align*}

[161],  and  (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 The handmaid committed fornication and 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 يَضْرِبُ [17] َرَأَيْتُ أَحْمَدَ جَعْرِيْنِي أَحْمَدَ and ُهُذِهِ [408] and لَنْ يَضْرِبَ [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 Ḫamm in (a) the م of the pl. [below] (SH), as لُهُمُ الْبَصْرُونَ XXX VII. 172. [252] (Jrb), in order to restore it to its o. f. (MASH), since it is orig. pronounced with Ḫamm, as is proved by the reading of the people of Makka [with Ḫamm of this م, and (MASH)] with أ, after it (Jrb, MASH), as عَلَيْكُمُ (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 s pronounced with Kasr [161], the best known [pronunciation] is Kasr of the م, as in the reading of IA1: بِيْحُمُ الْآَشْبَابِ II. 161. The ties between them, for alliteration to [the Kasr of] the s, 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 بِيْحُمُ الْآَشْبَابِ II. 161. and عَلَيْهِمُ الْقَطَالُ IV. 79. [204], with Ḫamm of the م, in order to mobilize it with the original vowel, i. e. Ḫamm: (b) if the م be after a Ḫamma, whether upon the s, as in هُمُ الْمُومُتُونَ VIII. 4. They are the believers and in the reading of Hamza [161] عَلَيْهِمُ الْقَطَالُ IV. 79. [above],
or upon any other [letter], as in xxxv.

16. Ye are the needy, *لَّنَمَّا أَلْيَوُمَاللَّهْ* viii. 50. For you to-day, and *يَأَبُّ يَمْعَمُاللَّهُ* 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) مُدَ (SH), as مُدَالْيَوُمَ [203, 510] (MASH), because, its o. f. being مُدَ, they mobilize [the ُ], in case of need, with the original vowel (Jrb): (a) Damm of the ُ of مُ, 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 مُ is said to be orig. مُ: or for alliteration [in the vowel] of the ُ to [that of] the م; or because it is like the finals [201]: (c) نَحْسُ [161], in order that the Damm may indicate plurality, as in فَتُمُو and مَنْ (R): (2) the preference for Fath in such as آَلِيَمُاللَّهَ 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 آَلِيَمُاللَّهَ iii. 1." is relevant only on the
assumption that the vowel of the ꞉ is imported on account of a concurrence of two quiescents, which assumption is based on the theory that the quiescence of the final in such as ﷽ is not on account of pause; and, on that assumption, the reasons for adopting Fath, in preference to Kasr, as the vowel of the ꞉, have been indicated by H in §. 321, and Jrb in §. 663:] but [R, who maintains the theory that the quiescence of the final in such as ﷽ is on account of pause, says that] the Fatha of the ꞉ is transferred from the Hamza, not [imported] because of [a concurrence of] two quiescents; [and in that case the citation is not relevant here]: (c) the Fath [on the final of the v.] in such [formations] as

Do thou surely strike and ﷺ Let him assuredly strike is on account of the [concurrence of] two quiescents, according to Zj and Sf (R);: [for] what we have mentioned, vid. that the v. [in such formations] is uninfl. upon Fath [402, 406, 610, 663], is the opinion of S, Mb, and F: while Zj and Sf say that the vowel is [imported] on account of the [concurrence of] two quiescents, whether the v. [before the affixion of the ﻤ] be infl., [as in ﷺ Let him strike,] or uninfl., [as in ﷺ strike thou,] because, by affixion of the ﻤ, the v. is estranged from resemblance to ns. [404]; and therefore reverts to its o. ﻖ, vid. uninflectedness [402], the
o. 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 ن in IH): (3) the allowability of Damm when the second of the two quiescents is followed by an original Damma in the same word [with the second quiescent (R, Jrb)], as قالت آخربج XII. 31. And she said “Come forth” [663] (SH), واعداء بَن آركص XXXVIII. 40, 41. [609], ومَعِيون أَد حَلوُها XV. 45, 46. And springs. Enter ye them (M), and قل آنظروا X. 101. Say thou, Consider ye [666] (IY), in [all of (IY)] which دامم is [allowable (Jrb)] for alliteration (IY, Jrb), the Damma of the ت in being an alliteration to the Damma of the ر in أخربج, since there is no barrier between them, except a quiescent letter; and similarly [the Damma of] the Tanwin [in واعداب] being an alliteration to the vowel of the ل [in أركص], since there is nothing between them, except the quiescent ر: and similarly [as] و آنقنص LXXIII. 3. Or deduct [666, 668], except that the Damma 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 لُوَٰ ٱلسَّطْعُ ٍ. IX. 42. [below], where دَامَم is allowable, although the ٌ after the س is pronounced with Fath (IY); and [similarly (Jrb)] قَالَتْ آخْرِجْ She said "Raid thou [fem.]" (SH), because the original vowel of the ٌ is دَامَم, since the ٍ is affixed to دَامَم of the ٌ (R): contrary to such as إِنِّي أَمَرُوٍٓ IV. 175. [16, 591] (SH), because the دَامَم of the ٌ (R, Jrb) is not original (Jrb), [but] is an alliteration to the accidental دَامَم of inflection, while an alliteration to an accidental [vowel] is accidental (R); and to قَالَتْ آذَرْمُوا She said "Shoot ye" (SH), because the original vowel of the ٌ is كَسَر, since the ٍ is affixed to كَسَر with كَسَر of the ٌ (R); and إِنِّي أَنْحَكَمْ VI. 57. Judgment belongeth not [666] (SH), because the دَامَم of the ُٰ, though original, is not in the same word as the second quiescent, since the art. is one word [599], and حَكَمّ another: (a) the secret of it is that, when the دَامَم is in another word, it is not inseparable from the two quiescents; and is therefore not taken into account (Jrb): (b) كَسَر is allowable [in all of this (IY)], according to the o. f. (IY, Jrb); and is read, as ٌٰ دَامَمٌ آخْرِجْ XII. 31. [above], ٌٰ دَامَمٌ آخْرِجْ XV. 45, 46. [above], and XXXVIII. 40, 41. [609](IY): (c) مُب does not approve of دَامَم (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) مَرْيَمْ آَلَدِي (K) 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 مِنْ آَلٌدِي [97. [89]; but the reading of the majority is مْرَيْمٍ آَلَدِي with the Tanwin [of مْرَيْمٍ ] 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 أَضْرِبْ Say thou "Strike"; and تَمْ أَلْدَيِلْ 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 ضَغِعَ أَلْكِيْرَ Do thou good (R) : (4) the preference for 106 a
Damm, (a) [in the, (R, Jrb) of the pron. (Jrb) of the pl., when preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (R),] in [such as (R, Jrb)] (a) \(\text{إِخْشَٰشُوا} \text{الْقُومُ} \) \(\text{Dread ye the people} \) (SH), II. 238. [547, 668], and دَعَوْا لَلّهٖ مُّخْلِصِينَ.

XXXI. 31. They call on God, being sincere (Jrb), contrary to IX. 42. [below] (SH) : (α) [the, of the pron. in] \(\text{إِخْشَٰشُوا} \text{الْقُومُ} [\text{above}] \) is pronounced with Damm to distinguish it from the, in such [words] as \\(\text{شُرُّكُ وَ} \) and \\(\text{أَيَّلَتْ} \) [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 ال or، (Jrb),] pronounced with Damm has been elided [here] before the، [of the pron.] (IY, Jrb), the o. f. being \\(\text{إِخْشَٰشٍ} \), and دَعَوْبُوا [and دَعَوْبُوا] (IY); so that, [when mobilization of the، is needed (IY),] they mobilize it with the vowel [of the letter (Jrb)] elided, which is more appropriate (IY, Jrb) than importation of a strange vowel; whereas, when the، is part of the word itself, they mobilize it with Kasr, according to the general rule.
[above] in the concurrence of two quiescents, since there is then no elided vowel, wherewith it might be mobilized (IY): (b) [610, 663], in order that the vowel of the letter preceding the ن may be similar in all conjugs., as [610, 663] (α) it may be said that they intend to distinguish the ن of the pl. from any other [ء،], as in IX. 42. [below]; while the ن of the pl. is more worthy of Ḍamm, in order that the letter preceding the corrob. ن may be made to keep one vowel in all conjugs., as just mentioned (R): (b) similarly in the ن of the pl., [when preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha] in the ن. [161] (R); [for] they treat the ن of the pl., [when so preceded,] like the ن of the pron., because each of them indicates the pl. masc., and has a letter pronounced with Ḍamm, vid. the ج of the word, elided before it (Jrb), as مَصْطَقْفُ عَلَّمِ the elect of God (R, Jrb), [which is so pronounced] in order that it may correspond with such as مَضْأَ رَبُوْ عَلَّمِ the strikers of the people (R): (α) in other cases, the ن [preceded by a Fatha] is pronounced with Kasr (Jrb); [so that] Kasr is preferred in the ن of لَيْ [and أَرْ] (R), as لَيْ أَسْتَطَعْنَا and لَيْ أَطَلَعْتَ XVIII. IX. 42. If we had been able (R, Jrb), [and أَرْنَفْنَ] LXXIII. 3. above] (Jrb), according to the o.f., because there is no such inducement to Ḍamm as there is in
the \( j \) of the \( pl. \); (b) the \( j \) of the \( pl. \) is sometimes assimilated to the \( j \) of such as \( \text{a}\) and \( \text{a}\); and is therefore pronounced with Kasr; and similarly the \( j \) of such as \( \text{a} \) [and \( \text{a} \)] is sometimes assimilated to the \( j \) of the \( pl. \), and is therefore pronounced with Ōmm (R): [thus]\\n\\nII. 238. [above] is read with Kasr of the \( \text{a} \), [of the \( pl. \)] (K): while IX. 42. [above] is read with Ōmm of the \( \text{a} \), [of Ōmm], by assimilating it to the \( j \), (K, B) of the \( pron. \) (B) of the \( pl. \) [masc.] in\\n\\nII. 88. Then wish for death (K), [and] in II. 15. [403] (B); and [similarly] \( \text{a} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{a} \) LXXIII. 3. above] [K, B]: but both of these [variations] are rare (R): (c) as for the \( \text{i} \), 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 \( conj. \): \( \text{a} \) Dread thou the man said to a woman, because, since they make the vowel of the \( j \), homogeneous with the \( j \), they make the vowel of the \( \text{i} \) homogeneous with the \( \text{i} \), which is treated here as the \( j \) is treated there; while, if you treat it like [the \( \text{i} \) in] II. 238. [above], you [still] pronounce with Kasr: so that in every case it is pronounced with Kasr: (d) the \( \text{i} \) in\\n\\nis [treated] like that in \( \text{i} \), as
from the elect of God (S): (e) in [202, 663, 666], because it is like the finals [201] (R): (5) the allowability of Ğamm [for alliteration (Jrb)], and Fath [for lightness, besides Kasr, according to the o.f. (Jrb),] in such [imps. and apocs.] as ٍ رِّبِّ Restore thou and ٴ لَمْ يُرُبِّ 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 أُرَدُّ دُلَّ ġamm [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 [ٌ رِّبِّ], and then a [second] concurrence thereof in two words [ٴ لَمْ يُرُبِّ] 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 Banû Asad (M),] pronounce [it (IY, Jrb)] with Fath [with the art. (IY)], as دُمْ أَسْتَنْذَرَ لَ آلِحَمْ [171] (M, Jrb), also related دُمْ with Kasr (Jrb); and as نَفْضَ أَطْرَقَ آلِحَمْ [below] (M): and [Jrb affirms that] some pronounce with Ğamm [below], which is rare (Jrb): (b) [all of] this is when the aor. is [orig.] pronounced with Ğamm of the غ (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 يَلْدُدَهُ إِنْفَطَلَقَ [663], from regard to its being a v., in which it is more proper to avoid a permanent Kasra; whereas in أُرُدَّ أَلْقَوْمَ [above] the matter of the Kasra is softened by its being accidental: so that they say مُدْ draw, عَصَّ bite, and عِرِّ be mighty; and, according to them, the Fath of عَصَّ is not for alliteration, otherwise they would say مُدْ with Damm, and عِرِّ with Kasr: (b) some flee from Kasr to alliteration, as in مُنْدُ [203, 663]; so that they say مُدْ عَصَّ, and عِرِّ; and, according to them, the Kasr in عِرِّ 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 Ghâni, 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 عِرِّ is not for alliteration, otherwise alliteration would take place in مُدْ and عَصَّ also: (d) the
Arabs, Hijāzīs and others, unite in adopting incorporation, together with Fath, in كَرَّمَةٍ [189], because, مُنْبَأ being compounded with مَكَا, 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 رَدَّ أَبْنِكَ Restore thy son and اَلْقُوْمَ 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 اَلْقُوْمَ 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

ْفَعْلَ الْطَّرِفِ إِذَّنَ مِنْ نُمْبَأٍ فَلاَ كَعْبَا بَلَغْتُ وَلَا كَلَابَا [above] (R), by Jarir (IY, Jsh) Ibn 'Atiya atTamimi, addressing 'Ubaid Ibn Huṣain an Numairī, the poet cognominated Ar Rā'ī, Then lower the eye: verily thou art of Numair; so that neither Ka'b hast thou reached, nor Kilāb (Jsh), with Fath of the ضّ (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 خَصُنُ, 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 رُدْنَاهَا. Restore thou her (SH), for affinity to the ل (Jrb): (a) the Arabs are all agreed upon the necessity for Fath when a س followed by an ل is attached to this imp. or apoc., as رُدْنَاهَا. Bite her, and إِسْتَعِدَّهَا. Make her ready (R), because the س is faint (R, Jrb); so that the ل, as it were, follows immediately after the [letter] incorporated into; while the ل is not preceded by any [vowel] but Fatha (R): (b) ِهِمّ in such as سَرِّهِ Restore thou him, [for affinity to the س (Jrb),] according to the chastest [usage]; while Kasr [in سَرِّهِ (MASH)] is a weak dial. var., [heard by Akh from the Banû 'Ukail (MASH)]; and Th is taxed with error in allowing Fath (SH) in such as سَرِّهِ [below] (MASH): (a) when the س denoting the sing. masc. is pronounced with ِهِمّ, all of them pronounce [the letter incorporated into] with ِهِمّ, as سَرِّهِ [above], عَضَه. Bite him, and إِسْتَعِدَّهُ. Make him ready, because the س [161], as it were, follows immediately after the [letter] incorporated into, since the س is faint, as though you said حَرْبَر, عَضَه, إِسْتَعِدَّهُ; and the ِهِمّ in سَرِّهِ is not for alliteration to that [vowel] which precedes it, otherwise عَضَه and إِسْتَعِدَّهُ would not be pronounced with ِهِمّ (R): (b) IH says "according to the chastest
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 ી also is pronounced with Kasr, by alliteration to it, as is the custom of the ી in 

[usage] [161], so that the ી is converted into خَلَمٍ; whereas, if the ી retained its original vowel, Kasr would be disliked, because the quiescent ી would, as it were, follow the Kasra, without separation, since the ી is faint: (d) Th in the Faṣṭḥ, without [the authority of] any hearsay, allows Fath of the [letter] incorporated into, notwithstanding the occurrence of the ી of the 3rd pers. [sing. masc.] after it, as اِسْتَعِيَّدُهُ [above], عَطْسَةٌ, and اِسْتَعِيَّدُهُ: 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 طَوْلٌ تَوْلُ saying and superiority (R): (c) Fath in the of the of the مِن حُرْجُلِ [of determination (Jrb)], as مِن آَبِنَكَ from the man, Kasr being weak; contrary to مِن آَبِنَكَ from thy son [666, 669] (SH), where Fatha 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 دابه beast and شابه lass (IY). Mobilization of the first quiescent occurs in two pardonable [663] sorts of concurrence of two quiescents, because of their dislike to the concurrence of two quiescents, unrestrictedly:—(1) where the quiescence of the second is on account of pause, and the first is not a letter of softness, as in جآءني مغمرو *I passed by *Amr, in which case the first is mobilized with the vowel of the second, [as مغمرو and مغمرو, ] because it must have a light vowel, as we mentioned [663] at the beginning of the chapter; and therefore to mobilize it with a vowel that was [orig.] expressed, and whose elision was then intended for an indication of a meaning, [vid. completion of the purport of the speech,] is more appropriate: (a) if the second quiescent be the s of the masc. [648], as in ضربته *strike him, مئة, and ضربته, the vowel of the s may be transferred to the preceding quiescent, as ضربته [641], مئة, and ضربته; but some of the Banu Tamim, vid. the Banu 'Adr, elide the vowel of the s, and mobilize the first [quiescent] with Kasr, as ضربته [641] and اخذتها She took him, as you say ضربت المرة The woman struck [607]: (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 َوَلَا ٱلسَّأَلِينَ I. 7. [539, 656] transmitted from Ayyūb es Sikhtiyānī; and in ُدَآبَةٍ [641, 656] and ُشَآبَةٍ transmitted from him by AZ, who cites

يَا عَجَبًا لَقَدْ رَأَيْتُ عَجَبًا ﷺ حِمَارٌ قَبَائِنِ يَسُوقُ أَرْبَابًا خَاطِمَةَ ُرَأَمِهَا أَنَّ تَذَهَّبًا ﷺ نَقْلَتُ أَرْبَانِي نَقْالَ مَرْحَبًا

[677] (R) O marvel! Assuredly I have seen a marvel, a woodlouse driving a hare, putting a halter upon her, attaching a nose-rein to her, in order that she might go. Then said I "Let me ride behind", and he said "Welcome!" (MAR), i.e., ُرَأَمِهَا, the ُب being converted [by poetic license (Jh)] into a Hamza pronounced with Fath, since the metre of the verse would not be correct with ُب, by reason of the combination of the two quiescents; and in the reading of [HB and (K)] 'Amr Ibn 'Ubaid ُفِيْبَطِيْسِدِلَ لا يُسَاسَل َعَنَّ ذِنْبِهِ إِنَّسُ ُرَلا ُجَانٌ LV. 39.

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

(1042 )

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

§. 666. The َْ of مِئَن, (1) when the ُل of determination [599] is conjoined with it, is most commonly pronounced with Fath, because the ُل of determination frequently occurs after مِئَن, and the succession of two Kasras is deemed heavy when frequent: (a) that [Fath] is not because the vowel of the [con.] Hamza [in ُل ] is transferred [to the َْ], otherwise ُل ُلُّ[663] would be allowable: (b) Ks says that they pronounce [the َْ] with Fath in such as مِئَن ُلُّ[664] because مِئَن is orig. مَئَن, but he produces no argument in [support of] it; and this is as he says that ُكَمُّ is orig. ُكَمَ: (2) when a quiescent other than the ُل of determination follows immediately after it, is commonly pronounced with Kasr, according to the o. f., as مِئَن أُئَنَك [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 ُ (R)] with Fath (S, R) with [a quiescent] other than the J of determination (MAR), to escape from the [succession of] two Kasras (R); so that they say من أَبْنِي and from the Muslims (S). And [they assert that (S)] some of the Arabs [also (R) say منِ الله *from God*; so that they (S) pronounce it with Kasr, [which is not common, with the J of determination (R), treating it (S)] according to the o.f. (S, R); and do not heed the [succession of] two Kasras, because the second is accidental. They keep also to Fath of [the final in] أَيْن ُ [206, 321, 663] and كَيْف ُ [207, 321, 663], in order to escape from the combination of two likes, i.e., the ُ and Kasra, [which would ensue] if they pronounced with Kasr, according to the o.f.; and because Đamma after the ُ, if they pronounced with Đamm, would be heavy. But كَيْف ُ [202, 663, 664] deviates from that [rule]: for they allow [the final in] it to be pronounced with (1) Đamm, in the chastest, best-known [usage]; (2) Fath, according to the rule mentioned [for كَيْف ُ and أَيْن ُ]; (3) Kasr, which is weak: though the last two [pronunciations] are rare. The reason for Đamm 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 ٴَٰٰ 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 ٴَٰٰ [above] (R).

And ٴَٰٰ Aleph from the man, [quoted by Akh (R)] with دام, is weak (SH); and, says he, is bad (R). He likens it to their saying ٴَٰٰ ا نُظْرِوا X. 101. [664] (IY, R) and ٴَٰٰ أُّ أَتْبُرُصُ LXXIII. 3. [664, 668] (IY), meaning that the ن is mobilized with دام for alliteration to the دامما of the ج, the incorporated ر not being taken into account, [so that ٴَٰٰ Aleph is reducible to ٴَٰٰ Aleph]: but this [explanation] is weak, because دام is not allowable in VI. 57. [664], notwithstanding the دامما 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] دام, as in ٴَٰٰ Aleph from the judgment; or by a letter [interposed] between them, as in ٴَٰٰ Aleph from the upper
arm (R). But عَنْ آلِ الرَّجِلِ 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 \(n\), the \(v\), and the \(p\), because each of them may be inceptive \([658]\), as \(قَامُ زَيْدٍ قَاهِمٍ [24]\), \(شَيْمُ زَيْدٍ قَاهِمٍ [20]\), and \(يَتَبَأَّدَا قَاهِمٍ [517] (IY)\). 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 \(عُمَرو\) of \(Aмr\), upon a neighbouring vowel; or, like the \(جَرَّامَة\) of \(ب\) and the \(تَلَيْيِمَة\) \([663]\), 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 ُشَعْرُ عُمَّرُ camel and ُسَتَامُ saddle-ornaments. Apparently, however, it is impossible; and beginning with a mobile is unavoidable: but, since that mobile in such as ُشَعْرُ عُمَّرُ and ُسَتَامُ 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” (1). The initials of words are generally mobile (M, R). But some of them occur quiescent (M), except that they prefix the conj. Hamza [668] as a means of effecting the articulation of the quiescent (IY). It being obvious that beginning is not possible, except with a mobile, if the initial of the word be mobile, the matter is plain; but, if it be quiescent, it needs the conj. Hamza (Jrb). That [quiescence of the initial] is [found] in (1) ns., [which are (Jrb)] of two kinds (M, Jrb), (a) confined to hearsay (Jrb), vid. [ten (IY, Jrb) non-inf. (M)] ns., [limited in number (IY),] i. e., ُبْنُ ابْنُ son, ُبْنُ ابْنُ daughter, ُبْنُ ابْنُ (Jrb), ُبْنُ ابْنُ two [masc.], ُبْنُ ابْنُ 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) إْنْفَعَلَ (M), like
إْنْتَلَقَ (IY); (M), like had power
[483, 668, 671]; and, like إْخْمَرَ, like; these three being
of one measure and one paradigm (IY) : (b) إْنْفَعَلَ [332,
482] (M), like إْفَعَمَّلَ, like [332, 432, 493, 668]; like
إْفَعَمْلَتْ [432, 496]; إْفَعَمْلَتْ, like [432, 496];
إْفَعَمْلَ, like [482, 494]; and, like إْفَعَمْلَ, like
إْفَعَمْلَ [494]; these five also being of one paradigm, [to which
belong three more formations, whose inf. ns. are men-
tioned below, vid. (c) إْفَعَمْلَ, like [482, 483]; and, like إْفَعَمْلَ, like
إْفَعَمْلَ (495, 496, 668): (c) إْفَعَمْلَ, like إْفَمَّلَ (495), which is a differ-
ent 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): (3) 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], (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), [332], (M, Jrb, Tsr, MASH), (IY), (Tsr, MASH), (IY), (Jrb, Tsr),] and (Jrb, Tsr, MASH), as (IY), (Tsr, MASH), (IY), (Jrb, Tsr), (IY), (Jrb, Tsr), [1757], inf. n. [332], inf. n. [332]; and (Jrb, Tsr): (γ) hence They overtook one another, inf. n. [668], (Jrb): (b) the paradigms of the imp. [of the 2nd pers. (M)] in the [unaugmented (M)] tril. (M, Jrb), as strike and go [428,
(1051)

668] (M), when neither the ف nor the ه of its aor. is unsound; for, if either of them be unsound, the conj. Hamza is not needed, as مُعَد promise and ﻓَتَيَ say [428, 668] (Jrb): (3) ps., the ج of determination [599], and its م [599, 687] (M, Jrb) in the dial. of Tayyi (M). The initial of the word is not quiescent, in a regular way, except in vs., and what is connected [330] with them, vid. inf. ns., because vs. have much plasticity, and are the principal subjects of [euphonic] transformation [697], such as conversion, elision, and transfer of the vowel; so that it is allowable, in their case, to make the initial quiescent. But that does not occur in the pure n., except a few irregular ns. vid. the ten [668] mentioned [above]; nor in the p., except the ج and م of determination. The Hamza in the ten ns. is a compensation for that infirmity which affects them, since they are trils., weak in constitution, their جs having been elided as forgotten, or virtually elided, which is an infirmity upon an infirmity, because the elided as forgotten is like the non-existent. But it is not necessary, in the whole of the trils. whose ج is elided, that the Hamza should be substituted for it, as you see in مُعَد morrow [153, 275], يَد [231, 260, 275, 306], and رَِـمَ vulva [275, 306]. Since, then, these [ten] ns. are afflicted with transformation, which ought to be in the v., they resemble vs.; so that the conj. Hamza [668] is prefixed to them, as a
compensation for the [actually or virtually] elided, as is proved by the fact that the two are not combined in such as ^2ِّ^2ِّ َبْنَوُي َبْنِي [306]. The finals of ^9ِّ ِبْنُم [16, 306], ^9ِّ ِمُرُّ [16, 306], and ُيُمُّ [650], are not [actually] elided, the ُم in ^9ِّ ِبْنُم being a subst. [687] for the ُل, i.e., the ُم, [which is therefore like the expressed]. But, since the vowel of the ُن and the ُر, in ^9ِّ ِبْنُم and ^9ِّ ِمُرُّ ِبْنُم respectively, is an alliteration to the vowel of inflection [on the letter] after them, they become like the letter of inflection, [so that the finals are virtually elided] (R). The ُم of ^9ِّ ِبْنُم is, [however, sometimes said to be (R)] aug.; [for corroboration and intensiveness (Jrb, Tsr),] as in ^9ُِّرُّ (R, Jrb, Tsr) and ^9ُِّسُتُهُم [below], the ُل being [actually] elided.

And, as for ^9ِّ ِيُمُّ [650], since the ُن is often elided, as ُيُمُّ [651], and the oath is the position of abbreviation, the expressed ُن becomes like the non-existent, [so that it too is virtually elided] (R). The o.f. of ^9ِّ ِبْنُم [275, 277] is [^9ِّ َبْنُي or (KF)] ^9ِّ َبْكُء (IY, R, Jrb, A, Fk), [since] the measure of ^9ِّ ِبْنُم is [orig.] فَعَلُّ، with two Fathas (Tsr), like ^9ِّ َتُكُمُ pen (A), with Fath of the ُن and (IY, R, Fk), because its [broken (Jrb, Fk)] pl. is ُيُمُّ [307] (IY, R, Jrb, Fk), upon the measure of ^9ُِّفَعَالُ (Fk), as ُنُحُنُّ ُيُمُّ ُلَّهُ V. 21. We are the sons of God and
being regular in فعال (R, Jrb) with Fatha of the ع, like اَجْمَال [237]; and [not] in quiescent in the ع, [except] when فعال is hollow [237], like أَبْنَاء and أَتْوَاب [242]; while may not be like pl. of تفاعل [237], nor like أَجْدَع اَعْل pl. of جَذَع trunk, because بَنُون indicates Fatha of the في its sing. [307] (R), for which reason they say in the rel. n. بَنْوًى [306], with Fatha of its ف (IY). The proof of the Fatha of the ف is its pl. بَنْوَان and its rel. n. بَنْوًى, 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 بَنُو, with Kasr of the ب, like جمل load, as is proved by بنت 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 بنت (Su). And the proof of the mobilization of the ع is its pl. أَنْفَعَال [above], أَنْفَعَال being pl. of فعال with mobilization of the ع; while the proof of the vowel's being Fatha is that أَنْفَعَال is more frequent in [the pl. of] the أَنْفَعَال pronounced with Fatha of the ع than in [the pl. of] the أَنْفَعَال pronounced with Damm of the ع, like أَعْضَان pl. of upper arm, or with Kasr of it, like أَكْبَان pl. of liver [237] (A). Its ظ [below] is elided (Jrb, Tsr,
Fk), for lightness (Fk); and its ﬂ 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)] j is [said to be (Tsr)] (1) a, (IY, R, A, Tsr), which is correct (Tsr), not a ى [below] (A), (a) because the j of those ns. in which the j is elided, [and the Hamza made a compensation for it (Tsr),] is a, (A, Tsr), in most cases (A), [i. e.] in the case of all but [إِسْتُ, إِسْتَتْ[below] (Tsr), not a ى (A); (b) because they say in the fem. ﷺ[above] (IY, R, A), substituting the ﺃ for its j (IY, A), and substitution of the ﺃ for the ﺖ is more frequent than for the ى [689] (IY, R, A); (c) because of [their saying (A)] ﷺ sonship [below] (R, A), while ﷺ youthfulness [243] from ﺖ a youth is irregular (R): (2) a ى (A, Tsr), as ISh reports to be held by some, who derive إِسْتُ from ﺖ He went in to his wife, aor. ﻲ (A), because the son is the effect of the father’s going in to the mother (Sn); [or] from ﷺ 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 ﷺ [above], because of ﻲ , which is from the ى (IY, A), since they say ﻲ in the du. [229, 326], and ﻲ and
in the pl. [243, 246, 257] (IY). And Zj allows both the modes [of representing the J] (A). The o.f. of َإِبَنُ [below] is َسَجُرَةُ [234] (R, Jrb, Fk, Sn), like َإِبْنٌ tree (Jrb, Fk), because it is fem. of َإِبْنُ (R, Jrb, Fk); and its predicament is [like] that of َإِبْنُ (Jrb). As for َإِبْنُ [above], it is َإِبْنَ augment[g] by the م [668] for intensiveness (IY, A, Fk) and corroboration (IY), as in َزَجَمْ intensely blue (IY, A) and َسَجُرُ big in the rump [671, 676] (IY). It has been heard (Fk), as

َعَلَيْ إِمَّ مُخِّرَمًا إِنَّ دَكَرُتهَا َآَبَيْ إِلَّا أَنْ أَكُونَ لَهَا أَبْنَأَ (IY, A, YS), by AlMutalammis, And have I any mother other than her, if I mention her? God forbid but that I should be a son to her! (MN); and is therefore to be remembered, but not copied (Fk). The م is not a subst. for the J (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk) of the word (IY, Jrb, Tsr), as [it is for the ع (Fk)] in ُنُمْ [16, 275, 278, 306, 687] (IY, Jrb, Fk), because that would require the Hamza to be dropped (Fk): for, if the م were a subst. for the J, [it would virtually be the J; and (IY)] the J would be like the expressed, so that [prefixion of (IY)] the conj. Hamza would be unnecessary (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr), since it is [prefixed as] a compensation [for the J] (Fk). The o.f. of َقَتَانِ [16, 313, 314] is َثَنَّبَانِ (IY, R, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), with Fath.
of the \( \text{ذ} \) and \( \text{ع} \) (A), like \( \text{kattiba} \) [above] (R), (1) because it is from \( \text{kattab} \) [313] IY, A, Fk, an explanation of the reason for the \( \text{ج} \) 's being a \( \text{i} \) (Sn): (2) because they say in its rel. n. \( \text{غ} \) \( \text{kattivi} \) [295] (R, Jrb, A, Tsr), with two Fathas (Jrb, Tsr, Sn), an explanation of the reason for the Fath of the \( \text{ذ} \) 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 \( \text{kattivi} \) with quiescence, like \( \text{kattivi} \) [302] (Jrb): but this is open to the objection that their saying \( \text{kattivi} \) does not prevent quiescence of the \( \text{ع} \) in the o. \( \text{ف} \), because, in the rel. n. of \( \text{اسم} \) [below], you say \( \text{اسم} \) with Fath of the \( \text{ذ} \) and \( \text{ع} \), according to the correct [opinion as to Fath of the \( \text{ع} \), when orig. quiescent, in such ns.] (Sn). The \( \text{ج} \) is elided, the \( \text{ذ} \) made quiescent, and the [\text{conj.} (Tsr, Fk)] Hamza put (Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk). And the o. \( \text{ف} \). of \( \text{نَتَتَن} \) [below] is \( \text{nattan} \) \( \text{Jrb} \), Tsr, Fk, Sn), like \( \text{شَجَرَائِن} \) two trees (Jrb, Tsr, Fk). The o. \( \text{ف} \). of \( \text{إِمْرَرَر} \) [and \( \text{إِمْرَرَر} \) (below) (Fk, Sn)] is \( \text{مَرَر} \) (A, Fk) and \( \text{مَرَر} \) (Fk, Sn), which are another \text{dial. var.} (Fk). \( \text{إِمْرَر} \) is a complete n., nothing being elided from it, except that, since its Hamza [in the o. \( \text{ف} \). \( \text{مَرَر} \)] may be elided by transfer of its vowel to the quiescent [\( \text{ر} \)] before it with the art. [below], as \( \text{أَمْرُ} \) \text{the man}, they transform it
because of that, and from frequency of usage. And is with the addition of the (Tsr). Their initial is made quiescent, and then the conj. Hamza is added to them, although they are of three letters, because their is a Hamza, and they are subject to abbreviation, as and [658]; so that they are treated like and [above] (Fk). For is abbreviated by transfer of the vowel of the Hamza to the ; then the Hamza is elided, and the conj. Hamza put as a compensation therefor; [the being made quiescent, as in its congeners (Sn)]; and afterwards, upon restoration of the [final] Hamza, the conj. Hamza is retained, because alleviation [658] of the Hamza [which is the , by transfer of its vowel to the quiescent before it with the art., as in the Tsr (above), and then by elision of it (Sn),] is always permissible, so that the expected [alleviation (Sn)] is treated like the occurring. As for the fems. of [above], and [i.e., , and ] (Sn), the discourse on them is like the discourse on their mascs. [668]: and the in and is for femininization [263], like the of [264]; contrary to the in and [277, 295, 307], which is a subst. for the of the word [689] (A). The o. f. of [275, 277, 306] is, (1) [according to the BB (Jrb, Tsr, Fk),]
(IY, R, Jrb, A, TsR, Fk), upon the measure of َفعلَ فَعَلَ، with Kasr of the ُفَ (IY), as S says (IY, A), like َفعلَ فَعَلَ, bunch of dates (Jrb, A, Fk), or َفعلَ فَعَلَ, [as is said (A),] like َفعلَ فَعَلَ (R, A), as is proved by their also saying َفعلَ فَعَلَ 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 َدامَ of the الس (MAR), meaning ُسمَى (AZ): [and by other evidence also,] because its [broken (Fk)] pl. is أَسْمَاءٌ (Fk, Sn), أَسْمَاءٌ being a pl. for these two measures, like جَذُعٌ, جَذُعٌ, pl. أَجْذَاعٌ, and سُكْلٌ, سُكْلٌ [above] (Jh); and its dim. is سَبَيْ (277) (Fk, Sn); and its v. is سَمُيَتُ I named [below]; orig. سَمْيَ, أَسَمَأَ, and سُمَرُتُ, where the canons of etymology require conversion
of the, into Hamza in the first [683], and into implicitly in the two last [685, 723, 727] (Sn): whereas, if its o. f. were ٰبُنَسَامٰ, [as the KK say (Sn),] its pl. would be ٰوُبُسَامٰ, and its dim. ٰوُبُسَامٰ, [and its v. ٰوُبُسَت (Sn),] the assertion of inversion [below] being improbable (YS, Sn): (a) A's phraseology necessarily implies that its o. f. is not said by anybody to be ٰبُسَر with Fath of the س, the reason being that ٰبُسَل with Fath does not form the pl. ٰبُئَل [237] (Sn): (b) it is derived from ٰسَا ٰبُسًا was elevated, because it elevates, and gives notoriety to, its named, which, but for the name, would be obscure (R): (c) its measure is ٰبُقُبٰ (Jh, IY), the [letter] gone from it being the ٰ (Jh): (d) its J (A, Tsr, Fk), the ٰ (IY, Jrb), is elided (IY, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), for lightness (IY, A), as in ٰبُنَةٰ [above] (IY), because the alteration 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)] J (Tsr, Sn), for which
reason they do not combine the two, [i. e., the J and the Hamza (Sn),] but express one of them, saying in its *rel. n.* \[\text{سُمْرُي} \text{ٍسُمْيَي} \] [306] (A), with Kasr or Damm of the س, and, in either case, with Fath, though some allow quiescence, of the م (Sn): (e) others than S transmit ٌ\[\text{سُمْيَي} \] [668] with Damm of the conj. Hamza (R): (2) according to the KK, ٌ\[\text{سُمْيَي} \] (R, Jrb, A, Tsr, YS), with Fath of the م (YS), meaning عامة mark (Jrb), because the name is [like (R)] a mark upon the named (R, Jrb, A): (a) its ف is elided (R, Tsr); and the خ remains quiescent, so that the conj. Hamza is put (R): [or] it is inverted, its ف being put last, after the J; and its variations occur in accordance with that (A): (b) according to what they say, there is no precedent for it, since one does not elide the ف, and put the conj. Hamza; and, though, as respects the sense, what they say is more probable than the saying of the BB, because the name is very like the mark, still its variations, vid. the *dim.* and broken *pl.*, like ٌ\[\text{سُمْيَي} \] and عامة [above], and others, like ٌ\[\text{سُمْيَي} \] namesake on the measure of خَلِيفُ َتَسْمَيْتُ َتَسْمَيْتُ I was named and خَلِيفُ َتَسْمَيْتُ َتَسْمَيْتُ [above], refute that; unless they say that the n. is inverted by putting the ف into the position of the J, when they intend to lighten the n. by elision, since the [usual] position of elision is the ج; and that then the ج is elided as forgotten; but is restored in its variations,
vid. the dim., broken pl., etc., in the position of the \( \mathfrak{j} \), since it was elided in that place (R): (c) the preferable opinion is the first (Jrb). As for \( \mathfrak{s} \), it is orig. \( \mathfrak{s} \) (IY, R, Jrb, A, Tsr, Fk), upon the measure of \( \mathfrak{g} \) (IY), with Fath of its first and second (Tsr, Fk), like \( \mathfrak{g} \) (Jrb, Tsr); and is curtailed of the \( \mathfrak{j} \), i.e., the \( \mathfrak{s} \) (IY), as is proved by (1) [its pl. (IY, Jrb, Fk)] \( \mathfrak{g} \) [260] (IY, R, Jrb, A, Fk), which may not be like \( \mathfrak{g} \) [above], because of the rel. n. \( \mathfrak{s} \) [306] (R); (2) [its dim. (IY, Fk)] \( \mathfrak{s} \) [275, 277] (IY, A, Fk); (3) their saying \( \mathfrak{g} \) Zaid is bigger in the rump than 'Amr (A). Its \( \mathfrak{j} \), i.e., the \( \mathfrak{s} \), is elided; its initial is made quiescent; and the Hamza is put (A, YS), because of what has been mentioned [under \( \mathfrak{e} \)] (A). And it has two other dial. vars., \( \mathfrak{s} \) [275, 306], with elision of the \( \mathfrak{u} \), its measure being \( \mathfrak{g} \); and \( \mathfrak{s} \), with elision of the \( \mathfrak{j} \), its measure being \( \mathfrak{g} \) (A, YS). The proof that the o. f. is \( \mathfrak{s} \), with Fath of the \( \mathfrak{u} \), is the Fath thereof in these two dial. vars.; and the proof of the mobilization, and Fath, of the \( \mathfrak{u} \) is what has been mentioned under \( \mathfrak{g} \) [above]. And, as for the \( \mathfrak{e} \) [650] peculiar to the oath, [which is a n. so constituted, with Damm of the \( \mathfrak{m} \) and \( \mathfrak{n} \), for the oath (Jh),] its \( \mathfrak{i} \) is conj. according to the BB, but disj.
according to the KK, because, according to them, it is pl. of "oath"; whereas, according to S [and the other BB (Sn)], it is a sing. n. from "blessing" (A). The BB hold that [the pre. n. in [650] is a sing., upon the measure of ُؤُنُعُلُ [372], upon which the sing. does sometimes occur, like [256, 628] and ُؤُنُعُل [255, 256], as in the tradition ُؤُسْتَعْعِل إِلَى قَيْتَةٍ صَبْبُ فِي أَذْنِيِّهِ أَلَّنَكَ Whoso listeneth to a singing female slave, into his two ears shall lead be poured (Jrb). And, since its ن is elided, as ُؤُمُّ اللَّهُ [651], they put the Hamza at its beginning as a compensation for the ن; but, when they restore the ن, they do not elide the Hamza, because the ن has a tendency to elision (A). It has twelve dial. vars. [650, 651, 653], collected by IM in these two [mnemonic] verses

The Hamza of (1, 2) اَيْمُ and (3, 4) اَيْمُ [with Damm of the م (YS, Sn) in both (Sn)] then pronounce thou with Fath and Kasr; or say (5) اَيْمُ [with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm of the م (Sn)]; or say (6-8) مُ or
[with Damm of the ﺖ, and (Sn)] with triple
vocalization [of the ﺖ (Sn), referring to ﺖ and ﻁ (YS, Sn)], when it is furnished with diacritical mark; and (12) [with Kasr of the Hamza, and Fath of the ﺖ (YS, Sn),] do thou finish off with: and postfix ﺥ everywhere to it in an oath—so wilt thou exhaust what has been transmitted (A, Fk). The result is that, if the Hamza of ﺖَيْسَنَّ be pronounced with Fath, the ﺖ must be pronounced with Damm [below]; but, if the Hamza [of ﺖَيْسَنَّ ] be pronounced with Kasr, the ﺖ 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) ﺖ with Fath of the Hamza, and Damm of the ﺖ [651, 668]; and (14) ﺖَيْسَنَّ with Fath of the Hamza and ﺖ, instead of ﺖَيْسَنَّ with Kasr of the Hamza, and Fath of the ﺖ [above]. And, according to this, the ﺖ need not be pronounced with Damm [above] in the ﺖَيْسَنَّ 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) ā'yin Allah and ā'yin Allah, the initial in both of which is also pronounced with Kasr; and (5, 6) ā'yin Allah with Fath of the m and Hamza, [the latter of] which is also pronounced with Kasr; and (7) ā'yin Allah with Kasr of the Hamza and m; [the l (in all) of which is said to be a conj. l (KF):] and (8) kāfim Allah with Fath of the s, and Damm of the m; and (9-11) ʾāʾim Allah with triple vocalization of the m; and (12, 13) ēm Allah with Kasr of the Hamza, and Damm or Fath of the m; and (14) sāʾim Allah with Damm of the m, and Kasr of the n; and (15-17) mīn Allah with triple vocalization of the m and n; and (18-20) māʾim Allah with triple vocalization; and (21, 22) kāʾim Allah and kāʾim Allah; is a n. constituted for [use in] the oath, the full phrase being ā'yin Allah Qasīmī Gods' blessing is mine oath" (YS). The summary [of the foregoing observations on the compensatory character of the conj. Hamzas in these ten ns.] is that these Hamzas are a compensation for (1) a l [elided], (a) a w, vid. in ḍīn, āṯān, [and āʾīm ]; (b) a ʾī, vid. in āṯānān and āʾīnān; (c) sound, i.e., a s, vid. in āʾīnān; (2) an imaginary elision, vid. in ʾūm and
an elision occurring at times, vid. in (Tsr). The Hamza in the *du.* also of such of these *ns.* as are dualized, vid. إِمْرَأَةٍ, إِبْنَانِيْ, إِبْنَانِيْ, إِبْنَانِ, إِسْتَنَانٍ, إِمْرَأَتَانِ, and إِسْتَنَانٍ is a *conj.* Hamza (Jrb).

The Hamza of *جُلِّ is similar [668] (IM), i.e., is a *conj.* Hamza, whether *جُلِّ* be determinative [599], conjunct [176], or *red.* [599]. The determination is by the *ج* alone, the Hamza being *aug.* [672], because, if the Hamza were intended, it would not be elided in continuous speech [669], as the Hamza of *أَؤْ[541] and *أَؤْ[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 *جُلِّ* 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 *ذَكَرَ [575] in the case of *vs.*; and, that being *bil.*, so is this: and because there is no [*other* *p.* constituted of a single quiescent letter; so that this must be made to accord with what has been, not with what has not been, authorized (Jrb). The opinion of Khl [668] is that the Hamza of *جُلِّ 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 ḫ in the dial. of AlYaman [599, 668, 687] (A). These initials, then, are quiescent, as you see, being pronounced as such in the interior [of the sentence] (M), because you conjoin the preceding word with the quiescent (IY). But, when they occur in the inceptive [658] position, then mobile aug. [671, 672] Hamzas [668] are put before them, because, in their language, there is no beginning with a quiescent, as there is no pause upon a mobile (M). From Z's saying "in their language", it is sometimes understood that this [predicament] is peculiar to the language of the Arabs, beginning with a quiescent being allowable in other languages: whereas the matter is not so; but, on the contrary, this [predicament] is caused by the impracticability of articulating the [inceptive] quiescent, and is not peculiar to one language more than another (IY).

§. 668. These Hamzas [667] are named conj. Hamzas (M), because they are dropped [below] in the interior [of the sentence], so that they conjoin what precedes with what follows them; and do not disjoin the former from the latter, as the other letters do (IY). The Hamzas at the beginning of words are of two sorts disj. Hamzas and conj. Hamzas. And they are also named disj. †s and conj. †s, because the Hamza and
are approximate in outlet [732], for which reason, when they need to mobilize the ِ، they convert it into Hamza [683]: Jh says "The ِ is of two kinds, soft and mobile, the soft being named ِ، and the mobile being named Hamza". The disj. Hamza is retained in the interior [of the sentence]; so that, by the utterance of it, what precedes is disjoined from what follows it, as ُتُ أَ حَمْزٌ. Ahmad took fright, where the Hamza of ُأَ حَمْزٌ forms a barrier between the ِ، and the ح، disjoining one of them from the other. And for this reason it is named ُلَتْا قَطْعُ Hamza of disjunction, [commonly rendered as if it were ُقَطْعٌ 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 ُكَتَبْتَ أَسْمَكَ I have written thy name, where the Hamza of ُاَسْمَ is dropped, so that the ِ is conjoined with the س. And for this reason it is named ُضَلْيَا حَمْزَا conj. Hamza of conjunction, [commonly rendered as if it were ِضَلْيَا conj. Hamza, which also is used] (Jrb). The conj. Hamza is every Hamza expressed at the beginning, and dropped in the interior [of the sentence]. And what is expressed in both [positions] is a disj. Hamza. The conj. Hamza is [orig.] constituted as a Hamza, because IM says "For conjunction there is a Hamza", [and does not say "an
"(Sn)]. This is the correct [opinion]; but it is said that possibly its o. f. may be the †, since it is expressed as an † in such as Ālā rā jūl 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 ḍā jāwūr rā lām [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 خَمْسَةٌ أَلْوَصْلِي 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 سَلَّمٌ أَلْوَصْلِي 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 خَمْسَةٌ أَلْوَصْلِ] 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, رَوْضٌ being the inf. n. of the trans. رَوْضٌ conjoined, if one said “so that the speaker conjoins what precedes with what follows it”, this would agree with the name خَمْسَةٌ أَلْوَصْلِ (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 ُاَثْمَر [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)] й й (Aud, A, Fk), according to [the opinion of] S [667] (Tsr): (a) like the й of determination are (a) its й in the dial. of Tayyi and Himyar [599, 667, 687]; and (b) the conjunct [176] and red. [599] й (Fk): (b) as for the conjunct [ й ], 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 й ] is rad., being made conj. from frequency of usage (Fk): nor (3) in any pret., [either] tril., like أَمَرْ commanded and أَخَذَ took (Aud)]; or [numerically (Tsr)] quad. [483, 488] (Aud, A, Fk), like مَضَكَ.
honored and ٢٠٢٠١ 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 ٢٠٢٠١ (Aud) and ٢٠٢٠١ (Tsr): or the sex., [which is of two sorts, the tril. containing three augs. (Tsr),] like ٢٠٢٠١ (Aud); and the quad. containing two augs., like ٢٠٢٠١ (Tsr): and (b) in their imp. (Aud), quin. and sex., like ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, and ٢٠٢٠١ (Tsr): and (c) [in (Tsr)] the imp. of the tril., [the second of whose aor. is literally quiescent (Tsr),] like ٢٠٢٠١ (Aud); contrary to such as ٢٠٢٠١ grant, ٢٠٢٠١, and ٢٠٢٠١, 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 ٢٠٢٠١ and ٢٠٢٠١ (Aud), in imitation of their vs.: (a) the formula for them is “every inf. n. the ٠ 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. ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, and the ٢٠٢٠١ (Tsr), i.e. ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, and the ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١, ٢٠٢٠١.
peculiar to the oath (Aud); while they ought to add [the conjunct ل and (Aud)] a dial. var. of يس (Aud, A), so that the non-inf. ns. are twelve [above] (A), vid. the ten ns., اسم، etc. [above], the conjunct ل included in IM's saying "The Hamza of ل is similar" [667], and يم (Sn): (a) if they say [of يم (Tsr)] that it is ى with the ل elided [651], we say "And ين is ى with the م added" [667] Aud, A), so that whatever is their answer is our answer (Tsr): (b) they may escape [from this dilemma] by drawing the distinction that, by the addition of the م, alliteration of the ن to the م in the vowels [of inflection], according to the ops., accrues to ين [16], which therefore becomes so like an original word that the KK even say that it is infl. in two places; contrary to يم, which does not undergo this process: and moreover there is no special appropriateness in the mention of ين for [the purpose of] comparison, since the fems. of these ns. are their mascs. [667] with the ى added (Tsr, Sn): (c) so in the Tsr: but, in my opinion, this distinction, if they do establish it, requires consideration, because the placing of the inflection upon the م accrues to يم also by reason of the defectiveness; so that, in both ين and يم, the place of the inflection is altered; but in the first because of
the addition, and in the second because of the defectiveness; and their difference, in this respect, is immaterial: 

(d) لُّمُلُومِدُ, not بُلُومِدٌ [651, 667], is exclusively specified by [IHsh and] A as to be added; and this suggests the notion that the Hamza of the latter is a disj. Hamza (Sn):  

(e) since IHsh looks at the dial. vars. of the word, he ought to say "And مَأ, a dial. var. of مَأ, according to Tayyi," who change the determinative م into a م [above], saying أَلْرَجْلِ for the man [599, 667, 687]:  

(f) [in case of doubt] reference should be made to the rule, vid. that every Hamza, if retained in the dim. [277, 283], is a disj. Hamza; and, if not, is a conj. Hamza:  

(g) they omit the conjunct مَأ [176] because of the dispute as to its being a n. [345], and because of its resemblance to the determinative مَأ [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 إِسْتَنْتَر became hidden, when the م of إِنْتَعَالّ is intended to be incorporated into what follows it, its vowel being transferred to the ف [756]; so that سَنَّر [with Fath of the س, and doubling of the ت (Sn)] is said, [the difference between this and the hid from سَنَّر 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 سَتَّار, with Kasr of the س, in the inf. n. of this, and ِتَسْتَدِير in the inf. n. of the second (Sn): except [in the case of] the determinative َد, when the vowel of the Hamza in such as َالْحَمْرَ ِلَّكَ ِبَايْمُ AlAhmar is standing; while ِلَّكَ ِبَايْمُ is weak: the difference [between this case and that of ِتَسْتَر] being that incorporative transfer [of a vowel] is more frequent than non-incorporative transfer (A); so that, with incorporation, that [conj. Hamza] which was before the transfer is not regarded (Sn). There is a dispute [among the BB (Sn)] as to whether the conj. Hamza be orig. quiescent or mobile, the first being the opinion of F, which is adopted by Shl; and the second the opinion of S, which is apparently correct, because every inceptive p. must be mobilized, like the َد 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 إِذْهَبٍ إِضْرَب ٍ[428, 667]; while, in such as أَخْرَجٍ إِذْهَبٍ [428], the Hamza is pronounced with دَلْمُ from dislike to the transition from كَسْرٍ to دَلْمُ [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 كَسْرٍ in إِذْهَبٍ إِضْرَبٍ, and دَلْمُ in أَخْرَجٍ إِذْهَبٍ; while, فَاتِحَ being disallowed in أَخْرَجٍ إِذْهَبٍ because of the liability to confusion with the aor. [below] in the state of pause, the Hamza is pronounced with كَسْرٍ, because this is lighter than دَلْمُ [below] (Tsr). The opinion of the BB is that the conj. Hamza is orig. pronounced with كَسْرٍ; but that in some positions it is pronounced with فَاتِحَ for lightness, and in some with دَلْمُ for alliteration. The KK, however, hold that its كَسْرٍ, and دَلْمُ in أَسْكِنَ dwell are for alliteration to [the vowel of] the third [lette.]. The absence of فَاتِحَ in إِذْهَبٍ know is adduced as an objection [to the saying of the KK (Sn)]; but it is replied that, if the Hamza were pronounced with فَاتِحَ 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 أَعْلَمُ I know, and with the pret. أَعْلَمُ 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 ال [663] (Aud, A), like الْجُنُبُ the man (Tsr), from frequency of usage (Tsr, Sn): (2) necessity for Damm, [vid. (A)] in (a) such passives as أَنْتَلَقَ أَسْتَنْخَرَجَ [436]: (b) the imp. of the tril. orig. pronounced with Damm of the ع, as أَكُتِبَ kill and أَكْتُبَ write, [from dislike to the transition from Kasr to Damm, because the quiescent barrier is not insuperable (Tsr, Sn) ]; contrary to إِمْشَوْا walk ye (Aud, A) and إِنْفَرْوَا judge ye (Aud), where the Hamza is pronounced with Kasr, because the ع is orig. pronounced with Kasr, the o. f. being إِمْشَيْوَا (Tsr, Sn) and إِنْفَرْوَا (Tsr): (a) sometimes the Hamza is pronounced with Kasr before an original دamma: this is transmitted by IJ from some of the Arabs; and the reason of it is that Kasr is the o. f. [664], while the Kasr and Damm do not [actually] meet, because of the separation by the quiescent between them: (b) the two
pronunciations are referable to taking; and not taking, the quiescent [barrier] into account (Tsr, Sn): (c) so in the Tsr; but Kasr is said to be a corrupt dial. var. (Sn): (3) preponderance of Ğamm over Kasr, [vid. (A)] where the Ğamm of the غ is accidentally made Kasr, as in غطٌ [428]: so says BD [in the C, following his father in the Kāsiya and the CK (Tsr)]: (a) F says in the Takmila that (a) the letter before the ی of the 2nd pers. sing. fem. must be pronounced with Ishmām (Aud, A), which here means what, according to Fr, is named Raum [640], vid. that the Ğamma 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 ی ] being necessary (Sn) for a notification of the original Ğamm (Tsr, Sn); and (b) the Hamza [must be pronounced] with pure Ğamm, [without Ishmām (Tsr)]: (b) IM says in the Tashil that the conj. Hamza is pronounced with Ishmām before the Ğamma 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 Ğamm of the Hamza (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (4) preponderance of Fath over Kasr, [vid. (A)] in یّمٌ
and [663] (Aud, A), because of the heaviness of the transition from Kasr of the Hamza to Ḍamm of the m, and afterwards of the n (Tsr): (5) preponderance of Kasr over Ḍamm, [vid. (A)] in the word [667] (Aud, A), because Kasr is lighter than Ḍamm, since Kasr brings one muscle, and Ḍamm two muscles, into operation (Tsr): (6) allowability of Ḍamm, Kasr, and Ishmaím, [vid. (A)] in such as ṣanāʿa and ḥulta when put into the pass. [436] (Aud, A), as [ and ṣanāʿa and ḥulta with Ḍamm, and (Tsr)] ṣanāʿa and ḥulta with Kasr or Ishmaím (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 Ḍamm, it may be pronounced with Kasr or Ḍamm, as ʿāntūla IV. 69. [below] and ʿāntūla LXXIII. 3. [664, 666] (A). In ʿāntūla ʿāntūla ʿāntūla ʿāntūla ʿāntūla ʿāntūla ʿāntūla ʿāntūla ʿāntūla ʿāntūla IV. 69. Saying, Kill yourselves, or go forth from your homes, IA1 and Yaʿkūb read ʿāntūla with Kasr of the n, according to the o. f. of mobilization [664]; and ʿāntūla with Ḍamm of the p, for alliteration, and [for] assimilation
to the, of the pl. in such as II. 238. [547, 664]: while Āsim and Ḥamza read with Kasr of both, according to the o. f.; and the remainder [read] with Ḍamm 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 أتقَّلُوا اقتَلُوا XL. 26. They said, Kill is excluded (Sn).

§. 669. Expression of any of these [conj.] Hamzas in the interior [of the sentences] 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 جَاءَوُرَآ أَلَح [below] (R, Jrb). The conj. Hamza, when preceded by what is not good to pause upon, must, in a case of choice, be elided: unless you stop your first speech, even if you do not pause [640], observing the rule of pause; [and begin again] after the time of the stoppage of the breath, or similar [interruption]. The poets sometimes do that, [i.e., make a stop] in [the beginnings of] hemistichs [below], because they are positions of separation; and begin [again] only after a stop, as

لا يُبَادِرُ في الْشَّتَآءِ وَلِيَّدًا ۗ أَنْتَدْرُ بِنِلَّهَا ۖ بِعَبْرِ جِعَالٍ
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, and from thy name. And the saying [of Kais Ibn AlKhaṭīm (IY, MN)]

إذا جاور ألانثييس سر فيّة ¥ يبشر وإفساء الكدديت قيّبٍ

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

is liable to dissemination, and multiplication by the tale-bearers (MN),] is a poetic license [below] (M). And like it is the saying of the other [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, inceptively (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 ١ [below]
Is God better, or what they associate [with Him]? (IY), because its elision would lead to confusion (M) of inquiry with announcement, since both [Hamzas] are pronounced with Fath; so that, if it were elided, one would not know whether the Hamza [sounded] was the interrog. [Hamza] or that [conj. Hamza] which accompanies the determinative ل [667]. For that reason, then, it is retained, [though in a modified form]; and is assimilated to the ل of أَخْبِرُ أَلَّهُ الْحَمْدَ [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 أَصْطَفَى أَبْنَاءٍ عَلَى أَبْنِينَ [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 ' to, while the second is putting it betwixt and between, as in \( \text{الْخَيْرُ الْأَلِيِّ} \) \( \text{الْحَمْزَةُ} \) \( [663] \) (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 \( \text{فَّتِحَة} \) \( 663,668 \) (Aud, A), which is (Sn)] the Hamza of \( \ddot{\text{اً}} \) and its subst. \( \ddot{\text{اً}} \) in the dial. of Himyar (Sn), and of \( \ddot{\text{اً}} \) and \( \ddot{\text{ثَمَّ}} \) (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] \( \text{فَّتِحَة} \) imported for separation, like the \( \ddot{\text{اً}} \) of \( \ddot{\text{إِسْرَائِيلٍ}} \) \( 497,610 \); 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 

الْكَسْنُ عَنْدَنَّ [below], which, but for the regard paid to its original vowel, would not be allowable, contrary to 

إِضْرَبَتْنَا [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 جَلُو and the Hamza of آيَمْسُ (Tsr). You [therefore (A)] say 

الْكَسْنُ آيَمْسُ عَنْدَنَّ [663], with prolongation, [by change (Aud),] more approvably; and with softening, less approvably, [but agreeably with analogy, as before mentioned (Sn)], whence
(1084)

(And, A), by Ḥassān Ibn Yasār 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 (Tṣr)] 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. (Tṣr) Hamza (Aud)] pronounced with Kasr, [which is the o. f. (664, 668) (Aud),] is elided, as یَا فَتْحُدْ نَا هُمْ سِخْرِيَا XXXVIII. 63. What! did we make of them a mockery?, [in the reading of others than ʿIAl and the Two Brothers (Tṣr),] this text being read with the interrog. Hamza by the two Ḥijāzīs and Ibn ʿĀmir and ʿĀṣim (B)]; and [as (Tṣr)] لَهُمْ لَاسْتَغْفِرْتُ وَاَلْلَّهُ LXIII. 6. [581, 543] (Aud, A), in the reading of all [the Seven]: the o. f. being یَا فَتْحُدْ نَا هُمْ and یَا فَتْحُدْ نَا هُمْ; with an interrog. Hamza pronounced with Fath, and then a conj. Hamza pronounced with Kasr; but the conj. Hamza being elided, because the interrog. Hamza enables it to be dispensed with (Tṣr): and as the [conj. Hamza] pronounced with ʿAmm is elided, as یَا فَتْحُدْ وَاَلْلَّهُ Was the man constrained? (A, Tṣr), the o. f. being یَا فَتْحُدْ with a Hamza pronounced with ʿAmm, 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 أَمَّا الْمَالِيْرَى إِلَى آَخِرُهُ [668] (Aud).

§ 670. When preceded by something spoken, no mobile initial of a word, besides the conj. أَ [669], is elided or altered, except the س of هُوَ and يَعِيُّ [161], which, when preceded by a ق or ف، or by a ل [of inception], is [often made] quiescent, as هُوَ ذَاعِبُ And he is going، لَهَوَّا خَيْرُ مَنْكِ Assuredly he is better than thou, and تَأَكَّمٌ Then he is standing, and similarly with يَعِيُّ [319]. But many of the Arabs leave the س with these ps. in its [original] state. And they do the like of that to the imp. ل with the ﺃَ and ﻤَ، as in your saying ﻲَلَيْسَ ﺩُوْرُ Then let him look and ﻲَلَيْسَ ﺤُضُرُ And let him strike; while those who leave the س of هُوَ and يَعِيُّ in its [original] state leave the Kasra of the ل in its [original] state (S). As for the quiescence of the س in هُوَ and يَعِيُّ [above], and لَهَوَّا، and لَهَوَّا، and لَهَوَّا، it is accidental, [but] elegant (SH), i.e., used by elegant speakers, contrary
to II. 282. [below], and to such as منتصبًا [below], from the frequency of its usage in the first [set of exs.] (R). And so is [the quiescence of] the imp. ل, as أَهْوَأَ رَأَيْتُم XXII. 30. And let them pay their vows [below]. And such as لَيْقُضُوا بَعْضٌ XXII. 30. [603] are assimilated to the foregoing. But such as أَنَّ يُبْلِعْ مَرَّةَ II. 282. That he himself should dictate [above] is rare (SH). If it be said “The initials of these words are quiescent, as in the texts رَهْوُ حُكْمٌ كَلْمَةً II. 213. [464, 539] لَهُمُ حُيْرُ أَلْلَهِ [543], فَهِيَ كَمُكْحَبْرَةٍ XXII. 57. Assuredly He is the Best of Providers, فُلْتِنَفْقُ XXIX. 64. Assuredly it is life, فُلْتِنَفْقُ LXV. 7. Let him expend, II. 282. [above], and in the saying of the poet فَقَلْتُ أَهْوَأَ سُرْتُ عَلَهُ [543]; so that, according to what you have mentioned [667], the conj. Hamza must be put, whereas it does not occur here,” IH answers that their quiescence is accidental, as is proved by your saying هُوَ وَثُمَّ [161], and لَيْنَفْقُ LXV. 7. [419, 603]: but that, وَهُوَ وَثُمَّ and حَيْيَ [368], quiescence [of the medial] is allowed as elegant with the, and ف and ل [of inception], because they become like part [of the pron.], in addition to [their] frequency of usage; while what contains the [interrog.] Hamza is assimilated to [what contains] the
[three ps.] mentioned, because, though not so frequent, it is *unil*.; and similarly what contains قَمْ, because it is copulative, like the رِّيْبِ and فَ [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 هُنَّا and حَيْثُ with the copulative رِّيْبِ and فَ, and [with the ل of inception and] the *interrog.* Hamza, and similarly the *imp.* ل that is preceded by a رِّيْبِ or فَ, 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 رَهْتَ and فَهْتَ being assimilated to عَصَدْ, and such as قَمْهُ and فَهْتَ to كَثِفْ; and so is it said of [the *imp.* ل in] XXII. 30. [above]: so that they are made quiescent only because they are treated like the medial of the word; and how should a *conj.* Hamza be imported for what is like the medial of a word [667]? And grant that it be not like the medial, is it not non-inceptive? And is not the *conj.* Hamza imported for accidental quiescence also, in the initial of a word, when it is inceptive [658, 667], since you say اسم اسم notwithstanding that اسم اسم occurs, and similarly اسم اسم and اسم اسم [667]? He ought therefore to say
that the Hamza is not imported [in ُهُرُ, 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 ُهُرُ and ُهُرُ آُهُ and ُهُرُ ُهُرُ ُهُرُ; and, for this reason, the alleviation [of the ُهُرُ by elision of its vowel] is rarer in their case: while ُهُرُ ُهُرُ and ُهُرُ ُهُرُ ُهُرُ, alleviation of the ُهُرُ being allowable in them, according to what is read in the Kur (R). As for ُهُرُا ُهُرُ…
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 Nafî', 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 fulfil [603] their purification, with quiescence of the imp. of, by assimilation of to the and, because it is a con., like them; while the BB deem that inelegant, because is independent, [susceptible of being] paused upon (R). Those who say XXII. 30. [above], with quiescence of the assimilate the second of to the and, treating as on a par with; and this is like their saying I see thee puffed up, meaning, the of being assimilated to, and the therefore made quiescent; and like it is

Then it passed the right erect, and did not contract [above] (IY). And II. 282. [above] is read anomalously, with quiescence of the s, by treating [in


like عَضْدُ : but it is inelegant, because بِيَلَ is an independent word, and cannot be assimilated to the con., as تَمْ is; and the saying نُبَاتُ مُنْتَصِبًا آلَحُ [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 (IV). Mobilization of the ۤ in هُرِ and هِيَ 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 ١ of ١ضَارَب١١ and the ١ of ١مَّضَرْوب١١ [369]; or for a kind of extension in the vocabulary, like the ١ of ١جِمَآر١١ [374, 401], the ١ of ١عَمْر١١ [246], and the ١ of ١سَعِيد١١ [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 ٤٥ضَرَن٤٥ [a rugged place (Jrb)] is co-ordinated [375, 731] (SH) with ٤٥جَغَت٤٥.
for which reason they say 

\[ \text{[253]} \] and 

\[ \text{[274]} \], as they say 

\[ \text{[245]} \] and 

\[ \text{[274]} \] (Jrb).

But such as 

\[ \text{[333, 361, 372, 676]} \] is not co-ordinated, 

although and may be formed from it (Jrb),] because the augment is proved to be regularly put for another purpose (SH), vid. indication of the \text{inf. n.} \[ \text{[333]} \], or of the \text{time or place} \[ \text{[361]} \]; and because a co-ordinative letter does not occur at the beginning (Jrb). And similarly [also (Jrb)] such as 

\[ \text{[488]} \], 

\[ \text{[489]} \], and 

\[ \text{[490]} \] (SH) are not co-ordinated 

\[ \text{[483]} \] (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 \text{conjugs.} \[ \text{[488-490]} \] (Jrb); and because their \text{inf. ns.} occur different (SH) from the \text{inf. n.} of 

\[ \text{[483]} \], being 

\[ \text{[332]} \] (MASH). The meaning of co-ordination 

\[ \text{[673]} \] in the \text{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 \text{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 *aged, impotent* is different from that of *corn in the blade*, and the meaning of *included, and similarly* [below] is not i. q. *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* [351] denotes *superiority* [354]; and the *aug.* *in* denotes the *inf. n.* [333], or the *time or place* [361], and in *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 مُفَاعَلاة [332, 490] (A): (2) co-ordination, as in (a) [the of (A)] [369, 374, 675], the of صَيْرُ [373] and عَتِيْر [374], the of أَرْطَّةَ and ٌرَعْشَن [673], and the ن of عَكَّفَل [below] and ٌرَعْشَن [375, 677] (A): (a) co-ordination [above], as [defined by IM] in the Tashril, is making a tril. or quad. to be commensurable with what is above it [in number of letters]; and what is meant, says Dm, is commensurability in appearance, since, in reality, the measure is different; for the measure of جُعَقَر [above], e. g., is قَوْعَل [392], while the measure of كُوَرَ [283, 675] is قَوْعَل [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 رسَالَة [246], the of صَكِيفَة [246], and the و of حَلْوَة [267] (A): (4) compensation, as in [the ل of (A)] زَدَادَة [265] (A, Tsr) and إِتَامَة [265, 338], the of س يُسْطِيعُ [680], and the م of آَلِلَّهَم [52, 56] (A): (5) magnification of the sense, and (Sn) multiplication (A, Tsr) of the letter (Sn), as in the م of مُسْتَهْم and زُرْقَم [667, 676, 681. A], which is added to denote magnification of the sense, and multiplication
[of the indicator (Sn)] thereof (A); and hence [the l of (A)] [272, 401, 673] (A, Tsr) and كُتَّبَ ۧ (401, 673) (A): (6) making [articulation (Tsr)] possible, as in (a) the conj. l [667] (A, Tsr), because it is not possible to begin with a quiescent (A); (b) the s of silence in [such as و and (A)] تُقَة [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 سُلْطَانَیٰ LXIX. 29. [615, 648] (Tsr); and hence the s of silence in such as مالیمیٰ LXIX. 28. [648, 679] and يَا زِیْدَا (48, 55, 679), which is added to make the vowel plain [in the former (Sn)], and the l [perfectly (Sn)] plain (A) in the latter (Sn): so says IU (Tsr). The letters of augmentation (IY, SH), [i. e.] the aug. letters (M), are [ten letters, vid. the Hamza, the l, the s, the ی, the ن, the ت, the س, the م, the و, and the l (IY), comprised in the (mnemonic) phrases (M, Jrb)] (1-3) [یَا أَوْسُ هَلْ نَمْتَ [369, 401] (M, SH), which somebody has combined in a verse, vid

بيا اوُسٍ هل نمت وَلَمْ يَا تَنَى سَهُو

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

And Solomon came to him (M), 114a
which is not good, because it contains a duplication of the ٰی (IY): (5) (M, SH): (a) it is said that a pupil asked his master about the letters of augmentation, and he said ٰی (IY): 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 ٰی To-day thou dost forget it [above], and the pupil said “By God, assuredly I do forget it”: and then the master said “I have answered thee twice, O stupid” (R): (6) (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 ٰی (b) Z [followed by IH] says ٰی, making ٰی precede, in order that the [conj.] Hamza may not be elided [669], in the interior [of the phrase], in which case the number of the letters of augmentation would be deficient; whereas,
when he begins with it, the Hamza is expressed: (7) He left me, and lost his way: (8) Death forgets him (IY): They question one another: (9) What thou hast asked is light: (10) They [fem.] sought, or Seek ye [fem.], my love: (11) 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

(12) 

(R) I asked the augmentative letters about their name; and they then said, nor begrudged saying, "Those letters are collected in [below]" (Jsh). The meaning of their being letters of augmentation is not that they are only aug., since there is no letter among them that is not rad. in many positions; but the meaning is that, when a letter is added to a word, then that added [letter] is only one of these letters, unless the added letter be reduplicative, whether the reduplication be co-ordinative, as in [above]; or non-co-ordinative, as in interpreted [489]; where the and 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 جَلْبَبَ amassed; or others, as in قْرَدْدُ set free: and is co-ordinative, as in قْرَدْدُ جَلْبَبَ \[731\]; and non-co-ordinative, as in عَلْمَ [above]. But that [aug. letter] which is co-ordinative, yet not reduplicative, is [taken] only from the letters of أَلْيَوَمَ تنْسَاهُ [above], as in ئَجْدُوْلُ \[369, 374, 675\], زْرَقُمُ [above], and عَبْدَل [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 سَأَلْتُمْ بِهَا [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 جَلْبَبَ [above] and جِلْبَبْ [385]: (2) the ع, (a) with union, as in قْتَلَ slaughtered [489]; (b) with separation by an aug. [between them (Tsr)], as in عَقْتَنُقَلِ [384, 677]: (3) the ف and ع, as in مَّرْمِيسِ [370]: (4) the ع and ج, as in ضَحْمَحَ [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 ُسبَحَّةٌ [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 مَرَمَرَةٌ [above], the third and fourth, i.e., the second م and the subsequent ر: and some adduce as evidence of the augmentativeness of the first ح in ُسبَحَّةٌ, and of the second م in مَرَمَرَةٌ, their elision in the dim., as ُسبَيْنَحٌ and مَرَمَرَةٌ [283]. But it is transmitted from the KK that the measure of ُسبَحَّةٌ is ُتَقْلَدَلَلٌ, its o. f. being ُسبَحَّةٌ, where they change the middle ح into م (Tsr). As for that [duplicate] which resembles the ف alone, as in قرَتْف [wine (Tsr)] and سُندُس [thin silk brocade (Tsr)], or the ء separated [from its duplicate] by a rad., as in حَذَرَةٌ Hadrad, [a man's name (Jh, Tsr), whence Abu Hadrad alAslamî, a Companion (KF), while no other ُتَقْلَدَلَلٌ, with repetition of the ء, occurs (Jh, KF, Tsr), and ُلَكَدْرَدُ 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 سِبْسَمٌ [311, 674, 677] (Aud), the measure of which is ُتَعْلَلُ [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 ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ , it ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ being repeated; but this is improbable (Tsr): (2) if its third be omissible, as in ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ i. q. ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ reunited it, that third is, (a) as the KK say, an *aug.* substituted for a letter resembling the second (Aud), the o. f. of ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩, according to their saying, being ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩, where, the succession of three similars being deemed heavy, they substitute for one of them a letter resembling the ٢٢٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩: but this is refuted by the fact that they say ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ for its *inf. n.* [332]; whereas, if ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ were *orig.* [a *tril.*] reduplicated [in the medial], its *inf. n.* would occur on [the measure of] ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ (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 ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ a repeated [formation] agreeing in sense with the reduplicated *tril.*, as the BB say of its similars, like ٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ I crushed, ٢٢٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ I restrained, and ٢٢٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ 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

٢٢٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ (Aud), i. e. (1) in ٢٢٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ *Congratulation and*
salutation (are a matter that), (2) in َيَوْمٍ أَنْسَهِ َنَهَايَةٍ has followed the day of his friendliness, (3) in أَمَانُ َمُسْوَلٍ an utmost craving (of desire), and (4) in ِتُسْهِيِلَ protection and facilitation [above] (Jsh).

And they ought to reckon the َشُ in such as َأُكَرِّمْتُكُشْنَ I honored thee [617, 680], in the 2nd pers. fem.; for, if they say "This is peculiar to pause", we say "And so is the َسُ of silence" [615, 644, 679] (Tsr). Mb omits the َسُ 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 َى and َى are heavy, it is [said of them] in relation to the َل [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 َل in outlet [732], and is convertible into a soft letter upon alleviation [658]: (2) the َسُ also is adjacent to the َل in outlet [732] (Jrb, Tsr), while Akh asserts that their outlet is one; and it is faint; and is sometimes substituted for the َهُذِهُ in َعَكَاةٍ [690], and for the َى in َعَكَاةُ [171, 174, 275, 648, 690] (Jrb); (3) the َمُ is [uttered]
from the outlet of the ج [732], vid. the lip; and contains a nasality [akin to the softness of the soft letters (Jrb)]:

(4) the ن [also (Jrb)] contains nasality [270]; and is prolonged in the upper part of the nose, like the ل in the throat: (5) the ت is a surd [734] letter; and is substituted for the ج in تِجَا [Jrb, Tsr] and تِجَا [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 سَتَ for سَتَ [759], the converse of which is سَتَ,

orig. سَتَ [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 مَلَدَنَة

XVIII. 2. [205], and the ن of protection is sometimes elided with it in لَعَلَّي [170], as with its like in إِنَّ لَهُ and كَأَنَّ [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 فعلَ.
[below] (Tsr). There must be a measure, whereby the \textit{aug.} may be differentiated from the \textit{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 \textit{فعل} [below], because it is the most general of the \textit{vs.} in sense, and may be employed for every \textit{act}, as \textit{فعل الضرب} \textit{He did striking} and \textit{فعل النصر} \textit{He did helping}, whence \textit{أمحم للَّدُّكُوة} \textit{فعِلُون}. XXIII. 4. And who are doers of almsgiving, i. e., مَزْجُونُ almsgivers (Jrb), where \textit{الَّدُّكُوة} алmsgiving (K). What is intended is the crude-form of \textit{فعل} [above], not its conformation, since the measure does not always keep to this conformation (Sn). The \textit{rads.} are represented [in the measure] by the \textit{ف}, [then (Aud)] the \textit{ع}, and [then (Aud)] the \textit{ل} [368, 369,] (SH, Aud), in the order imported from the word “then” (Tsr); and such [\textit{rads.} (R, Jrb)] as exceed [three (R, Jrb)] by a second or third \textit{ل} (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 \textit{rad.} and \textit{aug.} (A),] you represent its \textit{rads.} by [the letters of \textit{فعل}, the first by (A)] the \textit{ف}, [the second by (A)] the \textit{ع}, and [the third by (A)] the \textit{ل} (R, A), i. e.,
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 "ضَرِبَ struck is on the measure of فعل [below] (R). You, therefore, say (1) قَعَلْ [with quiescence of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] [368] (Aud, A), among *ns.* (Tsr): (2) فَعَلْ (Aud, A), with Fath of the [ ف and (A)] ع (A, Tsr), for [the measure of (Tsr)] ضَرِبَ [above] (Aud, A), among *vs.* (Tsr); and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] [403, 482] (Aud, A), in the hollow (Tsr), and شَدَّ [482] (Aud, A), in the reduplicated (Tsr), because their o. f. [before conversion or incorporation (Tsr, Sn)] is قَوِمَ [403, 684, 703] and شَدَّ [731]: (3) فَعَلْ [with Kasr of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] [432, 440, 482]; and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] حَابَ [in the hollow (Tsr)] and مِلَّ (Aud, A) in the reduplicated (Tsr), because their o. f. is حَابَ [403, 684, 703] and مِلَّ loathed, was weary of [731] (Tsr, Sn), with Kasr of their second (Sn): (4) فَعَلْ [with دام of the ع (Tsr)] for [the measure of (Tsr)] طَرَفَ [331, 432, 482]; and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] حَبَّ [482] and حَبَّ [476] (Aud, A), because their o. f. is حَبَّ [403, 684, 703] and حَبَّ [731] (Tsr, Sn), with دام of their second (Sn). And
by that means the explanation of the original vowels and quiescences is effected (Tsr). Then, if any of the rads. of the word remain, you add (1) a second J in [the measure of (Tsr)] the quad., saying جَعْفَر for [the measure of (Tsr)] جَعْفَر [392]: (2) a second and third [ J (Tsr)] in [the measure of (Tsr)] the quin., saying جَعْفَرُ for [the measure of (Tsr)] جَعْفَرُ [245, 401] (Aud). What IHsh mentions as to the measurement of the tril. is agreed upon. But what he mentions as to the measurement of the non-tril. is disputed, there being two opinions, (1) what he mentions, which is the saying of the BB, founded on [the theory] that the whole [of the letters in the quad. and quin.] are rads.; and is correct: (2) that whatever [letter] exceeds three is aug., which is said by the KK, being founded upon their theory that the extreme number of rads. is three [368]. Then they diverge into three opinions, (1) that the non-tril. is not measurable, because the mode of measuring it is not known; (2) that it is measurable, but that its final is represented by its own letter; (3) that it is measurable, but that its penultimate is represented by its own letter: which [divergence between the second and third opinions] is founded upon the question whether the aug. [in the quad.] be the final or the penultimate, the first [opinion] being held by Fr, and the second by Ks [368]. Thus, as to whether [the
measure of [392], as the BB say, or \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \) [392], as the BB say, or \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \) with the \( \text{aug.} \), or \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \) with the \( \text{ف} \) \( \text{aug.} \), or what it is be not known, there are four [different] sayings (Tsr). And the \( \text{aug.} \) is represented by its own [original] letter, [in order that it may be differentiated from the \( \text{rad.} \) (Tsr)], so that one says (1-3) \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \), and for [the measure of (Tsr)] \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \) [332, 482, 674], and \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \) [482, 675] (Aud), with the \( \text{aug.} \). Hamza, ى, and, respectively (Tsr): (4) for [the measure of (Tsr)] [667] (Aud), with the \( \text{aug.} \). Hamza and ﺃ (Tsr); and similarly for [the measure of (Tsr)] ﺍ \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \) [692, 756] and ﺍ \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \) [693, 756], because the o. f. is ﺍ \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \) and ﺍ \( \text{جَعَّافَر} \) [332, 482, 483, 493] (Aud), where the numbers of the \( \text{augs.} \) and \( \text{rads.} \) are equal (Tsr). When, however, the \( \text{aug.} \) is a repetition of a \( \text{rad.} \), [whether co-ordinate or not (Tsr),] it is represented, (1) according to the majority, by what that \( \text{rad.} \) is represented by (Aud), because, repetition of the \( \text{rad.} \) in the science of etymology being on a par with lit. corroboration [132] in the science of syntax, as that [lit. corrob.] is given the predicament of the \( \text{ant.} \), and therefore imitates it in its inflection, so this [repetitive \( \text{aug.} \)] is measured by the same measure as the \( \text{rad.} \), in order to make known that
this is a repetition of what precedes \( (Tsr) \), as in your saying \( \text{إِفُرُدُدُنَ} \), for \( \text{فُعُلُون}, \text{فُغِيلِدُن} \), and \( \text{ائية فُلُون} \), \( \text{starting of rain and wind} \ (Tsr, Sn) \) — so says \( \text{سُبُدَدُن} (Sn) \), and \[482, 483, 675\] \( \text{(Aud)} \), respectively, the \( \text{[second]} \) in \( \text{سُكْنُون} \), \( \text{جَلْتِيت} \), and \( \text{جَلْتِيت} \) \( \text{being for co-ordination with} \) \( \text{جَلْتِيت} \) \( [253, 396, 674, 677] \) and \( \text{جَلْتِيت} \) \( \text{cartilage} \) \( [396] \), respectively; while the \( \text{[second]} \) \( \text{سُكْنُون} \) \( \text{in} \) \( \text{إِفُرُدُدُنَ} \) \( \text{is non-co-ordinative} \) ; (2) according to some, by its own letter, unrestrictedly, even though it is a repetition of a \text{rad.} \); so that one says \( \text{إِفُرُدُدُنَ} \), \( \text{فُعُلُون}, \text{فُغِيلِدُن} \), and \( \text{ائية فُلُون} \), \( \text{ والن} \) \( \text{جَلْتِيت} \), \( \text{جَلْتِيت} \), \( \text{جَلْتِيت} \), \( \text{جَلْتِيت} \), and \( \text{جَلْتِيت} \) \( \text{respectively} \) \( (Tsr) \). The \text{aug.}, (1) when it is not one of the letters of \( \text{أَمَانٌ وَتُهْيِل} \) \( \text{[above]} \), is a duplicate of a \text{rad.}, like the \( \text{جَلْبَب} \) \( \text{in} \) \( \text{جَلْبَب} \) \( \text{[above]} \); (2) if it be one of them, is (a) a duplicate, as in \( \text{مَيْل} [661, 738] \) : (b) not a duplicate; but having the semblance of a duplicate, though some evidence, \( \text{[like the extraordinariness of} \) \( \text{فَعَلْلَ} \) \( \text{without repetition of the} \) \( \text{ف} \) \( \text{and} \) \( \text{ع} \) \( \text{(Sn)} \), \] \( \text{indicates} \) that reduplication is not intended by it, in which case it is represented in the measure by its own letter, as in \( \text{سَمَنُون\ Samnān, a [place wherein is (Sn) water belonging to the Banu Rabī'a, the measure of which is} \) \( \text{فَعَلْلَ} \), \( \text{not} \) \( \text{فَعَلْلَ} \), because \( \text{فَعَلْلَ} \) \( \text{is an extraordinary measure,} \)
no instance of which occurs without repetition [of the جرَّ عَالٍ (Sn)] as in [273, 332, 396], except جرَّ عَالٍ تَهْفَاقٍ [396] and جرَّ عَالٍ تَهْفَاقٍ denoting [hard (Jh, KF)] stone, [to which the KF adds جَسْطَالٍ dust and جَسْطَالٍ oats (Sn).] while Bahrām and شَهْرَامْ Shahrām are foreign (A) proper names: (c) not a duplicate, nor in the semblance of one, like the Hamza in أَكْرَمْ [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 جَعُلْ and مَفْعُولٌ for the measure of ذَرَّ [331] and repelling, respectively, because their o. f. is ذَرَّ and مَرْدَ (A); and similarly, as before mentioned, قَامٌ and شَدَّ, because their o. f. is قَومٌ and شَدَّ; and so هُابٌ and مَلِّ, and حَبْبٌ طَالٍ and حَبْبٌ [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 ráds.], you put the like [transfer or elision] in the measure, saying (1) مَلَعْ for [the measure of (Tsr)] نَسٍ [pret. of يَنْتَأَ (Tsr), a dial. var. of i. q. بَعْدُ was far away (Jh)], because it is from نَأَي (Aud), the o. f. being نَأَي; but the ج, vid. the ش, being transferred to the position of the ع, vid. the Hamza, so that it becomes نَأَيّ; and the ي then converted into ل [684, 703], because mobile, and preceded by a
letter pronounced with Fath; so that it becomes َّنَّا (Tsr): \text{\item[2]} \text{for [the measure of (Tsr)]} ٥٠٣٧٠٣ (Aud), the o. f. being ُبَعْ (Tsr): \text{\item[3]} \text{for [the measure of (Tsr)]} ٨٢٦٦٩٩ (Aud), the o. f. being ُبَعْ, because it is \text{orig. ىَفْعُل} with Kasr [of the َّع], and is afterwards pronounced with Fath because of the guttural letter; so that the elision is from َّنَّل* with Kasr: so says \text{Sd on ٨٢٦} and its congeners (Tsr): \text{\item[4]} َّلَلَّ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ٧٠٣٧٠٣ (Aud), \text{imp. of َّعَبْ, the o. f. being َّبْعَ, but its َّع being elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents [٦٦٣] (Tsr): \text{\item[5]} َّعَلَّ for [the measure of (Tsr)] ٧٦٣٧٦٣ (Aud), the َّل of which is elided, the o. f. being َّعَبْ, but its َّل being elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents [٦٦٣]. The measurement of some words is impracticable, like
and Jil/M [382, 679, 680], because we consider the original vowel and quiescence; and, the ف in those [words] being orig. quiescent, while the س and ژ [also] are quiescent, a concurrence of two quiescents would ensue in the measure; so that the right course is to say اَنْعَلَ for their measure, because they are orig. أَطْوَعَ and أَرِيقَ أَطْوَعَ, the س and ژ being aug. (Tsr). IM says (Aud), in the Alfiya (Tsr), The letter, if it be insep-arable [from the word in all its variations (A)], is a rad.; while that which is not insep-arable, [but is elided in some of the variations (A),] is the aug., like the ط of اَحْتَذِئَ [below] (IM). Thus he defines the rad. letter as being that which is insep-arable in all the variations, and the aug. as being that which is not insep-arable in all the variations; while he exemplifies the latter by the ط of اَحْتَذِئَ, which is aug., because it is elided in some of the variations (Tsr), since you say حَدَّا حَدَّوَةٌ (A, Tsr), i.e., as in the KF (Sn), did as he did (KF, Sn); so that, by the elision of the ط [in حَدَّوَةٌ and حَدَّدَ], you know that it is aug. in اَخْتَذِئَ was imitated, or was put on or worn (A). اَخْتَذَدُكَ is imitation; or putting on, or wearing, sandals (Tsr). One says اَخْتَذَدَتُهُ اَخْتَذَدُتَهُ is imitated [and] اَخْتَذَدَتُهُ مِقَالَةً [imitated his example (Jh, KF), i.e. اَخْتَذَدَتْهُ (Jh, KF, A); and
also (A)

The foot-sore barefooted man puts on any sandal, or wore, sandals, i.e., whence

The foot-sore barefooted man puts on any sandal, being a sandal [329] (Jh, A). But [both (Tsr)] the definitions require consideration:—the first [definition, vid. that of the *rad. (Tsr),] because the of [253, 373] and the of [392, 395] are *aug., as you will [soon (Tsr)] recognize [675, 677], notwithstanding that they are not elided [in all the variations (Tsr)]; and the second [definition, vid. that of the *aug. (Tsr),] because the of , the of , and the of are *rads., notwithstanding that they are elided in [482, 699], [663, 703], and [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 is excluded [from it], while such as the is included [in it]; and the definition of the *aug., because the second is excluded from it, while the first is included in it (Sn). And the accurate formula for recognition of the *augs. would be "Know that a letter is not judged to be *aug., unless the remaining letters of the word exceed two *rads. (Aud). But [IUK replies that (Tsr)] the
rad., when elided for unsoundness, [like the ِیِذَدُ (A),] is constructively present, [contrary to the aug. (Tsr)]; while the aug., when inseparable, [like the ِن of ُقْرَنْفُ and the ِکُوْکَبِ (A),] is constructively elided. And therefore the 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 o. f., like the elision of the ِل of ُصَارِبُ [343, 369, 373] in its o. f., i. e., the inf. n. [331]; (b) a deriv. form, like the elision of the ِل of ُکَتْبِ [above] in its pl. ُکُتْبُ [246, 256]; (c) a counterpart, like the elision of the ِیِذَلُ [674] in ِیِذَلُلَل [368], [which is like ُیِذَلُلَل in sense and crude-form (Sn)]: (a) the condition requisite, in order that elision of the letter from an o. f., a deriv. form, or a counterpart, may be adducible as an indication of its augmentativeness, is that its elision should not be for unsoundness; for, if its elision be for unsoundness, like the elision of the ِیِذَدُ in ِیِذَدُلُلَل [above], or in ِعدَة [401, 482, 699], it is not a indication of augmentativeness: (4, 5) the letter's occupying, in the non-deriv. [word containing it (Sn)], a position wherein it is aug. in the deriv., (a) invariably, like the ِن [673, 677], when it occurs as a quiescent, unincorporated, third, and is followed by two letters, as in ُرَنْفُلِل [675, 677], which is an evil, [a calamity, and
a great matter (KF),] [677], which is thick in the hands and feet, and which is a mountain, the 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 جْكَنْتُل [677], which in the solid-hoofed [animal] is like شَتْة lip in man, جْكَنْتُل 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 أَرْنُب [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 [249, 372]: (6) its being peculiar to, [i. e., found in (Sn),] a position wherein only a letter of augmentation occurs, like the of [such as (Sn)] كَنَّتَو (A), with which [380] is synomymous (Sn); and of such as كَنَّتَو [301, 380], سَنَّدَو, and كَنَّتَو [301, 380], جَنْثَا, 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 تَتْنَفَلْ [372, 678] with Fath of the first ت, and Damm of the ف, meaning the young of the fox; for its [first] ت is aug., because, if it were held to be rad., the measure of تَتْنَفَلْ would be جَعَلَل [392], which is not found: (b) the counterpart of the word to which that letter belongs, as in تَتْنَفَلْ [372], according to the dial. of those who pronounce the [first] ت and the ف with Damm; for its [first] ت is aug., according to this dial. also, because, although unprecedentedness would not ensue [in this dial. var.] from the assumption of radicalness, since, if the ت were held to be rad., the measure of تَتْنَفَلْ would be جَعَلَل, which is found, as تَنْتَنَعْ [392], still unprecedentedness does ensue in its counterpart, i. e., the dial. var. with Fath; so that the ت, when its augmentativeness is established in the dial. var. with Fath, is judged to be aug. in the dial. var. with Damm also, since the rule [in dial. vars.] is identity of crude-form: (9) the letter's indicating a meaning, like the aoristic letter [369, 404] and the ل 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 كَتْنَفَلْ [394, 677], [according to the dial. of those who pronounce the ب with Damm, as is proved by what follows (Sn),] since its measure, upon the assumption of the radicalness of the ت, is جَعَلَل.
[with Damm of the second Ġ (Sn)], like سْفَرْجُل with Damm of the ج, which is not found [401]; and, on the assumption of its augmentativeness, is فَتْعُلُ [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 IAز 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 أَرْنُب (M) and أُذَهَبُ [249], أَصْمَرُ [671], أَنْكِنُ [671], I go and أَجْلِسُ I sit (IY), and أُكْرُمُ [671] (M): (a) that is because the Hamza, when initial, is prevalently
and frequently *aug.* in those words whose derivation is recognizable, as in ُخْمَرُ أَحُمْرُ [above], أَخْضَرُ أَصْفَرُ [249], أَخْضَرُ إِجْفَيْلُ [above], إِخْرِيطُ إِجْفَيْلُ [379], from ُخْمَرُ redness, صْفْرَة yellowness, and ُخْضَرَة greenness, went and جُدَّس sat, taking fright and fleeing, and جُرْط defoliation; and is therefore decided to be *aug.* in those words of that class which are uncertain [in derivation], as أَفْكَلُ أَرْتَب [above], أَيْنَع [below], أَبْلَمُ (IY), n. un. of أَبْلَمُ [372] (Jh), and صْبَع [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 أَفْكَلُ is said by them to be like ُخْفَرُ [392]: but S refutes them by the argument that أَفْكَلُ [18], if used as a name, would necessarily be diptote; whereas, if it were ُفَعَلُ [392], it would be triptote: and also that, if it were ُفَعَلُ, a formation whose initial is Hamza would be allowable in the conjug. of ُفَعَلُ, aor. يَفْعَلُ, inf. n. ُفَعَلْلَا (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 ُعَمَّة [374] and *عَمَّة weak-minded* (M), because there is no *cp.* like ُعَمَّة; while, if we judged
the Hamza in them to be *aug.*, the word would be of the *cat.* of مَكَبَّرٍ and مَكَبَّرٍ [357, 674], which is rare, not to be acted upon (IY): (b) that both matters should be allowable, as in أَلْقَى [below] (M): (α) the Hamza, if accompanied by a letter that may be *aug.*, as in أَيَّدَعُ [249, 674] and أَيْصَرُ a short tent- rope, with which the lower part of the tent is fastened to the peg, is not judged to be *aug.* [below], except upon proof: for the Hamza is one of the letters of augmentation, and so is the ي; except that the [usual] way is to judge the Hamza to be *aug.*, because the Hamza, when first, is prevalently *aug.*, in comparison with the ي when second: so that in أَيَّدَعُ the Hamza is *aug.*, because of what we have mentioned; and because they say I dyed it with أَيَّدَعُ, *inf.* n. أَيَّدَعُ, [with elision of the Hamza,] this being a proof that the Hamza is *aug.*: while in أَيْصَرُ, if we were left to analogy, the Hamza would be *aug.*, because of the prevalence of [augmentativeness in] the Hamza when initial; but they say in the *pl.* أَصَارُ, as ذَاءَ تَبِينُهُنَّ أَلاَّ أَصَارُ

*And this unites between them the short tent-ropes*; so that the elision of the ي is an indication that it is *aug.* (IY): (β) the language of [IY and] IM intimates that, when the Hamza precedes three [letters], of which the whole are not certainly *rad.*, but one is
ambiguous, the Hamza is not judged to be \textit{aug.} [above], except by reason of some indication: but this is contrary to what IM decisively asserts in the Tashil, which is the well-known [rule], vid. that, when the Hamza precedes three letters, one of which admits of being \textit{rad.} or \textit{aug.}, the Hamza is judged to be \textit{aug.}, and that ambiguous [letter] to be \textit{rad.}, unless some indication exists to the contrary, for which reason the Hamza of \textit{\textit{أئ}} [673] and \textit{\textit{أي}} [above] is judged to be \textit{aug.}; but that, if some indication shows the Hamza to be \textit{rad.}, and that ambiguous [letter] to be \textit{aug.}, one judges accordingly, as the Hamza of \textit{\textit{أر}} and \textit{\textit{أول}} [below] is judged to be \textit{rad.}, according to those who say \textit{\textit{أديم مأر}} [673] and \textit{\textit{مألوني}} [below]: (γ) such as \textit{\textit{أر}} [673] is excluded [from the presumption that the Hamza in such a position is \textit{aug.}], since \textit{\textit{مأر}} and \textit{\textit{مأر}} have been heard for \textit{dyed with} [the leaves of (Jh on \textit{\textit{أر}} [673]: he that says \textit{مأر} makes the Hamza \textit{rad.}, and the \textit{aug.}; while he that says \textit{مأر} makes the Hamza \textit{aug.}, and the \textit{aug.} a \textit{subst.} for a \textit{rad.}: and, according to the first, the measure of \textit{\textit{أر}} is \textit{\textit{نعلای}}, its \textit{aug.} for co-ordination; so that, if used as a name, \textit{\textit{أر}} [18] would be diptote, because of the quality of proper name and [the \textit{\textit{أر}} of (Sn)] quasi-femininization, [which is the \textit{\textit{أر}} of co-ordination (Sn)]: while, according to the second, its
measure is انْعَلٌ; 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 مَأَرْطُطٍ are more numerous [than those of امْرَطُطٍ], since they say امْرَطُطٍ. I dyed the hide with [the leaves of] امْرَطُطٍ, and امْرَطُطٍ The camels ate امْرَطُطٍ, [act. part. امْرَطُطٍ, as our Master has written after it (Sn).] and امْرَطُطٍ The land produced امْرَطُطٍ; while امْرَطُطٍ The land produced امْرَطُطٍ, [inf. n. امْرَطُطٍ, as in the KF (Sn).] is also said: (5) similarly امْرَطُطٍ [above] (A): as for امْرَطُطٍ [674], which is a kind of madness (IY), it is said that (A) the Hamza [in it (IY)] is rad., [and the امْكَ التَّرْجُلٌ] because they say امْكَ التَّرْجُلٌ. The man was demented, [a pass. formation (Sn), i. q. جِنَّ (A).] pass. part. مَأَلْوَقٌ demented (IY, A), upon the measure of مَأَلْوَقٌ (Jh), which is a proof that the Hamza is rad., and the امْكَ التَّرْجُلٌ (IY); and its measure then is امْكَ التَّرْجُلٌ (IY, Sn), like امْكَ التَّرْجُلٌ [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 امْكَ التَّرْجُلٌ [above]; while in امْكَ التَّرْجُلٌ the Hamza may be orig. a, which is converted into Hamza because pronounced with जम्ब, as in امْكَ التَّرْجُلٌ.
for \[683\] (IY): and [it is said that (A)] may be \[\text{أَنْعُلُ} (IY)] from \(\text{أَلْقِينُ}\), [an act. formation (Sn),] i. q. \(\text{أَسْرَعَ}\) hastened (IY, A), whence 

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

\[\text{جاَء بِي} \text{عَنْس مِنَ} \text{أَلْقَٰم} \text{تِلِقُ}\]

* A strong she-camel has brought him from Syria, hastening (IY); and, according to this, the Hamza is aug., and the \(\text{أَنْعُلُ}\) (IY, A), its measure being \(\text{أَنْعُلُ}\) (A); so that, if used as a name for a man, it would be diptote [18]: moreover they say \(\text{أَلْقِينُ}\) and \(\text{أَلْقِينُ}\) for a swift charge, which shows that its \(\text{فُ}\) is sometimes Hamza, and sometimes \(\text{فُ}\), as in \(\text{أَوْصَدُتْ آَلْبَابٍ} I \text{shut the door and}

\(\text{أَوْصَدُتْ آَلْبَابٍ} (IY);\) but the first is preferable: (ε) similarly \(\text{أَوْتَكَّي}\) denoting a bad sort of date, [the | of which is decidedly aug., the discussion not being about it, but only about the Hamza and \(\text{أَرْمَ} (Sn),\) oscillates between two measures, \(\text{أَنْعُلُ}\), like \(\text{أَنْعُلُ} [381];\) and \(\text{أَنْعُلُ}\) [380] (A): (2) rad., (a) when it [occurs as an initial, but] is followed by two rad. letters, as in \(\text{إِنْبَ} [\text{a shirt without sleeves (IY)] and} \text{إِمْرَ} \text{a waist-wrapper,}

[the paradigms of which one \(\text{أَنْعُلُ} \text{and} \text{أَنْعُلُ, like} \text{جُمِّل} \text{and}\n
\(\text{جُمِّل}, \text{respectively (IY)]};\) or by four, as in \(\text{إِضْطَبَلُ} \text{stable
[283], [which, IA1 says, is not of the language of the Arabs (Jh),] and .Euler (M), the name of a territory (Jk, MI) in Persia (MI), which also is foreign (Jk), the paradigm of both being جرىدل م، like [401]; and hence .Euler and .Euler [283, 291], the measure of which is فيَّعَلًا لِبيل (IY): (b) when it occurs as non-initial, and nothing intervenes to necessitate its being aug., as in (a) شِمَال ُ لُ نُهٍ (374) (M), where the Hamza is aug., because they say شمَلْتُ الرّيح [373, 681. A] from لُنُه، the measure of which is north wind [below] (IY); (b) لُنُهُ [or لُنُهُ nightmare, where the Hamza is aug., because they say لُنُهُ with the ى, and Damm of the د, the elision of the Hamza being an indication of its augmentativeness (IY)]; (c) جُرَّ آنَث (384) (M), i.e., a bulky camel, where the Hamza is aug., because they say جُرَّ camel, i.e., شديد (IY); (d) سَهيَة (M), i.e., that does not menstruate, where the Hamza is aug, because they say سَهيَة 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) شمَال [681. A], where the indication is elision of the Hamza in some of its dial. vars., of which there are ten, (a) شمَال (374); (b) شمَال.
(1122)

[373]; (c) شمالل [above], upon the measure of فدل [246];
(d) شمالل, with Fath of the ش; (e) شمالل, with Fath of
the م; (f) شمالل, with quiescence of the م; (g) شمالل, upon
the measure of ضيقل [253]; (h) شمالل, upon the measure
of طويل [246]; (i) شمالل, upon the measure of طويل [246]; (j) شمالل, 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) جوهر شومدل, like
[369] (Sn): (a) IU and others adduce, as evidence that
the Hamza of شمالل is aug., their saying شمالل الريح [above], meaning blew northerly; but it is objected that
شمالل admits of being orig. [the vowel of the
Hamza (Sn)] being transferred [to the م, and the
Hamza afterwards elided (Sn)], in which case it is not
adducible as evidence: (2) [he was swollen in his
belly (Sn)], where the indication is the elision of the
Hamza in حيط [681. A], as حيط بطن ه 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 ְṣ and ָם [326, 683] (Aud), where the ָ is preceded by one rad. (Tsr); and ָב a building [683] and ָב [667] (Aud), where the ָ is preceded by two rads., not by more: and contrary to such as ָנ tidings, where the Hamza is not preceded by an ָ (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 ָ 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 ָ separated from the ָ by a double letter, as in סֶלֶת [prickles of the palm-tree (Sn)] and ָו [below], or by two letters, one of which is a soft letter, as in ָו and ָו [273], admits of two alternatives, that the Hamza should be rad., and one of the two similars [in such as ָו (Sn)], or the soft letter [in such as ָו (Sn)], should be aug.; or the converse. If, then, the Hamza be made rad., סֶלֶת is נָעַל [from סֶלֶת I pulled off the prickles of the palm-trees (Jh)], and ָו snake-charmer is נָעַל from ָו collecting; while, if it be made aug., סֶלֶת is נָעַל [from סֶל pulled out (KF)], and ָו greenish black or
blackish red, [and Eve (MAZ, Nw, KF), Adam's wife (KF), the mother of mankind (MAZ, Nw),] is فَقَعَلْدنَسَأنَسَاتْ from حَرْوَة (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 حَرْوَة is judged to be aug. when حَرْوَة is diptote (A), because the diptote declension indicates that it is the Hamza of femininization [263, 683], which is aug. (Sn); and rad. when حَرْوَة is triptote, like حَرْوَة denoting one that charms snakes: while the preferable [alternative] in سُقْلَة is that its Hamza should be rad., because, in plants, فَعُلْتْ is more numerous than سُقْلَة [273]. If, then, IM had said "more than two rads", [as IHsh says in the Aud above,] it would have been better. The Hamza is made aug., in the n., when (1) first, as in أَحْرَر [372, 671]; (2) second, as in شَأْمَل [373]; (3) third, as in شَأْمَل [above]; (4) fourth, as in حُطَّافْقُط [384], i. e., short; (5) fifth, as in حَرْرَا [385]; (6) sixth, as in عَقَرَبَائٌ [273, 399], which is a country; and (7) seventh, as in بَرَّ نَاسَآء [273, 400], i. e., mankind (A).

§ 673. An 1 that accompanies more than two rads. is [judged to be (IA, A)] aug., without any lie (IM), as
in \( \text{ضـاء} \) [below] (IA, Aud), \( \text{عـَـضـَـبـَـي} \) [248, 250], and (Aud) with دَامَم of the س, \textit{small bones in the fingers and toes} (Tsr), because in most words, where the \( ! \) occurs like that, \([i.e., \textit{accompanying more than two rads.} (Sn)]\) the derivation indicates that it is \textit{aug.}; and the rest are made to accord therewith (A), \(i.e., \) with the most (Sn): contrary to such as قَالٌ [below] and 
خَرَ [719] (Aud), where the \( ! \) is not \textit{aug.}, because it does not accompany more than two rads. (Tsr). IM \( [\text{here (MKh)}] \) means the soft \( ! \) [668]; and, as for the \( [\text{mobile} \) \( ! \), which is named] Hamzah, it has been mentioned [672] (Sn, MKh). The \( [\text{soft} \) \( ! \) is not made \textit{aug.} at the beginning \([\text{of a word}] \) (M, A, Tsr), because it is impossible to begin with it (M, A), since \( [\text{it is only quiescent, following} \textit{Fatha;} \) and (IY)] to begin with a quiescent is impracticable [667] (IY, Tsr). But, when not initial, it occurs only as an \textit{aug.} [below], when three or more \textit{rad.} letters are with it, as in ١٠٥.png
Mkh) decl., [i. e., infl. (Sn),] ns., [whether prim. or deriv. (Mkh)]: while in uninfl. [ns.], and in ps., the Ꝗ 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 یسَکِقَنِ یساق (A): because that [augmentativeness or substitution] is recognizable only by derivation, which is lacking (A, Mkh) in what is [here] mentioned (Mkh). The Ꝗ is made aug.,

(1) [in the n. (A),] when (a) second, as in ضَّرَب [671];
(b) third (IY, A, Tsr), as in كُتَاب [below] (IY, A); (c) fourth (IY, A, Tsr), as in حُبَلَى [below] and [above] (A); (d) fifth (IY, A, Tsr), as in جِلَبَلَب (IY, A), a plant (Jh, IY), which the vulgar name convolvulus (Jh); (e) sixth, as in یَتَعَفَّرَى [below] (IY, A, Tsr) and كُنْشَرَى [671] (IY); (f) seventh (A, Tsr), as in بَرَّدَرَآیا [272] (Tsr): (2) in the v., when (a) second, as in نَتَال [490]; (b) third, as in یَقَنَتَ [482, 483, 487, 678]; (c) fourth, as in سُلَقَتَى [482]; (d) fifth, as in یِجَارَى [The horse (Sn) was of dark chesnut color]; (e) sixth, as in یِغَرَدَدَى overcame [432, 496] (A). But [the Ꝗ, when it accompanies more than two
rads. in (Tsr)] the reduplicated quad. [674], [whose first J is homogeneous with its ف, and whose second J is homogeneous with its ع (Sn),] such as ضَرْدَمَى [674] (A, Tsr) shouted in battle (Sn), and عَالَقَى [674] (A) chid sheep, saying َعَا or َعْوَ or َعَأَى (Sn), is excepted [from IM's language (A)]: for the َل here [i.e., the َل of ضَرْدَمَى, as also each of the two َل's, the first and the second, of عَالَقَى (Sn),] is a subst. for a rad., [their measure being ُقُمِلَ (Sn)]; and is not aug. (A, Tsr). When the َل 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 َل is aug.; and, if it be assumed to be aug., the َل is non-aug.: but, if the ambiguous be an initial Hamza [672] or م [676], as in َنَوَسَى viper [672] and َرُوسَى razor [676], [not Moses, the name of the Prophet, because it, says Dm, is foreign (Sn).] or a quiescent ُث third [671, 677] in a quin., as in ُقُعَقَقَى, [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 َل to be converted from a rad., so long as no indication shows these letters to be rad., and the َل to be aug., as in ُأَرْطَقَى [below], according to those who say ُأَدِيمَ مُقَرَّطُ، meaning a hide dyed with ُأَرْطَقَى [672]; and in ُمُقَرَّى [below], because of their saying ُمَعَرَى and ُمَعَرَى; 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 سلقي [below] (M), سلقي [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* (IY), like عَزْرَبٌ [392] (KF); nor عَزْرَبٌ [395, 677] to be co-ordinated with ۱۰۱*مَدْعَيْلَة* [401]: because the unsound letter, when it occurs as a medial, and is preceded by a vowel homogeneous with it, like the ي of عَزْرَبٍ and the عَزْرَبٍ of سعَيد [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 أرطى [248, 272, 326, 375, 671, 672] and معرى [272, 375, 671, 676], which are co-ordinated by the | with جعفر and درهم [392], respectively:

(a) what indicates that the | is *aug.* in أرطى is their saying أرطى [above], the elision of the | in مَرْطَبُ being an indication that it is *aug.*; while their saying معرى [above] and معرى [255, 257] is an indication that the | is *aug.* in معرى:

(b) their saying أرطى and معرى with Tanwim indicates
that the ꞌ is not for femininization, since the ꞌ of feminini-
ization prevents triptote declension [18] ; so that Tanwin
is not affixed to it [17,609], as سَكْرَى خُبْلَى [below]:
(a) moreover ۚأٓرُنَا[258], has been heard from them, with
affixion of the ꞌ of femininization; whereas, if the ꞌ were
for feminization, another sign of feminization would
not be affixed to it, so as to combine two signs of feminini-
zation: (b) one indication that the ꞌ in معْرَى is not for
feminization is their making it masc., as ؤِعْرَى هُلْبًا آهَمٌ
[249], their qualification of it by the masc. being an
indication that it is masc.; whereas, if the ꞌ were for
feminization, it would be fem.: (c) it is proved, then, by
what we have mentioned, that the ꞌ here is aug. 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-or-
dination 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
coordination is a multiplication, though every multipli-
cation is not a co-ordination: (2) denotative of femininiza-
tion, as in سَكْرَى خُبْلَى [18,248,272,375], سَكْرَى [248,272], and
جَمَادَى جُمَادَى Jumādā [328]: (a) what indicates that the ꞌ here
is aug. is the derivation, since خُبْلَى is from preg-
nancy, سُكْرَى from drunkennes, and جَمَادَى سُكْرَى from
being frozen: (b) what indicates that it denotaes
femininization is the impossibility of Tanwîn'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 قَبُعَتَرُى [272, 326, 401, 497, 671], سُبَّانِي [311], and قَبُعَتَرُى [401, 671]. quâil, 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 بَاتِلَةٌ a bean and سُبَّانَا 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 كُتَابُ [401] [and كَبَّرُ (IY)] it is like the ٰ of كَتَابُ, because it exceeds the limit (M). Z means that the ٰ in كَبَّرُ 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 كَتَابُ and حَمَار [671] (IY).
§. 674. The َ [below] and ٌ [675] are similar (IM) to the ِ [673], in that each of them, when it accompanies more than two rads., is judged to be aug. (A), as in ﺟَﻨْﻴَل ْمُقْتَزَل [269, 347] and ٌ ْمَقْتَزَل [347] (Sn), if they do not occur [repeated (A),] as they are in ﺟَنْﻴَعُ (IM), the name of a bird [of prey (Jh),] having talons, that resembles the ِ ﻲـَﺷْـَقْـَل sparrow-hawk (A), and ٌ ﻦَـﻋَـعُ (IM), i.e., made a noise, in which sort [of formation] all the letters are judged to be rad., like the letters of ْسَـﻴـْـِـسَم [671] (A); and if they be not initial, the , unrestrictedly, according to the majority [675]; and the َ 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 َ and ٌ have three states: for, (1) if either of them accompany two rads. only, it is rad., as in ْبَـيْـتُ [697] and ـ ﺞُـسَوَـط [697]: (2) if it accompany three or more decided rads., it is aug., except in the repeated bil., [just now described as “the reduplicated quad.” (673) (Sn),] as above mentioned [by IM] in the text: (3) if it accompany two rads. and an ambiguous third, then, (a) if the ambiguous be an initial Hamza [672] or ٌ [676], the initial is judged to be aug., and the َ or ٌ to be rad., as in ْأَيْـ۱َـْـِـدَـع [672] and ْمَزَوَـن [676], [like ْمَـنَـَـِـَرُ (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 ١ْۧLINاق [672] according to those who say َلیق CLEAN and َلیق CLEAN; and as in ١ْۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧۧ
initial Hamza and م (Sn), it is judged to be rad., and the ى or ، to be aug., so long as no indication shows the contrary of that, as in (a) يَهْيَرُ ُدُ [with the ٰ doubled (Jh, Sn)], which is hard stone; and says IS, one of the names of البَاطِلُ the vain, unreal, naught; and is said to be the mirage, as أُكْذِبُ مِنْ الْيَهْيَرِ Falser than the mirage (A): (α) IS says that they sometimes add an ٰ to it, saying يَهْيَرٍ [272] (Jh, Md, A): (β) the letter which, but for the indication of augmentativeness, would be ambiguous, is the first ى (Sn): (γ) the first ى is decided to be aug. (A), [so that] يَفْعَلُ يَهْيَرُ (Jh, Md), because َّفَعْيَلٍ is not found in the language (Jh, Md, A), while there is no obscurity about the augmentativeness of the ى in such as يَفْحَرُ is red (A): (δ) the ى's are not both rad., because ى is not rad. with trils. in the non-reduplicated: nor are they both aug., because a ى is not formed of two letters: nor is the second ى the aug., because َّفَعْيَلٍ, with Fath of the ى, is not found in the language; while َّفَعْيَلٍ, which is found, has Kasr of the ى; so that, if the second ى were aug., يَهْيَرٍ, with Kasr of the initial, would be said, like يَحْيَرُ ُدُ [374] and ُدُ جَذَّيْمٍ skilful: and therefore the first must be the aug. (IY): (b) عَزْوَيْتِ 'Izwit [675], which is the name of a place; and is said to be also [an ep., meaning] short: (α) the
is decided to be \textit{rad.}, and the \textit{س} [below] and \textit{ت} \textit{aug.}, because its measure cannot be \textit{ضُرِّبُ}, since this is not found in the language; nor \textit{نَعْلِيَّة}, because the \textit{س} is not \textit{rad.} in quads. [675]; nor \textit{فُقُرَيْت}, because the word becomes without a \textit{ل}: so that its measure must be \textit{نَعْلِيَّة}, like \textit{عَفْرَيْت} [646] (A): (β) A’s mention of the \textit{س} [in \textit{عَفْرَيْت}] as \textit{aug.} is unnecessary, since it is not imagined [by any one] to be \textit{rad.} (Sn). When three \textit{rads.} other than the \textit{س} are found, the \textit{س} is \textit{aug.}, whether it be at the beginning, as in \textit{يَلْعَب} [below] and \textit{يَضَرِّبُ} \textit{بُ} \textit{strikes} [404]; or in the middle, as in \textit{رَجِيم} [349] and \textit{قَلْبِيَق} [calamity (MAR)]; or at the end, as in \textit{النights} \textit{اللَّيْلِي} [255]. And similarly with four or more \textit{rads.}, when the \textit{س} is non-initial, as in \textit{جَبْتَغُور} [398], \textit{سَلْسَبِيَّ} [368, 401], and \textit{سُلْكَفْيَة} [399]: whereas, if it be initial, with four \textit{rads.} after it, then, if the word be a \textit{v.}, like \textit{يُدَأَرْجُ} \textit{rolls down} [404], in this case also the \textit{س} is \textit{aug.}; but, if not, it is \textit{rad.}, as in \textit{يَسْتَغَفُّر} [below] (R). The \textit{س} is made \textit{aug.}, (1) in the \textit{n.}, when (a) first, as in \textit{يَلْعَب} [\textit{mirage} (Sn)]; (b) second, as in \textit{قَضِيَّم} [373]; (c) third, as in \textit{قَضِيَّم} [385]; (d) fourth, as in \textit{جَذْرِيَّة} [385]; (e) fifth, as in \textit{سُلْكَفْيَة} [above]; (f) sixth, as in \textit{مَغْنَأ طَيِّس} \textit{magnet}, \textit{lode-stone}, [which is arabicized (Jh, KF)]; (g) seventh,
as in خَفْرُ اِنْيَة [with a single ى, meaning pride (Sn)]: (2) in the v., when (a) first, as in ُضَرِّبُ [above]; (b) second, as in ُبَطَرَ [671]; (c) third, according to those who authorized نَعِيِّك [482] among the formations of vs., as طَشْبَا رَأَيْة [His judgment was unsound and (A on the Augmented Triliteral Verb)] (A), i.e., عَلَطَ َتُهِيَأ 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.] ُتُهَيَأ, which is interpreted in various senses, among them weakness, [incapacity (Jh),] flagging, and unsoundness, [and infinitity (Jh, KF),] of judgment (Sn on the Augmented Triliteral Verb); (d) fourth, as in تَوَلَّسْتُهُ (A), i.e., تَوَلُّسْتُهُ ُتُهَيَأ I put on him a cap [675], where ُتُهَيَأ [482] also is said (Sn); (e) fifth, as in ُتُهَيَأ I wore a cap; (f) sixth, as in ُتُهَيَأ [482, 483] (A), i.e., I slept on my back (Sn). The following are [additional] exs. of the aug. يُبَرَّعِ ٖ (1) when first, ُبَرَّعِ [372]; and, in the v., يُبَلَّدِ ُضَرَف [482]: (2) when second, ُضَرَفِ [373]: (3) when third, ُسَعِيدُ [671]: (4) when fourth, ُدَهْلُبِ ُضَرَف [385], vestibule, [which is Persian (Jh, Jk), arabicized (Jh),] and ُقَفْدِ ُضَرَف [396]: (5) when fifth, ُعَقَتُرِ ٗس [283]: (6) when sixth, ُعَقَتُرِ ٗس 119a
[283] and عناكُكُمَّات dim. and broken pl. of عِمْكُبوت [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 صيحيّة spur [of the cock (Jh, KF)], the two یs in it are rad., even though three rad. letters are with you, because the word is compounded of صيحيّة twice [uttered]; so that the first ی is rad., lest the word remain with [only] one letter, vid. the ی ص; and, since the first ی is rad., the second ی also is rad., because it is the first repeated. And hence حاكيت I called [goats (Jh, KF)] and عاعيّت [673], where the ی is rad., because it is the first repeated; while their measure is یعتلّتُ, the o. f. being حبّيكيّتُ and عيقّيتُ, but the first ی being converted into ی because of the Fatha before it, as they say دِيِنِعَلُ for ِيِنِعَلُ [684]. And similarly I clucked and ضوضيّتُ [673], where the second ی is rad., because it is the first [و] repeated, their o. f. being ضوضيّتُ and توضيّتُ, the second [و] of which is converted into ی, because it occurs fourth, as in یعّيّت and یعّيّتُ [629]. If it be said "Then why is it not aug., as in سلسّيّت and سّيّتُ [673]?", the reply is that, if this were so, ضوضيّتُ and توضيّتُ would become of the cat. of was agitated, flurried and سلسّيّتُ was loose, slack, which is small, while the cat. of تلّغتُ [332] is
more numerous, and only the more numerous is acted upon. And, if it be said "Then make the, in them aug., as in I collected [675] and جُرْفَلَت [482]", the reply is that, if this were done, they would become of the cat. of دُدُن and كَوْكَب [357, 671], whose and ع are homogeneous, which is smaller than [the cat. of] سِلْسَس and قَلِيق [above] (IY). When the ی is initial, then, if followed by three rads., it is aug., as in یْلُنَع above; but, if followed by four rads., in any [formation] other than the aor. [above], it is rad., like the ی in یِسَتْعُور [401, 678] (A), upon the measure of یِلْتَلَع [401] (Sn), because the derivation does not indicate augmentative-ness in such cases, except in the aor. [404, 497] (A), like یَد خَرْج [above] (Sn). یِسَتْعُور [in the poem of 'Urwa (Jh) Ibn AlWard al'Absî, who says

أَطِعْتِ الْآَلِمِينِ ِبِصْرُمَ سِلْسَيِّ فَطِّقَارَاهَا فِي بَلَادِ آليلْسَتْعُور

I obeyed those who bade (me) to part from Salmâ; then they fled away into the regions of AlYastaʻâr (ISk),] is the name of a place (Jrb, A), a district (R) in AlHijáz (R, A), near the stony ground of AlMadîna (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)] دَهْثٰبٰ فِي أَلْيَمَةٰ دَعْوَرِ He, or It, went into, i. e., came to, naught is said (R, Jrb), i. e., في أَلْبَاطِلِ (Jrb). As for يَأْتَجَجُ Yo'jaj, which is the name of a place [eight miles from Makka (MI)], the ی at its beginning is rad., that being indicated by the display of the reduplication; whereas, if the ی were aug., يَأْتَجَجٰ would be from أَجُّ أَجَّ, aor. يَأْتَجَجُ; and it would be necessary to incorporate, and say لِبَوُرُجٰ [482], like يُغْفَض is choked and يَغْفُض lowers: so that, since they do not incorporate, this indicates that the last ی is aug., for co-ordination with the paradigm of جُعَفْرٰ [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)] جّ with Kasr, saying يُأْتِجَجٰ: and, if what they transmit be correct, the ی is aug., because there is no جُعَفْرٰ, with Kasr of the ف, in the language; and the display of the reduplication is anomalous, of the same class as [in] مَهْبَبٰ Mahbab [4] (IY).

§. 675. The ّ, like the ل [673], is not made aug. when initial: and their saying وَرَنَّسِلٰ [671, 677] is like جُكْحُنَّسِلٰ [671] (M), the ّ in it being part of the word
itself; while the ن [677] is *aug.*, co-ordinating [it] with سَقَرَ جُلُ [393, 401], its measure being فَعَّالُ [395] (IY). The opinion of the majority [674] is that the , is not made *aug.* when initial, because of its heaviness, as some say: but, as others say, because, if made *aug.* [at the beginning] when pronounced with ِDamm, it would be regularly convertible into Hamza [683]; and similarly when pronounced with Kasr, although conversion of the [ ] pronounced with Kasr into Hamza is less frequent; and, when pronounced with Fath, it would be liable to conversion into Hamza, because the initials of the n. and v. are pronounced with ِDamm in the *dim.* [274] and *pass.* [436, 482], respectively: so that, since making it *aug.* at the beginning would lead to its conversion into Hamza, they avoid doing so, because conversion of the , into Hamza would sometimes occasion confusion (A) with the word whose [initial] Hamza is original, unconverted, as in ُكْئِلْ left, which, in the *pass.* [كئِلْ was left], is liable to conversion of the , into Hamza, in which case it would be confounded with أَكِلْ was eaten, the Hamza cf which is *rad.* (Sn). Some, however, assert that the , of ُزْرَنَتْل [above] is *aug.* extraordinarily, because the , is not *rad.* in *quads.*: but this is weak, because it leads to the formation زَرَنَتْل, which is not found; while the correct [opinion] is that the , is *rad.*, and that the ح is *aug.*, as in ُحْكَمْبَلَ 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 [373] and [482], Qسَرَ ظَرْفَلَ a lion [253] and [threw into a pit (IY)], [283, 385], منَفْوَان [283, 389], and قلَّنَسْوَة [254, 390, 674], except when that [indication of radicalness] intervenes which is [found] in عَرِضَتِ [674] (M). In that [position as medial, with three or more rads.,] it occurs (1) second, as in جَهَرْ [369] and صَوْمَع [674]; (2) third, as in جَذَول [671] and رَهْبَان آل الرّجَلَ The man swaggered in his walk; (3) fourth, as in عَرِضَتِ [above], إِخْرَوْطَةَ and عَلَفْنَوَان [482]; (4) fifth, as in عَضْرَ فُوْتَةَ [368, 401] and مَنَكْنُون [398, 676] (IY). The ج is made aug., (1) in the n., when (a) second, as in جَهَرْ [671]; (b) third, as in عَكْبُوْزَ [369, 673]; (c) fourth, as in عَرِضَتِ [248, 301]; (d) fifth, as in قلَّنَسْوَةَ [above]; (e) sixth, as in أَرْبَعَاَرْي [272] (A), with دَامَم of the Hamza and ب , as in the KF ; but with فاث of the Hamza on the authority of سَيْط و دَم (Sn) : (2)
in the v., when (a) second, as in حَقَل [above]; (b) third, as in جُهُور [482, 671; (A), i. e., raised his voice: (a) as for جُهُور Jahwar, like جَعْفَر [392], it is the name of a place (Sn): (c) fourth, as in إِعْدَدُودَن [482, 671] (A).

§. 676. The case of the م, in respect of augmentativeness, is [exactly (IY)] like that of the Hamza [672]. For the position of its augmentativeness is [mostly (Jrb)] where it occurs as an initial in trils., because the Hamza is [uttered] from the first outlet of the throat, vid. what is next to the thorax [732]; while the م is [uttered] from the lips, which are the first outlet from the other end [of the vocal organs]: so that the م [like the Hamza] is made aug. when initial, in order that their two outlets may correspond to the position of their augmentativeness (IY, Jrb). And, when non-initial [below], they are not judged to be aug., except when some indication shows them to be so (Jrb). But [the Hamza is made aug. in the n. and v.; whereas (Jrb)] the م is made aug. only in the n. [253] (IY, Jrb). The م is not made aug. in the v., [being one of the augments of ns., wherein vs. have no portion (IY)]: and, for that reason, [the saying of ‘Umar (ID, Jh, IY, KF), according to Jh, but, rightly, of the Apostle of God, transmitted by Abū Ḥadrād, the Companion (KF)], Imitate the sons of Ma‘add is cited as evidence that the م of مُعَد [375] is rad.; while such as
and ḥadāl are not taken into account (M), being rare, like the [v.] derived He said ʿalākhān Allāh. He said ḥadāl 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 مَنْيِج مَنبِيج [below] the name of a city, is aug., and ن rad., since you may not make them both rad., because there is no جُعْفَر with Kasr of the ف among o. fs.; nor both aug., because the infl. word would remain with [only] two letters, the ب and چ: 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). مِنْيِج [below] is made to accord with مَقتَل [671] and مَضَرِب [333, 361] the unknown being made to accord with the known. And, as for مَعِزى [above] and مَعِد [375, 673], their predicament, and their variance from this rule, have been already mentioned (R). The derivation of مَعِد is from [one of] two things, مَعِد being either مَفْعُول from عَدْد عدد, as though it were مَعِد, ...
and then the တ were incorporated; or [transferred] from မွေ [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 မွေ i. q. ထဲတော့ hardiness (ID). As for မြော့, [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 မ part of the word itself (Jk)]: so that its မ is rad., because of their saying မျိုး and မြော့ [673], which are နော့ and နား; whereas, if the မ in မြော့ were aug., and those paradigms were formed from it, မြော့ and မြော့ would be said (IY). The မ 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 မြော့ [361] and မြော့ [above], [which, says Jh, is the name of a place (Tsr),] contrary to such as (a) မြော့ [lion, because the မ is not initial (Tsr)]; (b) မြော့ [cradle, because the မ is not followed by three rads. (Tsr)]; (c) မြော့ [or မြော့ (below)] (Aud), i. q. မြော့ marjoram, [the arabicized form of မြော့ dead ear, the မ of which they pronounce with Fath (KF'),] a sweet-smelling plant, because the မ is not followed by three rads. only, but by more (Tsr);
and (d) गर्दन (soft wool (Tsr)), because they say वोन्ख्या a garment made of soft wool, retaining the म in in derivation (Aud), with which [argument] IM refutes the saying of S that the म in it is aug. [below]. It is also a condition of the augmentativeness of the म that its word should not be a quad. composed of two letters [repeated], like मर्गर्म marble, alabaster and महोत्स vast desert (Tsr). What fulfils the conditions mentioned is judged to be aug. so long as no indication of radicalness is opposed to such judgment. For, if an indication of radicalness is opposed to it, one acts as required by the indication, as in the म of मर्गल [a comb, and a cooking-pot of stone or copper (Sn)], मांगना, [a thing, like honey, exceeded by the म panic-grass, मृष्टिर gigantic swallow-wort, and मर्गर्म dwarf-tamarisk (Sn),] and मृगर्म [272] (A) or मर्गर्म [above] or मर्गर्म [273], with Kasr, and sometimes Fath, of the म in all (Sn), which is judged to be rad., although it is followed by three rads. [only]. As for मर्गल [above], the opinion of S and most GG is that its म is rad., because of their saying मर्जल आलिखातान्य नोह The weaver wove the cloth decorated with figured work called मर्जल [below] (A); whereas, if the म were aug., they would say मर्जल by eliding it (Sn): IKh says "The मर्जल is a cloth.
worked with circles like the جُرَاجُل [above], which are cooking-pots of copper" (A), or of stone (Sn). But AAMr holds that the مَرْجَل 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, from تَنْدَلُ from [379], and put on the مَدْرَعة tunic, where the م is aug.; though he has no argument in that, because the most frequent [formation] is تَسْكَن [483], تَنْدَلُ, and مَدْرَعُ, which, Mz says, is the most frequent in the language of the Arabs. As for مَغْفُر [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 دَعَبَوا يَتَسْفَرُون They went gathering مَغْفِر [above], which is [here said by A to be] a kind of truffle. And as for مَجْرَي [above], S holds its م to be aug. [above]: but some, and among them IM, hold it to be rad., because of their saying كِسْسَة مَرْجَي wrapper made of مَرْجَي, not مَرْجَي (A); while IM, says IUK, avers that S is bound to agree that it is rad. in مَرْجَي, or to differ [from the opinion that it is rad.] in the whole (Sn). The language of IM [and Jr:b and IHSh] intimates that (A), when non-initial [above] (R), [i. e.,] when medial or
final (A), the \( \text{م} \) is not judged to be *aug.*, except by reason of some [plain (R)] indication, as in (1) \([384, 681.A]\) (R,A), دُمْلِصُ، دُمَالِصُ [below] (A) in some MSS, but, in other MSS, دُلْلِصُ [below], and دُمْلِصُ، دُلْلِصُ, [all with Դāmm of the first, Fath of the second, and Kasr of the penultimate (Sn),] because of their saying دِرَع دِلَّصُ [246] or دُلْلِصُ، I made it glitter: (a) Mz holds that the م in دُلْلِصُ [and its fellows, adds IUK (Sn),] is *rad.*, although دُلْلِصُ agrees with دِلَّصُ in sense; so that according to him, it is of the *cat.* of سِبْطُ long, extended and سِبْطُ [245, 392, 679, 681] (A), i. e., of syns. agreeing in the bulk of the letters, the ر not being *aug.*, but *rad.*, since it is not one of the letters of سَلاَتُ مؤِيِّهَا [671], nor a duplicate of a *rad.* (Sn): (b) as for خَمْارِ ص sour, as لِبَنُ خَمْارِ ص sour milk, as though it يُقرُضُ الْلِسَانَ 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. إِنْفَطَحْ and أَنْفَطَحْ [382] are *aug.*, because of their saying and رُحْمَةُ قَتْكُلُ and قَتْكُلُ 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 هِرُمَاسٍ also,
which, according to what As transmits, is a name of the lion, is *aug.*, its paradigm beingُفعَالٌ كَرْسُ, because it is from كَرْسُ 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 كَرْسُ [strong (Jh, KF), from the crushing (Jh), or ravenous (KF)], as says the poet

شَدِيدٌ أَلْسَأَعَدَّيْنِ أَخَا وَثَمَّابٍ شَدِيدًا أَسْرُهُ كَرْسًا عَمَسًا

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 مُ is aug. here (IY): [زِرْقُمَ (2) [below] (R, A) and its cat., i.e., every tril. to whose final a م is added for multiplication of the letter, and intensification of the sense (Sn).] as دَلْيُقَمَ [an old woman, and an aged she-camel whose teeth are broken (Sn)].، فَسْحُكُمْ، [like 9 جَعُفرٍ or 9 ضَرْزَمُ (392), a she-camel aged, or having some remains of youth in her, or old and giving little milk (Sn)].، دِرْمٌ [a spacious place, and a man easy in mind (Sn)], and دِرْمٌ [with Kasr of the two د s, a woman that comes and goes by night, and an aged she-camel (Sn)], because they are from زِرْقُةُ blueness, 9 إِنْدِلَاقٍ coming out, 9 ضِرْزَمُ and 9 نَافِقَةُ ضِرْزَمُ a she-camel giving little milk, 9 إِفْنَاسٍ حُكُم being spacious, and 9 كَرْمُ losing one’s teeth, becoming toothless, the qual. from which is 9 أَذَرُ toothless and
on the measure of فرح [348] (Sn). When the م precedes three letters, one of which admits of being rad. or aug., the م is judged to be aug., and that ambiguous [letter] to be rad., unless some indication exists to the contrary: and therefore the م of موسى [673] and زور [674] is judged to be aug.; while, as to the م of مجن [shield (Sn)], two sayings are transmitted from S, the sounder of which is that it is aug.: but, if some indication shows the م to be rad., one judges in accordance therewith, as the م of Mahdad, [a woman's name (Sn),] and ماجج Ma’jaj, [a place (Sn),] is judged to be rad., and one of the two similar letters to be aug., since, if the م were aug., the measure would be عمل, so that incorporation would be necessary [712]; though Sf allows the م of ماجج to be aug., their dissolution [of incorporation] being anomalous, like that of أَلْلَهُ أَلْوَاهُ أَلْحَدِيدُ أَلْجَلُ [A], by Abu-nNajm al’Ijli, Praise be to God, the High, the Most Great, the Giver of bounty, the Liberal Giver, the Munificent! (MN, Jsh). When the م precedes four or more rads., as in مرنجوش مرنجوش (above) or mouse-ear marjoram, [the arabicized form of مرنجوش مرنجوش (KF),] it is judged to be rad., except when the word containing it is one of the ns. connected with vs. [330,]
like a *mādī ḥārij* an act. *part.* [343], and a *mādī ḥārij* 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 *m* is *rad.*, the *n* after it *rad.*, and the second *n* a *l*; the word being *quad.* in origin, but the second *n* being repeated in order that it may be co-ordinated with *عَضْرُ فُوْط* [368, 401]; and its paradigm being *مَنْكَِّنِن ِقَّتْلُوْل.* And, as for *مَنْكَِّنِنْيَقَّتْلُوْل* *ballista,* the *m* in it is *rad.*, and the *n* after it *aug.*, because they say in its *pl.* *مَكاَرِنِقُ مَكَارِنِقُ* [283] and *مَكَارِنِقُ مَكَارِنِقُ,* the elision of the [first] *n* in the *pl.* being an indication of its augmentativeness; and, since it is established that the [first] *n* is *aug.*, the *m* 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 *مَسْتَخْرِجُ* [382] and *مَسْتَخْرِجُ* [387]. This is the opinion of S and Mz; and, according to them, its measure is *مَسْتَخْرِجَْلِبُ فَتْعَلْيَلِبُ,* like [283, 290, 674]. Others, however, say that the first *n* and the *m* are *augs.*, together, inasmuch as some of the *Arabs* say *جَنَقْنَا هُمُم* meaning: *We shot them with the ballista,* while AU transmits from some of the *Arabs* *مَأَرّْنَا نَكَِّنِقُ* *We have not ceased to shoot with the ballista*; and, according to this, its measure is *مَنْفِعِلُ.* but the correct
opinion is that of S, because of their saying, in the broken
pl., مَكْتاَطِيٌّ [above] (IY). The م is made aug. when (1)
first, as in مَرْحَبٌ spaciousness [60]: (2) second, as in
دُلْيَصْ [above]: (3) third, as in دُلْيَصْ [above]: (4)
fourth, as in زَرْقَمْ [above]: (5) fifth, as in قُبَارَمْ sturdy,
strongly made, because it is from قَسْر, which is strength
of make; but IU holds that in قُبَارَم it is rad. : (a) Jh
says in the ِسَاهَان "The قُبَارَم 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 ٰ, and that this
ٰ be preceded by more than two rads. [below], the
substantive and ep. being alike in that respect (Tsr), as
in عُثْبانٌ [250, 274, 385] and عَضْبَانٌ [250, 348]; contrary
to such as protection and سِنَانٌ spear-head (Aud),
where the ٰ is preceded by two rads., not by more than
two (Tsr); (a) it is prescribed as a [third] condition for
augmentativeness of the [final] ن, in addition to what
has been mentioned, that the excess of what precedes
the ٰ over two letters should not be a reduplication of a
rad., [i.e., of the ف, not of any rad. unrestrictedly,
otherwise A's saying "and this condition is imported
etc." (below) would not quite hold good (Sn)]; so that
the [final] ن in such as َجَنَّاجَانُ [with Kasr of the first ج, orig. َجَنَّاجِّيَنَ which head of a rib, like َسَمُ (below) (Sn)], is rad., not aug.: and this condition is imported [above] from IM's saying "And judge [all (IA)] the letters of َسَمُ [671, 674] to be rad." (A), because َجَنَّاجَانُ is orig. َجَنَّاجِّيَنَ, like َسَمُ, 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 َو to be affixed to the cps. whose fem. is َعَضَبَانُ [272], as َعَضَبَانُ [above], َعَطَشْانُ [250, 348, 385], and َسُكْرَانُ [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 َو in substantives, such as َعَمْرانٌ [4] and َعَشْمانُ [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 َمَرَانُ [with Damm, a tree of which spears are made (Jh on مَرَانُ), َسِعَارَ (Jh on مَرَانُ),] is rad.; and that َمَرَانُ is [through َفَعَالَة (Jh)] from i. q. ُليِنَ، softness, smoothness: (a) َمَرَانُ Marrān, with Fatḥ [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 AlBasra, wherein is the grave of Tamīm Ibn Murr (Jh): (e) as for قَبَّانٌ [having beautiful long hair (MAR)], the derivation teaches us that three rads., exclusively of the Ʌ and ن, are not attainable in the word, since it is قَنَّٰنٌ [branch (T), lock of hair, tress]; and similarly in حسن Hasan [below] and جَبَّارُ قَبَّانٍ [7], when triptote, we recognize, by the triptote declension, that the ن is one of the three rads. (R): (f) حَسَّانٌ [below] is either from حَسَّ الْقُرُوم meaning Killed the people quickly, aor. يَّحَسَّ, inf. n. حَسَّ; or from حَسَن beauty: and, if it be from حَسَن, the ن is rad.; but, if it be from حَسَّ, the ن is aug. (ID): analogy requires the ن to be aug., and حَسَّانٌ to be diptote, in accordance with the most frequent [usage, vid. that the Ʌ and ن, when final, are aug.] but it may be derived from حَسَّ, in which case the ن is rad., and it is triptote: (g) [the جَبَّارُ قَبَّانٍ of] قَبَّانٍ is properly قَبَّانٍ [from قَبَّ في الْأَرْضٍ went away through the land, i. q. دَهَبْ (IY on §. 7)], and diptote: but it may be from قَبَّ in i. q. دَهَبْ [above]; and, according to this, it is triptote, because the ن in it is rad. (IY): (h) the looseness of IM's language [in the Alfiya, "And the ن at the end is like the Hamza" (672),]
requires the ن to be clearly aug. in the case where a double letter, as in ُخَسَان [above] and ُرَمَان pomegranate [below], or a [sound] letter and a soft letter, as in ُعَقَيْلاَن "native gold (Sn)" and ُعَنْوَان superscription, title are interposed between the ] and the ف; and this looseness is in agreement with the opinion of the majority, who judge the ن in such as ُخَسَان and ُعَقَيْلاَن to be aug., unless some indication shows it to be rad., because the diptote declension of ُخَسَان in the saying of the poet [Umayya Ibn Khalaf alKhuzā'i, satirizing Ḥassān (MN, Sn) Ibn Thābit alAnṣārī (MN),]

[Now who will be conveying to Ḥassān from me a message carried from town to town, that will creep to ʿUkāz? (MN, Sn)] shows its ن to be aug.: but in the Tashīl and the Kāfiya he holds the ن in that case to be like the Hamza in equality of the two alternatives, neither of which is negligible except by reason of some indication; and this is the opinion of some of the ancients: (i) some add another condition for the augmentativeness of the ن when final, vid. that it should not be in a n. whose first is pronounced with Ḍamm, and whose second is doubled, when [such n. is] a name of a plant, as ُرَمَان [above], in which case they make it rad., because ُنَعَال in names of plants is more frequent
than ُفعَّالٌ; and IM adopts this [opinion] in the Kāfiya: but it is refuted by the fact that augmentativeness of the ′ and ن, when final, is more frequent than the occurrence of [the name of] a plant upon [the measure of] ُفعَّالٌ; while the opinion of Khl and S is that the ن of ُرَمَّان is aug.: S says "I asked him", i. e., Khl, 'about ُرَمَّان when used as a [proper] name; and he said 'I do not decline it as a triptote in the det.', [i. e., when it is a proper name (Sn),] 'but make it accord with the most frequent [usage],' [vid. augmentativeness of the ′ and ن (Sn),] 'since it has no meaning whereby it is recognizable', [i. e., because it has no sign whereby the state of its ن is recognizable (Sn)]: (j) Akh, however, says "Its ن is rad., like [the final of] تَرَأَصْ ُفعَّالٌ [chamomile (Sn)] and ُحَمَّاض [384], because ُفعَّالٌ is more frequent than ُفعَّالٌ"], meaning "in [the names of] plants": and the correct [opinion] is what he holds, not because of what he mentions, [since it is refuted, as before explained, by the fact that augmentativeness of the ′ and ن, when final, is more frequent than the occurrence of (the name of) a plant upon (the measure of) ُفعَّالٌ (Sn)]; but because the ن is retained in derivation, as أَرْضُ ِمَرْمَةٌ [364]; whereas, if the ن were aug., they would say أَرْضُ ِمَرْمَةٌ (A): (2) when medial, is made aug. upon three conditions, that it be exactly in the middle
between four [letters (A)], that it be quiescent, and that it be unincorporated, as in [lion (Tsr)], $\text{قَرَنْفَل}$ [384, 671], $\text{جَبَّنْتَي}$ [283], and $\text{رَنْنَت}$ [671, 675]; contrary to $\text{عَنْدَر}$ ambergris, [where it is preceded by one letter, and followed by two (Tsr),] $\text{قَرَنْفَل}$ stork, crane, [an aquatic bird, long in the neck, where it is mobile, not quiescent (Tsr),] and $\text{عَكْجَنَّس}$ [below] (Aud) a bulky, [hardy, strong (KF)] he-camel, where it is incorporated (Tsr): (a) the $\text{n}$ 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 $\text{سَبَّدُ}$ [395], the $\text{و}$ of $\text{جَكَّلَدِبَ}$ [395], and the $\text{l}$ of $\text{عُدَّاِر}$ [395, 673] and $\text{فَكُس}$ [395]; (b) that it is mostly interchangeable with the soft letter, as in their saying $\text{شُرِّاَيْت}$ [671] and $\text{شَرِّنَتْ}$, [like $\text{عُلْنِاَط}$ thick, corpulent (Sn),] for thick in the hands, $\text{جَرَفْش}$ and $\text{جَرَفْقُش}$ for burly, and $\text{عَرْنَقَصْان}$ [with Fath of the and $\text{ك}$, quiescence of the $\text{n}$, and Fath of the $\text{ق}$ (Sn)] and $\text{عَرْنَقَصْان}$ [400] for a plant; (c) that it is found to be aug. in every [word] whose derivation or variation is known, [such as $\text{جَكَّنْفَل}$ from $\text{جَكَّنْفَل}$ (671) (Sn),] with which the others, [like $\text{شَرِّنَتْ}$ (Sn),] are made to accord (A): (b) they say $\text{عَرْنَتْ}$ [392, 395], where the [first] $\text{n}$ is aug., because of what we have mentioned,
[vid. that this is a position where the ن is frequently aug.]; and sometimes عرتبُي [392], with elision of the [first] ن: (c) they say صلبُ عرنَدَدُ 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. عَرْدُ (below)]; while the last ن also is aug., co-ordinating عرنَدَدُ [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 تَعْشَلُ [wolf (Sn)]; unless some indication decide it to be aug., as in تُرْجَسُ narcissus, [681. A], because, if the ن we.e rad., its measure would be مَعْثَل [with Kasr of the first ج (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 تَنْطَارُ a hundred weight, عنيقودُ [253, 396, 674], جُنْدُ رِيْسُ a bunch, عَنْدِيلُ [253, 401], and عَنْدِلِيبُ nightingale, where it is rad.: unless some indication decide it to be aug., as in (a) عَنْبَسَ lion, because it is from عَبوسُ frowning; (b) حَنْطَلُ [254, 681, A], because of their saying حَطَلَتْ آتاَبَلُ [The camels ate much colocynth (Sn)]; (c) عَنْسلُ [373], because it is from عَسلانَ going swiftly; (d) عَرْدُ [374], because it is from their saying شَيْءِ عَرْدَنَ a hard thing
O

\[\text{i.e., } \text{صلب} \{394, 671\} \text{ with } \text{Fath or } \text{Damm of the } \text{ب} (\text{Sn}), \] because they say, in place of it, 
\[\text{صلب} \text{ with Fath of the } \text{ب} (\text{Sn}), \] and because of the unprecedentedness [of the formation in the \text{dial. var.} with Damm of the \text{ب} ] on the assumption of radicalness, [together with inclusion in the narrower of two \text{cats.}, since unprecedentedness ensues on the assumption of augmentativeness also, as there is among measures no 
\[\text{نعلل} \text{ with Damm of the doubled } \text{ل} , \] so there is among them no 
\[\text{نعلل} \text{ with Damm of the first } \text{ل} (\text{Sn})\]: (f) the third restriction, [vid. that the \text{ن} should be quiescent,] excludes such as 
\[\text{غَرَنيَّة} \text{ [above], which is } \text{an aquatic bird, and (Sn)} \] the exalted chief \[396\], \text{غُرَّنَوب} \text{ a kind of tree, and } \text{كُنَّابْيَل} \text{ Kuna’bil, [with a quiescent Hamza, the name of a } \text{place} \text{ in AlYaman—so in the } \text{Tsir (Sn)}\], where the \text{ن} is \text{rad.}, since there is no 
\[\text{نُعَنَّوَل} \text{ or } \text{نُعَنَّيَل} \text{ or } \text{نُعَنَّيَل} \text{ in the language}: \text{(g) the fourth [restriction, vid. that the } \text{ن} \text{ should not be incorporated,] excludes such as}
\[\text{عَكَجَّس} \text{ [above] (A)}\]: (a) here the augmentativeness of the \text{ن} contends with the augmentativeness of reduplication; and reduplication prevails, because it is more frequent: (b) the measure of \[\text{عَكَجَّس} \text{ is held to be } \text{نعلل} \text{ [396], like } \text{عَدَّبَس} \text{ [strong (Jh, KF, Sn), firmly made (Jh, KF)]}: \text{but AH says } " \text{What I hold is that the two} \]
َنُس met. (A, Ts.), and the proof is that we find the two َنُس to be aug. in those words whose derivation is recognizable, as ِبَعْثُٰٔ (with a double َن (Sn), fat, flabby (KF)) and زَرُّORN [short and mean-looking (Jh)], which are from ِبَعْثُٰٔ [bigness of belly (Sn)] and زَرُّORN [walk of the crow (Sn)]; so that those whose derivation is not recognizable are made to accord with them” (A): (3) when initial [above], is made aug. in the aor. [404] (Aud), as َنُضْرُبُ We strike (Ts.). The َن is regularly made aug. in (1) the aor., as ِبَعْثُٰٔ [above]; (2) ِبَعْثُٰٔ and its variations, like ِبَعْثُٰٔ (332, 667), ِبَعْثُٰٔ (483), ِبَعْثُٰٔ (382), etc.]; (3) ِبَعْثُٰٔ [and its variations], like ِبَعْثُٰٔ (332, 667), ِبَعْثُٰٔ (495), etc.: and the reason why IM is silent about them is only that they are manifest. He does not mention the Taَربَن [608, 678, 679], the َن of the du. [228] or pl. [234], the sign of the ind. in the five paradigms [405], the َن of protection [170], and the corrob. َن [610], because these are specific augments; while the intent of the [present] chapter is to specify the augments needing specification because of their being so mixed up with the rads. of the word as to become [like] part of them (A). The َن is made aug., when (1) first, as in َنُضْرُبُ [above]; (2) second, as in


§ 678. The \( \text{ضَرَبَت} \) is aug. in [four positions (A),] (1) the fem. [263] (IM), as (a) [263, 265] and 122a
like [263, 264, 267, 679] (IA, Aud) and [263, 646] (Ts); and \( \text{ضَرْبَت} \) [265, 336] (A), so in some MSS, with the tied \( \text{s} \), meaning the n. un. from \( \text{ضَرْبَت} \); but \( \text{ضَرْبَت} \) in other MSS, with an extended \( \text{ت} \), as being a pass. v.: (a) as for the notion that it is \( \text{ضَرْبَت} \) [161, 403], with a \( \text{ت} \) of the 2nd pers. pronounced with Kasr, it is a blunder, since this \( \text{ت} \) 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 \( \text{رَبَت} \) [505], \( \text{ثَمَت} \) [540], and \( \text{ثَمَتَ} \) [109] (Sn): (c) "in the fem." means "in a sing." as IA exemplifies it; or "a pl.,” like \( \text{مُسَلِّبَات} \) [234, 646] (MKh): (d) IHsh says "In my opinion, the [quiescent] \( \text{ت} \) of [feminization in] \( \text{قَامَت} \) [above] and the like should not be reckoned in this cat., because it is an independent, self-supporting word [607], contrary to the \( \text{s} \) of \( \text{مُسَلِّبَات} \) [402] and \( \text{مُسَلِّبَات} \) [above], which is part of a word, for which reason the inflection settles on it [402, 607]” (Sn): (e) as for the [mobile] \( \text{s} \) [679] of feminization, [which, like the quiescent \( \text{ت} \), is not mentioned in the SH under the aug. \( \text{ت} \), R says that] it [also] is a p. [294], not a formative letter (R): (b) \( \text{آَنَت} \) 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 သ is the pron. and န a p. of support; and it
is obvious that the သ, according to this, is not an aug.
letter: (β) that the whole is the pron., the သ 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 تَفَعُّل
[165] (IA), like تَقْرِبُ Thou [masc.] strikes or She
strikes (A): (a) IHsh says "IM does not reckon
[among the augs.] any of the aoristic letters except the
သ, 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 န of the
du., the န of the pl., and the Tanwin [677, 679] (R on
the န): (3) such [inf. ns. (A)] as (a) إِسْتَفْعَالٌ [332, 667]
(IM), where it is made aug. together with the س [680]
(IA), and إِسْتَفْعَالٌ (R, Aud, A, MKh), like إِسْتَفْعَالٌ
[368] (IA, A, Tsr) and إِفْتِدَارٌ [667] (A, Tsr, MKh);
[332] (R, Jrb, Aud, MKh) and تَفَعُّلٌ (R, Jrb, Tsr, MKh), as تَكْسَرُ breaking [intrans.] in pieces [486]
and تَفَعُّلٌ تَقْرَبُ fighting together [487] (Tsr), like تَجَسَّدُ
tَفَعُّلٌ [332] and تَقْرَبُ fighting together (MKh); and تَفَعُّلٌ,
[like تَدْحَرُ (below)] (R, Jrb); and the derivs. thereof
(R, IA, Aud, A, MKh), vid. the v. and part. (Tsr, Sn),
like قَفَعِيَّلَ (IA) : (b) ثَرْدِيَّ (IA) and ﺛَثْرَدِيَّ (R, A, Tsr, MKh), as much rejecting (A, Tsr), like تَقُلِّبُ يِسٌ hallowing, sanctifying, consecrating (MKh), and ﺗَرْدَدُ (IA) without their derivs. (A, Tsr, MKh), because there is no ﺛُ in their derivs. (Tsr), as ﺛُ rejected much and ﺛُ rejecting much (Sn), like ﺛُ قدَّ الصّ hallowed, etc., and ﺛُ rejected (MKh), which are without a ﺛُ (Sn, MKh):

(4) the quasi-pass. (IM) of ﺛُ نَاعَلَ ﺛُ ﺛَعَلَ [or ﺛُ نَعَلَ ﺛُ ﺛَعَلَ] (IA), from the tril. and quad. (Tsr), as (a) ﺛُ تَعَلَّمَ He learnt [432] (IA, Aud, A), inf. n. ﺛُ ﺛَعَلَ ﺛُ ﺛَعَلَ [332] (A), quasi-pass. of ﺛُ عَلَّمَ I taught him (IA); (b) ﺛُ ﺛَرَحَجَ [495. A] (IA, Aud, A), in? n. ﺛُ ﺛَرَحَجَ [332]; (c) ﺛُ ﺛَعَلَ ﺛُ ﺛَعَلَ [487], inf. n. ﺛُ ﺛَعَلَ ﺛُ ﺛَعَلَ [332] (A). As for the ﺛُ of such as ﺛُ ﺛَرَمَسَ [482], its augmentativeness is not regular (Sn). In any [position] other than those mentioned, the ﺛُ is not judged to be aug., except by reason of some indication (A). IM's confining himself to what is mentioned intimates that the ﺛُ of تُرْجَمَانَ interpreter, translator, with Fath or Damm of the ﺛُ and ﺟُ, or Fath of the ﺛُ and Damm of the ﺟُ, is rad.; and this is the sounder [opinion], as is proved by the retention of the ﺛُ in the remaining variations of the word, which is arabicized, or, as is said, Arabic (Sn).
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 *وَسَحَّرَْلَمْ* (373), and *تانَّظِعَب*, a town near Makka (Sn),] [the *فُنْفِلَْلَمْ*, [the fox, or its cub (372, 671) (Sn)], *تَذَرَْلَمْ* [331, 372], and 

*فَحْلَلْلَمْ* [274, 372] (A) : (a) as for the irregular augmentativeness of the [when initial], it is [also in] such as 

*تَجْفَلْلَمْ* (α) [283, 334, 379], which is from the thing was dry and hard, i. q. *يَبْسَلْلَمْ* and 

*تَبْيَانَلْلَمْ* (β) [334, 379] from *مَثِلْلَمْ* likeness; (γ) [332, 334, 379] from *بِيَانَلْلَمْ* plainness; (δ) [332, 334, 379] from *لَقَالَلْلَمْ* meeting; (ε) [334, 379] from *صَرَلْلَمْ* covering: and, in all of that, the ت, but for the derivation, would be rad., because it corresponds to the 

of *قَبْطَسُلْلَمْ* [253] and the س of *سَرْخَانَلْلَمْ* [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 *رَغْبَوْتُ,* humbly petitioning, supplicating, *رَحْمَوْتُ,* mercy, pity, *مُكْتَبَوْتُ,* kingdom [681. A], and 

*جَبْرَوْتُ* [331, 385] (A) : (α) they say *رَغْبَوْتُ,* Fear is better than pity, [i. e., That thou
shouldst be feared is better than that thou shouldst be pitied (Md)]: (b) رَحْمَوتِي and غَبْوَتِي are said, upon the measure of نَعْلُوَتِي [272]; but this is rare, not to be copied (IY): Mb says رَكَبُوتِي خَيْر مِن رَحْمَوتِي (Md): (b) تَرْنُمُوتُ twanging, which is the sound of the bow upon shooting, because it is from تَرْنُمُتُ trilling, quavering, its measure being [399, 646] (A): (a) when the ٣ is at the end of the word, after the aug. ٣, and is preceded by three or more rads., S does not hold this to be one of the prevalent [augs.], for which reason he says that سُبْرُوتُ [a desert land, and a man having nothing (MAR),] is نَعْلُوَتُ [below]; but he holds augmentativeness in the like to be recognizable only by derivation, as in مُلْكُوتُ جَبْرُوتُ and مَلْكُوتُ [above], because they are from حُرْبَى haughtiness and مُلْكُ dominion [681. A]; and so in سُبْرُوتُ [above], رَحْمُوَتُ, and غَبْوَتُ: (b) similarly S does not hold the ٣ which is at the end [of the word], after the [aug.] ٣, when preceded by three rads., as in وَرْبُومِ [646, 674, 681. A], to be one of the prevalent [augs.], the augmentativeness of the ٣ in وَرْبُومِ being, according to him, recognizable by derivation from وَرْبُومِ [343], which is the wicked, crafty: (γ) in سُبْرُوتُ S makes unprecedentedness preponderate over derivation; and therefore says that it is نَعْلُوَتُ [above],
like عصفر [253, 396]; not عصفر [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 عصفر, although عصفر is extraordinary, on the evidence of the obvious derivation, because عصفر 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): (8) the opinion of S is that the عنكبوت of عنكبوت is rad., because they say, in the sense of it, عنكبوت; 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 إسفعل and إنسعال 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 يسعور [401, 674], and a subst. for the كلهنا in [263, 307, 689] (A). In other cases, it is rad., [wherever it be found (IY),] except [when there exists an indication of its being aug. (IY),] as in [274, 372] (M), i. q. the established thing, where the first ن is aug., because, according to S, there is no [paradigm] in the language like جعفر with Damm of the [392] while, according to
Akh also, it is *aug.*, because \(\text{ٔ}^{\text{ٓ}} \text{تُنْصُبُ} \) is derived from \(\text{ٔ}^{\text{ٓ}} \text{زَكَبَ} \) was established; so that it is *aug.* because of the derivation, not on account of the paradigm: (a) the counterpart of this is \(\text{ٔ}^{\text{ٓ}} \text{تُنْصُبُ} \) for a *kind of tree*, where the \(\text{ت} \) is *aug.* because there is no paradigm in the language like \(\text{جَعْفَر} \) with Damm of the \(\text{ٔ} \) [372, 681. A] for a kind of tree, where the \(\text{ت} \) is *aug.* because there is no [paradigm] in the language like \(\text{جَعْفَر} \) with Damm of the \(\text{ٔ} \) [392, 671]: (b) similarly \(\text{تُنْفِّفُ} \) [above] with Damm, and \(\text{تُنْفِّفُ} \) [372] with Fath, of the \(\text{ٔ} \) are said, where the first \(\text{ت} \) is unavoidably *aug.*, according to him that pronounces with Damm, because of the unprecedentedness [of \(\text{تُنْفِّفُ} \)]; and is also *aug.* according to him that pronounces with Fath, because it is not *rad.* in one *dial. var.*, and *aug.* in another (IY): (2) \(\text{تُنْفِّفُ} \) [689] (M), which, according to the Bdd, is \(\text{تُنْفِّفُ} \), the \(\text{ت} \), 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) \(\text{سَنْبَتَةَ} \) [385], meaning a *period of time*, the first \(\text{ت} \) of which is *aug.*, because they say, in the same sense, \(\text{تَنْبُرُ} \) and \(\text{سَنْبَة} \), like \(\text{تَنْبُرُ} \) and \(\text{سَنْبَة} \) [254]; so that the elision of the \(\text{ت} \) is an indication of its augmentative-ness (IY).

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

\[\text{فَرَجَتْ أَلَّا ذَلَّةً بِأَمْمَٰتَكَ}\]

[below] \, (Tsir) \, (a) \, the $[\text{is added in}] \, \text{mothers, as it is added in} \, \text{poured out, shed} \, [\text{below}], \, \text{where} \, \text{is said (K on XVI. 80.)} \, (b) \, \text{is said [by some] to be pl. of} \, \text{[below], as}

\[\text{إِذَا لَدَى الْحَرْبِ رَحِيْلَ اللَّدَبِ} \, \text{$[\text{is added in}] \, \text{the} \, [\text{in} \, \text{(Tsir); \, by} \, \text{Kuṣayy Ibn Kilāb [Ibn Murra (N)], an ancestor of the Prophet, Verily I am easy in mind in battle (Jsh, N), the lion of (Jsh), [or] resolute in (N), attack, lofty in lineage: my mother is Khindif [309], the cognomen of Laila [Bint Ḥulwān Ibn ‘Imrān (Jsh)], wife of AlYās Ibn Muḍar [Ibn Nizār (Jsh)], and AlYās is my father (Jsh, N), the $[\text{being aug. in the sing. and pl. (Tsir); but the addition of the $[\text{in the sing.}, as} \, 123\, a\]
[above], is anomalous (K): (b) (Aud), inf. n. of [below] (Tsr): (2) [of the J (Tsr)] in (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 Kl (Tsr); or particles of sand, and the ocean; like طَيْسُ [above] in all [these senses]; and abundance of everything, such as sand and water, etc. (KF). But, as for the exemplification, by IM [in the Alfiya (Tsr)], his son [in the C (Tsr)], and many GG, of the s [below] with such as لِیْه and لَمَّ ترَة [above], and of the J [681] with [the masc. and fem. dems. in distance (Tsr)], دَلُكُ and ۠نَدَلُكَ [173, 599], it is rejected, because the s of silence [615] and the J of distance [599] are, each of them, an entire word, not part of another [word] (Aud): nor [is either of them] equivalent to part of what precedes it, [the addition of this clause being necessary:] lest it be said against IHsh "And so is the [mobile] s of femininization, as in قَآثِمَة [678], an entire word, not part of another [word]; and yet he exemplifies with it" (Tsr). The s is a letter of augmentation, as before stated [671], except that its augmentativeness is rare in any [position] other than pause. It is not regular except in pause upon (1) the interrog. ُمَا governed in the gen. [648], as لِیْه [above]:
(2) the v. whose J is elided for apocopeation or uninflectedness [644]; (3) every [word] uninfl. upon a vowel inseparable [from the word, as in كَيْفَةُ عَرْسٍ and كَيْفَةُ، contrary to the (word) uninfl. upon a vowel supervening for a cause that sometimes ceases, like the voc. and the sub. of ٰ (Sn)], save what has been previously excepted in the chapter on Pause (A), vid. the pret. v. [648] (Sn). It is necessary in some of those cases, and allowable in others, as before explained [615, 644, 648]. Mb denies the augmentativeness of the ٰ [671], saying that it is affixed in pause, after completion of the word, only to make [the vowel plain, and the ٰ perfectly (Sn)] plain, like the ٰ in such as LXIX. 28. and يَا زِبْدِادُ [671]; or to make [pause, which is only upon a quiescent (Sn),] possible, like the ٰ in such as ٰٰ and ٰٰ [671]: so that it is [a specific augment (Sn),] like the Tanwin [608, 677, 678], [besides being a p., like the Tanwin] and the prep. ب [503]. But the correct [opinion] is that the ٰ is a letter of augmentation, although its augmentativeness is rare. The proof of that is their saying أَمْهَاتُ [above] for أَمَاتُ, its measure being ﻤُfellahاتُ, because it is pl. of أَمَيْتُ mother; while sometimes they say أَمْاتُ (A). The author of the saying

إِذَا الأَمْهَاتُ تَبْلِغُ الْوَجْهَةَ # نُزِّحُ الْطَلَّامَ بِأَمَّادِكَ
[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, أَمَهَّةٌ is used for brutes, and أَمَهَّةٌ for mankind: but sometimes the converse occurs, as in إِذَا أَمَهَّةٌ قَبَّعَٰنَ أَلْحُم. 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 أَمَهَّةٌ [above] for مَلْعَبٌ (A), making the مُلْعَبْ a syll. in the sing., as in the pl. (Sn). The measure of أَمَهَّةٌ is فَعْلَةَةٌ (A, Tsr), the مُلْعَبْ being multiplicative; or co-ordinative, according to those who authorize فَعْلَةٌ [392] (Tsr). But IS allows the مُلْعَبْ [here] to be رَادًةٍ, [the measure of (Tsr)] فَعْلَةٌ أَمَهَّةٌ, like [مَلْعَبٌ and (A)] أَمَهَّةٌ (A, Tsr), which is grandeur (Tsr, Sn), splendour, and pride (Sn); and this is confirmed by [their saying (A)] مَلْعَبَتُ أَمَّا meaning I took as a mother, transmitted by Khl in the Kitāb al‘Ain: [so that the o. f. of مَلْعَبٌ is فَعْلَةٌ (Sn);] but afterwards the مُلْعَبْ is elided; and there remains مَلْعَبٌ, the measure of which is فَعْلٌ (A, Tsr). And, if this be established, [i. e., both what is transmitted by Khl, vid. that مَلْعَبٌ is a deriv. of فَعْلَةٌ, which alone is the o. f., and what is indicated by the preceding paragraph, vid. that the measure of مَلْعَبٌ is فَعْلٌ (Sn),] then
and are two different o. fs., like سْبَطَرِ [676], and دَمْتُرِ (KF), دَمْتُرِ (KF, Sn), دَمْتُرِ [681], [or دَمْتُرِ (KF, Sn), i. q. سَهْلَ, smooth, level, said of ground (KF)] so that, according to this, أَمِهَّةٌ is pl. of أَمَةٌ [above], and أَمَةٌ of أَمَةٌ. But what IS holds is weak, because it is contrary to the apparent [weight of evidence] (A), since, in the case of أَمِهَّةٌ, what imports augmentativeness [of the s] is found, vid. أَمِهَّةٌ, contrary to أَمِهَّةٌ and أَمِهَّةٌ; while the cat. of سْبَطَرِ and دَمْتُرِ [above] is small: so says SBd (Sn). And, as for the transmission [of أَمِهَّةٌ] 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 أَمِهَّةٌ is pl. of أَمِهَّةٌ, the o. f. of which is أَمِهَّةٌ (Ts). The s is also made aug. in أَمِهَّةٌ, I poured out the water, aor. أَمِهَّةٌ (382), inf. n. أَمِهَّةٌ, the o. f. [of أَمِهَّةٌ, aor. أَمِهَّةٌ, inf. n. أَمِهَّةٌ (Sn),] being أَمِهَّةٌ [above], aor. أَمِهَّةٌ, inf. n. أَمِهَّةٌ (A). And [they say that (Ts)] Mb has no answer to the augmentativeness of the s in أَمِهَّةٌ, except the allegation of blundering on the part of the
sayer thereof, who, since the Hamza is changed \[into \text{ ráq} (690) (Tsr)]\), imagines that the \text{ f} is the first 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 \text{ f} in \text{ al-merkum} which is \[the girl (Jh)] \text{ big in the hips, is aug.}, the measure being \text{ هَيْنَة} \[kicks in her walk; but most hold it to be rad.], the measure being \text{ مَعْلَوْس} ;

and Akh says that it is \text{ aug.} in \text{ حَجَرَ} and \text{ هَيْنَة} \[372, 392], which, according to him, are \text{ هَيْنَة}, because the first is from \text{ هَيْن} \[swallowing], and the second from \text{ حَجَر} \[which is the level place; but the argument of the majority \[for the radicalness of the \text{ f} in \text{ حَجَر} (Sn)] is that the Arabs say of two \text{ long} or \text{ tall} \[things or persons], \text{ هَذَا أَطْوَلُ مِنْ هَذَا This is longer, or taller, than that, i. e., \text{ أُطُولُ} (A); whereas, if the \text{ f} were \text{ aug.}, they would say \text{ أَحْجَرُ}, with elision of the \text{ aug.}, and retention of the rad.; while \[in \text{ أُحْجَرُ} they elide the \text{ ع}, though it also is rad., without dispute, because elision is more suitable for finals (Sn). What Khl holds, however, \[about the \text{ f in \text{ al-merkum}} \] 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 \text{ al-merkum}] \text{ عِلْقَاة} \[which is \[a name of (IY)] the lion, and
is [also (A) an ep. meaning] bulky, tall (IY, A), the 5 in it being aug., because it is from ُلْقَمَ [331] (IY). And in ُسَلِبْ # [392] the 5 may be aug., because ُسَلِبْ also means long, tall, as ُتَرْفُن ُسَلِبْ a long horn [or ُسَلِبْ (A)], i.e., طَوْبِلَ (IY, A), this being a good derivation, apparent in sense and letter (IY); or ُسَلِبْ may be of the cat. of ُسِبْطُر and ُسِيَطَ [above]. The truth is that the 5 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 5 is regularly made aug., (1) [together with the ت (A),] in ُإِسْتَفْعَالَ [678] (Aud, A), like ُإِسْتَفْعَالِ [368] (Tsr), and its derivs. (A, Tsr): (2) as is said [by Z in the M], after the ل of the fem. in pause, as أَكْرَمْتَكْ I honored thee, which is [the 5 of] the كَسْكَسْةُ [617]: but this sayer is bound to reckon the ش of the كَكَسْكَسْةَ, as أَكْرَمْتَكْ [617, 671]; and, the object of putting them being to make the Kasra of the ل plain, their predicament is [like] that of the 5 of silence [679] in respect of independence (A). The reckoning of the 5 of the كَكَسْكَسْةِ is a blunder, [because it is a p., not a formative letter; and also (R)] because this entails [the reckoning of (R)] the ش of the كَكَسْكَسْةَ (SH), which, by common consent, is not a letter of augmentation. This
is a refutation of Z, who reckons the س of the كسمسة in 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 قدموس (1) ancient [681. A]: أسطاع (2) [671, 681. A], with the disj. Hamza, aor. يسطيع [671], with Damm of the initial; [contrary to أسطاع, with the conj. Hamza, aor. يسطيع (382, 759), with Fath of the initial, i. q. أسطاع was able, aor. يسطيع (Sn)] for, according to S [below], its o. f. is أطلاء obeyed, aor. يطبع; while the س is added as a compensation for [the departure of (Sn)] the vowel of the س of the v. [from the س (Sn)], because the o. f. of أطلاء is أطوع (A), not for the departure of the vowel absolutely (Sn). أسطاع with Fath, and disjunction, of the Hamza occurs in their language: but the GG differ in accounting for it. S [above] says that it is of the conjug. of أطوع، its o. f. being أطوع، like أقوم، أفعل [703, 707]; but the س being treated as unsound, and converted into ة after transfer of its vowel to what precedes it; and the س afterwards put as a compensation for the mobility of the س, which has escaped it; as the س is put in أطوع أهترائى [382, 671, 679], with quiescence of the س, as a compensation for the like of that [loss of mobility in the س]. And there is no doubt that the
mobility of the $e$ has escaped because of the mobilization of the vowel of the $f$ with the vowel of the $e$ [below]. But, notwithstanding all of this, the putting of the $s$ and $s$ as compensation is anomalous. The aor. of $اَسْطَاطع$, therefore, according to S, is $یَسْطُطِعْ$ [671], with Damm. But Mb, supposing S to say that the $s$ is a compensation for the vowel, rejects that [account], saying "How shall compensation be given for a thing, when the thing for which compensation is given", i.e., the Fath transferred to the $f$, "is remaining?": whereas S's meaning is not what he supposes, but is that the $s$ is a compensation for the mobility of the $e$; and there is no doubt that the mobility of the $e$ has escaped because of the mobilization of the $f$ with the vowel of the $e$ [above]. Fr says that the o. f. of $اَسْطَاطع$ is $یَسْطُطِعْ$, of the conj. of $اِسْتَفْعَلْ$, the $t$ being elided for the reason assigned in the chapter on Incorporation [759]; so that there remains $یَسْطُطِعْ$ [382], with Kasr of the Hamza, which is then anomalously pronounced with Fath, and made disj.: and, according to him, therefore, the aor. is $یَسْطُطِعْ$ [759], with Fath of the aoristic letter. But, when the $t$ of $یَسْطُطِعْ$ is elided, because of the impracticability of incorporation, the well-known dial. makes the Hamza remain pronounced with Kasr, and conj., as it was [before the elision], whence $فَمَا یَسْطُطَلَّا$.
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 إستفعَالَ" [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 إستفعَال and its derivs." (A).

§. 681. The ج is aug., (1) in (M, IM) the well-known dem. [below] (IM) ns., regularly (IA), as (IA, A) دْلَك (M, IA, A) and تَلْك [679] (IA, A), هُنَالِك [175] (M, IA A), and أُولَالِك (A) [pronounced] أُلَالِك [173], whence

أولَئِكُ قُومُي لَمْ يَكُونُوا أَشَابَةَ وَهْيَ يَخْطَطُ الْأَشَابُّ إِلَّا أَلْفَكَ (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, ذَلِك [171] and دَلَّ [172] without a ي and تَلِك [175], and أَلْفَك [pronounced]
(1177)

الأَنَّ [172]: (a) the ج is added in the demons. 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 is not said; because, the حا indicating the nearness, and the ج the distance, of the demonstrated, there are incompatibility and contradiction between them: (b) [except in تَلتُك (173).] this ج is [mobilized to avoid a concurrence of two quiescents; and] pronounced with Kasr, lest it might be mistaken for the ج of ownership [604], if [ذَا لَّك that sounding like] ذَا لَّك This belongs to thee were said (IY): (2) in عبْدُل slave, servant [671], زِبْدُل Zaidal [283], and فَكَحْجَل [675] (M), where their saying عبْدُ slave, servant, زِبْدُ Zaid, and أَفْكَحُ [below] is an indication of the augmentativeness of the ج (IY): (a) عَيْقَلِ (male ostrich (IY)) is ambiguous (M): if you derive it from عَيْقَمِ [male ostrich, like عَيْقَم (Jh, KF), the م being aug. (Jh), and slender, tall (KF)], the ج is aug., its measure being عَيْقَلِ, and the i is rad.; while, if you derive it from عَيْقُلِ [with Kasr (KF), young ostrich (Jh, KF), and tall, stupid (KF)], the i is aug., and the ج rad., its measure being عَيْقَلِ; but the first [derivation] is more frequent, because they say عَيْقَمِ and عَيْقَمِ [i. q. عَيْقِمِ (above), the م being aug.
and this is the meaning of Z's saying "is ambiguous", i.e., admits of the J's being aug. or rad., according to the derivation (IY). The J is one of the letters of augmentation (A). As for the J [679], it is rare, as in زيدل and عبدل [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) عبدل for عبدل [above]: (2) نقع for ٢٦٣٥٧٥], which is having the thighs wide apart: (3) عقيق for عقيق [above]: (4) نيشلة for ٢٦٦٥۸٣٥], which is the gland of the penis [below]: (5) طيس for طيس [679]. It is reported from Akh that the J of عبد اللہ is rad., عبدل being compounded from ٢٦٦٥۸٣٥ The servant of God, as they say عبدشیب [309, 311]; but this is rendered improbable by their saying زيدل for زيدل [above]. He says, however, in the Ausat [fi-nNahw (HKh)], "The J is made aug. in عبدل alone", [not in the remainder, vid. زيدل, etc., as though he said that the remainder were of the cat. of سبت and سبطر (Sn);]
"and its _pl._ is عبَّادْلُةٌ" : so that he has two sayings (A) on عِبَّادْلِ (Sn). The remainder, indeed, [i.e., all except عِبَّادْلِ (Sn),] admit of being [derived] from two crude-forms, like سَبْطُرُ [676] (A); so that Akh's saying "[The ب] is made _aug._ in عِبَّادْلِ alone" is correct (Sn). Jr denies that the ب is a letter of augmentation. And the ب of distance in such as دِلْهَ [above] is not opposed to this, because it is a _p._ [599], like the Tanwin [608] (R). [For] the ب of the _dem._ [above] ought not to be mentioned with the letters of augmentation, because of what we said on the س of silence [679], vid. that it is an entire word (A). And he holds that قَيْمَةَلْ [above], مُقَيِّقَلٌ، طِيْسَلِ، and قَيْمَةَلْ, 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 تُرَكُّا [talkative woman (KF)], and دِمْثْ [679]. But all of that is forced, on his part: and apparently the ب is _aug._ in all those [words]; for its augmentativeness, notwithstanding the rarity thereof, is conclusively established, as in عِبَّادْلِ زَيْدَلْ [above], i.e. دِمْثُ زَيْدٌ and عِبَّادْلِ دِمْثَ زَيْدٌ: whereas دِمْثُ زَيْدٌ and عِبَّادْلِ دِمْثَ are not like that, since augmentativeness of the ب 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 ْحْيَضَتَا [672], the s of دَلْامِصُ [676] and ابْنُ [667, 671], the n of حَنْطَلْ [677] and سَنْبُلُ ears [of corn], the t of مُلْكَوْت [678], and the s of قُدْمُوس [680], are judged to be aug., because of their elision in شُمْوُل [inf. n. of شَمْلُتِ الْبِيرُح] meaning The wind shifted to the north (Tsr) and حَبَط [with two Fathas, swelling of the belly (Tsr)], عَفْر [678], مُلْك [677], بَنْوَة with Fath of its initial, i. e., dust, قُدْمَ antiquity and طَاعَة obedience, and in their sayings حَظْلَتْ أَلاَّ بَلْ [677] when they have been harmed by eating colocynth and أَسْبَلُ الزَّرْع The corn put forth ears: (2) the n of [677] and دَنْدَلْجِس [with Damm of the s, the name of a herb (401) (Tsr)], and the t of تَنْصُب [678] and تَعْجِب (Aud) with Damm of the and خ, [or Fath of the latter (KF),] and كَسْر, [with doubling (Tsr),] of the ى (KF, Tsr), upon the measure of تَفْعِل, with Damm of the and ف, [or تَفْعِلْ with Fath of the ف,] and كَسْر, [with doubling,] of the ع (Jh), diptote [because of the verbal measure combined with the quality of
proper name] (Jh, KF), i. q. َبَاطِلٌ (Jh, Tsr), as َبَاطِلٌ َوَأْتْنَ ادِى َتُحَرَّبُ They fell into the valley of Disappointment, i. e., َبَاطِلٌ َفَيَّ َدِى َتُحَرَّبُ [into] a vain, futile state (Tsr), [or] meaning َبَاطِلٌ َفَيَّ َدِى َتُحَرَّبُ into the vain, etc. (KF)—so says Ks (Jh, Tsr)—are judged to be aug. (Tsr), because of the non-existence of َفَعَلُّ [with َدَامِمٍ of its first, Fath of its third, and Kasr of its fourth (401) (Tsr)], َفَعَلُّ [392], and َفَعَلُّ (Aud), with َدَامِمٍ 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 [َتُحَرَّبُ] requires consideration, because it is transferred from the v. [4], like َتُعْلِمُ It was learnt [or َتُعْلِمُ Thou teachest]: they distinctly declare that, and [therefore] they decline it as a diptote (Tsr).
CHAPTER IX.

THE SUBSTITUTION OF LETTERS.

§. 682. Substitution occurs in the three kinds [625], as [683], [690], and [683] (M). IH says in the SH (KIF), Substitution [in conventional language (Tsr, Sn)] is putting a letter in the place of another letter (SH, Tsr, Sn, KIF), unrestrictedly (Tsr, Sn). By "substitution" the substitution arising with incorporation [735] is not meant, but only substitution without incorporation (IY); and [therefore the author of the KIF says that by "putting a letter"] IH means putting one of the [fourteen] letters of substitution, vid. the letters of [the mnemonic phrase] Аөсбі тәом жөд тоаі [below]; so that such as Эәтәлм [below], orig. өөктәлм [below], the [second] б being put in place of the of because of the intention to incorporate [756], is not adducible as an objection; for that is not named "substitution", since the б 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 ё of ёд and the Hamza of й [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 \( \mathbf{j} \) in such as \( \text{تَوْبَي} \) [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 

\[ \text{فَتَنَفَّذَقَّ} \]

XXVI. 63. *Then it was divided* to be an instance of it, i. e., [for which reason] \( \text{فَلَكَنَّ كُلُّ فَرْنُي} \) XXVI. 63. 

*And each division was* is said, the \( \mathbf{r} \) and \( \mathbf{j} \) being interchangeable (IKn)]; and it is transmitted from Khl that, in 

\[ \text{فَتَكَّاسُوا} \]

XVII. 5. *And they ransacked the interiors of the houses, فَتَكَّاسُوا* is meant, the \( \mathbf{ج} \) being put in the place of the \( \mathbf{ح} \), which also is read [by Talha (K)]; while F holds 

\[ \text{أَحَبَّتْ حُبَّ الْخَيْر} \]

XXXVIII. 31. *have preferred the love of horses* [508], i. e., \( \text{الْخَيْر} \), and AU holds 

\[ \text{إِلَّا مِكَّةَ وَتَصْدِيَةٌ} \]

VIII. 35. *Save whistling and clapping of hands* [685], i. e., 

[\( \text{تُصْدِيَة} \), orig.] , the [second] \( \text{د} \) being changed into 

\( \text{ك} \) (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 ٖٛٞ of ٖٖٞ and ٖٛٞٞٞ [689]: (2) conversion [above], in the sense of transmutation, of the letter itself into the form of another [letter]: (a) this is [found] only in the unsound letters, vid. the , و , 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) قَلَامٖ, orig. قَوْمٖ, the ٓ being aٛ in the o.f. [684]; (b) مُوْسَرٖ, [the ٛ in] which is orig. ٛ [686]; (c) ٔ رَاسٖ and ٖٔٚٞٞ, the ٓ being orig. Hamza, the rising [658] of which is softened, so that it is transmuted into ٔ [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 ٖ of ٖٖٛٞٞ [699], the Hamza of ٖٖٛٞٞ [667], and the [second] ٖٔٞٞ سَفْيَرٖ [283, 284]: (2) it is [given] for (a) a consonant, as mentioned; (b) a vowel,
like the س of أَسْطَاع [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 أ [739]: (2) what is extraordinarily substituted, vid. six [or rather seven] letters [below], i. e., the خ, the غ, the ق, the ض, [the ط, ] and the ذ, as in زَيْتُونَة for young camel brought forth in autumn [696. A]; أَعْنَ أَخْنُ for speaking through the nose [696 A]; خَطْرَة for خَطْر [696 A]; كَنَّة for كَنَّة [699 A], which is the nest of the sand-grouse in the mountain; جَلْدَة for جَلْدِي hardy [696 A]; and تَمْعَدُم for تَمْعَمَدُم 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 لَمْ يَّدِجْ صَرَفْ شَكْسُ آمِي طَيَّ قَوْبُ عَرْتُه [below]; (b) what is necessary in etymology, vid. nine [letters], combined in the spelling of your [mnemonic] phrase عَدَّتُ مُوطِيِّا [below], i. e., the س, the ج, the ل, the حامزة, the د, the ج, the م, the و, the ط, the ى, and the أ (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 l, 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)] هَدْأَتُ مَوْطِيَّا I was still, finding [the camel-saddle (IA)] *easy to ride upon* [above] (IM), سَكْنَت هَدْأَتُ meaning أَرْضَتُ مَوْطِيَّا; while أَرْضَتُ is [an *act. part.* (IA, Tsr)] from أَرْضَتُ (IA, Aud, A), except that its Hamza is alleviated by being changed into ى, 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 أَمْسِلَانَ — an irregular *dim.* of مَغْرِبُ [285, 286], like مَغْرِبُ *dim.* of [286] — in رَقْفُ فِيهَا أَلْحَم [691]; (b) the ض of أَضْطَكْجَعَ in لَمَّا رَأَيْ أَنْ آَلَحْم [647, 691]: (2) the rare, like the substitution of the ج for the double ى in pause, as in خَالِيَّ
and sometimes (a) without pause, as in [694] for \( \text{伊ل} \) [the mountain-goat (Sn)]; (b) without doubling, as in [694] (A). IM's mention of the \( \text{s} \) [in the Ālfiya (Tsr)] is an addition to what is [mentioned by him] in the Tashil, where he combines the letters of substitution in I was hungry continuously [below] (Aud, A), which is open to criticism in three respects, (1) omission of the \( \text{s} \), as has been mentioned; (2) repetition of the \( \text{l} \); (3) making the pret. govern \( \text{دآنیا} \), which is like \( \text{ابد} \) for ever [206]: so says IHsh in the Glosses (Tsr). Moreover, [when IM mentions the \( \text{s} \) (Tsr),] he does not discourse upon it here, notwithstanding his reckoning it, the reason being that its substitution [for the \( \text{ت} \) (A)] is regular only in pause upon such as \( \text{حَمْسَة} \) [638, 690], which is mentioned in the chapter on Pause [646]; while its substitution for any [letter] other than the \( \text{ت} \) is confined to hearsay, as in their saying \( \text{هیَان} \) [for \( \text{بیَا} \) (Tsr)], \( \text{أَرْقَتُ ذَلِكَ آَلَمَّة} \) [for \( \text{لَانَكَ} \) (Tsr)], \( \text{آَرْدَتُ آَلَمَّة} \) [for \( \text{لاَنَكَ} \) (Tsr)], \( \text{تَرْهَحْتُ الْدَادَة} \) [for \( \text{رْهَحْتُ الْدَادَة} \) (Tsr)], and \( \text{آَرْحَتُ الْشَّیْء} \) [for \( \text{آَرْحَتُ الْشَّیْء} \) (Aud, A) for \( \text{آَرْحَت} \) [690], in all of which they substitute the \( \text{s} \) 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-incorporative]
common substitution, meaning [common] in the speech of [all, or a body, of (Sn)] the Arabs, are twenty-two, these nine before mentioned being the letters of the [non-incorporative] substitution [common in etymology, which is the substitution (Sn) described in the Tsr above, and the Tashil below, as] necessary in etymology. For he says "The letters of the non-incorporative common substitution are combined by your [mnemonic] phrase 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 طرثت دَأَثَّبًا " [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] نَعْشَرُهُ بِبَلّ 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 لَحْمٌ خَرَادِلٌ meat cut up small for خَرَادِلٌ [in the KF خَرَادِلٌ Sn]; the idea connecting the د and ذ being that they are vocal [734], and approximate [in
outlet (732)]: while Z explains the reading as a transposition by putting the  before the  [in the sense of  Then scatter thou (K), as though it were a transposed form of  (K, B),] from their saying  [211] (A), a comp. meaning in every direction (Sn). It implies also that the above-mentioned substitution of the  for the  and  and of the  for the  , and similarly the substitution of the  for the  [688], like their saying  for  which is the long-tailed horse, and for the  , like their saying  for  The sheep gave its milk red, when its milk comes forth red, like  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  for the  , 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  , [i. e., the substitution of the  for the  (Sn),] in the dial. of Kuḍā'a [694]: (2, 3) the  , [i. e., the substitution of the  for the Hamza (Sn),] as in their saying  I thought that thou was going, i. e.,  [527, 580]; and the  [below], as in their saying, when addressing a female,  What is that which has
brought thee?, meaning بَدِّيْلٍ، and in the reading of some قَدْ جَعَلْ رَبِّيٓ تَحْكِينْ سَرْيَا ١٩٩٠. ٢٤. *God hath made below thee a rivulet* [617]: [both of which substitutions are] in the *dial.* of Tamīm, [this clause referring to the عَنْعَنَة also, as is proved by the language of the CK to be shortly cited (Sn)]: (4) the كَسْكُسَة in the *dial.* of Bakr, as in their saying, when addressing a female, أَبُسُورَّ أَبُورَّ أَمَكَ وَأَمَسُّ thy father and أَمَكَ وَأَمَسُّ thy mother, meaning أَبُورَّ أَبُسُورَّ [617, 680]. And, says IM in the CK, [even] this sort of substitution, [meaning the عَنْعَنَة and what follows it (Sn),] is fit to be mentioned [only] in books of lexicology, not in books of etymology, otherwise the عَنْعَنَة would have to be mentioned, because its substitution for the mobile Hamza is regular in the *dial.* of Tamīm, that being named عَنْعَنَة; and the ل also would have to be mentioned, because its substitution for the pron.* is regular, as in يَا أَبِينَ الرَّبِيرَ آمِحُ [129, 169, 696 A], meaning عَصْيَت; while the exs. of this [sort of substitution], among the letters substituted for others, are many: but in etymological substitution only that [substitution] ought to be reckoned whose omission would occasion error, as in your saying مَلِّيْلٍ for مَلِّيْلٍ [278, 683, 703] (A), because the, must be converted into l [684] (Sn); or difference from the most frequent [formation],
as in your saying Framebuffer [683] (A) fem. of سبّاقة (160,9),(380,83) [282] (Sn). This is his language. Many of the Etymologists reckon the letters of substitution [more general than the necessary (Sn)] as twelve, which they combine in many [mnemonic] phrases, whence  طَالِ يَومُ آنْكِدَةُ He bestowed benefits on the day I succoured him (A), with the adv. pre. to the prop. [124] (Sn).

Some drop the  ج [691], reckoning them as eleven, which they combine in the phrase  أَحِدُ طَبِيبَتْ مِنْهَا Do well (mayst thou be destroyed for it!) [below] (A), where  أَحِدُ is an imp. v. from  إِجَادَةُ (Sn). And some add the  ص and  ز , reckoning them as fourteen, which they combine in the phrase  أَنْصَتْ يَومُ زَلَّ طَالِ جَدُّ A grandfather was silent on the day a cook slipped (A), where  طَالِ , act. part. of  طَهَا , aor. ْبَحُرُ , i. q. ْبُطُرُحُ , is aq. of  جَدُّ ; while  جَدُّ is ag. of  أَنْصَتْ (Sn). The letters of substitution, [i. e., that are sometimes substituted for others (R),] are [fourteen, which are combined in their phrase (Jrb)]  أَنْصَتْ يَومُ جَدُّ طَالِ زَلَّ [above] (SH) Be silent on the day the grandfather of تَأَهِّ , a [proper (Jrb)] name [of a man (MAR)], has slipped (Jrb, MAR), i. e., on this day (Jrb). And [A asserts that] Z reckons them as thirteen, which he combines in  إِسْتَنْكِدَةُ يَومُ طَالِ He asked him for succour.
on the day he bestowed benefits [below]. But this [combination], says IH, [who calls it "the phrase of one of them," without specifying Z,] is erroneous, because it drops the ص and ذ [695, 696], which are letters of substitution, as in سِ رَا طْ for road and صَ حُ قْ hawk; and adds the س [696A], which is not a letter of substitution. For, if إسْقَعْ be adduced [by way of exemplifying the occurrence of the س as a subst. (Sn)], then إذَّكْرُ [below] and إلْمَ [above] are adducible, because إسْقَعْ 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 تتْكَدْ to be orig. إتْكَدْ [696 A, 759]; so that they substitute the س for the first ب, as they substitute the ب for the [second] س in سْ بْ ت, orig. سْ دْ سَ [689, 758]; and perhaps, therefore, Z takes that into consideration (A). [R, like A, asserts that] إسْتَتْكَدْةً يَوْمٌ طَالِ [above] is the phrase of [Z,] the author of the M (R): but, according to what Z [really] mentions [in the M] (H), the letters of substitution are (M, H) fifteen (H), the [ten] letters of augmentation [671], and the ط, the ج, the ص and the ذ (M),
which are combined by your phrase \( \text{سَتَنُّبِكَة} \)  and \( \text{صَال} \)  

He asked him for succour on the day some Zutt [a race of Hindus, arabicized form of جَت 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 \( \text{ل} \)  and \( \text{س} \); and three others, vid. the \( \text{د} \), the \( \text{ط} \), and the \( \text{ج} \) (A): which are combined by أَجْدَدُ طَرَيْتُ مَنْهَا [above]. And some add seven others, vid. the \( \text{ل} \) in أُصِيْلاً [above], the أَجْدَافُ [695] and زَرَاطُ [above], the ف in زَرَاطُ [below], the ع in تُزْرَغُ الْدَلُوْرِ [580], the ب in بَا آَسْمَك [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 \( \text{س} \)  and \( \text{ز} \) [above] in the chapter on Substitution, but Sf reckons them at the end of [his commentary on] the Book. And with them he reckons the \( \text{ش} \) of the جَكْسَكْشَة [above], which is a subst. for the \( \text{ل} \) of the fem. [696A], as in تَصَكُّي هَنـى الْعُ [617]: but, as for that which is added after the \( \text{ل} \) of the fem. as in آَ كَرُمْتِكْش [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 cross-pieces of the leathern bucket [above] for فُرُغَهَا, which is from فُرِّغَ emptying. And similarly the ب: F transmits, on the authority of As, مَا أَسْبَكَ [696A], i.e., What is thy name? (R): [while] مَكَّة Makka and بَكْرَة Bakka are two dial. vars. for the proper name of the Sacred City, like their saying آل البَيْط AnNubait and آل البَيْط AnNumait for the name of a place in AdDahna; and similar instances of interchange-ability are أَمْرٌ رَآبُ [L.A.], an established matter and رَأَبُ أَمْرٌ (B on III. 90),] and حَمْيَ مَغِيبَة constant and لَمْ يَمْلِكُ (K on III. 90). The ح [696A] occurs anomalously, in poetry, as a subst. for the:X: the poet says, [describing the beauty of the women by the brilliance of their faces (MAR),] يَنفُخُونَ مَنْهَةٌ لَهَبًا مَنْفُوَحًا [They blow from it (the face) a flame blown, a gleam that is seen to be not blazing, nor struck from a flint, orig. مَنْفُوَحًا (MAR)]; and Ru'ba says غَيْرُ الآثَارِ كَرِيمٌ أَسْمُحَ # أَبُلُجٌ لَمْ يُؤَلَدَ بَنُوَّمٌ السَّمُ [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 \( \text{سَخُنَ} \) into \( \text{ح} \) for the exigency of the rhyme (MAR). The \( \text{نَتَّشْلَة} \) occurs anomalously as a subst. for the \( \text{دَرْعَة} \) and for a coat of mail [696A], because they say \( \text{دَرْعَة} \). He put on him his coat of mail, not \( \text{نَتَّشْلَة} \); so that the \( \text{دَرْعَة} \), being more generally employed, is the original. The \( \text{ف} \) is a subst. for the \( \text{ث} \): F transmits, on the authority of Ya’kūb, \( \text{قَامَ زِيدٌ فَمَ عَمَّرَ} \) Zaid stood, and afterwards ‘Amr [696A], i. e., \( \text{نَمُّ عُمَّرَ} \) [540]; and they say \( \text{جَدَف} \) and \( \text{جَدَف} \) [540], the \( \text{ف} \) being a subst., because they say \( \text{جَدَف} \) graves [below], but not \( \text{جَدَف} \) [above] (R); [though] Fr says that the Arabs make the \( \text{ف} \) and \( \text{ث} \) interchangeable in the language, saying \( \text{جَدَف} \) and \( \text{جَدَف} \), \( \text{بَل} \). \( \text{أَجْدَاف} \) and \( \text{أَجْدَاف} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh). The \( \text{ل} \) occurs as a subst. for (1) the \( \text{ق} \), as \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) a pure Arab and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) [696A], \( \text{كَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \), but not \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) and \( \text{kَمُّ عَرْبَى تَخَّن} \) (Jh).
that Zaid is standing for \(\text{أَنّ} \text{هَذَا} \text{كَانَ} \) \([696A]\), and recite

\[
\text{فَعِنْتَكَ عَيْنَاهَا وَجِيَّدُكِ جَيْدَهَا}
\]

\([617]\) 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 أَجْدَانَ [above] with the only: (2) prevalently, as in أَقْنَلَتُ [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 لْضَتُ [below] for لَصُصُ thief, robber [689], the ت being a subst. for the ص, because its pl. لْصُرُصُ is more frequent than لْصُرُصُ (A): (a) the exemplification of the second [case], vid. reversion prevalently, by أَقْنَلَتُ [above] is not correct, because the prevalence of reversion to the ت is in أَقْنَلُتَا itself, which is more used with the ت than with the ط; not in its variations, like مُقَلَّتُ saving, مُقَلَّتُ saved, and
[act of] saving, because the ُلِصَتْ, 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 ُلِصَتْ in exemplifying the second: (b) ُلِصَتْ with Kasr of the َلِ is chaster than ُلِصَتْ with َلِDamn or Fath; but ُلِصَتْ [above] is with Fath of the َلِ: 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 أَرَّخْ بَاءَتْ and أَرَّخْ وَرَخُ dated, and أَكَنْ ُلِصَتْ and 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 تَرَّبَث inheritance, heritage [689] (SH, A), i. e., property inherited (Jrb, Sn), since "the paradigms of its derivation" are تَرَّبَث he inherited, [تَرَّبَح he inherits (482, 700) (R),] تُرَّبَح heir, [and (A)] صَرُّرَتْ inherited (R, A), all of which are derived from تَرَّبَث inheriting, as تَرَّبَث is derived from
it (R); and [similarly (R)] in أَجْهَة [683] (SH), pl. of أَجْهَةُ face (Jrb), since أَجْهَةُ betaking oneself; مَواَجَهةُ facing, and أَجْهَةُ worthy of regard are derived from أَجْهَةُ, from which أَجْهَةُ is derived (R): (a) [above], دُرَّتُ and مُؤُورُتُ indicate that the o. f. of تَرَتُّ is ; and similarly دُرَّةُ, and مَواَجَهةُ تَرَتُّ, and مَواَجَهةُ indicate that the Hamza in أَجْهَةُ is a subst. for a أَجْهَةُ (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 أَلْتَعَالِبُ (SH, A) for the foxes, and أَلْتَعَالِبُ لِهَا أَشَارِيرُ the hares; while S cites لِهَا أَشَارِيرُ the التَعَالِبُ [685] (A): for, being more used than التَعَالِبُ، the بُ in the latter is known to be a subst. for the بُ (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 جَلْكِيلَ [above], which are synonymous, while the first is less used than the second (R): (b) the substitution in أَلْتَعَالَيْسٍ is recognizable by "the paradigms of its derivation" [above] also, because تَعَالَيْسٍ is pl. of تَعَالَبُ fox, the female of which is called تَعَلِبْةٌ, and the male تَعَلَّمُانِ (Jrb): (c) IJ says "And أَلْتَعَالَيْسٍ may be pl. of تَعَالَبُ] [7], being [orig. تَعَالَيْسٍ, but (Sn)] transposed [by putting the l before the Hamza (Sn)]; so that it is like جَلْكٍ for statutes, ordinances, [except that the Hamza, when postponed from its place, is changed into ش. for alleviation (Sn)]: but what S says is more appropriate, in order that أَلْتَعَالَيْسٍ may be like أَرَائِهَا [in the verse]; and also because تُعَالَةٌ 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 l of ضَارِبٌ (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 ضَرَّيْرٌ [686] (SH, A), dim. of ضَارِبٌ [278]; for, since the o. f., [vid. the
non-dim. \((Sn)\) is known, this is known to be substituted for the \(\dagger (A)\): (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 \(s\) of \(\mathbf{\text{موية}}\) \((R)\), in which case the letter corresponding to it in the o.f., is a subst. for it \((Jrb)\)], as in \(\mathbf{\text{موية}}\) [275] \((SH, A)\), which is [a deriv., because it is \((Jrb)\)] the dim. of \(\mathbf{\text{لا}}\) [683]; for, since the dim. is \(\mathbf{\text{موية}}\) [with the \(\) \((Jrb)\)], it is known that [the \(s\) is original, because the formation of the dim. restores things to their o.f. (278, 282); so that \((Jrb)\)] the Hamza [of \(\mathbf{\text{لا}}\) \((Jrb)\)] is a subst. for the \(s\) \((Jrb, A)\): (a) IH's sayings "by the fact that etc." [in cases 3 and 4 above] mean by the fact that one expression is a deriv. of another, as the dim. is a deriv. of the non-dim. [274]; while, in the place of a letter in the o.f., the deriv. contains a letter, which can be a subst. for the letter in the o.f., as the \(\) of \(\mathbf{\text{ضَرِّي}}\) is a subst. for the \(\dagger\) of \(\mathbf{\text{ضاَرِ ب}}\); or for which the letter in the o.f. can be a subst., as the \(\) and Hamza of \(\mathbf{\text{لا}}\) are subs. for the \(\) and \(s\), respectively, of \(\mathbf{\text{موية}}\): (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 $\text{٢}$ into $\text{١}$ [in $\text{٢} \rightarrow \text{١}$] is removed in $\text{٢}$ by the preceding letter's being pronounced with Damm, and [as] the cause of conversion [683] of the $\text{٢}$ into Hamza [in $\text{٢} \rightarrow \text{٠}$], vid. the occurrence of the $\text{٢}$, which is a quasi-unsound letter, after the $\text{١}$, which is quasi-augmentative, [is removed in $\text{٢}$ by the disappearance of the $\text{١}$] 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 $\text{١}$ in $\text{٢}$ into $\text{١}$ supervenes in $\text{٢}$ by reason of the $\text{٢}$'s being pronounced with Damm, you recognize that the letter in the deriv. is a subst.: (c) there is no doubt as to the obscurity of IH's expressions here (R): (5) by the fact that an unknown formation would be entailed (SH, A), if you did not judge a [particular] letter in a word to be a subst. for another (R), as in (a) $\text{١}$ [690] (SH, A), which is [judged to be (A)] orig. $\text{٢}$ (Jrb, A), since, if it were not so, its measure would necessarily be $\text{٢}$, which is an unknown formation (A), not recognized among the measures (Sn), because there is no $\text{٢}$ [482] (Jrb); (b) $\text{١}$ [692] (SH), which is
orig., because there is no $\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{Jrb}}}}$; (c) this [argument that such formations are unknown] is true of $\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{MASH}}}$, but not of $\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{Jrb}}}$; (a) you recognize the two letters in these two formations to be subs. by the fact that the $\text{ط}$ does not occur in place of the $\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{MASH}}}$ except when preceded by a letter of covering [692, 756]; while, the $\text{ط}$ being akin to the $\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{MASH}}}$ in outlet [732], and to the preceding letter of covering in covering [734], the substitution of the $\text{ط}$ for the $\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{MASH}}}$ is a probable supposition, because of the heaviness of the $\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{MASH}}}$ after the letter of covering, and the affinity of the $\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{MASH}}}$ to the letter of covering and to the $\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{MASH}}}$: and the incorporated letter, as in $\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{Jrb}}}}$ [above] and $\overset{\text{إِفْطَعَلُ}}{\overset{\text{إِدَاَلَرُ}}{\text{Jrb}}}$ [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 ã, õ, and û (IY, A); (4) the y; (5) the õ (M, SH, A); (6) the õ; (7) the õ (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 õ, as ٢٥١٣٧٣١ and ٢٤٨٩٣٢ [328, 723]; (2) the õ, as ٢٥١٣٧٣٠ [708]; (3) the õ, as ٢٥١٣٧٣١ [below]. And, since alteration is more appropriate in the final [than in the medial or initial], what has the substitution in its õ is put by IH [and others] before what has it in its õ, and what has it in its õ before what has it in its õ (Jrb). The Hamza is [necessarily (A, Tsr)] substituted for the õ and û in four cases, (1) where the õ or û is final, [whether a õ or a co-ordinative aug. (Tsr, Sn),] after an aug. õ, [whether the initial of its word be pronounced with Kasr, Fath, or Damm (Tsr, Sn)—so in the Tsr (Sn),] as ٢٥١٣٧٣١ [above], ٢٥١٣٧٣٠ [246], and ٢٥١٣٧٣٠ prayer, [where the
Hamza is substituted for a ۱, the o. f. being ١ُکَسْاَرُ, ١ُعَلْبَّاَرُ (Tsr)); and as ۱ُبُئَآ١٧٧٢, ۱ُعَلْبَّاَرُ gazelles [237, 260] (Aud. A), and ۱ُفُنْاَس١٦٨٤ evanescence (Aud) and ۱ُفُنْاَس١٦٨٤ decree (A), where the Hamza is substituted for a ۱, the o. f. being ۱ُعَلْبَّاَرُ, ۱ُبُئَآ١٧٧٢, and ۱ُفُنْاَس١٦٨٤, ۱ُبُئَآ١٧٧٢, ۱ُفُنْاَس١٦٨٤ (Tsr); and, [says Kh in the Tsr (Su),] as ۱ُعَلْبَّاَرُ and ۱ُفُنْاَس١٦٨٤ [248], where the Hamza is substituted for a ۱ added for co-ordination with ۱ُفُنْاَس١٦٨٤ قُرْنَاس١٦٨٤ and ۱ُفُنْاَس١٦٨٤ قُرْنَاس١٦٨٤ (Tsr, Su): contrary to such as (a) ۱ُقَارَل١٧٠٣ and ۱ُتَعَاوَن١٦٨٦ trafficked with (Aud, A), ۱ُتَعَاوَن١٦٨٦ helped one another and ۱ُبُث١٦٨٦ became separated (A), ۱ُدَأ١٦٨٦ and ۱ُدَأ١٦٨٦ [below] (Tsr), for want of finality (A), because the ۱ and ۱ occur as an ۱ (Tsr, Sn) in the first two [exs., as also in the next two]; while the last two words are formed with the [inseparable] ۱ of femininization [266], contrary to the adventitious [۱ of] femininization, which does not prevent substitution, as بُنَّاَر ۱ fem. of ۱ builder [below] (Tsr): (b) ۱ُعِّز١٦٤٣, ۱ُعِّز١٦٤٣ غَرَز١٦٤٣, ۱ُعِّز١٦٤٣ طَلْبَي١٦٤٣ (Aud, A), for want of the ! (A, Tsr): (c) ۱ُر١٦٤٣ [below] (Aud, A), the name of the [particular (Sn)] letter (Tsr, Sn), and ۱ُر١٦٤٣ [below] (Aud, A), pl. of ۱ُر١٦٤٣ (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 \( \iota \),
and conversion of their \( \mathcal{J} \) into Hamza (Sn),] would occur in succession, which is disallowed (A): (a) as for \( \dot{\iota} \{\text{[723]}\), its measure is \( ^m \mu \) with two Fathas: but as to whether its \( \varepsilon \) be a \( \varepsilon \) or a \( \mathcal{J} \), there are two sayings, the first by F, and the second by Akh [698]; and, according to both sayings, the \( \iota \) is converted from a rad. : (b) as for \( \dot{\varepsilon} \{302\), its o. f. is \( ^b \mu \) with two Fathas; but the first is converted into \( \iota \), because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684] (Tsr): (c) the \( \iota \) shares with the \( \varepsilon \) and \( \mathcal{J} \) in that [predicament; so that, when final after an \( \text{aug.} \iota \), it is changed into Hamza (Tsr)], as \( ^m \mu \{273, 385\] : for its o. f. is \( ^b \mu \) [with an abbreviated \( \iota \) (Tsr)], like \( ^m \mu \text{\textsc{s}} \{250, 272\}; but an \( \iota \) is added before the final for prolongation, like the \( \iota \) of \( ^m \mu \text{\textsc{k}} \{671, 673\} \) and \( ^m \mu \text{\textsc{g}} \{369\}; and, [two \( \iota \)s then concurring, which it is not possible to articulate (Tsr),] the second \( \iota \) (Tsr) is changed into Hamza (Aud, A), because this is from the same outlet as the \( \iota \{732\]; and the vowel [of inflection], which was assumed on the \( \iota \{16\}, appears on it (Tsr): (d) this substitution is retained in company with the adventitious \( \varepsilon \) of feminization, as \( ^s \text{\textsc{b}} \) fem. of \( ^s \text{\textsc{b}} \) [above] : but, if the \( \varepsilon \) of feminization be unadventitious, substitution is disallowed, as \( ^s \text{\textsc{g}} \) guidance.


and enmity, because the word is formed with the [inseparable] s, i.e., is not formed [without a s (Sn)] as a masc. (A), being either not constituted as a masc. at all, like [above]; or shaped as a masc. in another sense, like [above], since s is the skin of a lamb, or kid, prepared [as a vessel] for [holding] water, or milk (Sn): (e) IM says in the Tashil that the letter of softness is sometimes sounded true, [i.e., retained without conversion (Sn),] with the adventitious, and changed with the inseparable [s of femininization], the first as in the prov. Give water to Rakish [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], resembles what is formed with the [inseparable] s of femininization; [but this, in my opinion, requires consideration, because it is good as an assignment of the cause for the s’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 with Hamza, as when not in a prov.: and the second as in for [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 \( رُدَآءَانَانِبَكَسَآرَانِ\) (A); i. e., allowably, which is not incompatible with IM's saying "And such as خَيَأَةَ،ٓ عَلْبَاءَ،ٓ and كْسَآرَأَعَلْبَاءَ [are dualized] with \( \text{a} \), or Hamza" [230] (Sn): but, if the word be [orig.] formed as a \( du \), substitution is disallowed, as in their saying خَقَقْتُهُ بِشَتَايْعَيْسُ [228, 230, 721]: (g) it is objected that such a rel. n. [below] as كْجَأَرَيْ، 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 \( \text{a} \), and ى، when final after an aug. !", because constructively "for every \( \text{a} \), and ى" (Sn)]: for you say عَلَّا O Ghāwī with Damm of the \( \text{a} \), without substitution, notwithstanding that it falls within the rule mentioned; the reason that substitution is not employed being that عَلَّا has already been transformed by elision of its ل [301], [on account of the ى of relation, as is expressly stated by IUK (Sn),] so that two transformations are not combined in it (A): (h) this objection is not restricted to the "rel. n." [above]: for, when [the voc.] غَأَرَيْ، without [the ى of] relation, is [similarly] curtailed, its predicament is like that [of the voc. غَأَرَيْ، since here also you say عَلَّا،] and hence Syt; when he quotes the language of IUK, omits this.
expression ["rel. n."] from it: but the condition of the curtailment of \( \text{غَارِي} \) or \( \text{غَارِي} \) 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 \( \text{غُ} \) of \( \text{غَارِ} \) is not 'final'; but medial, the elision being accidental (Sn): (j) [A suggests that,] if IM had put "when a \( \text{ج} \)" in place of "when final", saying "when a \( \text{ج} \) after an aug. \( \text{l} \)", it would have been right (A), because it would have excluded \( \text{غُ} \text{اَرُ} \), where the \( \text{ع} \) is an 
: but the expression "when a \( \text{ج} \)" is open to the objection that it does not include such as \( \text{عِلَبَاَه} \) and \( \text{نُرَبَاَه} \) [above], where the Hamza is substituted for a \( \text{س} \) added for co-ordination; and therefore IUK says that the rule should be corrected by saying "for a \( \text{س} \) or \( \text{س} \) that is a \( \text{ج} \) or co-ordinated with one": while A's expression "when a \( \text{ج} \)" and IUK's correction of the rule are both open to the objection that they do not include such as \( \text{حُرَرَاَء} \) [above], where the Hamza is substituted for the \( \text{l} \) of feminization (Sn): (k) the manner of this substitution is disputed:—(α) it is said that the \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{س} \) are changed into Hamza, which is apparently the language of IM: (β) critical judges of etymology say that an \( \text{l} \) is substituted for the \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{س} \), and afterwards the \( \text{l} \) is changed into Hamza: for, when \( \text{رَدُّي} \) and \( \text{كِسَارِ} \) are said, the \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{س} \) are mobile
after a Fatḥa [684], there being no barrier between them except the *aug. ۱*, 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 ۱, because made to accord with [the ۰ and ۱ in] the cat. of ۱َ and ۱َُ [719]; and, two quiescents then concurring, the second ۱ is converted into Hamza, because this is from the same outlet as the ۱ [732] (A): the first ۱ 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 ۰ or ۱ occurs as an ۱ of an act. part. from a v. whose ۱ is transformed, [whether the act. part. mentioned be, or be not, denuded of the sign of the fem., du., and pl. (Sn),] as ۱َ ۱َُ [above] (Aud, A), which are orig. ۱َ ۱َُ and ۱َ ۱َُ; 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 ۱ into Hamza [below], and in the v. by conversion of it into ۱ (Sn): contrary to such as ۱ََ was blind of one eye [684], act. part. ۱َََ [708], and ۱َََ was large in the eye, act. part.
because the \( \text{ع} \), being sounded true in the \( \text{v.} \), from fear of confusion with \( \text{عاءر} \) rendered blind of one eye and \( \text{عان} \) smote with the evil eye, is sounded true in the \text{act. part.} \ [\text{also}] \ (\text{Tsr}): (a) this substitution is current in what is on the measure of \( \text{فَاعِل} \) or \( \text{نَافَعِل} \) when not an \text{act. part.}, like \( \text{جَآيْرٌ} \ [247] \), which is [spelt with a \( \text{ج} \) and \( \text{س} \) by \( \text{Kh} \), who expounds it as (Sn)] a \text{garden}, whence

\[
\text{صَعَدَةٌ تَابِتةٌ فِي جَآيْرٍ} \end{equation}
\]

[419] (A), where it is spelt with a \( \text{ح} \) and \( \text{ر} \) [247] by \( \text{Al'Aini} \), who expounds it as a \text{place where water collects} (Sn); and like \( \text{جَآيْرٌ} \), which is a \text{piece of timber put in the middle of the roof}: but the language of \( \text{IM} \) here and in the Kāfiya does not include that, [because it has no \( \text{v.} \), nay, is not really an \text{act. part.} (Sn)]; though he notices it in the Tashil (A): (b) \( \text{Kh} \) says in the Tsr (Sn):—What \( \text{IM} \) mentions, following others, \text{vid.} that the \text{act. part.} is subordinate to the \( \text{v.} \) in transformation and sounding true, is dubious for two reasons, firstly that transformation is sometimes introduced into the \text{act. part.}, when it has no \( \text{v.} \) at all, like \( \text{جَآيْرٌ} \) [with the \( \text{ج} \) and \( \text{س} \), which is \text{a garden (Tsr)},] and [its \text{fem.} (Tsr)] \( \text{جَآيْرٌ} \), [which is the \text{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 ی or ی 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 ی, [because each of them
is mobile after a Fatha separated (from it) by a not
insuperable barrier (Sn)]; and afterwards the ی is
changed into Hamza, as before mentioned [under case 1
(k, β)] in connection with ٰرِداٰكَس and ٰرِداٰكَس; 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 ی of ٰنَعَل مٰعُ ن is inserted before
the converted ı in  kako and  kä [684, 703], and their likes; so that, two ı's then concurring, both of which are quiescent, [the one representing] the ı is mobilized, because it is orig. mobile; and the ı, when mobilized, becomes a Hamza [below] (A): (d) according to the saying of Mb, then, the ı and ı 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 ı and ı are written with the ı, according to the predicament of alleviation [by softening the Hamza between pure Hamza and pure ı, as is proved by what follows (Sn)], because the rule of the Hamza in those [formations] is to be softened between Hamza and ı [658], for which reason it is written as a ı: (f) as for changing the Hamza in those [formations] into pure ı, they categorically declare it to be a solecism: and so [do they declare] sounding the ı true in ı, [i. e., pronouncing it as though it were the rad. (ı), not changed from the Hamza, so that this (solecism) is not the same as the preceding (Sn)]; while, if the ı might be sounded true in ı, the ı might be sounded true in ı: (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 قَالَ is disallowed: MM says "The dotting of the ی of قَالَ is vulgar:
and", says he, "I have seen in one of IJ's compositions
that F entered the presence of one of the so-called
learned; and lo, before him was a piece of paper having
قَالَ written on it with two dots below [the ی ]: so F
said to that Master 'Whose writing is this?', and he said
'My writing'; whereupon F turned to his companion,
and said 'We have wasted our steps in visiting his
like', and instantly went out" (A) : (3) where the ی
occurs [in the pl.] after the ی of مَعْلُوٰ [18, 256], while,
in the sing., it is an aug. letter of prolongation [third],
as [عَجْرُزْ , pl. (Tsr)] عَجْرُزْ , and [سَكِيفَة , pl. (Tsr)]
سَكِيفَةٌ [246, 703, 717]: (a) the ی shares with the
and ی in this case, as قَلاْدَة necklace, collar, pl. قَلَانِد ،
and ی , pl. رُسَانِل [246, 717] (Aud) : (b) IM indicates
the third [case] by his saying "And the [letter of (Sn)]
prolongation", [whether ی , ی , or an ی (Sn),] "when
an aug. third in the sing., is seen as Hamza in the like
of [the pl.] قَلَانِد [above]," i. e., The aug. letter
of prolongation third [in the sing.] must be changed into
Hamza in the pl. on the paradigm of مَعْلُوٰ , as قَلاْدَة
, pl. قَلَانِد [above]; عَجْرُزْ , سَكِيفَة , pl.

\( \text{شکارثیف، رساءل، و عجباثر، because the letters of softness in these words are not orig. mobile; but are only dead letters, not entered by a vowel: so that, when they occur after} \)
the \(^1\), [which, being quiescent, requires to be followed by a mobile,] they are turned into Hamza; and do not appear [in their own form], since they have \textit{orig.} no vowel (Tsr, Sn) : so in the (Tsr) : (e) [the preceding \textit{exs. are}] contrary to [such as (A)] (\(\alpha\)) [or \(\text{قَسْوَة}\) \(\text{قَسْوَة}\)], which is \(\alpha\) \textit{lion} (Tsr, Sn)], \textit{pl.} \(\text{قَسْوَر}\) \([253, 675]\) (Aud, A), because the \(,\) [in the \textit{sing.}] is not a letter of prolongation (Tsr) : (b) \([\text{\textit{مَعَابَيْش}}\, \text{\textit{مَعَابَيْش}}\, \text{\textit{مَعَابَيْش}}\), \textit{pl.}\] \([246, 717]\) (Aud, A), and \(\text{\textit{مَنَابُر}}\, \text{\textit{رَدَة}}\) \([\text{\textit{رَدَة}}\, \text{\textit{مَنَابُر}}\), \textit{recompense}, \textit{pl.}\] (A), because the letter of prolongation in the \textit{sing.} is \(\text{\textit{راد.}}\), so that it is not changed [in the \textit{pl.}] (Tsr) : (\(\alpha\)) \([\text{\textit{مُصَيْبِة}}\, \text{\textit{مُصَيْبِة}}\), \textit{affliction}, \textit{pl.}\] (Aud)) \([\text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\, \text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\, \text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\), and \([\text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\, \text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\), \textit{minaret}, \textit{pl.}\] (Aud)] \([\text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\, \text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\), \textit{[with change, notwithstanding that the letter of prolongation in the \textit{sing.} is \(\text{\textit{راد.}}\), because it is the \(\epsilon\) of the word (Tsr),] are anomalous (Aud, A), what facilitates its change being the assimilation of the \(\text{\textit{راد.}}\) to the \(\text{\textit{أغ.}}\) (Tsr); and the \(\textit{o. f. is} \, \text{\textit{مَصَابِب}}\) \([\text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\, \text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\, \text{\textit{مَيْنَرَة}}\), which also are said (A) : \(\beta\) \(\text{\textit{مَعَابَيْش}}\) also, with Hamza in one version transmitted from Na\(\hat{f}\)t, is anomalous, the well-known \[\text{\textit{version} transmitted from him being with} \(\text{\textit{ي}}\), as \[\text{\textit{mentioned} in \text{\textit{the Commentary of}}}\] \text{IUK} \[\text{\textit{on the} IM}\] (Sn) : (c) \([\text{\textit{صَيْرَف}}\, \text{\textit{صَيْرَف}}\, \text{\textit{صَيْرَف}}\, \text{\textit{صَيْرَف}}\), \(\text{\textit{مُعَسِّج}}\) \([373, 674]\), \(\text{\textit{مُتَفَاءَح}}\) \([373, 675]\), and \(\text{\textit{تَفَّيَّدُ}}\) \([247]\); and \(\text{\textit{مَتَفَأَح}}\) \([366, 379]\), \(\text{\textit{تَفَّيَّدُ}}\) \([253, 396]\), and \(\text{\textit{مُكَرَّم}}\). \textit{a certain dry measure} \([685]\) : because the unsound
letter is not third (A); while ٠ and ٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠..
like عوارض, you would say تراَتِل 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 ي, and of dotting's being disallowed, is [the same] as was mentioned in the case of ناْئئ and ُبَنَع above (A). And here is a [fifth (A)] case peculiar to the ، (Aud, A):—— when two ،s 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 ،، then the first ، 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 كَرَن [357, 672, 674]; and, since reduplication at the beginning of a word is rare with sound letters, it is impossible with the ،، from the heaviness of the latter: (2) that, since they allow [the initial ، of] وَجَرْي [below] and the like, which is a single ،، to be changed [into Hamza], on account of [the fact] that, by reason of the Damma, it is like two ،s, they are naturally disposed to make the change obligatory when two ،s are [actually] present, because two ،s are heavier than a ،، and a.
Damma: these two reasons are given by S. Two cases are included under that [rule], (1), where the second, is mobile; (2) where it is quiescent, [but] original as a.

(Tsr): the first [case (Tsr)] as in the pl. of joining and preserver, where you say لَوْلُ [357, 661] and أَوْلِي (Aud), like ضَوْرَبِ، ضَارِبَةً، pl. لَوْرَبِ [247, 383, 686] (Tsr), orig. لَوْرَبِي and أَوْلِي (Aud), with two s [below], the first of which is changed into Hamza, as لَوْلَي [48] (Tsr): and the second [case (Tsr)] as in لَوْلَي fem. of لَوْلُ [357], orig. لَوْلَي [below] with two s, the first being a ف pronounced with Damm, and the second a quiescent ع (Aud), original as a,  while its pl. is لَوْرَبِ [357], orig. لَوْرَبِي [below], which is treated as above mentioned [under the first case] (Tsr): contrary to such as (a) [the passives (Tsr)] لَوْرَبِي and دْوَرُنَى، [below], where [it is not necessary that the first should be changed into Hamza, because (Tsr)] the second is quiescent, [and] converted from the لَوْلَي of فَعَلَ [490, 671] (Aud), with Fath of the ع، vid. لَوْلَي reached and دْوَرُنَى hid; so that it is not original as a، because it is a subst. for an aug. لَوْلَي (Tsr): (b) دْوَرُنَى with two s, alleviated [658] from دْوَرُنَى [below] with a pronounced with Damm, and then a Hamza, fem. of لَوْلُ لَوْلَي أَوْلِي [of superiority (Tsr)] from لَوْلَي [357], i. q. لَجَبَأ fled for refuge (Aud),
where it is not necessary that the first should be changed into Hamza, because the second, being converted from a Hamza, is not original as a: (a) allowability is to be understood from the negation of necessity (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 [, that is] inseparable [from the formation], as in (1) and (above), pls. of ْبُنَسْلَة and ْبُنَسْلَة, as (above): (2) [661], dim. of ْبُنَسْلَة joining [below] (M); and [below], dim. of ْبُنَسْلَة [above]: orig. ْبُنَسْلَة and ْبُنَسْلَة, in which there are two causes for conversion into Hamza, (a) the combination of two, s [above]; and (b) the [initial], 's being [permanently] pronounced with Damm [below], on account of the dim. formation [274]: (3) [below] and [below], which you would say if you formed a n. like ٰجُرَب [253] and lion from ْعَنَد promised, threatened and ْعَنَد weighed: (a) if used as names, they would be triptote, because they are, like ٰكُوْث ٰكُوْث Kauthar [671] and ٰجُوْهَر Jauhar [369]; not [18], like ْأَذْرُع Adra' and ْأَذْرُع Aulaj (IY). The rule for it is [here said by R to be] this:—Whenever two, s are [combined] at the beginning of a word, and their second is not an aug. [letter of prolongation] converted from another letter [699], their first is converted
into Hamza, as (1) [and above]; (2) ٰٓ�َٔٓلَٔٓلٓ [above], from ٰٓ�َٔٓلَٔٓلٓ, upon the measure of ٰٓجُرَبٔٓبَٔٓb] ٰٓجُرَبٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓb] The age of maturity was reached and VII. 19. [686]; (b) a Hamza, as in alleviated from [above]: (2) adventitious, [but not caused by substitution, in order that this case may be distinguishable from what precedes it (Sn)], as when you form the paradigm of ٰٓفَّعَلٓ [with Fath of the (Sn)], as in ٰٓرُومٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓبَٔٓb] and VII. 19. [686]; (b) a Hamza, as in alleviated from [above]: (2) adventitious, [but not caused by substitution, in order that this case may be distinguishable from what precedes it (Sn)], as when you form the paradigm of ٰٓفَّعَلٓ from ٰٓعَهَلٓ, and then reduce it to the pass., [in which case you say ٰٓعَهَلٓ, the second ( ) being an adventitious letter of prolongation caused by the supervision of Damma (436) before it (Sn)]: (3) aug., as when you form the paradigm of ٰٓطَمَّٔٓبَٔٓb] from ٰٓعَهَلٓ, in which case you say ٰٓعَهَلٓ: (a) in these four cases the change [of, into Hamza] is not necessary, but allowable: (b) some differ
about the fourth, where they hold the change to be necessary, [as above,] because two s are combined [at the beginning of the word]; while the second, [though an aug. letter of prolongation (Sn),] is not substituted for an aug., [contrary to the (second) of such as وْهُ (Sn),] since the Damma before it is unadventitious, [contrary to the Damma before the letter of prolongation in such as وْهُ (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 وْهُ (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) pl. of اَلْأَوْلِي, orig. وْرُوْلُ [above]; (b) and اَلْأَوْلِي, pl. of اَلْأَوْلِي and اَلْأَوْلِي, orig. وْرُوْلُ and اَلْأَوْلِي, with two s [above], the first the ف of the word, and the second a subst. for the of [686], as it is substituted in the dim., like وْرُوْلُ (A), dims. of اَلْأَوْلِي [above] and اَلْأَوْلِي preserver; though وْرُوْلُ and اَلْأَوْلِی [above] would be more conformable to what
precedes (Sn): (e) َٰٰٝٽ [above], which you would say if you formed the paradigm of َٰٰٝٽ [373] from َٰٰٝٽ, orig. َٰٰٝٽ [above]: (2) an original letter of prolongation, as in َٰٰٝٽ, orig. َٰٰٝٽ [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 َٰٰٝٽ fem. of َٰٰٝٽ, orig. َٰٰٝٽ [above]: (2) not a letter of prolongation at all, because not after َٰٰٝٽ, whether it be (a) mobile, as in َٰٰٝٽ [and َٰٰٝٽ] mentioned [above]; and in َٰٰٝٽ pl. of َٰٰٝٽ, orig. َٰٰٝٽ [above]: or (b) quiescent, after a vowel other than َٰٰٝٽ, as in َٰٰٝٽ, orig. َٰٰٝٽ 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 َٰٰٝٽ of َٰٰٝٽ, as in َٰٰٝٽ and َٰٰٝٽ [above], where َٰٰٝٽ and َٰٰٝٽ [below] with Hamza are allowable; or for a Hamza, as in َٰٰٝٽ alleviated from َٰٰٝٽ [above]; or for any other [letter], as detailed by A (MKh). The restriction of initiality [in the first ] excludes such [forms] as َٰٰٝٽ [661] and َٰٰٝٽ (Aud, A), rel. ns. of َٰٰٝٽ love and َٰٰٝٽ 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 [i. q. promising, threatening (Sn)], in which case you say إِبْاَوَأٍ، orig. إِرَوَأٍ، the first, being converted into ى because of its quiescence after a Kasra [685, 699], and the last ى into ٰ because of its mobility and the Fath of what precedes it [684, 719]: and, when the vowel of the first [disj.] Hamza is transferred to the quiescent ى before it, the conj. Hamza is elided, because it can be dispensed with, [since the initial is no longer quiescent]; while the ى reverts to its o. f., vid. the ى, because of the cessation of the motive for its conversion; so that the word is reduced to [with a ى pronounced with Fath, and then a quiescent ى (Sn)], where two ى are combined at the beginning of the word, and change is not necessary, but both modes are allowable: and similarly, if the vowel of the second Hamza were transferred to the ى, the word then becoming لَىٰرٰ [with two ى pronounced with Fath, and then an ى (Sn)], both modes, [retention of the (first) ى, and its change into Hamza (Sn),] would be allowable, agreeably with the opinion of F. But others are said to hold change to be necessary in that [accidental
conjunction of two, s], whether [the vowel of (Sn)] the second [Hamza (Sn)] be transferred, or not (A). The allowable [substitution of the Hamza for a letter of softness] is its substitution for every, [permanently (IY)] pronounced with Ḍamm [675], occurring (1) single, when (a) a ف, as in [ٍﺀُ وُجُهَّةَ and (IY)] [278, 322, 682, 699] (M), وُجُهَّةَ timed and أَقتَ [278, 322] (IY); (b) an ع not [doubled by having another ] incorporated into [it], as ُﺀُ أَقتَ [278] (M), pl. of دَار ُﺀُ أَقتَ pl. of ُﺀُ أَقتَ: 'Umar Ibn Abi Rabì'ā says

فَلَا فَقَدْتُ الْصُّرْطَ مِنْهُم َّأَطْفَقْتُ

مَصَابِيْنِ يَسَتْ بِالْعَمْشَاءَ وَآَنْهَرْ

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

لِكَلِّ دُهْرٍ تَدْ لَيْسَتْ آَئْوَبَا

[242] (IY): (2) coupled [with another ], when [the permanently pronounced with Ḍamm is] an ع, as in ُﺀُ أَجْوَّةَ [below] and ُﺀُ أَجْوَّةَ [278] (M). The formula for it is "Every, pronounced with a permanent [below] Ḍamma, whether such, be initial, [as in ُﺀُ أَجْوَّةَ;] or medial, [as in ُﺀُ أَجْوَّةَ and ُﺀُ أَجْوَّةَ:] and whether that which is initial be followed by an aug. و, converted from another letter, as in ُﺀُ أَجْوَّةَ [above]; or not, as in ُﺀُ أَجْوَّةَ [above]" (R). As for
the substitution of the Hamza for the, pronounced with Damm, mentioned [in the last two paragraphs], it is good, regular, as in (1) أُجْوَة [above]; (2) أُدِّور [above] and أُنْوَر pl. of أَنْور fire, orig. أُذِّرُ and أُذِّرُ سَرُوق [242]; (3) سَاقِ شَانَك, and غَوْر inf. n. of غَوْر The water sank, aor. يَغْرُ, inf. ns. غَوْر and غَوْر, where the conversion is not on account of the combination of two s, because the second is an aug. letter of prolongation (A). Our saying [that the 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 دُلُو This is a bucket (IY, A); (2) the [concurrence of (IY, A)] two quiescents (IY, R, A), as in II. 15. [403, 664, 684] and II. 238. [547, 664, 684] (IY, A). And "not doubled [by having another, incorporated into it]" is to guard against such as تَعْبُدُ taking refuge and تَكُّوْلَ shifting. As for the substitution of the Hamza for the for pronounced with Kasr between an and a double ى, it [also] is [an allowable substitution for a letter of softness; and occurs] in such as رَأَيْى and غَلَيْى [305], rel. ns. of رَأَيْى and غَلَيْى, orig. رَأَيْى and غَلَيْى with three ىs, 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 1 in [a good number of positions (IY), such as (M)] (a) and [665] (M, A), for َدَآْثَةٌ and َشَآْثَةٌ, where the 1, being mobilized on account of the concurrence of two quiescents, is converted into Hamza, because the 1 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)] إِبِتَاضٌ (M, A), إِشْعَالٍ, إِبِيَاضٍ (M), and إِدْهَامٍ, إِبِيَاضٍ, and إِدْهَامٍ (M), and إِشْعَالٍ, إِبِيَاضٍ, and إِدْهَامٍ, and إِشْعَالٍ, and إِدْهَامٍ, and إِشْعَالٍ:

Dukain says

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

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

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

يَا دَارُ سُلْمَيِّي يَا اسْلَمَيْي ثمَّ اسْلَمَيْي فَخَذْنِنَّ هَذَا اَلْعَالِمَ (M) O abode of Salmā, O hail, again hail! Then Khindif [309, 679] is the head of this world (Jsh), because the 1 would be a foundation in العَالِمَ (IY) with which only a word [ending] like آسْلَمَيْ (M) or
آَلِلَّمِ (IY) would be allowable; so that, since he says
ثَمَّ أَسْلَمَيْي
(at the end of the first hemistich), he pronounces
الْعَالِمَ with Hamza, in order that the rhyme may run in one course as respects lack of foundation (IY): while بَآْز [665] is transmitted (M) from them by Lh with Hamza, orig. بَآْز without Hamza, as is proved by their saying, in the pl., بَآْز (IY): the poet says

As though he were a tame falcon above a watch-tower, that had discovered the sand grouse in a level smooth plain (Jh, IY): and [hence (IY)] The hen clucked [674]; and the poet says صَبِّرْا فَنَقِّيَتَ هَيْجُبْ آلِلَّمِ [665] (M), cited by Fr, where the poet, being
constrained to mobilize the ل before the ق of المَشْتَاقُ, because it corresponds to the ل of [the foot] مُسْتَفْعَلُون, 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 ل where-from the ل was converted, since مُسْتَفْعَلُون is مُشْتَاقُ لُون, being orig. مُشْتَروٰق (IY); and Fr transmits, in a case of no constraint, لُون لُون مُشْتَلٰل. The man discharged the obligation of performing the pilgrimage (R), for لُون (MAR): (a) that [conversion of the ل into Hamza in the exs. given under (b)] is not for escape from the [concurrence of] two quiescents; but is because of the proximity of the outlets of the ل and Hamza [732] (R): (2) the ل not pronounced with Damm (M), (a) when a ف pronounced with Kasr or Fath (IY) : (a) as for the substitution of the Hamza for the initial ل below pronounced with Kasr, it is (A) in such as وُشَاحٌ, and [for] baldric, وُنَادَةٌ, embroidery, and وُسَادَةٌ cushion (IY, A); and [إِعْامَةٌ and وُعَابٌ for وُسَادَةٌ] sack, whence (IY) إِعْامَةٌ أَخِيهٍ XII. 76. The sack of his brother [Benjamin (K, B)] in the reading of [Ubayy (A).] Sa‘id Ibn Jubair (M, A), and IIU (A): S cites [the verse by Ibn Mu‘kbul (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 Ḍamm, since they deem Kasra, as they deem Ḍamma, to be heavy [on the,] (IY): (β) Mz holds this substitution to be regular [322] (M, R, A) in the [initial], (R) pronounced with Kasr (M, R): but others restrict it to hearsay (IY, A); while I'm reports that IUK says "I have seen in some book that it is the dial. of Hudhail" (Sn): (γ) "initial" [above] is to guard against such as the, of طَرِيْلَ long [684], which is not converted, because the [,] pronounced with Kasr, being lighter than the one pronounced with Ḍamm, 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)] لأَنَا languid [699] (M, A), on the measure of تَنَا spear-shaft (Sn), said of a woman, orig. لنَّي (IY, A), نُنْيُ thể from لنَّي i. q. فُتْرُ languor (IY), [or] from لنَّي [with Fath of the, and quiescence of the ن, as is understood from the KF (Sn),] i. q. بَطْطُ slowness (A); أَسْبَآء Asmā (M, A), a
woman's name (IY, A), to guard against أَسْمَاءٍ pl. of ٌاَسْمُ [667] (Sn), because, says IS, it is orig. ٌارْسَامَةٌ [699] (A), its measure being فَعَلَاءٍ (IY), from ٌحُسْنُ i. q. عَنْचَّا beauty (IY, A); and أَحْدَ [322] (M, A), when used as a num. (IY, A) in أَحْدَ وَعَشْرُونَ and أَحْدَ عَشَرَ [313] (IY), orig. ٌرَحْدٌ, from ٌرَحْدَةٌ unity; contrary to أَحْدَ (IY, A) in مَا جَآَءَنِي أَحْدَ [322] (A), [and] in مَا بَآَلَدَرُ مِنْ أَحْدَ أَحْدَ There is not any one in the house (IY), where the ُهَامْزَة is [said to be (A)] original (IY, A), because أَحْدَ is not in the sense of unity (A), since it denotes generality, not singleness (IX); though [here also] the Hamza is said [by some] to be a subst. for the، (Sn); and أَحْدَ in the tradition (M) that Muhammad said to a man, who made the sign with his two forefingers in reciting the creed، أَحْدَ أَحْدَ Make the sign with one, one, i. e., أَحْدَ وَجَٰدٍ (IY): (b) [when a letter of prolongation: for] F recites أَحْبَبْتَ الْمُوَتِّدِينَ إِلَى مُوسَى وَجَعَدُهُ إِذْ أَفْضَأَهُ إِلَىْالْقُوُونُ (R), by Jarîr, praising Hishâm Ibn 'Abd AlMalik, The dearest of the kindlers (of fire) to me are, also related لَكِحَبْتُ الْمُوَتِّدِينَ Assuredly very dear to me are [476] the two kindlers (of fire), Mûsâ and his sister Ja'da, when the blaze has lighted them up (Jsh), with the of the المُوَتِّدِينَ [or مُوسَى] and pronounced as
a Hamza; while [reported to have been (B)] read [by Ibn Kathîr with the ] (B) pronounced as Hamza (R), because of the Ăamâma before it, like [for ] (686) (B): (a) the reason of that is said to be that the  , being in the vicinity of Ăamâma, becomes, as it were, vocalized with Ăamma; while the  vocalized with Ăamm is [regularly] pronounced as Hamza, as in [above] (R): (3) the  (M, A), (a) when [initial, and] pronounced with Fath, in which case they substitute Hamza for the  , as they substitute it for the [initial]  [pronounced with Fath], though more rarely than for the  [above] (IY): they say (a) God cut off his hand! (M, R, A), with Fath of the Hamza, and quiescence of the  (Sn), meaning [i. e., ] (A),] by restoring the  [260, 719], and (IY, R, A) substituting a Hamza for the  (IY), [i. e.,] changing the [first (R)]  into Hamza (R, A): so says IJ (R): (α) F says that  is a dial. var., [i. e., ] (IY, R, A), which is shortness of the [upper (IY)] teeth, or, as is said, their curvature towards the inside of the mouth, whence said of a
man, and یَلَّاَلِیَهَلَةِ of a woman (IY, A): (b) [when a letter of prolongation: for] they (M, R), [or] some of them (A), say ُشَعْبَةَ nature (M, R, A) with Hamza (A), orig. with ی (IY, R), the Hamza being a subst. for the ی (IY); and similarly ُرُبُّبَالِ, 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)] ۳۶۰۵ [304, 326, 682, 684] (M, Jrb, A), and [sometimes also in its pl. (Jrb)] ۳۶۰۷ [below] (M, Jrb): (a) the o. f. of ۳۶۰۸ (IY, R, Jrb, BS, A) is ۳۶۰۹ [below] (Jrb, A), the o. f. of which (A) is ۳۶۱۰ (IY, R, BS, A), as is proved by [the dim. (IY)] ۳۶۱۱ [275, 278] (IY, Jrb, A) and [the broken pl. (IY)] ۳۶۱۲ [278] (IY, A), its ۳۶۱۳ being converted into ۱ (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 ۳۶۱۴ becomes ۳۶۱۵ [above] (IY): while its ۳۶۱۶, [being then assimilated to the unsound letters (IY, R), on account of its faintness, and being therefore like a ی or ی occurring as a final after an aug. ۱ (R),] is converted [into ۱, and afterwards (R)] into Hamza, [as in case 1 (۲; ۳) 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 ۳۶۱۷ [above]
with the ٠, which they sometimes change [into Hamza] (BS); [so that] in the pl. (IY, MAR) they also say ٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠ (IY, R) for ٠٠٠٠٠٠, for a similar reason, [vid. the assimilation of its ٠ to the unsound letters, as explained above under ٠٠]. (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 ٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠ [278], according to the o. f., with the ٠, not otherwise (BS): (d) the substitution in (Jrb) ٠٠٠٠ is anomalous (SH, Sn), in two respects, [the substitution of Hamza for the ٠, and the transformation of two consecutive letters] (Sn); but is (R) obligatory (SH), whereas in ٠٠٠٠ it is not so (Jrb): (e) hence ٠٠٠٠٠٠ [275, 278, 304, 326, 684], a [lexicological] pl. of ٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠, orig. ٠٠٠٠٠٠ [260, 304] with quiescence of the ٠: for they elide the ٠ by assimilation to the unsound letters, because of its faintness, weakness, and finality; and, when the ٠ is elided, the n. remains as ٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠; and then the ٠ is pronounced with Fath, because of its vicinity to the ٠ of femininization, the letter before which, [when not an ٠, ] is pronounced with Fath [646]; so that the ٠, being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath
is converted into ٍ [684], the n. becoming ٩ َدَلَّة; and, when it is pluralized, the ٨ of femininization is rejected, on the principle of ٩ َدَلَّة and ٩ ُتَمَرَ [254]; so that the n. remains with two letters, the last of them an ٍ, which, when Tanwin is affixed to it, is exposed to elision, as the ٍ of َعَصَا and َرَحَى is elided [643, 684, 719], in which case the explicit n. would remain with one letter; and, that being impossible, they restore the ٨ elided from the sing., so that the word becomes constructively ٩ َدَلَّة, restoration of the elided being more appropriate than importation of a strange, extraneous letter; and then the ٨ is changed into Hamza, so that ٩ َدَلَّة is said (IY): (f) ٩ َأَهْل family is said to be orig. ٩ َأَهْل; then ٩ ُلُل, the ٨ being converted into Hamza; then ٩ َأَل, the Hamza being converted into ٍ [658]: that is because conversion of the ٨ into ٍ [684] is not established, while its conversion into Hamza [above] is established; and it is better to rely upon that conversion of which similar instances are established: but Ks says that its o. f. is ٩ ُأَوَل [684], because they, [i. e., the members of the family,] َيُولُونَ إِلَى أُصُلٍ go back to a [common] stock, or origin (R): (2) ٩ ُأَلْ َفَعَلَت (M, A), i. q. ُأَلْ َفَعَلَت and ُأَلْ َفَعَلَت (A): (a) AU relates that the Arabs say ٩ ُأَلْ َفَعَلَت [above], meaning ُأَلْ َفَعَلَت (IY, R); while the Hamza here is
decided to be a subst. for the $s$, because in interrogation $\text{هلل}$ is prevalently, and $[\text{لل} \text{with}]$ Hamza rarely, used, for which reason the $s$ is [considered to be] original : (b) as for their saying $\text{لا تعلم (IY)}$, it is said [that the Hamza here is a subst. for the $s$, and (IY)] that the o. f. $[\text{لا in excitation (R)}]$ is $\text{لل} [573]$ (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

\[\text{وما دعاكما للوديقي باب بكحص شاحك رحمي} (M, A)\]

And the deserts of intense heats were agitated at times, like a billow of a laughing, far-extending sea (Sn), cited by As, where $عباب$ is meant (IY), $عباب$ being orig. $عباب$ (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 $\text{أَعْمَنَ تَرْسَمْتُ أَلْحَم} [580, 682]$ and the like (IY). Some, however, say that the Hamza [here (A)] is [original (IY),] not a subst. [for the $ع$ (A)]; and that $أَبَاب$ is only $[\text{دعال (A)}]$ 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 ی pronounced with Kasr between an ی and a double ی, the initial ی pronounced with Kasr, the ș, and the ع, as also the irregular substitutions for the ی, and ی] are not mentioned here by IM is only that the substitution of the Hamza for them is allowable [or anomalous], not necessary; whereas here he notices only the necessary; and, if he notices any thing else, it is [merely] by way of digression. As for its substitution for the ع and ی, it is [found in] their sayings صرخ screamed, and رَفْنَه [hearkened, and agreed, to it (Sn)], transmitted by Akh and Nr, respectively, on the authority of Khl. But its substitution for these two letters is very strange (A).

§ 684. The ی is substituted for (M, SH, A) four letters (IY, A), (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), the ی, and ی (IY, A, MASH); (3) the Hamza (M, SH, A); (4) the [single (A)] ن (M, A). [And IH mentions a fifth, vid. the ș below.] Its substitution for its two sisters is (1) [regular (M), obligatory (SH),] in (a) such as باب, and دِعَا [703] (M, SH), َبَعَ [719] َرَمَى and قَالَ [703, 711], vid. where the ی and ی are mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (M, R),
subject to the [other] conditions mentioned [by A below] (R): (b) ٌل، according to one opinion (SH), since its o. f., according to Ks, is ٌل [683], because its dim., according to some, is ُل; but the ِل is converted into َل: while, according to the BB [below], the َل is substituted for the ِل (Jrb): (2) irregul., [rare (IY).] in such as ٨٨٨ [below], ٨٨٨ ح، and ٨٨٨ (M), where they substitute an َل, from desire of lightness [below], for the quiescent ِل and ى, when preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (IY). IM indicates the [regular] substitution of the َل for its two sisters by his saying “Substitute an َل for a ِل or ى orig. mobile, after a conjoined Fath”, i. e., Change of the ِل and ى into َل is necessary upon eleven conditions, (1) that they be mobile; for which reason they are sounded true in ٨٨٩ and ٨٨٩ [703], because of their quiescence: (2) that their vowel be original; for which reason they are sounded true in ٨٩٠, ٨٩٠ and ٨٩٠, alleviated from ٨٩٠ the she-hyæna and ٨٩٠ 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 ٨٩١ in compensation [711], ٨٩١ [685], and ٨٩١ 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 علبت [392] were formed from raiding and رمي shooting, غز و and would be said, defective (A), like غز و with two s, and رمبي with two ىs (Sn); and the [first] ى and ى would not be converted into ى, because the conjunction of the Fatha with them would be adventitious, caused by elision of an ى, since the o. f. would be غر و [727] and رمبي, because علبت is orig. علبت [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 ىs; and that they be not immediately followed by an ى or a double ى, if they be ىs: (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 ى, or [than] a ى wherein doubling is customary": (b) for that reason
the ḫ is sounded true in such as جِبَانِی perspicuity, طَلِیل [348, 683], خُرَّتِیق KHawRāNāK; and the ḫ in such as خُرَّتِیق [348], and عَصْوُانِی Fāṭīmā and خُرَّتِیق [663, 719], and فَتْیانِ and Ḫūţā [299, 300] (A), these [last] two exs. being combined by A because the ḫ, in the first is converted from the second ḫ of عَلیّ عَلیّ al-ʿAlī, which is converted from a ی; and in the second is converted from the ی of青春 youth, which is converted from a ی (Sn) when the ḫ is transformed in بَابُ قَامُ [703], بَابُ بَاعُ [703, 711], because the letter after it is mobile; and the ḫ in دَاوَا and زَمِی [719], since there is no ی or double ی after it: (c) similarly [the ḫ is transformed in] یَخْضَسْوَن They dread and یَخْضَسْوَن They obliterate [with Fath of the ی, according to the dial. of those who say یَمَكْسِوْن, aor. یَمَکْسِوْن (Sn), inf. n. یَمَکْسِوْن (Sn)] and یَمَکْسِوْن (Sn), the [second] ی and [first] ی, respectively, being converted into ل, because mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; but being afterwards elided, because of the two quiescents: (d) and so, in the pl. of عَصَصَ ʿAṣā, when used as a name [for a rational male (Sn)], you say قَامُ عَصْوُن [properly The] ʿAṣā's [13] stood, orig. عَصْوُن, [the first of] which is treated as mentioned [under (c)]; (e) according to this, if you formed from عَزَزِی and یَمَكْسِوْن a word
like ُعَنْكَبُوتُ [399], you would say ُرَمْيَتُ and ُغَرْزَتُ [with Fath of their first and third, and quiescence of their second (Sn)], orig. ُرَمْيَتُ and ُغَرْزَتُ, the [second] ي and ُbeing converted [into َ]; and [afterwards] elided, because of meeting the quiescent [َ]; and that [formation] would be facilitated by the freedom from confusion [of the transformed with the o. f. (Sn)], since there is no ُفَعَلْرُثُ in the language (A); so that [in ُرَمْيَتُ and ُغَرْزَتُ] one would understand it to be transformed, orig. ُفَعَلْرُثُ [399] (Sn): (f) some hold that this [unsound letter in the word formed on the measure of ُعَنْكَبُوتُ from ُرَمْيَتُ and ُغَرْزَتُ (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 يَخْشَرُونَ [above], يَشْكُرُونَ, and عَضُوْنَ, alleviation by means of the transformation mentioned is [not so] suitable [in it as] in the pl. (Sn): (g) the reason why they sound [the َ or ََ] true before the ََ and the double ََ is that, (a) if they transformed [it] before the ََ, two quiescent ََs would be combined, so that one of them would be elided [663]; and therefore ambiguity would result in such as ُرَمْيَا ُغَرْزا [above], because it would become ُرَمْيَا ُغَرْزا, and no one would know whether it belonged to the du. or to the sing.;
while what would not involve ambiguity, [such as قُلُبٍ and عَضْرَانٍ (Sn),] is made to accord with what would involve ambiguity, because it belongs to the same cat. [in that the  and  are followed by a quiescent ] (Sn)): (b) the  of such as عَلَوْيِإ is in a position where  is changed into , because the  of relation necessitates conversion of the  [third] into [300]; so that, if the  were converted into  because of its being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, the  would be converted into , on account of the  of relation; and an endless concatenation of conversions [from  ] into  and [from  ] into , would be entailed (Sn): (7, 8) that neither of them be an  of the  [with Kasr of the  (Sn)], whose qual. is  [348]; or of the inf. n. of this v. [331]: (a) these two conditions IM indicates by his saying “But the  of ”, as عَلَدَة tenderness and squinting, “and  فَتَّلَّ as was tender and squinted, “when possessed of” a qual. “أَنْبَعَلَلْ [below], like أَغْيَدُ [tender in body (Su)] and أَحْوَلَ squinted, cross-eyed, wry, is sounded true” [703]: (b) the reason why the v. in this cat. must be sounded true [in the ] is only that it is made to accord with  [707], as  squinted and  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 َنَفَّعُ" [above] IM guards against such as حَاف [403]: for it is َنَفَّعُ with Kasr of the ع [704], on the evidence of َأَمِن َنَفَّعُ 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 َنَفَّعُ, like حَاف fearing, not َنَفَّعُ: (9) which is peculiar to the ع, that it be not an ع of the َنَفَّعُ 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 َنَفَّعُ, the ع, when a ع [below], is preserved, and is not transformed", i. e., When the َنَفَّعُ whose ع is ع is i. q. تَفَاعَلَل [487], it is sounded true [in the ع], because made to accord with َنَفَّعُ, تَفَاعَلَل 703], on account of its being in the sense thereof, as إِجْتُنَّوْا [492, 707] and إِرْدَوُزْوا. They intermarried [693, 707], i. q. إِرْدَوُزْوا َنَتَمَأَوْزْوا: (b) by his saying "And, if reciprocity be plain" [above], he guards against َنَفَّعُ 's not being i. q. تَفَاعَلَل, in which case its transformation is necessary, unrestrictedly, [i. e., whether its ع be ع as in إِرْتَبَب doubted; or ع (Sn),] as in إِخْتَانَ was unfaithful, i. q.
passed through, i. q. جاز: (c) by his saying "when a," [above], he guards against its ج's being a ی, in which case its transformation is necessary, even though it be indicative of reciprocity, as إمتازوا إبتاعوا They were distinct, one from another, إستانونوا meaning They trafficked, one with another, and إستانونوا إستاني
by their saying حَرَوَانِي for its du. [229], and حَرِّ وَ حَرَوً [672] for the pl. [249] and fem. [273] of black; (β) of two ی is [in] such as لَحْيَةٌ for rain, its o. f. being حَيَّيٍ, because its du. [229] is حَيْيَانُ, but its second ی being transformed [into ] because of what has been mentioned above [under (α)]; (γ) of the ی and ی is [in] such as لَهْوِی love [326], its o. f. being حَوْرِی, but its ی being transformed: (b) for that reason one sounds [both the ی and ی] true in such as حَیْوَانُ animal [638], because the [letter] entitled to transformation is the ی, transformation of which is impossible [under the sixth condition], because it is a ی followed immediately by an ی (A): (b) IM indicates by his saying “But the reverse is sometimes true”, [i. e., holds good anomalously (Sn),] that sometimes, in the preceding [combination of two unsound letters in the word (Sn)], the first is transformed, and the second sounded true, as in غَايْةٌ utmost extent [723], orig. غَايْةٌ [with Fath of the two ی s (Sn)], the first ی being transformed [into ی], and the second sounded true, which is facilitated by the second’s not occurring as a final: (α) like غَايْةٌ in that [respect] are (α) نَائِیةٌ [305]: (β) طَائِیةٌ [305]: (γ) آیَیةٌ [302, 305, 683, 723], according to Khl, its o. f. being آیَیةٌ; but the ی being anomalously transformed, since the rule is to transform the second; and this, as IM says in the Tashlîl, is the easiest mode
[of accounting for َّيّأ] : (b) the saying that its o. f. is (α) َّيّأ [commonly written َّيّأ، as in B on II. 37.], with quiescence of the first ى [298], entails transformation of the quiescent ى, [contrary to the first condition]: (β) َّيّأ, on the measure of َّعَلَّة، entails elision of the َّع without any necessitating cause (A) for its elision, because the customary [procedure] in the like [formation] is conversion of the first ى into Hamza, as [the ى and َّع are converted] in َّعَلَّة and َّعَلَّة [683], [respectively] (Sn): (γ) َّيّأ، like َّقَبَّة [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 َّيّأ into ى, not into َّع [661] (A), in order to give precedence to incorporation [in َّيّأ] over transformation [in َّيّأ] but Jrb holds that precedence should be given to transformation; while some hold that precedence should be given to incorporation in the َّع, and to transformation in the ج, 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 َّيّأ] are
six, the four mentioned by A [above in \(\alpha\) (\(\gamma\)) and \(\beta\)] : the fifth that its \(o.f.\) is \(\text{أَيَّةٌ} \), with \(\text{Damm}\) of the first \(\text{ى} \), like \(\text{sُرَى} \) [254], the \(\text{ع} \) being converted into \(\text{l} \), which, says \(\text{Kh} \), is refuted by [the fact] that conversion of the \(\text{Damma}\) into \(\text{Kasra}\) would be necessary, [so that this mode would be identical with the fourth] ; but this requires consideration, and the language of \(\text{Frd}\) is “and, it is said, \(\text{أَيَّةٌ} \) with \(\text{Damm}\) of the first \(\text{ى} \), the transformation of which [into \(\text{l} \)] is according to rule” : [and] the sixth that its \(o.f.\) is \(\text{أَيَّةٌ} \) with \(\text{Fath}\) of the first \(\text{ى} \), as in the first saying, except that the second \(\text{ى} \) is transformed, according to rule; so that \(\text{حِيْأَةٌ} \) becomes \(\text{أَيَّةٌ} \), like \(\text{حِيْأَةٌ} \) life; and then the \(\text{j} \) is moved up to the position of the \(\text{ع} \), in which case its measure is \(\text{nَلَّة} \) with three \(\text{Fathas} \): (d) the commentary of \(\text{B} \) [on \(\text{II. 37.}\)] contains two other modes, \(\text{أَرْيَةٌ} \) [like \(\text{Tَرْسَة} \) a date (\(\text{B}\))], with quiescence, and \(\text{أَرْيَةٌ} \) [like \(\text{Rَمَكَة} \) a marc (\(\text{B}\))], with \(\text{Fath}\) of the \(\text{ٍ} \); so that the modes are eight: (c) if [only] one of the two [consecutive unsound letters] be entitled to transformation, but its transformation entail transformation of the other, that is not an instance of the forbidden occurrence of two consecutive transformations; so that there is no difficulty in such as \(\text{مَعْدَيٞ} \) [685, 722], \(\text{عُصَيٞ} \) \(p.l.\) of \(\text{عُصَيٞ} \) [243, 685, 722], and \(\text{عُشَيٞ} \) \(i.n.\) of \(\text{عَنَا} \) [685, 722]: so says \(\text{YH} \): (d) the combination of two transformations is
allowable with a separative, as in يُفرِن They fulfil, since its o. f. is يُرِيُنَ: nay, IM, in the CK, rejects [the assertion] that the occurrence of [even] two consecutive transformations is a catachresis that ought to be avoided unrestrictedly, disallowing it when they agree [in kind]; and pardoning it when they differ, as in مَا and شَآ [683] and تَرَى [658], orی. ضْرَة and شَة and تَرَى: but it is sometimes replied that these expressions are anomalous: so says YS (Sn): (11) that neither of them be an ع of what ends in an augment peculiar to ns. (A), like the ﰊ and ﺔ, and the ﰄ of feminization (Sn): (a) this [condition] IM indicates by his saying "And the ع of that [word (IA)], at whose end that [augment (IA)] which is peculiar to the ﰊ has been added, must be preserved", i. e., The conversion of the ﰋ and ﯽ into ﰄ, on account of their being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is prevented by their being an ع 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 ﯽ. [667], becomes remote; and that is [exemplified in] such as جُولان [331, 698, 703] and ِسْيَلَان flowing: (b) whatever instances of this sort, [whose ع is ﯽ, or ﯽ, and at whose end are an ﰄ and ﺔ (Sn),] occur transformed are reckoned anomalous, as دَارَان Dārān and مَأَضَان Māhān (A), [each of which is] a 133 a
[proper] name (KF), by rule مَهْـائَانُ (A, MKh), because orig. the du. of دَارُ and مَآ (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, M.Kh): (c) Mb [dissents, and (A)] asserts that the rule [in what ends in an ] and ن (Tsr, Sn) is transformation (A, Tsr); and that there is no anomaly in دَارُانُ مَهْائَانُ, but the sounding true in ُجُولَانُ and مَهْائَانُ, being distracted by love is anomalous (Tsr); because the ] 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 ُزَعْقَرَانُ from ُزَعْقَرَانُ [274, 282, 283], the ] 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 ] of feminization [263, 272] in such as صَرَّئى Sawarà, [on the measure of ْفَلَي, mentioned by S (Bk),] which is a name of a water, Mz holding that this ] is a preventive of transformation, because of its peculiarity to the n.; while Akh holds that it does not prevent transformation, because it does not exclude the n. from resemblance to the v., since صَرَّئى, in pronunciation, is equivalent to ْنَعَلا. They two [masc.] did: so that the sounding of [the ] صَرَّئى true is, according to Mz, regular; but, according to Akh, anomalous, not to be
copied; and therefore, if the like thereof were formed from تأويل s. saying, then, according to the opinion of Mz, تأويل would be said; but, according to the opinion of Akh, تأويل: 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)] ș of feminization [263] is disregarded [as a factor] in sounding true, because it does not exclude the n. from the semblance of a v., since the [quiescent (Sn)] ت is affixed to the pret. [607]; so that no incongruity [with the v., such as تأولت She said and بَاعْت She sold] is established by affixion of the ș in such as تأولت and بَاعَت [247] (A), pls. of تأولن saying and بَاعن selling, orig. بَاعْت and بَاعَت, like كَبَاعَت [247], pl. of كَبَاع perfect (Sn); and, as for the sounding true in such as حَوَّلَت and حَوَّلَت [247, 711], [pls. of حَوَّلَت weaving and حَاكَثَن 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 ș be not a subst. for a letter not transformable, by which he guards against شَيْكّة [with Fath of the ش, though Kasr is more excellent, as SBd transcribes from the CK (Sn),] for شَجْرَة tree [685]; for they do not
transform [this ى (MN)], because the ى is a subst. for the ج : the poet says

إذا لم يكن فيكُن هل ًلا جَنِّي فَأَبَعَدَ كَن الله من شِكْرِات

[685] (A) If there be not in you any shade, nor any fruit, then God curse you for trees!, where شِكْرِات, with Fath of the ش, is orig. شَكْرِات (MN). And the other is that the ى 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 ى 'مُس despaired, since its ى, though mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is not transformed [into ى], 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 ى 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 ى in ى أَيْس 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 ى], 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 ى in] أَيْس is not transformed is that the conjunction of the [preceding]
Fatha with it is adventitious, because the \( \text{i} \) is the \( \text{f} \) 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 \( \text{i} \) 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 \( \text{قَرَّة} \) retaliation [685, 703, 711], \( \text{صَيْد} \), a certain disease in a camel's head [703], and \( \text{جَيْد} \), i. e., length, and beauty, of neck; \( \text{حَمَار} \) \( \text{حَيْد} \), as \( \text{حَمَار} \) \( \text{حَيْد} \) [272]; and \( \text{حَوْقَة} \) and \( \text{حَوْقَة} \) [above]. But this is not needed because these [ns.] are anomalous [in that their \( \text{و} \) or \( \text{i} \) is not converted into ] notwithstanding their fulfilment of the conditions (A); though \( \text{حَيْد} \) 's being anomalous proceeds only upon the opinion of Akh [above] that the \( f \) of feminization does not prevent, not upon the opinion of Mz that it does prevent, transformation (Sn): and like those [ns.] in anomalousness are \( \text{زَوَّح} \) and \( \text{غَيْب} \), [lexicological (Sn)] pl. of \( \text{رَأَتَح} \) going at evening and \( \text{غَاوِب} \) absent [257]; \( \text{عَجَّ} \) \( \text{عَفُر} \) i. q. \( \text{جَحَّش} \) a young ass; \( \text{هُيَاوَا} \) Huyawa, [a stronghold belonging to the Banu Zubaid in AlYaman (MI)]; \( \text{أَرَّ} \) \( \text{أَفُ} \) pl. of \( \text{أَفُ} \), which is the very cunning man; and \( \text{مَر} \) \( \text{مَر} \) pl. of \( \text{مَر} \), which is the dog's
platter (A). طَائِتُ [above] is anomalous (SH), because of what we have mentioned [298, 311]; but is (R) obligatory [below] (SH), necessary (R). They say, for the rel. n. (1) of AlHira, [a city near AlKūfa, جَبْرِيَّة]; and (Jh, KF) also (Jh) حَارِيَّة, [irregularly (Jh),] as though, deeming the combination of the two Kasras with the [three] ی s to be heavy, they substituted a Fatha for the Kasra of the ح, and an ٰ for the [first] ی: (2) of دَوُ [302], دَارِی، converting the quiescent first ی into ِ [311]. And [the Prophet's saying (KF)] "Repent ye when laden [with sin], unrewarded occurs in tradition, orig. مُسْرَرْتِ, the [quiescent], being converted into ِ for lightness [above], as we have mentioned (IY): [or] for conformity (KF), because of the influence of مَاجُوْرَتْ (Jh); whereas, if it stood alone, مُسْرَرْتِ would be said (Jh, KF): so says IAI (Jh). And hence their saying یَبَجُّلُ یَبَجُّلُ for [333, 674, 701, 703], and یَبَجُّلُ یَبَجُّلُ for یَبَجُّلُ [701], converting the [quiescent] ی and ی into ِ, because they consider the combination of ی with ِ to be easier for them than the combination of two ی s, and than ی together with ِ (IY). But such as یَبَجُّلُ [or یَبَجُّلُ], [though regular in some dials. (R),] is weak (SH), because of the conversion of the quiescent ی [or ی], preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath,
into I (R). And the most likely [opinion] is that the saying 

[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 ّدّم [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 ّس [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)] ٣ [and the Tanwin (R)] is (M, R, A) in pause (M, R), exclusively, upon three things, (1) the 

acce. pronounced with Tanwin (M), as in ّدّم I saw (M) Zaid [640] (M, R): (2) that [v.] to which the single [corrob. (IY)] ٣ preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath is affixed (M), as in ّدّم XCVI. 15. [153, 497, 608, 610, 649] (M, R, A); and similarly [614, 649]: AlA'shà says ّلا تَعْبِدُ ٱلسَّيِّطَانَ ٱلْحُجَّة

[497, 649], meaning ّتَعْبِدَنَ; and the other says ّتَأْجَكِنَ [154, 424], meaning that shall assuredly blaze up brightly, [orig. ّتَأْجَكِنَ, as explained below]; while Imra alKais, in his saying ّتَأْجَكِنَ
[115, 640], is said to mean ُقَفَّٰنِ [649]; and the counterparts of that are numerous (IY : (a) ُتَأَجَّجَكَا 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) نَارًا a fire: AHD says in the Kitāb an-Nabāt "[264, 282] is made masc., which is rare"; and then cites this verse: while some say that نَار is only fem.; but that the poet makes the pron. masc., because by نَار  책임ا a flame, which is masc., or because the feminization of نَار is improper [263], نَاراً ُتَأَجَّجَ ُهَبَا being analogous to حَطَبَأ [21, 263]: (β) حَطَبَا 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, حَطَبَا and نَاراً; while the pron. is made masc. because of the predominance of [the masc.] حَطَبَا over [the fem.] نَاراً [320]: F says "Akh says that he means the fire and the firewood": (b) some say that ُتَأَجَّجَا is an aor. v., from whose beginning the [aoristic] ت is elided; but that the l is substituted for the single corrob. ن, the o. f. being ُتَأَجَّجَٰنِ [above]: and in that case the latent pron. [165] belongs to the fem. ُنَاراً, for which reason the v. is made fem. (AKB): (3) ُذِئْنِ [594, 640], as ُفَعَّلْتِهَا إِذَا XXVI. 19. [201] (M). The l is
substituted for the \( \textchar020 \) in these positions because of the \( \textchar020 \)'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 \( \textchar020 \) is [authorized by IH] in \( \textchar030 \) [above], according to one opinion (SH), i.e., that its o. f. is \( \textchar032 \), which is the saying of the BB [above]. This is valid, as respects [both] sense, because \( \textchar030 \) is i. q. \( \textchar032 \); and [letter,] because its \textit{dim.} is \( \textchar032 \); although the saying of Ks [above] is nearer to analogy in changing \( \textchar020 \), into \( \textchar022 \). And for this reason the author of the KF adopts the opinion of the BB, saying “Its o. f. is \( \textchar032 \)”: [though he does not follow IH and Jrb in holding its \( \textchar020 \) to be converted directly into \( \textchar022 \); but prefers the indirect conversion described by R in § 683, adding] “the \( \textchar020 \) is changed into Hamza, [so that \( \textchar032 \) becomes \( \textchar033 \) (KF);] and then [two Hamzas occur consecutively, so that (KF)] the [second (KF)] Hamza [is changed (KF)] into \( \textchar022 \)” (MASH).

§ 685. The \( \textchar020 \) is the letter most extensively substituted (A). It is substituted for (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), the \( \textchar022 \) and \( \textchar033 \) (MASH); (3) the Hamza; (4) one of the duplicate [or triplicate] letters; (5) the \( \textchar020 \); (6) the \( \textchar025 \); (7) the \( \textchar026 \); (8) the \( \textchar027 \); (9) the \( \textchar028 \) (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 ل, the ل, and the حمزة (IY). Its substitution for the ل is [regular] in two cases, vid. where the letter before the ل is (1) pronounced with Kasr, as in مَصَابِيحُ فل. of مصباح [18, 253, 256], and مَفْتَاحَ مَفْتَاحِ pl. of مفتاح [253, 386]; and similarly in their dims. (Aud), مَفْتَاحِ مَفْتَاحِ [274, 283] and مَفْتَاحِ مَفْتَاحِ [274] (Tsr): (a) hence ضِيِرَابُ تائِلّا inf. n. of ضَيِرَابُ تائِلّا, and ضِرْبُ ضَيِرَابُ تائِلّا [332]; (b) the reason why the ل, when the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, must be converted into ل is that, being weak, on account of the width of its outlet, it acts as a [mere] letter of prolongation, impleting the vowel of the preceding letter (IY): (2) a ل of the ديم. [279], as in غَلَّامُ غَلَّامِ dim. of غلام [369, 374] (Aud), because the letter after the ل of the ديم. is only mobile [274], whereas the ل does not receive a vowel; while the letter before the ل is only mobile, whereas the ل of the ديم. is only quiescent: so that, after the ل of the ديم., the ل 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 ل, because of
its affinity to the preceding letter; and because, if the ٠ were converted into ی, it would afterwards have to be converted into یُ, as in ث * سَيْدُ [below] (Tsr). Its substitution for the ی is [regular] in ten cases, (1) where the ی occurs after a Kasra, when the ی is (a) final, [whether it be in an act. or pass. v., or in a n. (Tsr),] as in َرَضِىُ ٍwas pleased [686, 719] and َقُرِىُ ٍwas strong, َعُفِىُ ٍwas effaced, the raider [301] and the caller (Aud): (a) the ی, in these five exs. is converted into ی because of its occurrence as a final after a Kasra, their o. f. being َرَضِىُ and ٍ[728] from َرَضْوَان ٍpleasure and َتُرَيْدُ ٍstrength [729], َعُفْوُ ٍfrom َعُفْوُ ٍeffacement, and َأَلْدَاعُ ٍأَلْغَارِ ٍ from َأَلْدَاعُ ٍأَلْغَارِ ٍ raiding and َدُوعُ ٍدَعُوَةُ a call (Tsr): (b) before the ٠ of femininization, as in شَبِكْهَةُ sad (Aud), said of a woman (Jh), an act. part. [on the measure of ْفُعَلَةُ (Jh)] from ُضَرْعَةُ ٍsadness (Tsr); ٍأَكْسِيَةُ [246] (Aud), pl. of ٍكِسَآءَ ٍشَحَجُ [683] (Tsr); ُعَرْبَيْةُ ٍraider [724] (Aud), a [fem.] act. part. from ُعَرَوُ ٍعَرَوُ ٍ(Tsr); and ٍتُرْقِيقَةُ ٍ(Aud) and ٍتُرْقِيقَةُ [283] (Tsr), dim. of ٍتُرَقُى ٍ[248, 301, 675] (Aud) and ٍتُرَقُى ٍ[385, 675]: (a) the ی, in the whole [of these exs.] is converted into ی because of its occurrence as a final after a Kasra, since the ٠ of femininization is virtually separate [266]: (b) the ی, in ٍتُرْقِيقَةُ [or ٍتُرْقِيقَةُ] ought not to be converted into
because the word is [orig.] formed with the š, as is proved by [the fact] that we have no infl. n. ending in a š, preceded by Damma, which shows that [or ترَثِّثَةٍ] [عَرْنَوَةٍ] is on a par with [721]; but they make no distinction here between the word’s being [orig.] formed with the š and its not being so (Tsr): (c) pl. of سَوَاسَةٍ [with Fath of the د, i. q. مُسْتَثْمَرٍ] The people are equal in this matter (Tsr),] and meaning servants [below] are anomalous (Aud): (α) is, as it were, pl. of مُسْتَثْمَرٍ [above] by elision of the augs., except that another د is added in it (Tsr): (β) its measure is ِفَعَالِدَةٍ: and it is anomalous in several [other (Sn)] respects, firstly the repetition of the د in the pl., notwithstanding its not being repeated in the sing., which is the counterpart of the repetition of the د [in the dim. (Tsr)] in ِعْشَيْشَيْهَا [286] (Tsr, Sn), dim. of ِعْشَيْهِ, notwithstanding its not being repeated in the non-dim. (Sn): secondly the pluralization of ِفَعَالٍ upon this measure, the pl. required by analogy being أَقْبَيْهَا pl. of تِنْكِهَةٍ tunic [246]: thirdly [the repetition of the د as an aug., notwithstanding that the د is not repeated with it, since (Sn)] the rule is that, when the د is repeated as an aug., the د [also (Tsr)] should be repeated with it, as in ِمُرْمَرْبَسٍ [370, 671]; and
that, when it is repeated alone, it should be *rad.*, as in

\[(671)\] (Tsr, Sn): so in the Tsr (Sn): (γ)

\[\text{سُنّدَسُ تَرْقَفَ} \]

[above] is [said by Dm to be (Sn)] pl. of *مَقْتَوْيَة* act. part. (Tsr, Sn) of i. q. خَدْمَةِ *served* (Sn), from *تَقْتَرَ تَقْتَرَ* i. q. خَدْمَة service (Tsr), being *orig.* [as in the Tsr (Sn)],

\[\text{سُبْلُ} \]

; but having the [second (Sn)] یُ converted into یُ, because final after a Kasra; and being then subjected to the same transformation as تَّأْسِف [16] (Tsr, Sn); [so that its sound pl. is مُقَتْرُونَ, like قَاَضُوُنَ (234),] as

\[\text{مَتَى كَنَّا لَأَعْلَكَ مَقْتَرِيْنَا} \]

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

[but the author of the KF says that] اَقتَوْهَا is i. q. اَسْتَخْدَمْهَا *took him as a servant*, anomalous, because یُ is *intrans.* [494A, 496]; and [that] the sing. of اَنْفُلْ is intrans. [494A, 496]; and [that] the sing. of مَقْتَوْيَة* and مَقْتَوْيَة* [below] is مَقْتَوْيَة* [like ُاشْعَتْيُ sing. of ُبَسْعَتْيُ (253, 265)] (KF): (8) the servant is called مَقْتَوْيَة* with Fath of the م, and doubling of the ی, as though it were a rel. n. [300] from مَقْتَوْيَة* service, which is an *inf. n.;* but the ی of relation may be made single, [as in یُ بَلِ (311), in which case مَقْتَوْيَة* becomes مَقْتَوْيَة*, the sound pl. of which is مَقْتُوُونَ, like قَاَضُوُنَ (234),] as in the saying of ‘Amr Ibn Kulthūm
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 ی of relation; so that you say مَقْتُورُونَ in the nom., and مَقْتُورٌ in the acc. and gen. (EM): S says “They asked Khl about مَقْتُورٍ pl. مَقْتُورٌ; and he said that it was on a par with مَقْتُورٌ *اِشْعَرْرِ [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 مَقْتُورة, except one word that AUd had told him, vid. مَسْتَمِعٍ meaning سَوَاء [5] (Tsr): (i) q. مَسْتَمِعٍ is predicatable of one or more, as لَيْسُوا سَوَاء III. 109. They are not equal, because it is orig. an inf. n. [143], i. q. سَوَاء equality (ML): (η) they say سَوَاسِيَة also, according to the general rule in transformation (Tsr, Sn); and the pl. of مَقْتُورة ought to be مَقْتَاتِيَة [above]: (θ) IBr says in the Glosses on the Jh that سَوَاسِيَة is a heteromorphous pl. of سَوَاء, like بَعْضُ ْالْأَبْطَالِ pl. of بَعْضُ [255]; as though it were pl. of سَوَاسِيَة: and that the measure of سَوَاسِيَة is مَقْتَة, like [that of] شَوْرَشَة agile; not فَعْلَةٌ, because
the cat. of سَلَسُ [674] is extraordinary; nor فَعَلَتْ, because the cat. of كَوَكَبِ [373, 671, 672] is extraordinary; nor فَعَلَتْ, because the ف is not repeated alone: so that [the notion of] فَعَالَةُ فَعَلَتْ or فَعَالَةُ فَعَالَةً or سَوْسَـِيَّةُ فَعَالَةُ فَعَالَةً is vain; and it must be فَعَالَةً: and this is a fine discourse, which the author of the Aud transcribes in the Glosses [on the IM]: (c) before the ] of feminization, (α) abbreviated, as when you form from غَزِيْبَ a word [on the measure of غَزِيْبَ] like [397, 399], in which case you say غَزِيْبَ ; (b) prolonged, as when you form from غَزِىْبَ a word [on the measure of غَزِىْبَ] like [273, 390], in which case you say فَغُزِيْبَ (Tsr): (d) before the aug. ] and , [which resembles the two ]s of feminization (Tsr),] as in your saying غَزِيْبَانِ [686] on the pattern of غَزِيْبَانِ [385] from غَزِيْبَ (Aud), because the two ]s of feminization [263] and what resembles them are virtually separate [from the n. ending therein] (Tsr): (2) where the ] occurs as ُ of an ]n. of a v. transformed in the ُ, and is preceded by a Kasra, and followed by an ], as in صَيَامُ fasting and [713] (Aud), ]n. ns. of the [unaugmented] tril. (Tsr); and ) إِنْتِبَادُ submissiveness [713] and إِنْتِبَادُ accustoming oneself (Aud), ]n. ns. of the augmented [tril.]: orig.
and ِنَقْرَةُ ُؤُمُ ِنَقُرَةُ ُؤُمُ, the ُؤُمُ in which is converted into َل, because it is transformed in their vs. by conversion into َل [684, 703]; while its remaining sound in the inf. n. after a Kasra, and before a letter resembling the َل in prolongation, would be deemed heavy; so that it is transformed in the inf. n. by conversion into َل, 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 َل] (تَرَ): contrary to such as (a) ُسَّوَأُ bracelet [below] and ُسَّوَأُ tooth-pick (عَد), generic ns. [3], where the ُؤُمُ is not converted into َل (تَرَ), because the quality of inf. n. is non-existent; (b) ُلُؤَنُ inf. n. of ُلُؤَنُ sought refuge, one with another, and ُجُؤُرُ inf. n. of ُجُؤُرُ was neighbour to, [where, though they are inf. ns., the ُؤُمُ is not converted into َل (تَرَ),] because the َل of the v. [ُلُؤَنُ and ُجُؤُرُ (تَرَ)] is sounded true; (c) ُرَّوُاحُ inf. n. of ُرَّوُاحُ went in the evening, for lack of the Kasra (عَد) before it (تَرَ); (d) ُحُولُ [below] inf. n. of ُحُولُ shifted and ُعُودُ inf. n. of ُعُودُ visited the sick, [where, though they are inf. ns. whose vs. ُحُولُ and ُعُودُ are transformed by conversion of their َل into َل, the ُؤُمُ is not converted into َل (تَرَ)] for lack of the َل (عَد) after them (تَرَ): (a) in this case, [i. e., where the َل is lacking (تَرَ),] transformation
is rare, as

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 Nafi' and Ibn 'Amir, [i. q. قیوم, like i. q. عیاد (K, B),] and جعل الله الكعبة لیت V. 98. [135] to be a station for men, [where the fearful shall take refuge, and the weak be safe, and the merchant shall gain, and whereof the pilgrims and settlers shall repair (B),] in the reading of Ibn 'Amir (Aud), their o. f. being قیوم, but the، being converted into ل because the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr (Tsr): (α) قیم is an inf. n. on [the measure of] فعل، like شبع [348], its خ being transformed [into ل], as it is transformed [into ل] in its v. (B on V. 98.): (β) sounding [the،] true, notwithstanding the fulfilment of the conditions, in نوار الطبيعة inf. n. of

The doe-gazelle shied away, i. q. فقرت، is anomalous (Aud): (α) by rule it should be دیابر; but it occurs with the، sounded true, as in the saying of Al'Ajaj

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 Allâh Ibn 'Umar reads قَوْمًا

135a
with the [in IV. 4. above]; but [this is not an *inf. n.,
since] ُقُومٌ is what a thing is supported by, like مَلْکُ for
what a matter is governed by (K): (3) where the ُجْلِ occurs as ُجْلِ 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 دَارُ pl. of دَيْرُ house, جميلُ pl. of
حملة artifice [684], قَمْسُ pl. of دِبَّة pl. of
قَيْمَة belle [below], قَتْمَلُ pl. of قَامْة
value, price [238, 278], and قَمْسُ pl. of قَمْسَة stature [238]
(Aud): (a) the o. f. is دَوْمُ, حُوْلُ, دُوْرُ, and قَوْمُ; but, since
the ُجْلِ is preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr in
the whole [of these *exs.], and in the sing. is transformed
by conversion into 1 in the first and last, and into ُجْلِ in
the intermediate [exs.], it becomes weak, so that the
Kasra overpowers it: (b) we deduce from the multiplica-
tion of the *exs. that, when the ُجْلِ is transformed in the
sing., the occurrence of the ُجْلِ after it [in the *pl.], as in
ديْرُ [above], is not prescribed as a condition, contrary to
the opinion of IUK (Tsr): (c) حَاجَة ُجَرَحُ pl. of حَاجَة need is
anomalous (Aud), the regular form being جَيْحُ, because
the ُجْلِ is preceded by Kasra, and is transformed in the
sing. [by conversion into ُجْلِ] (Tsr): (b) quasi-transformed,
i. e., quiescent, in which the condition of conversion is
that it be followed in the *pl. by an ُجْلِ, as in سِيَابُ pl. of
† whip [242, 713], ُجَيْضُ pl. of ُجِوْدُ cistern, and
pl. of زِبْدَة [238, 254, 713] (Aud): (α) their o. f. is سَوَاطِر: but, since the o. f. 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 l (Tsr), because of what is mentioned [in case 2] above, that the l resembles the s [in prolongation] (Sn): (β) it results that conversion of the o. f. into s in this case has five conditions, (α) that the expression be a pl.; (β) that the o. f. in its sing. be dead by reason of quiescence; (γ, δ) that the o. f. in the pl. be preceded by a Kasra, and followed by an l; (e) that it be sound in the l (A): (c) if the l be missing, the o. f. is sounded true, as in كُرْزَة pl. of كَرْز mug, and عَرْدَة pl. of عَرْنَة with Fath of its initial, meaning an old camel (Aud), because, when the l is lacking, the work of the tongue is less; so that the articulation of the o. f. after the Kasra is lightened: for which reason the o. f. is sounded true; and may not be transformed, because to the lack of transformation [in the sing.] is joined the protection of the o. f. by its distance from the end [of the word], in consequence of the s of femininization, [which is regarded as an outwork protecting the o. f. on its weak side, i. e., towards the end, where alteration is prevalent] (Tsr): (α) نَثَرْة [pl. of نُثَر bull, by
change of the \( \text{س} \) into \( \text{i} \) (Tsr),] is anomalous (Aud), the regular form being \( \text{س} \) with the \( \text{s} \), sounded true: (β) it is said that the o. j. is \( \text{s} \) with quiescence of the \( \text{s} \), which is transformed [into \( \text{s} \) (257)] by conversion of the \( \text{s} \) into \( \text{i} \) [case 5 below]; and that the \( \text{i} \) is afterwards pronounced with Fath: (γ) Mb asserts that it is contracted from \( \text{s} \) [237], being orig. \( \text{م} \), for which reason it is transformed, [because of the presence of the \( \text{ل} \) ]; and that it is afterwards contracted [into \( \text{s} \) ]; so IM transmits from him: (δ) the [explanation generally] recognized as his, however, is that they say \( \text{s} \) in order that the conversion [of the \( \text{s} \) into \( \text{i} \)] may be an indication that it is pl. of \( \text{s} \) bull, meaning the animal, not of \( \text{s} \) slab, meaning of dried curd, the distinctive peculiarity [of \( \text{s} \) in the former sense] being that, since they say \( \text{s} \) [256], by conversion of the \( \text{s} \) into \( \text{i} \), because quiescent, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [case 5 below], as pl. of \( \text{s} \) bull, meaning the animal, they make its pl. \( \text{s} \) accord therewith; whereas the pl. \( \text{s} \) 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 \( \text{s} \) is also sounded true, (α) if it be mobile in the sing., as in \( \text{s} \) pl. of
[246, 279, 713]: while the saying is anomalous (Aud), by rule and usage, the regular form being طَوَلَهَا, 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 جَوَانَ (Tsr): though جَيِبانُ in the text (Tsr)] is said to be [not anomalous, but only (Tsr)] pl. of [courser or (B)] جَيِّدُ (Aud); and, says IM in the CK, as for عِلْبَانُ pl. of طَوَلَلٌ, possibly it may be regarded as [a heteromorphous pl.] of the cat. of جَيِبانُ pl. of جَوَانَ, as though it were pl. of طَلَالٍ جَيِّدُ meaning surpassed him in tallness (Tsr): (β) if the ل be unsound, [a ى or ى, the first (Tsr)] as in رَيْبَانُ [343, 348] (Aud), جَرُّ from رَيْبَانُ [348], orig. رَوْيَانُ, the جَرُّ being converted into ى, which is incorporated into the ى [case 7 below] (Tsr); and [the second as in (Tsr)] جَرُّ with [Fath of the ج, and (Tsr)] doubling of the ى, جَرُّ (Aud), the air (KF), i.e., what is between the sky and the earth, and Jaww., the name of a district in AlYamāma (Tsr): in which case one says [in their pl. (Tsr)] رُوَانَ [278, 713] and جَرَآنَ [below] (Aud), like رُجَالِ [235, 237] (Tsr), with the ى, [vid. the ى (Tsr),] sounded true (Aud);
orig. ٌّ and ِّ ٌّ، the ى and [second]ّ، being changed into Hamza, because final after an aug. ٌّ [683]: while transformation of their ى is not allowable with that [transformation of their ٍ] (Tsr), lest two transformations occur consecutively (Aud); so that one is restricted to transformation of the ٍ, because it is the seat of alteration (Tsr): and similarly in what resembles them (Aud), i. e., where the ٍ is transformed by being changed into Hamza, and the ى is [therefore] sounded true (Tsr): (4) where the ى 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 ى be in a n. or v. (Tsr):—you say ى ٌّ (I took (Tsr)) and ى ٌّ (I threw, by retaining the ى, in its own form, because it is third (Tsr)); but, when you put the Hamza or reduplication [433], you say ى ٌّ (I gave and ى ٌّ (I purified, [by changing the ى into ى, because it becomes fourth (Tsr)]: and you say, in the pass. part. [of ى ٌّ and ى ٌّ ى ٌّ and ى ٌّ (Tsr)], ٌّ ى ٌّ ى ٌّ ى ٌّ (Aud), by changing the ى into ى [229]: (a) the reason why it is changed into ى in the pret. and pass. part. of the augmented v., although it is not after a Kasra, is that (Tsr) they make the pret. ى ٌّ (Tsr)
accord with the aor. [٠ُرْكَة١ (Tsr)], and the pass. part. [مُرْكِبَة١ (Tsr)] with the act. part. [مُرْكِبَة١ (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 تُغَازِيَّنَا

We raided one another [727] and تَدَعَأْنَا. We called one another, [orig. تَدَعَأْنَا تَغَازِرْنَا, the being changed into ی (Tsr),] notwithstanding that the aor. [تَغَازِرْنَا and تَدَعَأْنَا (Tsr)] has no Kasra before its final: and he answered that the transformation existed [in the pret.] before the coming of the initial ّت, vid. in غازِيَّنَا and دَعَأْنَا, for conformity with [the aor.] تُغَازِرْنَا and دَعَأْنَا [with Kasr of their penultimate (Tsr)]; and that it was afterwards retained in company with the ّت [of تَغَازِرْنَا, given (Tsr), the ی of which is converted from a ی, because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684]; while this ی is converted from a ی, 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.]
[with Fath of the Hamza, as likewise is the aor.,
(Sn)], meaning preceded, outwent, is anomalous, the
regular form being ٞشِتاِرِانِ, because it is from ٞشَاٛرِ;
while [in the aor.] there is no Kasra before the ٛ, on
account of which it might be converted into ٚ; 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 ٞشِتاٛیِانِ [in the pass. (Sn)], for
conformity with the act. (A) ٞشِتاٛیِانِ, the ٛ of which is
converted into ٚ on account of the Kasra before it (Sn):
(5) where the ٛ, when quiescent, [and] single, follows
immediately after a Kasra, as in مَیَرَانِ a balance, [orig.
میقات, because from ٠رَنَ weighing (Tsr),] and time appointed for performance of an action [278]
(Aud), orig. مروانِ, because from ٠تَنَ time, where the
ٛ is converted into ٚ, because quiescent [and single]
and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr (Tsr):
contrary to such as (a) ٠سُواٛنِ receptacle of a thing (Tsr)]
and ٠سَوْارِ [above] (Aud), because the ٛ in them is mobile,
not quiescent (Tsr); (b) ٠جَلْوُودٛ (Aud) continuance, toge-
ther with swiftness, of journeying [332, 482, 494] (Tsr),
and ٠عَلْوُودٛ (Aud) clinging to the neck, as ٠عَلْوُودٛ
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 إِنَّا زَيَّانَاهُمُ السَّماَءَ ألْدُنْيَا XXXVII. 6. Verily We have adorned the heaven nearest [to you (K, B)] and your saying لِلْبَتْقِينَ الدَّرَجَةُ أَلْدُنْيَا For the pious is the highest rank [725] (Aud), orig. العلوييٌّ and the العلوييٌّ الدنويٌّ, because from دُنِىٌّ nearness and elevation, the , in them being converted into ى , because the , with the Damma [of the initial] and the sign of feminization, is deemed heavy in the ep., [which is considered heavier than the substantive:] so that its ل is lightened by conversion into ى: (a) the proof that ىٌّ [here] is an ep. is its being preceded by its qualified, as exemplified: (b) this is the original use [of الدُّنْيَا]; 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 الْبَتْقِينَ [إِلْفُصْرِ (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)] إِسْتَحْرَدَ mastered, and [the substantive, like (Tsr)] 684, 711] (Aud), by rule إِسْتَحْسَدَ and قَدَ.
with transformation, which is omitted for notification of the o. f. [725]: (d) the Banū Tamīm say أَنْتُشِيَا with transformation, according to rule (Tsr): (e) if نَعُلُى be a substantive, [not an ep., the ل in (Tsr)] it is not altered [by being changed into ى]; but the ى is retained in its o. f., to distinguish the substantive from the ep. (Tsr), as in the saying [of Dhu-rRumān (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 ى in حُزْوَى 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 نَعُلُى, when a ى, 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 Etymologists, who reverse [it], changing the ى in the substantive, not in the ep., so that they make حُزْوَى 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 الدْنِيَا, where the substantivity is adventitious; and they assert that the sounding (of the ى) true in
is anomalous, like that in حَيَّةُ (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 الدُّنَيَا and is with the ى, 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 AlHijāz display the, in القَصْرِيَة اَلْفَصْصِيَا [above], while the Banū Tamīm say القَصْصِيَا” (A, Tsr): and, as for the saying of IH “contrary to the ep., as أَلْفَرْزِي” [725], meaning the fem. of أَلْفَرْزِي 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 أَلْفَرْزِي should be said, as يَلْفَرْزِي is said” (A): (7) where the, and ى meet, [and are combined (Tsr),] in a [single (Tsr)] word (Aud), or what is virtually a [single] word, like مُسْلِيُّي my Muslims (A), in the nom., because the pre. and post. are like one thing, especially when the post. is the ى 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 a.e combined, the ى must be converted into ى, whether the ḫ precede o
follow, because it is heavier than the ی, in order that lightness may, so far as possible, be attained (Tsr); and then the [first] ی must be incorporated into the [second] ی [747] (Aud), because of the combination of two likes [731] (Tsr): (a) *ex.* of that, (α) where the ی precedes [the ی (Tsr)], are سبید and میت [251, 703], *orig.* سبید and میت [683, 716] (Aud), because from سان was lord, aor. سیون by common consent, and مات died, aor. نیعل according to one of the two dials. [482]: (α) their measure, according to critical judges, *vid.* the BB, is نیعل with Kasr of the ی: (β) the Bdd hold it to be نیعل with Fath of the ی, like صیرف and صیغم [373], transferred to نیعل with Kasr of the ی, because, say they, we do not see, in the sound, any n. on [the measure of] نیعل 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 فعالة *pl.* of فعال, as رماة and نفصة [247]; and, if سبید were نیعل with Fath, they would say سبید with Fath (Tsr): (b) where the ی precedes [the ی (Tsr)], are وکی and لی [278, 302], *inf.* ns. of I folded and I twisted, *oric.* طوی and طوی (Aud), with Fath of their first, and quiescence of their second [letter], their ی, being converted into ی, and incorporated into
the \( \text{i} \) (Tsr): (b) sounding \([\text{i} \text{ (Tsr)}] \) true is necessary, 
(a) if the \( \text{i} \) and \( \text{i} \) be in two words, as \( \text{بِدْعَوُو بَيِّسُرٍ} \) \( \text{Yāsir} \) calls \([\text{with the} \) preceding the \( \text{i} \) (Tsr)], and \( \text{i} \) \( \text{رَأْيُي} \) \( \text{وَإِيَّدٍ} \)
A threatener will shoot \( \text{Aud} \) with the \( \text{i} \) preceding the \( \) (Tsr): (b) if the first of them be (\( \text{α} \)) mobile, as \( \text{طَبِيلْ} \) [with the \( \) mobilized with \( \text{Kasr} \) (Tsr)], and \( \text{عُيِّبَر} \) \( [348,714] \) \( \text{Aud} \) with the \( \text{i} \) mobilized with \( \text{Damm} \) (Tsr): (\( \beta \)) adventitious in nature \( \text{Aud} \), [not, however, as \( \text{Kh} \) distinguishes, when necessarily so, but only when] allowably, which is [explained by him as] of three sorts, substituted for \( \text{ا} \) \( [686] \), as \( \text{sُوَيَرَ} \) \( [716] \); substituted for \( \text{ا} \) \( [686] \), as when you form from \( \text{بٍٓيَع} \) \( \text{a} \) [v.] commensurable with \( \text{بٍٓيَع} \) \( [482] \), saying \( \text{بٍٓيَع} \), and then put it into the \( \text{pass.} \), saying \( \text{بٍٓيَع} \); and substituted for a Hamza \( [658] \) (Tsr), as \( \text{رُوْيَةٌ} \) alleviated form of \( \text{رُوْيَةٌ} \) sight \( \text{Aud} \): for in the whole of that there is no change \([\text{of} \) into \( \text{i} \) \], nor any incorporation, because the first [unsound] letter is [allowably] adventitious; contrary to \( \text{أَوْيَمُ} \) alleviated form of \( \text{أَوْيَمُ} \), which is on the model of \( \text{أَبْلَم} \) \( [372] \) from \( \text{أَيْمَة} \) being without husband, or without wife: since the second Hamza is changed into \( \) [as in \( \text{أَرْتَيْنَ} \),] because the one before it is pronounced with \( \text{Damm} \) \( [661] \), so that \( \text{أَوْيَمُ} \) becomes \( \text{أَوْيَمُ} \); and this change is necessary \( [661] \): and then the \( \) is converted into \( \text{i} \), which is incorporated
into the [second] ی, so that یُّ یُّ becomes یُّ یُّ; and this [process also of] change and incorporation is necessary, because the , 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 تَرْوَى [with quiescence of the , (Tsr)], orig. [ثَرَى ] with Kasr [above] (Aud), because it is a pret. v. (Tsr); but made quiescent [in the medial] for lightness, as عُلْمُ [with quiescence of the ج (Tsr)] is said for عُلْمَ [482] (Aud) with Kasr of it: though some allow تَرْوَى with incorporation after conversion (Tsr): (c) three sorts deviate anomalously from what we have mentioned, (α) a sort [in] which [the ,] is transformed, though it does not fulfil the conditions, like the reading [لِدْرِيَّا ] in XII. 43. [498] with change [of the Hamza into , and of the , into ی,] and incorporation [of the first ی into the second] (Aud), although the , is [allowably] adventitious in nature, because it is alleviated from the [single] Hamza [658]: (α) Ks, who heard this reading, transmits that [doctrine of its anomalousness]; but some, says IM in the CK, transmit that it is regular, according to one dial. (Tsr): (b) a sort [in] which [the ,] is sounded true, notwithstanding [its] fulfilment of them, [i.e., of the
conditions (Tsr),] as ضیون [male cat (Tsr)], [below], رِجَاءٍ، بِذنَّ عَوْى ْلَکْلُبُ The dog howled, and [below], جَیْحَا رَجَا Ibn Haiwa (Aud) : (α) you do not incorporate in ضیون [below], because it is a [prim. (Jh)] substantive, which is not conformable to the v. (Jh, Tsr); and similarly in جَیْحَا [below], a man’s name; both being different [in this respect] from جَیْحَا, سبید, مبیت, عبان, and حَیَدَل [251] (Jh): so says Jh : (β) أیوم’ is on the measure of Aفعل : they say, on a day wherein hardship has befallen them, أیوم’ a most hard day, i. e., کَبْیرُ الْشَّدَةُ containing much hardship (Tsr) : (γ) Haiwa, [says Jh in the Sahah (Tsr),] is not subjected to incorporation, [as مبیت and مبیت 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 so:it in which the ی is changed into ، into which the [preceeding] ، is incorporated, [according to the converse of the rule (Tsr),] as عَرْعَةٍ [inf. n. of عَوْى ْلَکْلُبُ (above), by rule عَيْنَةٍ (Tsr),] and نَهْوُ عِنْ السَّلَکْر [686] (Aud), by rule نَهْوُ [722], because orig. نَهْوُ , 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] جَدَّوْلُ [369] (Aud), pl. جَدَّاَوْلٌ [253]; and أَسْوَدُ, when [a substantive (Tsr)] denoting serpent (Aud), pl. أَسْوَدْنُ (Jh, Tsr), because it is a substantive; whereas, if it were an ep. [below], its pl. would be [سُودُ] on [the measure of] فعل [249] (Jh): so that, in the dim. of جَدَّوْلُ and أَسْوَدُ, you say أَسْبِيرُ and جُدْبِيٰلُ [279], by sounding [the] true; and أَسْبِيرُ and جُدْبِيٰلُ [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 مَيْتُ سَيْدَةٌ and مَيْتُ [above], according to the rule; and, as for the sounding true, it is because you treat this ى [of the dim.] like the لا of جَدَاوْلُ and أَسْوارْنُ [279], since the ى of the dim. and the لا of the broken pl. are each put to denote a meaning; (b) if أَسْوَدُ were an ep. [348], transformation would be necessary in [the dim. of] it, because it does not take the pl. أَسْوارْنُ: so says BD (Tsr); [but Jh says that] the dim of أَسْوَدُ black is أَسْبِيرُ, and, if you will, أَسْبِيرُ, [meaning blackish], i.e., approximating to blackness [287] (Jh): (c) by our saying "mobile in the ى" [above] we guard against such as عُمْوَنَ عَكْبَرُ, because, though their broken pl. [246] is on [the measure of] مَفَاعِلُ [above], transformation [of the ى] is necessary in their dim., as
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. [آسيون] is not taken into account, because it is adventitious: so says IAز (Ts_r):

(d) the pl. of ضيئون [above] is ضيئون [715], the being sounded true in its pl., because sounded true in the sing.: but, for its dim., S says ضيئن, transforming it, and making it like *آسين, [which is allowable as dim. of serpent,] although its pl. is *آسيون; while there is nothing to prevent those who say *آسيون for the dim. [of *آسوذ] from saying ضيئن (Jh): (8) where the ج is the ج of the متعول [of the v. (Ts_r)] whose pret. is on [the measure of] فاعل with Kasr of the ج, [the trans. and intrans. being alike in that respect, the first (Ts_r)] as approved it, pass. part. مرضي approved [722]; and [the second as (Ts_r)] قَري على زيد مقتر مٹئچ overpowered Zaid, pass. part. مرضي مقتر مقتر مقتر overpowered (Aud); orig. مرضي مقتر مقتر مقتر [722] and مقتر مقتر مقتر, with two ة after the ج, the first being the ج of مقتر [347], and the second their ج: (a) their ج is converted into ج, 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 مَرَضْوٰى and مَرَضْوٰى, 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 رَاغِيَة مَرَضْوَة LXXXIX. 28. Approving [what thou hast been vouchsafed (K, B)], approved [before God (K, B), with the ۝ sounded true (Tsr)], is anomalous (Aud); but IM in the Tashil pronounces it to be [merely] inferior (Tsr): (b) if the ى of the v. be pronounced with Fath, sounding true is necessary, as مَذْعَرُ raided [722] and called (Aud), orig. مَذْعَرُ and مَذْعَرُ, 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 عَلِمْتُ عَرْسِي مَلِيَّةٌ أَنْتِيُّ أَنَا أَلْهَيْتُ مُعَدِّيًا عَلَيْهِ وَعَادِيًا [722] (Aud), by 'Abd Yaghūth [Ibn Wakṣāš (MN)] alḤārithi, And my wife Mulaika has known that I am the lion, when assailed, and when assailing, where he transforms [the ۝ of] مَعْدِي [684], orig. مَعْدِيُّ (MN,
Tsr), upon the measure of مَفْعُولُ (MN): (α) Mz recites this verse with مَعْدَرًا, by sounding [the ل] true: but others recite it with transformation (A, Tsr); and IM indicates the allowability of this by his saying "And sound the [ل of] مَفْعُولُ from such as عَدًا true; or transform, if you do not aim at the more excellent [method]": (β) sounding true is for conformity with the act. v., and transformation for conformity with the pass. v. [722]; but sounding true is more proper, because conformity with the act. v. is so (Ts.): مَعْدَرًا عَلَيه وَعَادِيًا (γ) occurs thus, with the undotted ع and د, in the MSS of [the commentary by] IUK: but مَعْدَرًا عَلَيه وَعَادِيًا when raided, and when raiding, with the dotted ع and ز, occurs in Z's book, [the M,] where he says "They say مَعْدَرًا عُتِي and مَعْدَرُ عَتُّو; but they do say مَعْدَرُ عُتَّي and مَعْدَرُ عَتُّو, as

وَقَدْ عَلِمْتُ عِرْسِي مُلْيِكَة ُأَنَّى أَتاَلْئِيْتُ مَعْدَرًا عَلَيْه وَعَادِيًا [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 مَعْدَرًا عَلَيْه in the text of the M; and this is the version given by IY, as also by R, IHsh, and A;
while either version suits the argument in the Aud:

(9) where the ٌ is the ل of ِفْعُول [with Damm of the (Tsr)], when a pl., as ٌْلاٌم of [243, 299, 684, 722], ٌْلاٌم of [328], and ٌْلاٌم of [237, 243] (Aud):

(a) the o. f. is ٌْلاٌم ِعُصِي, ِهِنُفْوُو, and ِهِدْلُر: but, deeming the combination of two ِ ٌs heavy in the pl., they convert the last ٌ into ِ; and then the first is transformed by conversion into ِ, and incorporation [case 7]; while the letter before the [first] ِ is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the ِ may sound true (Tsr): (a) sounding [the ل] true [in the pl.] is anomalous, as ٌْأَيْو and ٌْأَخْو, [pls. of ِْأُبُبَب father and ِْأُبُبُب brother, both transmitted by IAr (Tsr)]; ٌْنَكْرُ [with an undotted (Tsr)], pl. of ِْنَكْرَ i. q. ِْنَكْرَ ِجِهَة direction; ٌْنَكْرَ ِ، pl. of ِْنَكْرَ, which is the cloud that pours down its water; and ٌْبَهْرُ pl. of ِْبَهْرَ, which is [the cavity of (KF)] the chest (Aud), transmitted by AHm on the authority of AZ: (c) the pl. mentioned are pronounced with Damm of the first and second [letters], orig. ٌْبَهْرُ, ٌْنَكْرُ, ٌْأَخْو, ٌْأَيْو, ٌْلُكْرُ, and ٌْلُكْرُ, ٌْلُكْرُ, ٌْلُكْرُ, ٌْلُكْرُ, ٌْلُكْرُ, and ٌْلُكْرُ, with two ِ ٌs, the first of which is incorporated into the second (Tsr): (b) if ِفْعُول be a sing., sounding [the ل] true is necessary, as ٌْخُنِتْبَعَا ِعْمَلا كَبِيرًا XXV. 23. And have exceeded [the limit in wrong-doing (K, B)] with great excess, لا يَرِبَدُونَ ِعْمَلًا ِفَيَّ الْرَّضِّ XXVIII. 83. Seek not
elevation in the earth, \textit{Zaid} was exalted (Aud), all of these \textit{exs.} being \textit{sing. inf. ns.}, pronounced with Damm of the first and second \textit{letters}, \textit{orig.} \textit{Jullu'ul, Samo'ul, Ummu'ul}, and \textit{Samu'ul}, with two \textit{s}, the first of which is incorporated into the second (Tsr): (a) sometimes, however, the \textit{sing.} is tranformed (Aud), by conversion of the last \textit{s}, into \textit{y}, and transformation of the first, like the transformation of [the \textit{s} in] \textit{case 7} (Tsr), as \textit{unni} [684, 722], \textit{inf. n. of Umn \textit{All\text{\textae}shiyu'}}, \textit{His heart was hard} (Aud): (c) what is [said by \textit{IM}] in the Alfiya necessarily implies that the \textit{pl.} [\textit{Dabbul}] and the \textit{sing.} [\textit{Dabbul}] are equal \textit{[in this respect, that sounding true is preferable to transformation]}; for \textit{[immediately after \textquote[And sound the ( \textit{l} of) \textit{Maddu'} from such as \textit{Ada} true; or transform, etc.\textquoteright, cited above under case 8,]} \textit{he says \textquoteright Similarly the \textit{Dabbul} from the [crude-form] containing the \textit{y}, when this letter appears as a \textit{l} of a \textit{pl.} or \textit{sing.}, occurs biform\textquoteright}: whereas transformation is more suitable in the \textit{pl.}, because of its heaviness; and sounding true in the \textit{sing.}, because of its lightness (Tsr): (10) where the \textit{s} is an \textit{e} of \textit{Nallu'ul} [with Damm of the \textit{f}, and doubling of the \textit{e} (Tsr)], when a \textit{pl.} sound in the \textit{y}, like \textit{Samm\textit{Dabbul} (Tsr)} and \textit{Zim\textit{Dabbul} (Aud), the \textit{y} [in
both] of which is a, [247, 715, 716, 722]: (a) their o. f. is ُو
[715, 716, 722] (Aud), by Dhu-r-Rumma (IY on §. 715), [or] by Abu-l-Ghamr al-Kilābī, 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 ُنِيَّمَهَا by IAR (IY), is anomalous (Aud), by rule ُنَوَّامَهَا, with the ُ sounded true, which IM indicates by his saying “But the anomaly of such as ُنِيَّمَهَا is attributed” (Tsr) to the learned (Sn, MKh) in Arabic (Sn), i.e., is transmitted [by them] (A, Tsr) in ُنِمَّا أَرَقَّ ٱلْأَحْجَم [above] (A). And the ِ is [regularly] substituted in place of the ُ and ُ in [the gen. and acc. of] such as مُسْلِمٍ [16, 228] and مُسْلِمٌ [16, 234] (R). Its substitution, (1) for the ُ, is (M, SH) (a) regular in such as (M, R) (a) مُفْتِيَّهُ and مَفَاتِيْحٍ [above] (M), فِرْطِيْسٍ [274, 283] and فِرْطِيْسٍ [253] (IY, R); (b) حَمْرَيْرٍ [281, 282, 293, 298] (R) : (b) anomalous in such as حَبْلِيٌّ [643, 686] (SH): (a) حَبْلِيٌّ with the ِ is regular, according to Fazāra; so that IH should rather say “weak” [643], not “anomalous” (R): (2) for the ُ, is (a) [regular (M), obligatory (SH),] in such as (a) مَبَقَائِتٍ (M, SH) and مَبَقَائِتٍ [above], whence
wind and still rain [278], because from being windy, breezy, cool and
The cloud rained continually (IY); (b) غَازِ (M) and [above] [243, 721] (M); (c) حِيَّاضُ [above] (M); (d) [above] (M, SH); (e) تَمَّ (M, SH) and ٌّأْدلُ [above]; (f) ذَيْمُ [above] (M, SH); (g) ذَيْمُ [above] (SH); (h) سَيْدُ [above] (M, SH) and لَيْةُ (M), orig. فُعَّلَةٌ لَوْى غِريبُهُ مُكَرَّمُهُ ٌّأْدلُ from لَوْى ٌّأْدلُ twisted his hand and put off his creditor (IY); (i) أَصْرَبْتُ I equipped for raiding [629, 674, 719, 727] (M, R) and I urged to raid (M), for conformity with the aor. يُغَزِّي and يُسْتَغْزِي (IY): (b) irregular (M), anomalous (SH), in such as (a) [246, 257, 724] (M, SH) and [246], orig. صَبْوَانْ صَبْرَةٌ and صَبْوَانْ صَبْرَةٌ, from I was a boy, or boyish, aor. أَصْرَحْوُ, where the ٌّأْدلُ is converted into ى because of the Kasra of the ص before it, the ب between them not being [regarded as] a separative, because of its weakness by reason of quiescence (IY); (b) ثَيْرَةُ [above]; (c) عَلَّمُ (M), fem. عَلْيَانَةٌ, tall, corpulent, from عَلَّمُ I was high, where they convert the ى into ى because of the Kasra before it, not taking the quiescent [ل] between them into account [as a separative], because of its weakness (IY); (d) صِيْمُ [above] (SH); (e) يُجْلَبُ
[333, 701] (M, SH), with conversion of the • into ی without Kasr of the aoristic letter [404], by treating the mobile ی here like the quiescent, for which reason they convert the • into ی, on the principle of "ٖسْبَد ُمَيْت [above], as they treat the quiescent [ی and •] like the mobile in [یاَجَّل] and ۡطَائِئۡيَل and [684] (IY on §. 684): (α) [according to R, however,] such as ضِمْع is regular, though weak: (β) so is such as یَیِبَجَّلٰ: F says “It is regular, according to some folk, although it is weak”; but Z decides that یَیِبَجَّل، ۡصَيۡيَل، ۡبَيِبَجَّلٰ, and ۡقَيِرَةٰ are anomalous (R). Its substitution for the Hamza is (1) [regular, but not obligatory (R),] in such as ۡذِبَّ [278, 642] (M, SH), for ۡذِبَّwolf (IY on §. 658), orig. with Hamza (Jh, Jrb); and ۡمِبَر [by alleviation of ۡمُثَر pl. of ۡمِثْرٰ, 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 ی when the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr [658] (IY): (2) necessary in [such as] یَیِبَت [659, 661] (R). The [necessary] substitution of the • [686] and ی for the Hamza occurs in two cats., (1) the pl. upon [the measure of (Tsr)] ۡمَفَعَلٰٰ [726]: (2) the two Hamzas concurring in a [single (Tsr)] word [661] 138a
(Aud). The  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  for the [six] remaining [letters mentioned (MASH)] is confined to hearsay. It is frequent in such as (1) and [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 [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 and [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 , because of the heaviness: (b) if the expression be an unaugmented tril., the second [similar letter] is not converted; so that for  extended is not said: and, as for their saying  Then no, by thy Lord!, i.e., [below], it is anomalous: (c) they also substitute the  for the first of the duplicate letters in [the n. on] the measure of , when a simple substantive, not an inf. n., as in , and [below], according to him.
that says [in the pl.] דָּנָנִיר, קְבַּאָיִם, דָּמָּאָמִיס (MAZ), פָּרָצָט [278], and but this substitution is regular, since פְּעַל, when non-inf., does not occur except with the first of its duplicate letters changed into י, to distinguish the simple substantive from the inf. n., in which it is not changed, as קְדַב inf. n. of קְדַב [332]: (a) when the simple substantive is with the י, as in [head of the spindle (MAR)] and [short (MAR)], it is not changed, because of the freedom from ambiguity: (b) as for him that says דָּיָאִים and דָּיָאִים, it may be (α) that, since the י 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 פְּעַל [377] (R), the י not being a subst. (IY, R) for [the first of] the duplicate letters (R), but an aug. for co-ordination with סֶלֶד [396] (IY): (c) as for their saying שֶׁנֶּאֶר יְשֵׁרָא, with the י, in the pl. of יְשֵׁרָא [below], it is based upon [the supposition] that יְשֵׁרָא is orig. שֶׁנֶּאֶר יְשֵׁרָא, although there is no פְּעַל in their language [377]; or may be orig. שֶׁנֶּאֶר יְשֵׁרָא, the י being changed into י, by assimilation to the p. pl. חָאָמ [247, 686], in which case its o. f. [in the sing.] is אָבָא [713, 716] and אָבָא [713, 716] occur in
the inf. n. of ḳālāt [332, 482, 494] and ḳālāt [482, 494, 667, 675] (R): (e) the substitution of the َى for one of the duplicate [or triplicate] letters is [exemplified] in (a)

I dictated the writing (M, Jrb), aor. أَمْلَى، inf. n. إِمْلَأَت [for إِمْلَأْت] (Jrb), orig. إِمْلَّأَت [above] (IY); the Kur has ْنَهَى تَمَلَّى عَلَيْهِ بُكْرَةً وَآصِيَلًا XXV. 6. And they are dictated to him morning and evening (IY, Jrb) and َلِيَسَلُ الَّذِى عَلَى الْحَقِّ II. 282. And let him on whom lies the debt dictate [below] (IY); and the poet says

فَآلَيْتْ لَا أَمَلَةً حَتَّى يَفَارِقَا

Then I swore I would not weary of him until he should depart, i. e., لَا أَمَلَةُ: (α) they say that the o. f. of أَمَلَةُ is أَمْلَّهُ, inf. n. إِمْلَأَت, as in II. 282 [above] (Jrb): but [some hold that (Jrb) properly (IY)] they are two [excellent (Jh)] dial. vars., [both occurring in the Kur (Jh),] because their employment is uniform (IY, Jrb), as أَمْلَّى أَلْكَتَابَ, aor. يُبِلُلُ, inf. n. إِمْلَآ، and أَمْلَى أَلْكَتَابَ, aor. يُبِلُلُ, inf. n. إِمْلَآ (IY); so that to make one of them original, and the other deriv., is not more appropriate than the converse (IY, Jrb): (b) قَصَصْتُ أَظْفَرَي (I clipped my nails [below] (M, Jrb), transmitted by ISk (IY), for قَصَصْتُ (IY, Jrb), where they substitute َى for the third ص, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): (c) No, by thy Lord, I will
not do! (M), meaning زرُك [above], where they substitute a ی for the second ب, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): (d) تَسْرَتْ (M), orig. I took a concubine, سررُتْ from یا. یکاح [231], which is named سررُت secrecy, because he that intends it hides, and seeks to conceal himself (IY): (α) سررُت ءُعلِية, [a rel. n. (Jh)] from سررُت (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 دامم, because formations are sometimes altered, especially in the rel. n., as یارض سِهِلة دُعْرَى سُهْيلى دُعْرَى [311], rel. ns. of دُعْرَى and سُهْيلى smooth ground (Jh): but Akh says that it is سررُت ءُعلِية (IY), derived (Jh)] from سررُت gladness, because her master is gladdened by her (Jh, IY): (e) تَتَظَنُبْتَ (M), orig. تَتَظَنُبْتَ I exercised thought, ءُالْتَظَنْب, being the exercise of thought, orig. ءُالْتَظَنْب, one of whose نs they change into ی, because of the heaviness of the reduplication (IY): and لَمْ يَتَسْنَ [read by ْهَمزا and Ks in (B)] II. 261. [644, 647] (M), orig. لَمْ يَتَسْنَ It hath not been altered from مِن حَيَا مَسْتَنَوْنِ XV. 26, 28, 33. (IY), meaning of [black (K)] clay wrought into shape (K, B), i.e., altered, a ی being substituted for the third ن, and then converted into
because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684], so that يِتَسَنَّ becomes يِتَسَنَّ; and the ٰ being afterwards elided for apocopation [404, 720], so that لَمْ يِتَسَنَّ becomes لَمْ يِتَسَنَّ: this is the saying of IAl [below] (IY): تَقَضَّى الْبَازِي (ج) The falcon stooped, or swooped (M), i. e. إنْقَصَ أَلْطَائُر meaning The bird dropped in its flight (IY): (α) they do not use its تَفْعَل except changed (Jh, IY), as, where, deeming three ضِ ضِ heavy, they substitute ى for one of them (Jh): AlʿAjjāj says تَقَضَّى الْبَازِي إِذَا الْبَازِي كَسَرٍ [below] (Jh, IY): (g) the saying نُزُّر أَمْراً أَمْمَا أَلَّاهُ فَيْتَقَقُي وَأَمَّا يُفَعَّلُ الْصَّالِحِينَ فِيَتَهَيَ 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 يَعْتَم , but substitutes ى for the second م (IY): (h) تَقْصِيَة (M), [as] in وَمَا كَانَ صَلُوْتُهُمْ عِنْدَ الْبَيْتِ إِلَّا مَكَاءٍ وَتَقْصِيَة VIII. 35. [21, 682], where the ى is a subst. for the [second] ى (IY), according to those who pronounce it to be from صَدِّ (M); i. e., clapping of hands and making a noise, whence إِذَا قُرِّمَكَ مَنْهَ يُصَدّّرَنَ XLIII. 57. [below].
i. e., Lo, thy people [Kuraish (K, B)] clamour, and cry out, at it; one of the two $s$ being transmuted into $\imath$: this is the saying of AU: $\alpha$ [being orig. تِلْعَبُتْ تَصْدِيْةٌ, then by incorporation تَصْدِيْةٌ, like تِلْعَبُتْ تَصْدِيْةٌ exiation and تِلْعَبُتْ diversion; but, when the second $d$ is converted into $\imath$, incorporation is impossible, from the difference of the two letters (IY): (i) تِلْعَبُتْ [I ate endive (IY)], from لِعَةُ endive (M), which is a delicate herb, according to what ISk transmits, on the authority of IAr; whence, says As, the world is called لِعَةُ: (\alpha) its o. f. is تِلْعَبُتْ; but they substitute a $\imath$ for one of the $s$, from dislike to the combination of [three] $s$ (IY): (i) دَهْدَهْتَ $\alpha$ and دَهْدَهْتَ [below] (M): they say دَهْدَهْتَ (IY), a $\imath$ being substituted for the [second] $s$ (Jh): Dhu-rRumma says

"كُنْ كَذَٰلِكَ مِنْ الْعَرْضِ الْجَلَالِمِٔ"

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

"كَانَ ضُرْبُ جَرْحِهَا أَلْسُعْعُجًا ۖ جَنْدَةٌ دَهْدَهْتَهَا مِنْ جَنْدِلٍ"

As though the sound of her hurried swallowing were a stone that thou hadst rolled down from stones: while their
saying دُعُودُهُ الْجُعُلِ for what the black-beetle rolls together indicates that the o. f. is :Number formation (β) : دُهْدَعْتُ [below], for  Meaning I said “Hush! hush!” [187], i. e., “Be silent”, the ى being a subst. for the ى, from dislike to the reduplication (IY): (h) مَكَاكْيِكُ (IY)] pl. of مَكْرُوكُ (below) (M), according to what AZ transmits, the [second] ى being followed by two ى s, the first a subst. for the ى of مَكْرُوكُ [683], which becomes a ى in the pl., because the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr; and the second a subst. for the [third] ى, because of [the heaviness of] the reduplication (IY): (l) دَيَاَجُوجُ pl. of دَيِّجُوجُ [below] (M) dark, as لِيْلَ دَيْجُوجُ meaning intensely dark night, orig. دَيَاَجُجُ, where, disliking the reduplication, they substitute a ى for the last ى; and, this ى being then combined with the one before it, they lighten [the word] by elision of one of the two ى s; so that it becomes دَيَاَجُ, of the class of the defective [16] (IY): (m) دِبْوَانُ register [332, 716], دِبْنَجُ brocade [above], and تِبْرَاطُ carat [278, 332] (M), orig. دُوَانُ (a), the paradigm of which is نَعَال, the ى in it being a ى, because they say كُونُت I registered, and, in the dim., دُبْنِبْسُ: if, then, it be said “Then wherefore do you not convert the ى [of دِبْوَانُ] into ى, because of the
's occurring quiescent before it, on the principle of its conversion in سَيْدُ and ﷲ مَيْت [above]?' the reply is "Because that would lead to destruction of the object: for, disliking the reduplication in دِوَان , they change [the first ] into ی , in order that the two letters may be different; so that, if they were afterwards to change the [second] ی [into ی ], saying ﷲ دِيَاٰن , 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 دَوَابِسِن , 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 دِيَاٰبِسِن , making the subst. inseparable": (۶) دِبَّاج that being indicated by their saying دِبَجَيْضُ [above], with the ب , in the pl., as though they disliked reduplication [in the sing.], and therefore changed [the first ب into ی ]: (۷) تِرُطَط (۶) , where, because of the heaviness of the reduplication, they substitute a ی for the first ر , that being indicated by the pl. تِرَطَط [۲۷۸], where the appearance of the ر is an indication of what we have said (۸) شِيرَاز curd (M), coagulated milk, the water of which is extracted (KF), orig. شِرَاز, like تِرَطَط (۸) ; and دِيَمَسَن [۳۷۷] (M) a dungeon [belonging to AlHajjāj.
(Jh, KF) Ibn Yusuf (Jh)], and a burrow, den, [orig. دمّاس,] the ی being substituted for the [first] م (IY): according to him that says دمّایس، شراییژ [above] (M) in the pl. (IY); (o) the saying of the poet, [describing a wild cow in search of her calf (Jsh),]

قامت بها تستنى كَل الْبَنْشِدِ فَأَيْتَصَلَتْ بِمُثِلّ ضَوْءُ الْفَرْتَدِ

[below] (M) She stood in it (the ُبَقَعّة patch of ground), seeking with all inquiry, البَنْشِدِ in the shape of the pass. part. being a mîmî 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 اَتْصَلَتْ أَنَاسِيٍّ (٢) [248, 253] (SH), orig. اَنَاسِينُ [248, 274], because it is pl. of ُإِنْسَان (Jrb); (a) اَنَاسِيْتُ أَنَاسِيٍّ may be pl. of (a) إِنْسَانْ, in which case the ی is not a subst. for the ن: so says Mb: (b) إِنْسَان, [by conversion of the ن into ی (K, B on XXV. 51.),] its o. f. being اَنَاسِينُ [above], which also is used; so that it is like طّرْبَان [248, 274], pl. of طّرْبَانِ [237, 385] (R), the o. f. being طّرُایَیْنِ [250] (K). As for the ع, the ب, the س, and the ث, they are [sometimes replaced by the ی ], as in (1) the saying

ْمَنْهَلِی لِبْسُ لَهُ حَواَّقِی: زِلْفَادْیَی جِبِّی نَقَائِیْ.
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 ع for the ع by poetic license (IY): (2) the saying

لَهَا أَشَارِبٌ مِنْ لَحْمٍ تَتْبَعُهُ مِنْ التَّعَالِي وَخَزٌ مِنْ أَرَابِيُّهَا

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

إِذَا مَا عَدّ أَربَعَةٌ نَسَالٍ فَرَّوْجُكَ خَائِسٌ وَأَبُوكَ سَادٍ

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

يَفْدِيكُ يَا زَرعَ أَبِي زَهَالِيْيِ # قَدْ مَرَّ يُومَانِ وَعَدَ آللَّالِيْيِ

وَآنَتْ بِأَلْهَمْٓهُمْ لاَ تُبَالَٰيْ
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 

\[(R)\] [of the third (Jsh)], as though he disliked the cat. of the third [674] (IY). But [and عشایی, عشایی, عشایی are weak (SH), because unheard from trustworthy Arabs (MASH). And sometimes the ی is substituted for the ی, ج, and ی, ی, (R). It is [therefore said by A to be] substituted for eighteen letters, (1) the ی, as in علیم [above]: (2) the ی, as in اغزیت [above] and the variations [of the inf. n. (Sn)] thereof, [as یغزی and مغری (Sn)]: (3) the Hamza, as in پیچ [642, 658]: (4) the ی in سپهسیت [above]: (5) the ین in یدما عد اخ [above]: (6) the ب in آلارنی and التعلی [above]: (7) the ر in شیار [above]: (8) the ن in (a) طبرایی [above] and (b) تظیمیت [above]; (c) as IAl holds, [above]; (d) دیکار [above], orig. دنار, because of their saying [18] and [278]; (e) ایسان, with the ی, for انسان man: (9) the ص in تقیت اظفار [above]: (10) the ض in
When the generous hasten to the noble deed, he hastens with the swoop of the falcon, when the falcon contracts his wings (Sn), i. e., تَقَضَّصَ الْبَارَى إِذَا الْبَارَى كَسَرْ. [above] (A) [taken (Sn)] from إنْفِضَافِ، [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 مُلَمَّىتُ [above], where, says IAr, the poet means نُزُورُ أَمْرًا أَلَمْ [above], (13) the ع in (a) مَمَّهِلٍ الْحُرُ [above]; (b) تَلْعِبَتُ [above]: (14) the د in [above], orig. تَصْدِیئة (A); and so in النَّتَصْدِیئي: Fm says in the Msb "I applied, and devoted, myself exclusively to the matter, orig. تَصَدَّدُتْ لِلَّأَمَرٍ I applied, and devoted, myself exclusively to the matter", then changed for lightness” (Sn): (15) the تَبِينَتُ بِبَنِيلِ الْحُرُ [above]; (16) the تَبْينَتُ [above], i. e., البِنْيَاءُ (a) [684], i. e., مَنْ شَجَرَتْ اللَّهُ الْحُرُ pl. of دِيَاجِيُّ [above], orig. دِيَاجِيُّ (A): YH says “so that the ی of the pl. is elided, and the [last] جُ then converted into ی”; and analogy requires that the like of this should be said on A’s saying “orig. مَكَابِكُ” [below]: but this is correct only when the ی of دِيَاجِيُّ
and مُكاكيٍّ [with Tanwin ﺪِيَاجٍ and مَكاكيٍّ] is single; not when it is double, as the ﯽ of مُكاكيٍّ is marked in such correct Mss of the KF as I have seen: nay, [in مُكاكيٍّ and مُكاكيٍّ] the quiescent ﯽ is the ﯽ of the pl., [being a subst. for the ﯽ of مُكاكيٍّ and مُكاكيٍّ, 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 [or ﻟ] (Sn): (18) the ﻟ in مُكاكيٍّ pl. of مُكاكيٍّ [above], orig. مُكاكيٍّ [above] (A).

§. 686. The ﯽ is substituted for (M, SH, A) three letters (A), (1, 2) its two sisters [697] (M, SH), by which are meant (IY) the ﯽ and ﯽ (IY, Jrb, A), because all [three] are letters of prolongation and softness (IY); (3) the Hamza (M, SH, A). As for its substitution for the ﯽ, it is in one case, vid. where the letter before it is pronounced with ﺪاَمَم [below] (Aud), whether it be in (1) a v. (Tsr), as in ﺪِبَرٍ [below] (Aud): (a) their o. f., before they are put into the pass., is بَابَيُّ trafficked with [683], swore allegiance to, and ﺪَاَمَبَ [below] fought with [490]; but, when you put them into the pass., you pronounce their initial with ﺪاَمَم [436]; while it is impossible for the ﯽ to remain after a ﺪاَمَم, because the letter before the ﯽ is pronounced only with فَاث; so that the ﯽ is converted into ﯽ, for homogeneity
with the vowel of the letter before it (Tsr); (b) the Revelation has 

What was hidden from them [683] (Aud): or (2) a n., as in ضُرِّبُ dim. of [below]; if the I be not second, converted from a ى , as in تَأْبَ meaning [canine] tooth, [fāng,] in which case it returns to its o. f., vid. the ى , as ُنْيِبُ [278] (Tsr). And, as for its substitution for the ى , it is in four cases, (1) where the ى is quiescent, single, and [in a sing. (IA),] not in a pl. (Aud), [and is] after a َظَمْما (IA), whether it be in (a) a n. (Tsr), as in مُوَسِّر [278] and مُوَسِّر [278, 682, 699] (Aud), orig. مُيِّسِرُ and مُيِّسِرُ, act. parts. [of was certain and َأَيِّسَرَ was well off (A)] from َكِيِّسِرُ certain and َيِسِرُ easy, the ى in both being changed into because occurring after a َظَمْما; or (b) a v., as in ِيُوَسِّرِ is certain and ِيُوَسِّرِ is well off (Tsr): (a) the ى must be preserved [from change (Tsr)] if it be (α) mobile, [because by means of the vowel it resists change (Tsr),] as in َهُيِّامُ (Aud), i. e., says Jh, most violent thirst, and delirium from love, and a distemper that seizes camels, so that they wander about the land, and do not graze (Tsr): (β) incorporated [into its like (Tsr)], as in حُيِّصُ (Aud), pl. of حُيِّصُ [247], where the ى 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 َابَّةٍ [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 [Ḍamma] does not succeed in converting the incorporated ى into َ: but this ex. [ُحَيْض] 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 ُحَيْض [384] from ُبَعٌ , saying ُبَعَ١ , [the ى in] which, for the [first] reason that we mentioned [in the case of ُحَيْض ], is not transformed (Tsr): (γ) in a pl.: but in this [case (Tsr)] the ِḌamma [occurring before the single ى in the pl. (Tsr)] must be converted into Kasra, [because of the heaviness of ِḌamma, ى , and the pl. (Tsr),] as in the ُنَعَلٍ pl. of ُنَعَلٍ َأَنْعَلَ [243, 249, 710], like ُحَيْض wandering about, [pl. of ُحَيْض] ُحَيْض (Tsr),] and ِبيض white (Aud), pl. of ِبيض and ِبيضآ , or of another [measure], like pl. of ُعَظَمٌ, on the principle of ُرُزَلِ pl. of ُعَظَمٌ [247], ُعَظَمٌ being the she-camel that does not conceive [718], pls. ُعَظَمٌ and ُعَظَمٌ [247] (Tsr): (2) where the ى occurs after a ِḌamma, and is the ل of (a) ُنَعَلٍ [468, 476],
like intelligent the man is! and What a good judge he is!, [with Fath of their first, and Damm of their second (Tsr),] i. q. مَأْ أَنْهَا أَعْقَلْهُ, i. e., and مَأْ أَتْصَبَّة (Aud), i. e. أَحْكَمْهُ, orig. نَهَى and from I forbade and I judged, the ي in them being changed into , because occurring after a دَمْمَة (Tsr): (b) a n. ending in a [fundamental, inseparable] ٨ [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 أَزْيَى a [n. ending in ٨ (Tsr),] like مَقْطُرَة [333], [with دَمْمَة of the د (Tsr),] in which case you say مَرْمَوَة [with the ], orig. مِرْمِيَة, the ي being changed into , because occurring after a دَمْمَة (Tsr), contrary to [what happens when the ٨ is affixed after the formation of the word, in which case the دَمْمَة must be converted into كَسْرَة, in order that the ي may be preserved, as in (Tsr)] such [formations] as تَوَانَيْة inf. n. un. of تْوَانَى flagged [336]: for its o. f., before affixion of the ٨ , is تَوَانَی with دَمْمَة [of the د , because it is of the cat. of تَفَاعُلْ, since تَوَايّ with دَمْمَة inf. n. of تْوَانَى is (Tsr)] like تَكُأسُّل [with دَمْمَة of the س (Tsr),] inf. n. of تْوَانَى تَكُأسُّل was sluggish; but its دَمْمَة is changed into كَسْرَة, in order that the ي may be preserved from conversion [into , (Tsr)]; and afterwards 140a
the ı supervenes, to import unity [336]; while the transformation [of the Ḍamma into Kasra (Tsr)] remains in its state (Aud), the predicament [of the ı] not being altered by restoration of the Ḍamma to its original place, and change of the ı into ı, because that would lead to the occurrence of an inf. n. ending in ı, preceded by an inseparable Ḍamma [721], since the adventitious ı, being virtually separate [266], is not taken into account (Tsr): (c) a n. ending in the [aug. (Tsr)] ı and ı, as when you form from زَمَيْن [a name (Tsr)] on the measure of سُبْعَان Sabuʿān [with Ḍamm of the ب (Tsr)], the name of the place about which Ibn ʿAḥmar [or rather Tamīn Abn Abi Mukīb, according to the correct opinion (Tsr),] says أَلْلَآ يَ دِيْاَرْ أَلْحَكِي أَلْحَي Ramūwān (Aud) with Ḍamm of the م, orig. زَمَيْن, the ı being changed into ı, because occurring after a Ḍamma: (a) you may, however, say that, when a [n.] like عُلْبُيَان [237, 250] is formed from عْلَبُيَان, then غَرْبُيَان [685, 723] is said, the letter before the ı and ı being given the predicament of what occurs as a genuine final, like [the ı of] زَضْيَ [685]: while this necessarily requires that, in the like of زَضْيَ سُبْعَان [above], زَمَوْنَ should not be said, because, in the paradigm of غَضْد [368] from زَضْي, it is not allowable to say زَضْيَ, since we have no decl. n. ending in an inseparable ı.
after a Damma [721]; but the Damma must be converted into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved, so that you say یز[724]; and similarly رُمْینانُ 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 ٌفْعَلَي فَعَلَي when a substantive, not an ep., as قُرْوَى ثُمَّ قُرْوَى Thou hast its like, or match, i. e., مَنْثَلْ, transmitted by IJ (Tsr),] and قُرْوَى [248] (Aud), orig. قَرْبُي, قَرْبُي, and قَرْبُي, because I feared, reverenced, قَرْبُي I sold, and قَرْبُي I was youthful, the ی in them being changed into ٌ, to distinguish the substantive from the ep.; while they appropriate transformation to the substantive in particular, because, being lighter than the ep., it is more tolerant of heaviness (Tsr); (a) IM [in the CK (Tsr)] and his son [in the C (Tsr)] say that سعَيْا، [a name (Tsr)] for a [certain (Tsr)] place, [a district in AlYaman or its immediate neighbourhood, by rule, says IJ, سعَرى (Bk),] and ٍلْيَبُا for the [nice (EM)] odour, and طَغْيَا [with Fath, says Th (Jh),] for the young of البقرة الوحشية the wild cow, or bovine antelope, are anomalous: but [this requires consideration, since (Tsr)] the first, [vid. سعَى from سعَى striving (Tsr),] may be
transferred from an *ep.* [4], like صَدِيَّانَا حَرْبٍيَا [725], *fems.* of حَرْبٍيَّانِ [250] and صَدِيَّانِ thirsty (Aud), the sounding [of its ی] true being retained as an accompani-
ment after its being made a name, as F explains (Tsr); while the second, [vid. رَیَا from ۴٦٩ (348) (Tsr),] is said by the GG, [S and others (Tsr),] to be an *ep.* wherein the quality of substantive predominates [149], the o. f. being رَآفِكَةٌ رَیَا a fragrant odour, i. e., filled with per-
fume; and the third, [vid. طَفَّیَانِ inordinate wickedness (Tsr),] is more often pronounced with دامم of the ط [below], so that perhaps they retain the sound-
ing [of the ی] true as an accompaniment when they pronounce [the ط] with فتح 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 ٍ for the ی, when a ل of فَعَلَیْنِ, is not to be taken as a precedent, because there is no cause [for it], while it necessarily involves increase of heavi-
ness’”: (c) various spellings of طَفَّیَانِ [272] are trans-
mitted: As says “with دامم of the ط [above], like حَبْلِی”; while Th says “with فتح of the ط [above], on the paradigm of سَکْرَی”; and AU says “with فتح
of the ط, and Tanwin"; so says ISd (Tsr): (4) where the ی is the ع of [718], with Damm [of the (Tsr), when (a) a substantive, like طبیبی happiness, [i. q. طبیبا (Tsr),] an inf. n. of was happy (Aud), aor. طبیبی (Tsr), like بشری [272, 331] and رلی [272] (K, B on XIII. 28.); or تابا, a name for Paradise (Aud), whence شکرا the tree of Paradise (Tsr): (a) the meaning of طبیبی لله Mayst thou be happy! or Happiness be thine! is یاسبت خیرا وطبیبا Mayst thou find good fortune and happiness!; while the [syntactical] place of طبیبی is the acc. or nom., as in طبیبا لله, and سلام لله [41] or سلام [25, 28], its two places being indicated to you by the reading of طبیبی كیم وحاس مانپ 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 ی denotes explanation, as in سقیبا لله [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 فظیل of فظیل [272, 355], like الطربی the happy state, or life, الگوسی the shrewd woman, and الخری the good woman, fems. of الطربی [718], and یسر [351] (Aud), ns. of superiority acting as prim. substantives (Tsr): (a) what indicates that
they are acting as [\textit{prim.} (Tsr)] substantives is that the أَفْعَلُ of superiority takes the \textit{pl.} أَفْعَالُ [249], as the learned and the great, [\textit{pls. of} and (Tsr),] like أَفْعَالُ pl. of أَفْعَالُ [249] (Aud), which is a \textit{prim.} substantive: (b) the o. f. is أَكْبَرْ , أَطْلِيَّٰ, and لَحْيَرُ with دَامَم of their initial; but the يُ is changed into ، because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with دَامَم (Tsr), as in مُوقَن and مُوسَر [\textit{above}] (K on XIII. 28.): (c) if فَتَلَى be a pure ep., [i. e., preceded by a qualified (Tsr),] its دَامَم must be converted into كَسَرَة, [in order that the يُ may be preserved from conversion into ، to distinguish the ep. from the substantive (Tsr)]; but no instance of that has been heard except [two words (Tsr),] an iniquitous division, i. e., جَآكِرَة wrong'ul, [from حَقَّة deprived, or defrauded, him of his right, aor. يَصَبِّرُ, i. q. بَخَسَةُ حَقَّة diminished to him his right and جَآرُ عَلَيْه diminishes him (Tsr),] and مِشْيَة جُيَّكَى an elegant, or affected, gait, i. e., wherein the shoulders move [272, 718] (Aud), from حَلَانِ فِي مَشْيى meaning moved his shoulders \textit{in his walk}, orig. حُيِّكَى and ضَيْرُى with دَامَم of their initial, the دَامَم being changed into كَسَرَة in order that the يُ may be sounded true, as in بَيِّض pl. of أَبْيَضُ.
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[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 ُعلّى, when an ep., the ُدامّة may [either] be preserved, the ی being converted into َ; or be changed into Kasra, the ی being preserved: so that you say ُطُوْبِي the happiest or ُليبِي, and ُكوْسِي the shrewdest or ُكِيسي, and ُصومتِي the narrowest or ُقيقِي (Aud), from vacillating between conformity with its masc. [by retention of the ی] at one time, and observance of the measure [by retention of the ُدامّة] at another: (e) this differs from the language of the GG, S and his followers, in two respects, (α) that IM and his son allow two forms in ُعلّى when an ep.: whereas the GG decide upon one of them, saying that the ی [occurring as the ُع] of ُعلّى, when a substantive, is converted into َ, as ُكوْسِي ُطُوبِي; while, in the ep., it is not converted, but the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, so that the ی is preserved, as َفسُة: (β) that the GG mention the ُنُعلُ in the cat. of the substantives [718, 725]; and assign to it the predicament of the substantives in retention of the ُدامّة and conversion of the ی into َ: 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 ُعَلَّلَل as an ep. throughout case 4] (Tsr) : (g) Makwaza alAًrābī reads ُلَّلَل* in XIII. 28. [above], pronouncing the ط with Kasr [in the substantive], in order that the ى may be preserved, as ُبيَّض [above] and ُ диагност [333,710] are said (K). Its substitution, (1) for the ى, is (a) [obligatory (SH)] in such as (ا) ُضَوْرَب [18] (M, SH), pl. of ُضَوْرَبَة ج [247, 278, 383] (Jrb); and ُضَوْرَب (M, SH), dim. of ُضَوْرَب [278, 682] (Jrb) : i. e., in the ultimate pl., and the dim., of (R) such as (IY) ُفَاعِل and ُفَاعِل [above] (IY, R), like ُفَعَّلَت ُضَرَّب [373]; and ُفَاعُول ُفَاعُول, like ُفَعَّلَت ُساَبِط [377]: for, whenever you mean to form the dim., or [ultimate] broken pl., from any of those [ns.], you convert its ى into ُصَوْرَب, as ُصَوْرَب [above], ُصَوْرَب, ُخُوَيْنَم, ُخُوَيْنَم, ُعَوْجَيْنَم, ُعَوْجَيْنَم, ُعَوْجَيْنَم, ُعَوْجَيْنَم, ُعَوْجَيْنَم: (α) the cause of its conversion in the dim. [278] is obvious, vid. the fact that the letter before it is pronounced with ِDamm [above]: (β) as for its conversion in the broken pl. [247], it is by conformity with the dim. : for, when you say ُخَوَيْنَم ُضَوْرَب [above], there is no ِDamma on the ض and necessitating conversion of the ى into ُخَوَيْنَم ُضَوْرَب.
in the *dim.*, you say خواتِم in the broken *pl.*, which is
made to accord with the *dim.* in this [conversion],
because they follow one course [247, 274, 279], this
broken *pl.* being treated like the *dim.* in many of its
predicaments, in that the sign of the *dim.* is a quiescent
ى third preceded by a Fatha [274], and the sign of the
[ultimate] broken *pl.* is a quiescent َ third [256], pre-
ceded by a Fatha, while the ى is the sister of the َ, as
above shown; and that the letter after the ى of the
*dim.* is pronounced with Kasr [274], as is the letter
after the َ of the [ultimate] broken *pl.* [256] (IY) : (b)
ضُرَبٌ [below], *dim.* of ضَرَبٌ [278], *inf. n.* of ضَرَبٌ [332,
685] : (c) ضُرَبٌ [above], which they
treat like خواتِم and خواتِم [above], since the substitution
is obligatory, because of the combination of two Hamzas
(IY) : (d) ضُرَبٌ [above] (IY, R) and تُضَرَبٌ (R), where
you convert the َ of the [act.] v. ضارَب [and تصارِب] into ،
according to the rule mentioned [above], because the letter
before it is pronounced with ذَمَم (IY) : (e) ذَمَم
[294, 300] (M, SH), and the like [rel. *ns.*]
from the abbreviated (IY), where the َ third or fourth
[300] has the ى of relation affixed to it, in which case
you convert the َ into ، (R), whether the َ be [converted]
from أ or ى (IY, R), because of the occurrence of the
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double ی after it: (α) the reason of its being converted into ی، and the reason of this ی's not being converted into ی، notwithstanding its being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, have been explained [300, 684] (R): (f) یلی [229, 639], du. of یلی [500], when [used as (IY)] a name (M); and similarly یلی [229], إذا [205], لدی [559], and یلی، یلی، یدوآی، یدوآی [204], whether [an adv. of] time or place, لدی [559], and لدی [543, 544], when you name a man by one of these things: and so, if you made one of them a name of a woman, and then pluralized it with the ی and ی، you would say یلی یلی [234], and the like: (α) the cause of the conversion of such یس as those into ی، is that they are original, neither aug., nor substituted; so that, since they have no o. f. to which they might be restored when mobile, nor has Imāla been heard in them [639], the predicament of the ی، is assigned to them, and therefore they are converted into ی، when they need a vowel: (β) if it be said "Since they are original, not substituted, why is their conversion into ی، not disallowed, because they have no o. f. as ی، or ی؟", the answer is that the matter is so, except that, when these words are used as names, they are translated to the predicament of یس: so that what is predicated of the یس in those یس, which it is not good to pronounce with Imāla,
such as َعَصَّا ٍقَطُّا ٍsand-grouse, is predicated of their اٍ; and, as you say َعَصَّرَانِ ٍقَطَرَانٍ, so you say َلَدْرَانِ َعَصَّرَانِ and َلَدْرَانِ َعَصَّرَانِ: and somewhat similarly, if you named a man َضَرِّبٍ [482], you would inflect it, saying َرَأَيْتُ َضَرِّب١َٰ I saw َضَرِّب٠ َI passed by َضَرِّب١َ. This is َضَرِّب١ َDarab, I saw َضَرِّب١ َDarab, and َضَرِّب٠ َDarab, although, before use as a name, it is not invaded by inflection [402, 403]; so that, as َضَرِّب٠ , when used as a name, is transferred to the predicament of ِns., and is therefore infl. [194, 206], so ُلَدْرَى, ُإِمَا, ُلَدْرَى, when used as names, are transferred to the predicament of ِns., and their اٍs are decided to be [converted] from the اٍ, since they are original, and ِImāla has not been heard in them (IY): (b) weak in: [such as] ُعَلُّر١ أَنْعُر٠ َviiper [in pause] (R), [where] some of ُتَأْمَي ي say ُحَبْلِي٠ with the اٍ for ُحَبْلِي٠ (M on §. 643); (a) ُفَزَارَة١ and some of ُكَاٍس convert every final اٍ, whether for feminization, as in ُحَبْلِي٠ [248, 272], or not, as in َكَسْرَي٠ [401, 671, 673], into اٍ [in pause]; so say the ِGG; but IH makes that peculiar to the اٍ of “such as ُحَبْلِي٠” [643, 685], which is not proper: (b) the reason why they convert it into اٍ is that the اٍ 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 اٍ 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 \( \text{هُرَالُة} \) [648] and \( \text{يَا رُبَّاه} \) [54] are said, with the ٰ of silence [615] after it; so that in pause they substitute [for it] a letter homogeneous with, but plainer than, it, vid. the  الاسلام; (c) it is only for the object mentioned, vid. plainness, that, in the state of pause, which ought to be lighter than the state of continuity, they tolerate the heaviness of the ٰ, which is heavier than the ٰ; and also because the letter before it is pronounced with Fath, which somewhat lightens the heaviness of the ٰ: (d) this is also an excuse for the conversion of the ٰ into ٰHamza [643], although it is heavier than the ٰ: (e) Tayyi leave it, in continuity, in the same state as in pause, saying ٰ with the ٰ in both states: (f) some of Tayyi convert the ٰ into ٰ [in pause], because ٰ is plainer than ٰ, and plainness is intended: for the ٰ is [sounded] farther in the mouth than the ٰ, because it is [emitted] from the throat [732]; and after it the ٰ, because it is from the middle of the tongue; and after it the ٰ, because it is from the lips: (g) the ٰ is more frequent than the ٰ, in the dial. of Tayyi, in such a position, because the lightness suitable to pause ought to be observed together with the observance of plainness: (h) those who convert the ٰ into ٰ [in pause] leave the ٰ, 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 ı is converted into ı or ı is that the three resemble one another in prolongation and width of outlet (R on Pause): (2) for the ı, is (a) [obligatory (SH)] in such as (a) مُوتّن (M, SH) and مُوسِر [above] (IY), طُريّ [above], and بُيِطر (M, SH), orig. بُيطر (Jrb), pass. of بُيطر [482] (IY), from بُيطرة [332], whence بُيطرة [377] (Jrb); vid. where the ı is quiescent and unincorporated, and is preceded by a letter pronounced with دamm (M, R), and followed by two or more letters [below], except in such as بِيضان [249], and حِيَكِي [above] (R): (α) if the in مُوسِر and مُوتّن become mobile, or the دامما before it be removed, the word reverts to its original ı, as in the dim. مُيِطْرُ and مُيِطْقَن [278], and the broken pl. مُيِطْرُون and مُيِطْقَن [252] (IY): (β) our saying ＂[and followed by] two or more letters ＂[above] is to guard against such as بِيضان [above] (R): (γ) as for ضُوْترِیب [above], the ı in it is a subst. for the ı substituted for the ı of فأَل; while the last ı is a subst. for the ı of نيَعَال [332] (IY): (β) بَقُوَى sparing, taking compassion on [725] (M, SH), orig. بِقیَا، [a quasi-inf. n. (KF)] from بَقَى عَلَیه spared him, i. q. أَشْفَقَ عَلَیه took compassion on him, from بِقیَا remained,
as though he desired him to remain (Jrb); and as though 
[above], from ٍمٍيَت [689] (IY): (c) ٍمٍيَت [294, 301] (R):
(b) [anomalous, weak (SH),] in such as (α) ٍتَدَا ٍأَمُرُ ٍمَضُوٍءَ عَلَيْهِ. This is a matter accomplished (M, SH), orig. ٍمَضُوٍءَ (R, Jrb), from ٍمَضُوٍءَ [below] (Jrb), the last ٍح in it being a subst. for ٍح, which is a ٍح in مَضِيَت (IY), because it is from مَضِيَت, aor. يَمضِيَت (R): (b) ٍهوُ أَمَرُ ٍبَالْمُعِرَفَ. He is (M, R) a strong enjoiner of good conduct (IY, R),] a strong forbidder of bad conduct [685] (M, SH), which is from نَهِيَت I forbade (IY), [being] orig. ٍنَهِيَت (R, Jrb), from ٍنَهِيَت (Jrb), as though the ٍح were converted into ٍح, in order that ٍح might correspond to ٍأَمُرُ; whereas, if they converted the ٍح [of ٍفَعَلٍ] into ٍح, the Damma would be turned into Kasra, and ٍح would become ٍح [722], which would not correspond to ٍأَمُرٍ (R); and therefore ٍشَرِيَتْ مَشْرَأٌ I drank a purgative (IY, R), which is the medicine that moves the stomach (R), from ٍمُكَبَيْت I moved, because the laxative necessitates motion: (α) they change the ٍح into ٍح, because they mean the formation ٍفَعَلٍ; and therefore dislike it to be confounded with the formation ٍفَعَلٍ, [as would happen] if ٍح and ٍح [722] were said (IY):
(c) ٍجَبِيَتْ ٍجِبَارَةٌ (M, SH), for ٍجِبَارَة inf. n. of ٍجَبِيَتْ ٍجِبَارَةٌ
I collected the tax (IY, R, Jrb): (α) [the assertion] that the [last] ٰٔ of مَضْرَعُ is a subst. for the ی is said to require consideration, because one says مَضْرَعُ ُعَلَى ُلَّا ُمُرْ. I accomplished the matter, inf. n. مَضْرَعُ ُعَلَى ُلَّا ُمُرْ; and similarly [the assertion] that the ی in جَبَرَةٌ is a subst. for the ی, because جَبَرَةٌ and جِبَارَةٌ are two dial. vars., since Jh says in the Sahāh "[Ks says (Jh)] جَبِيتُ أَلْمَأْنِي أَلْحُوضُ I collected the water in the trough or cistern and جَبَرَةٌ", the inf. n. of the first being, it is said, جَبِيَ, جَبِيَ, and of the second جَبْرَةٌ; and Jh also says "جَبِيتُ أَلْحَجَ جَبِيَّةٌ, inf. n. جِبَارَةٌ, and جِبَارَةٌ", inf. n. جَبَرَةٌ: so they mention; but it is [a] feeble [argument], because, from the [mere] use of the two [forms], it does not necessarily follow that both are o. fs., since substitution may be recognizable [in one of the two forms] here by the paucity of [its] usage [682] (Jrb); and [R says that] the whole are anomalous [substitutions of for ی] (R). They say شِوَى and عَبْيَةُ شَيْ and عَبْيَةُ ُعَيْنَ َعَيْنُ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَيْнَ ُعَيْنَ ُعَا
another. And of this class is their saying ضَرْعَةُ بَيْتٍ as dims. of ضَرْعَةُ real property, or estate, and بَيْتُ tent, house, respectively: whereas the form adopted in them is ضَرْعَةُ and بَيْتُ, as in a verse by AlKhalil Ibn Aḥmad that I have had recited to me

إِنْ لَمْ يُكَنْ لَّكَ جَذَى # أَغْدَانَ خَلَط وَرَمَتْ
أَوْ لَمْ يُكَنْ ذَا وَلَا ذَا # فَكَسَّرَةُ بَيْتُ

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 [ ضَرْعَةُ and] بَيْتُ [274, 721] (Jh, KF), with Kasr of the initial, as also in the dims. of ضَرْعَةُ عَبْرُ شِئٍ [274], شِئُ ass, شِئٍ [above], and their likes (Jh). This [retention of the ی, however,] is not obligatory, which is proclaimed by H's saying "the chastest"; and therefore his reckoning that [conversion of the ی into ٰ] among the "mistakes" [which the D, by its title "The Pearl of the Diver on the Mistakes of the Distinguished", professes to expose,] is an excess of language. And IM distinctly declares in the Tashil that the ُع before the letter [ی characteristic] of the dim. is made into a ٰ, (1) necessarily, if it be an ی converted from a ی; so that you say بَيْتُ as dim. of بَيْتُ [278]: (2) allowably, though less approvably, if it be a ی or an ی converted from a ی: so that بَيْتُ and بَيْتُ.
are allowable as *dims.* of ُشَيْحَةٍ and ُتَأْبِعَ [278]. And similarly ُشَوَهَةٍ and ُسُوَّيَةٍ [above]. And what H dis-allows is allowed by some, who transmit it from the KK, saying "They say ُشُواْرِيّ as *dim.* of ُشَيْحَةٍ": so that what H mentions is of no account (CD). Or ُشُواْرِيّ is a weak dial. var., on the authority of Idris Ibn Mūsā, the Grammarian (KF). The substitution of the ُ for the Hamza [685] is (1) [allowable (R)] in such as ُجُؤُنَةٌ [642], pl. ُجُوُنَ (M, SH), orig. ُجُونَةٌ and ُجُونَةٌ with Hamza: (a) the *ex.* is said to be a blunder, because the composition ُجَانَ is neglected in the language, and thus the ُ in ُجُرْنَةٍ is not known to be *orig.* Hamza: the author of the ُثِئَلَ says "And ُجُونَةٍ with ُدمَم is the *inf.* ُن. [331] of the ُجُونَ intensely black, [pl. ُجُونَ (Jh).] of horses, [like ُغْبَسَةٌ *dingy whiteness* and ُرَزَّةٌ *bright bay color* (Jh)]; and ُجُونَ is also the ُجُونَةُ 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 ُ], and the Hamza in it a *subst.* for the ُ: (b) "the ُجُونَةُ of the perfumer" [above] is his ُحَقَّةٌ small round box (Jrb): (2) necessary in (a) [such as: (MASH) ُأَرْمُسُ ُوُحَمٌ أُوُرٌَْلَوَيْ I believe [661]: (b) such as ُخْمَئْؤاَْيٍَْلِ.
[230, 726], according to the most recognised [usage]; and
[248]; and [304] (R). [On the substitution of the , for the s see §. 687.]

§. 687. The م is substituted for [four letters (IY, A),] (1) the ، [necessarily (SH, Aud),] in [673] [16, 667] (M, SH, Aud, A), according to most (A), alone (M, SH), the م not being substituted for the ، except in [673] ، but this substitution being obligatory (R), lest [the ، be elided, so that (R)] the infl. [n. (Jrb)] remain until. [below] (R, Jrb), according to what has been mentioned [278] (Jrb): (a) its o. f. is [673] فَرْج [16, 306] (IY, R, Aud, A), like فَرْج crowd (A), its ع being a ، and its ل a ٖ (IY), as is proved by [its broken pl. (IY, Tsr)] ْفَرْجَة (IY, R, Aud, A) and its dim. فَرْج [275] (IY), because the broken pl. [or the dim.] restores things to their o. f. [260, 278] (Tsr), and by فَرْج wide-mouthed and تَّفَرْجَة I opened my mouth (R); and its measure being ٌفَعَل with Fath of the first [letter], and quiescence of the second (IY): but the s [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 ْيَد 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 ْفَرْجَة would be said, which would be deemed heavy (A);
and, when the ẓ is elided, the ẓ remains of two letters, the second a Ṝ, and the first pronounced with Fath [below]: while its retention in this state would lead to conversion of the ẓ into l [684], on the principle of [the conversion in] ẓ ẓa and Ṝ Ṛ [719], because of its being mobile with the vowels of inflection, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; and, this l being elided, as in ẓa [643, 683], because of the concurrence of two quiescents, upon affixion of Tanwin to it, the decl. ẓ would remain unil. [below], which is not found (IY): and [since, according to what has just been mentioned, the ẓ requires the ẓ to be retained (IY),] they substitute the ẓ for the ẓ (IY, R, Aud, A), because the ẓ [is a sound letter, on which the vowels are not heavy; and (IY)] is from the same outlet as the ẓ [732] (IY, Tsr), both being from the mouth; and has in it a nasality akin to the softness of the Ṣ: (α) if it be said "What is the proof that the Ṣ is pronounced with Fath [above] to the exclusion of ḫamm or Kas: ?", the answer is "The [common] pronunciation testifies to that": and then, if it be said "AZ transmits Ṣ and Ṣ, with ḫamm and Kasr, for Ṣ", the answer is "That is not common in it; and the decision is [based] only upon the most frequent [pronunciation], which is Fath, ḫamm and Kasr being rare, of the cat. of blunder, the explanation of which is that, seeing [the vowel of] the Ṣ in this ẓ vary, when
the n. is pre. [otherwise than to the ي of the 1st pers.], as 
\( \text{I saw thy mouth, and I passed by thy mouth} \) [16], they treat it in the same way when the n. is aprothetic: (b) as for the saying of the poet [Al'Ajjaj (AKB)]

\[ \text{O would that it, by which he may have meant } \text{كلمة } \text{a word that was to be spoken, had issued from his mouth, so that the kingdom might return to its owner, and its rightful claimant!}, \text{ i. e., says } \text{Jh, خفرق في أهل (AKB)}, \text{ it is related with Damm and Fath of the ف, together with doubling of the م:—as for the Damm of the ف , the answer to it has been given above: and, as for the doubling, there is no foundation for it in the word, because they say for its pl. ُنْأُوَانْ } \text{, and for its dim. ُنْأُوَة [above], not ُنْأُم [below] nor ُنْيِم ; but the explanation of it is that they double the م in pause, as they double [the final] in خالد ُيُبَعَل [640]; and that continuity is then treated like pause [647], as in ُنْأُم [640, 647, 648] (IY): (c) if ُنْم be pre. [to an explicit n. or a pron. (Tsr)], it is returned to the o. f., [vid. the } \text{ Zaid's mouth and (Tsr)} ] as [ ُنْم ُوَ نْم } \text{ thy mouth [below] (Aud, A), because prefixion} \]
restores things to their o. fs. (Tsr): and the substitution seldom remains, as in [the saying of the Prophet (Tsr)]

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

[16] (Tsr), where ḥaṣṣān is i. q. ḥaṣṣān, which thus occurs in some places (MN); but F asserts [in the Baghdādiyāt cited below] that the  is not retained except in poetry, which is refuted by the preceding tradition (Tsr): (b) Akh says that the  is a subst. for the  [below], its o. f. being  , which, being transposed, becomes  , whereupon the  is elided, and the  made into a ; and, in proof of that, he cites  [below], which, according to him, is like  [153] in restoration of the elided [ ] by poetic license (R): (c) as for [the explicit n. in]  [above], it has three states, (a) severance from prefixion, where the  must be changed into  from the impossibility of eliding or retaining it, because by elision the decl. n. would remain until [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 Tanwîn, 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 ی of the 1st pers., where it has two dial. vars. :—(α) the more notorious of them is [130] in the three cases [of inflection] : by analogy, it is orig. ْنَوْيَ, like ْخَلِيدَ my morrow; then ْفَأَي [684], because of the ّ ’s being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath : but since, in what is infl. with vowels, [like ْقُلْامُ , ] the custom runs that, when it is pre. to the ی, [as in ْقُلَامِي , ] one is confined, out of all the [inflectional] vowels, to Kasra [129], [which is then put not for inflection, but] for affinity [to the ی ]; while here the ی is like an inflectional vowel, the ّ being like Damma, the ی like Kasra, and the ّ like Fatha [16]; therefore the ی is made obligatory in the three cases [of inflection] before the ی 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 ٌيَّٰ is assimilated to the inflectional, so that the ّ and
are put in its place in and and [48]; and
[as] the uninflectional Fathā in  لا رَجُلَ  لا مُسَلِّبِن  لا رَجُلٍ [99]; all of this being because of adventitiousness: and therefore, since the ى, which is an ع in نَفَّى, becomes assimilated to the inflectional [ى], and what is before the inflectional ى in the six ns. [16] is pronounced with Kasr, therefore the ف in نَفَّى is pronounced with Kasr: (b) sometimes قَبْتُ, and قِمْ زَيْلٍ [above] are said in all the states of prefixion, as كَالْخَوْتِ لا أَلْحَ  [16]: (γ) the first [dialectal var.] is more correct and chaste, because the cause of the need for change of the , upon severance from prefixion, is fear of elision of the ع 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 , into م is more properly omitted: (c) prefixion to [an explicit n. or a pron.] other than the ى of the 1st pers., where the more recognised [practice] is to inflect it with consonants, as mentioned [16]; but قِمْ زَيْلٍ [or قَبْتُ] occurs, as above shown: (α) the poet has combined the م and ى, saying هُما نَفَّا آخَر [231, 233, 306], which is a combination of the subst. and original, [vid. the م and ى (AKB)]; but
some endeavour to excuse it by saying that the subst. for the $s$ [above], which is the $j$ put before the $e$ (R on IH upon the Genitves) : (β) the constructive meaning of the first saying, as [shown] in [the Kitāb (IKhn) alMasā’il (IKhn, BW, HKh)] alBaghdādiyat [above] by F, is that the poet, by poetic license, prefixes with the $j$ substituted for its $e$, as in ْئِنَى َالْبَحْرِ َالْمَيَّة [above]; and then puts the $\pm$, which is an $e$, though the $j$ 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 ْأَقُلُ ْيَا َالْلَّهَمَّ َالْحَلِ [56], where the poet combines the premonitory $p$. [551] and the two $\pm$s which are a compensation for it [52]: and, according to this account, two poetic licenses are combined in ْكُسِيَّةُهُمَا, prefixion of $\pm$ with the $j$, its predicament being that it should not be pre therewith; and combination of the subst. and original: but I say that prefixion of $\pm$ with the $j$ is chaste; and is not a poetic license, this being refuted by the tradition ْكَحْلُقُ ْمُ ْأَلْصَّلَّيْمُ َالْمَحِ [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 ْالإِضَافَة, says the following words: —"As for $\pm$, two
letters have gone from its o. f., because it is *orig. *\text{\textsuperscript{1}}*; but they substitute the *\text{\textsuperscript{2}}* in place of the *\text{\textsuperscript{3}}*, [in order that it may resemble the aprothetic *\text{\textsuperscript{4}}* of their language (S)]; so that this *\text{\textsuperscript{5}}* is equivalent to the *\text{\textsuperscript{6}}*, like the *\text{\textsuperscript{7}}* of *\text{\textsuperscript{8}}*, being retained in the n. [through its variations in the gen. and acc., the rel. n., and the *\text{\textsuperscript{9}}* (S)]: and therefore he that leaves *\text{\textsuperscript{10}}* in its [curtailed] state, when he forms its rel. n. [306], leaves *\text{\textsuperscript{11}}* in its [curtailed] state; while he that restores the *\text{\textsuperscript{12}}* to *\text{\textsuperscript{13}}* restores the *\text{\textsuperscript{14}}* to *\text{\textsuperscript{15}}*, putting it into the place of the *\text{\textsuperscript{16}}*. as they put the *\text{\textsuperscript{17}}* into the place of the *\text{\textsuperscript{18}}* in *\text{\textsuperscript{19}}*: the poet says *\text{\textsuperscript{20}}*, and they say *\text{\textsuperscript{21}}* [231] (AKB); so that you restore [the elided letter] in the rel. n., as you restore [it] in the *\text{\textsuperscript{22}}*. and [in] the pl. with the *\text{\textsuperscript{23}}* [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 *\text{\textsuperscript{24}}* has the option of saying, at his will, *\text{\textsuperscript{25}}* or *\text{\textsuperscript{26}}*; while he that says *\text{\textsuperscript{27}}* *\text{\textsuperscript{28}}* says *\text{\textsuperscript{29}}* 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 *\text{\textsuperscript{30}}* , saying "It is said that AlFarazdaḵ substitutes *\text{\textsuperscript{31}}* for the *\text{\textsuperscript{32}}*, which is a *\text{\textsuperscript{33}}*, as it is substituted when the n. is aprotthetic; and then substitutes *\text{\textsuperscript{34}}* for 143 *\text{\textsuperscript{a}}*
the ٠ which is a ٠: and that substitution of ٠ for ٠ [686] is not strange, its permissibility being indicated by [the fact] that they are [sometimes] interchangeable in a single word, like ﾄَ posted [306], the ٠ of which is judged sometimes to be ٠, because of their saying ﾄَ [275, 311]; and sometimes to be ٠, because of their saying ٠ [234, 244, 275, 311]" : (٠) IJ holds ﾄَ to be дu. of ﾄَ [below] with abbreviation, saying on ﾄَ ﭘ that ﾄَ ﭘ may be an abbreviated n., like ﾄَ [16]; and that ﾄَ ﭘ occurs accordingly (ＡＫＢ): (٠) ﾄَ has [ten] dial. vars. : — — (٠) the most notorious and chaste of them is (٠) inflection with consonants in prefixion to [an explicit n. or a pron.] other than the ٠ of the 1st pers. [16]; (٠) Fath of the ٠, together with a single ﭘ, in the state of severance [from prefixion]; and (٠) change of the ٠ into ٠ upon prefixion to the ٠ [130]: (٠) the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th are ﾄَ, with the ﾐ ﭘ ﭘ ﭘ, with the ﭘ triply vocalized, and the ٠ elided as forgotten, unrestrictedly, [i.e., in the three states (٠—١) just detailed,] together with change of the ٠ into ﭘ: (٠) the triple vocalization of the ﭘ is founded upon [the fact] that, in the state of prefixion, the ٠, for which the ﭘ is substituted, is converted into ﭘ and ٠ [in the acc. and gen. respectively], for which reason the ﭘ 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 ُلاِّمَا, with the ُفَآمَا triply vocalized, [and the ُفَآمَا 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 ُفَآمَا were a subst. for the ُفَآمَا put before the ُلاِّمَا, as above mentioned [in (c, c, α)]; so that ُلاِّمَا is ُدُعَٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓٓ_
(2) the ج [of determination (IY, SH, A), where its substitution is weak, occurring (SH)] in the dial. (M, SH, A) of some of the Arabs (IY) of AlYaman (A), [e. g.] of Tayyi [599, 667, 668] (M, SH), as in لَيْسَ مِنَ أَمْكَرَ الْحَقّ [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 ذَالَكُ جَلَّابِيلُ الْحَقّ [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 عَنْبَرُ [677] (M, SH, A) and مَنْبَأْ (M, SH) having sharp, serrated, canine teeth (MASH), fem. of كَنْ بَكْر (Jrb, MASH), and from Bahr (IY), whether the ن and ب be (Aud) in one word or two words (R, Aud), as عَنْبَرُ [above] and سَيْغَ بِصِرْ [above] and إِذَ أَنْبَعَتُ أَشْقَاكَهَا XCI. 12. When the most wretched of them arose, [i. e., of Thamūd, vid. Kudār Ibn Sālīf, or he and those who abetted him in the slaughter of the she-camel, because the أنعل of superiority, when you prefix it, is applicable to the sing. and pl. (B),] and مَنْ بَعْنَتْ XXXVI. 52. [182] (Aud): (a) IM indicates that by his saying "And before a ب convert [below the . . . when it is
made quiescent, into مَ (Tsr), like من بَت آنِبَدَا [below]" (IM), i.e., Whoso cuts (thee), do thou surely cast out (from thy mind, and reject), where the ٌ of ﷽ is a subst. for the single corrob. ن [614, 649, 684] (IA, A): (b) that [conversion] is [only (Tsr)] because articulation of the quiescent ﷽ before the ب is difficult, from the difference of their outlets [732], together with the incongruity between the softness and nasality of the ﷽ and the rigidity of the ب [734] (A, Tsr); so that, when the ﷽ occurs quiescent before the ب, it is converted into مَ (Tsr), the مَ being exclusively distinguished by that [substitution] (A), because it is from the same outlet as the ب, and is like the ﷽ in nasality (A, Tsr): (c) there is no difference in that [respect] between the [ن (Sn)] detached [from the ب, by its being in one word, while the ب is in another, notwithstanding their concurrence (Sn),] and the attached; and IM has combined the two in his saying "like ﷽ من بَت آنِبَدَا" [above] (A): (d) it is written as a ﷽, but pronounced as مَ (Jrb): (e) they often term change of the ﷽ into مَ "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 حَمَّطَلٍ حَمَّطَلِ [254, 677]: (b) mobile (A), as in بَأْنَم (SH, A) for بَأْنَم (Jrb, A), which are the [fingers or (KF)] finger-tips (Jrb), in [such as (Aud)] the saying [of Ru'ba (M, R, MN, Tsr, Jsh) Ibn AlAjjaj (MN Jsh)]

"باللهApollo, or the [proper (Tsr)] name of a woman, possessed of the lisping speech, and of thy hand dyed in [the tips of (MN, Jsh)] the fingers (MN, Tsr, Jsh) with henna (Jsh), orig. الْبَنَاتِ (Aud), the م being substituted for the ن (MN, Tsr, Jsh), as in عَنْبَرُ حَمَّطَلٍ, etc. (MN), for observance of the rhyme (Jsh), anomalously, since it does not precede a ب (Tsr); and in طَأْمَةَ الْمَلَأٍ حَمَّطَلٍ God disposed him to good (M, SH), transmitted by ISk (IY), i.e., طَأْمَةَ (IY, R, Jrb), from طَيِّبَةُ (IY, R); (α) the converse of that, [vid. substitution of the ن for the م (Tsr),] occurs in their saying [in describing hair (Tsr)] اِسْرُوْذُ قَاَّتِنِ black, dusky, orig. قَانِمٍ [688] (Aud, A): (4) the ب in (a) بَنَاتُ مَكْرِ (M, SH, A), transmitted by As (IY), for بَنَاتُ بَكْرِ [with Path of the ب and quiescence of the dotted خ, as in the KF (Sn),] which are [thin (Jrb) white (IY, R,
Jrb)] clouds (IY, R, Jrb, A), that come before the summer (IY, R, Jrb), rising high in the sky (R), the بُخَارُ بَحْرٍ (Jrb, A): (a) IS says that it is [taken (IY)] from vapour, exhalation (IY, R), because the clouds are from the بُخَارُ آَلْرَضٍ vapour, or exhalation, of the ground; and, according to this, the بُ خَارُ بَحْرٍ is original, and the مُ بَنَّأَتُ مَخْرَجٍ a subst. for it (IY): but IJ says that, if بَنَّأَتُ مَخْرَجٍ were said to be from شَقُّ مَخْرَجٍ i. q. شَقُّ مَخْرَجٍ cleaving, from the text وَتَرَى آَلْفُلْدَ فَيْدَ مَخْرَجٍ 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 ح, as though it were from بُ خَارُ بَحْرٍ sea, because the clouds are from the vapour, or exhalation, of the sea (IY): (b) I ṣ َلْتُ رَئَتْمَا (IY, A)] I have not ceased to be constant (M, SH, A) to this (IY, A) matter, transmitted by IA1 (IY), i. e., رَتَّبَ رَتَّبَ [below] (IY, Jrb), from رَتَّبَ, inf. n. رَتَّبَ i. q. رَتَّبَ was constant (Jrb), the م being a subst. for the ب, [as is deducible] from the frequency, and versatility, of the ب, since you say رَتَّبَ [above], aor. رَتَّبَ, act. part. [682], i. e., رَتَّبَ constant; but do not say رَتَّمَ, aor. يِرَتْمُ, in this sense: so that the ب is the original (IY): (a) AASh says that مَا زَلْتُ رَئَتْمَا عَلَى هَذَا is for
[above], i. e., مَكِيداً keeping, the م being a subst. for the ب, because رَتَبٌ like رَتَمُّ is not said: but IJ says that the م admits of being original, from رَتَمُّ, which is a thread bound on the finger to remind one of a want, and is also a kind of tree: the poet says

Shall the multiplicity of what thou enjoinest and the tying of the Ratam indeed profit thee if she care for them? for, when one of their men meant [to go on] a journey, he would betake himself to two branches of two trees near one to the other, and tie one of them to its fellow; then, if he returned, and saw the two branches tied together in the same state, he would say that his wife had not been unfaithful to him; but, if not, he would say that she was unfaithful (R): (c)

I saw him (M, Jrb, A)] from a near spot (M, SH, A), according to ISk (A), transmitted by Ya'kūb (IY, R), for i. q. قُربٍ (IY, R, Jrb, A), where the ب ought to be original, and the م a subst. for it, because كُتِبٌ is [the crude-form] generally employed, as كُتِبَ لَكَ الَّذِي أَتَيْتَهُ رَمَاهُ مِن كُتِبٍ. The matter has drawn near to thee and He shot him from a near spot, i. e., مِن قُربِ (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),] نُغَبَأ (M, A), pl. of i. q. جُرَعَة gulp (IY). The [reason why the م is used as a subst. for these four letters is that the] م and، [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 ن، [anomalously (SH),] in بِئْرَائِنَى صَنِعَانَى and بِئْرَائِنَى صَنِعَانَى [311] (M, SH, A), rel. ns. of بِئْرَائِنَى and بِئْرَائِنَى (R, A), orig. صَنِعَانَى and بِئْرَائِنَى [311], because the Hamza [substituted for the ] of femininization [263, 683] is converted into، in the rel. n. (A): (a) by rule the rel. ns. of صَنِعَانَى and بِئْرَائِنَى should be صَنِعَانِى and بِئْرَائِنِى، as you say صَنِعَانِى بِئْرَائِنِى from صَنِعَانَى [304], and صَنِعَانِى from [247, 273, 390], substituting a 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 صَنِعَانِى and بِئْرَائِنَى [311], irregularly: (b) authorities differ about that (IY): —
(a) according to S, the ن is a subst. for the ح (IY, R), as though they said حـَرَوْي [311], like حَرَوْي [above], and then substituted a ن for the ح (IY), because the regular form is حـَرَوْي, like حـَرَوْي, from حـَرَوْي [304]: while the ن and ح 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 حـَلْلَة is orig. ن"; and adduces, as evidence thereof, its return to the o. f. in حَرَوْي and حـَرَوْي (R): (c) some say that the ن is a subst. for the Hamza [below] in حَرَوْي and حـَرَوْي (IY, Jrb); but the first [opinion] is the most correct (Jrb): (c) the opinion of S is preferable (IY, R, because there is no affinity between the Hamza and the ن (IY, R, Jrb), since the ن is from the mouth, and the Hamza from the farthest [part] of the throat [732]; whereas the ن is akin to the ح (IY, Jrb), and is therefore substituted for it (IY): (d) they make the ن a subst. for the ح, 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 ح (Sn): (2) the ج, [weakly (SH),] in لَعْنَ (M, SH, A), for لَعـَن [537] (M, A); and لَعْنَةَ Nَبِي تَعـَلَّتَا كَذَا No, but thou hast done such a thing, for بَل [545] (A): (a) it is said [by some] that (R) the ن is a subst. for the ح, [the o. f.
being لُعْلُ (Jrb),] because لُعْلُ 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 وَثُبَتْ مِن لَدْنَا أَجْرًا عَظِيمًا IV. 44. And will bestow from Himself a great reward (IY, Jrb); and (b) the ن of protection is elided with the ل in لَعْلِي, as with the ن in لَعْلِي and كَانَي [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 فَقَمَ يَا صَاحِبِي الْعَلَم [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 لَيْلَمُ أَيْمَ لَيْلَمُ [with Fath of their Hamza, and quiescence of their ى (Sn),] denoting serpent; and أَسْوَدُ قَاطِنٌ [687] (A), قَاطِمٌ [in this phrase] being a corrob. of أَسْوَدُ (Sn); (4) the Hamza [above], جَنَان being transmitted by Fr for جَنَان [384], what is what is used as a dye (A). The ن in the قَعَلَانْ
of is [said by S to be] a subst. for the Hamza [of ], as the Hamza [in ] is a subst. for the l of [263, 683] (S). As for the saying of Khl and S that the of the whose fem. is , like the of and [250], is a subst. for the Hamza of , what is meant by it is not this [technical (Sn)] substitution [under discussion (Sn)] ; but only that the alternates with Hamza in this position [after ], as the l of determination alternates with Tanwin [262, 609] (A), because the Hamza is for the fem., and the n for the masc., so that they are not combined. But the unrestricted application of "alternation" to that [appearance of the n in , and Hamza in , ] is tropical, because alternating letters are in one word; whereas what is here is not so, since the fem. of is with abbreviation, not with prolongation (Sn).

§. 689. The t is substituted for [seven letters (A),] (1, 2) the and (M, SH, A), when [the or is] (a) a ف [699] (M), in which case its substitution is (IY, SH) of two kinds, (a) regular (IY), obligatory (SH), in [ ] and its variations (IY),] such as threatened [below] (M, SH) and  ] [278]
and مَّتَرَنْ, where they convert the ت, and incorporate it into the ت of إِفْتَعَلْ entered [below] (IY): and [such as (M)] divided into portions [below] (M, SH), from يَسِر [368], where they substitute a ت for the ي, as for the ت in إِفْتَعَلْ and [above] (IY): (α) IH means every ي, or ي that is a ق of إِفْتَعَلْ [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 ي (Aud, A), not substituted for a Hanza (Tsr)], when a ف, is [necessarily (IA, A)] changed into ت, [according to the chastest dial. (A, Tsr),] in إِفْتَعَلْ” (IM) and its derivs. (IA, A); and incorporated into the ت of إِفْتَعَلْ 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), انْتَصَالُ (IA, A),] مَّتَصَلْ (IA, A), انْتَصَلْ (A), مَّتَصَلْ يَهِ (IA, A), and يَتَصَلْ (A), from رَصَلْ (Aud), orig. [إِرْوَتْصَلُ (IA, A),] مَوْتَصَلْ (IA, A), and
and [similarly] \( \text{بُّعْدَة} \) \( \text{above} \), from \( \text{أَذُّنَة} \) \( \text{A} \), orig. \( \text{أَذُّنَة} \); the  \( \text{T} \) being converted into  \( \text{T} \) and incorporated into the  \( \text{T} \) of \( \text{إِنْتَعَالَ} \), because incorporation removes the heaviness (Tsr): and as, [in the case of the \( \text{T} \) \( \text{إِنْتَسَارُ} \) \( \text{A} \), interpreted by Frd as \text{playing at hazard with gaming-arrows}, which our Master confirms, accounting for its derivation from \( \text{يَسَارُ} \) by the statement that the heathen used to think that such playing would occasion \( \text{يَسَارُ} \) \( \text{ease, opulence} \) \( \text{Sn} \),] \( \text{إِنْتَسَرُ} \) \( \text{Aud, A} \), \( \text{يَسَرُ} \) \( \text{[above]} \) \( \text{A} \), from \( \text{يَسَرُ} \) \( \text{i} \), and \( \text{يَسَرُ} \) \( \text{[above]} \) \( \text{A} \), orig. \( \text{يَسَرُ} \) \( \text{[above]} \) \( \text{A} \), \( \text{يَسَرُ} \) \( \text{[above]} \) \( \text{A} \), \( \text{يَسَرُ} \) \( \text{[above]} \) \( \text{A} \), \( \text{يَسَرُ} \) \( \text{[above]} \) \( \text{A} \), the  \( \text{T} \) being converted into  \( \text{T} \) and incorporated into the  \( \text{T} \) of \( \text{إِنْتَعَالَ} \), from their anxiety for incorporation, because it makes two letters become like one (Tsr): the poet [\( \text{T} \) \( \text{T} \) \( \text{T} \) Ibn \( \text{T} \) \( \text{T} \) \( \text{T} \) alBakr̲i (MN)] says

\( \text{فَإِنَّ الْفَوْقَاءِ يَتَلَّجِّي مَرَّةً} \) \( \text{IY, Aud} \), constructively \( \text{وَتَضَلِّيْغُ عَنْهَا} \) \( \text{And verily the rhymes, by which he means odes, enter places of entrance, from which the entrance of needles has been excluded} \) \( \text{MN, orig.} \) \( \text{وُلَجَّيْنَ} \), from \( \text{وُلَجَّيْنَ} \) \( \text{entrance} \)
(MN, Tsr): and the [other (IY)] poet [A1A'shâ Mai-
mûn Ibn Kais (MN, Tsr), satirizing (MN), intimidating (Tsr), 'Alkama Ibn 'Ulâtha (MN, Tsr),] says

(IY, Aud) And, if thou threaten me, I shall threaten thee with the like thereof: and I will add the lasting, biting (words) (MN), orig. أَرْتَعَذَني تَرْتَعَذَني (MN, Tsr): (γ) the reason why they change the ﬁ in that [formation] into ﺖ 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 ی [rad. or converted from a ، (Sn)] after Kasra [685], an ٌ [con-
verted from a ، or ی (Su)] after Fatha [684, 701], and a ﺪ [rad. or converted from a ی (Su)] 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 ﺖ, which [they choose because it (Sn)], among the augs. [issuing (Sn)] from [the fore part of (Sn)] the mouth, [vid. the lips, the central incisors, and the tip of the tongue (Sn),] is the nearest [in outlet (Sn)] to the ، [732]; [while they do not make the subst. a م (Sn),] in order that it may agree with, and therefore be incorporated into, the following letter, [vid. the ﺖ of ﻉُنَعَلَ ]: (Ṣ) some GG
say that the substitution, [even] in the cat. of إِنْصَلَلَ، [where the ف is a و،] is only for ی، because the و is not retained with the Kasra in إِنْصَلَلَ and إِنْصَلَلَ; while the aor. and act. and pass. parts. are made to accord with the inf. n. and pret. (A): but [the advocates of] the first [theory] may say that the doctrine that ، is not retained with Kasra [685 (case 5)] applies only when its retention in perpetuity is meant: whereas here the case is not so; and therefore the ، is retained, but then changed into ْب (Sn): (ɛ) "soft [letter]" comprises the َب and ی، as above shown: but, as for the ِ [697], it is not included in that, because it is not a َف [673]; nor [is it, when original (Sn),] an َع or a َل (A), which is not incompatible with its being an َع or a َل, when it is a subst., as in ْقَفَّل and ْرَمَي [684, 703, 719] (Sn): (ξ) some people of AlHijaz leave this substitution, and pronounce the َف of the word according to the vowels before it, saying َفَيَتَصَلَلَ [685], aor. مُؤْتَصَلَلُ [701], act. part. يَيَتَصَلَلَ َيَاتَصَلُلَ، aor. مُؤْتَسَرَّرُ [701], act. part. مُؤْتَسَرَّرُ and Jr transmits that some of the Arabs say يَيَتَصَلَلَ and يَيَتَصَلَلَ، with [a second] Hamza, which is strange [661] (A): these two dialectic peculiarities are guarded against by A's saying above "according to the chastest dial." (Sn): (η) we have restricted the ، and ی by saying, as in the Tashil, "not substituted for a Hamza", to guard
against such as [661, 702], *inf. n.* أَيَتَرَ [699, 702] (Tsr): (b) irregular (IY), anomalous (SH), in such as أَنْتَجَةُ (M, SH), *orig.* أُنْتَجَةُ because from "َولَوْجُ [above] (Jrb), as says the poet [Imra alKais (IY)]

_ربَّ رَأْهُ مِنْ بَنِي نُعُولٍ مَنْ تَلُقَّى كَفُّهُ فِي قُتْلٍ_ (M, R) Many a marksman of the Banū Thuʿal, putting his two hands inside his lurking-places! (MAR), lest the wild animals [see them, and] flee away (IY); and

_ضَرْبَةٌ حَتَّى أَنْتَكَهُ_ He smote him, so that he made him fall in a reclining posture (R), *orig.* أُوْكَاءُ (MAR): (α) numerous expressions [illustrative] of that [irregular substitution of *بَلْ* for the *فُؤَ] occur (IY): and hence (R) they say (IY, A) تَنْجَاهُ [408, 646, 671] (M, R, A) for جَاهُ (MAR), جَاهُ from *جَاءُ i. e., the location in front of everything, as فُلُانٌ تَنْجَاهُ زَيْدُ Such an one is in front of Zaid, i. e., قَدَأَتُهُ befoe him (IY); and *تَرَاتُ [278, 307, 408, 671, 682] (M, A), as تَرَاكُمُونَ الْتَّرَاتُ أَكْلًا لِمَّا LXXXIX. 20. And ye devour the inheritance with wholesale voracity, *orig.* نُعُولٌ تَرَاتُ (IY); and the like (A): and تَيَقُورُ (M, R), *orig.* فيعولُ تَيَقُورُ (Jh), تَيَقُورُ (IY) from *غَرَمُ gravity, staidness (IY, R), as says the poet [AlʿAjjaj (S, Jh)]

فَكَانَ يَكُنُّ أَمْسِىَ الْبَلَيْلِ تَيَقُورٌ 145a
Then, if I have become the cause of my gravity (IY), meaning رَث۪رَ (S, Jh): and فَكَلَن (M, R) incapacity and reliance upon another (Jh, KF), فَلُكَتْ from I committed, deputed, delegated, aor. آَکِلِ (IY): and تَکَّأَتْ staff to lean upon [682] (M), the ت being orig. ا و (Jh); and [307] (M, R), as تَکَلَّبْ رَجُل تَکَلَّبْ for ءا رُحُم تَکَلَّبْ, i.e., a man incapable, committing his affair to another, whence كَیل commission, deputy, delegate, as though he were كَیل commission, deputed, delegated, the root in them being one (IY); and تَكَّمْ [278, 646, 682] (M, R), a malady like cholera, from رَحَم or رَحَمْ, which is pestilence (IY); and تَهَمْ تَهَمْ from طَنُنْ تَهَمْ I thought, the [first] ت of [ being a subst. for the , because it is from the fancy of the mind (IY): and تَقَيَّة (M, MAR), تَقَيَّة [331, 686] (M, R), and تَقاَة (IY, R), respectively تَقَيَّة, تَقَيَّة, تَقَيَّة, تَقَيَّة, تَقَيَّة, تَقَيَّة, تَقَيَّة, Tَقَيَّة, تَقَيَّة, Tَقَيَّة, Tَقَيَّة, I guarded, or was cautious (IY): and تَقَرَّ تَقَرَّ consecutively, uninterruptedly, or at intervals (M, R), فَعَلَّ (IY) from مَوارِث, فَعَلَّ (IY, R), i.e. مَوارِث making consecutive, uninterrupted; though Lh says “There is no مَوارِث but amongst it is an interval, as تَمْ ارْسُلْنا رُسلَنا تَتَرَا XXIII. 46. Then We sent Our Apostles at intervals”: it has two dial. vars.
[282], Tanwin and omission thereof; and those who decline it is a diptote make its denotative of feminization; while, according to those who decline it as a triptote, the ! is co-ordinative (IY): and Penta-
tectuch (M, R), one of the Revealed Scriptures (IY), from producing fire (R), orig. ُقَعُّلَةَ (IY), ُقَعُّلَةَ (IY,R) from The fire-stick produced fire [699] (IY), because [below] is extraordinary (R); and [similarly (R)] ُقَعُّلَةَ [693] (M, R), the covert of the wild animal, into which he َتَلَقُّجَ enters (IY), ُقَعُّلَ (Jh, IY, Jrb on §. 693), says S (Jh, Jrb), because you hardly ever find َتَفْعَلُ as a n. [in the language (Jh)], whereas َتَفْعَلُ is frequent (Jh, Jrb), as says the Rājiz [Jarīr (Jh on ضعا )], describing a bull [taking cover (Jh)] among thorn-trees,

Making for himself a covert among trees of the kind called ُضَعَةَ: the Bdd say that ُقَعُّلَةَ [above], and is ُقَعُّلَةَ [678]; but the correct [opinion] is the first, because َتَفْعَلُ َتَلَقُّجَ is more frequent than َتَفْعَلُ among ns.: and, according to us, if the Arabs did not convert the [initial], [of ُتَرَأَةَ] into in ُتَرَأَةَ, its conversion into Hamza would ensue, because of the combination of two s, as in أُوَاصِلُ pl. of ُوَاصِلَةَ [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 َّت, to be converted] (IY): and ُّتْوَّأَم [253, 255] (R), the measure of (T) which is [construed, says Khl, to be (Jh).] ُّتْوَّلَعَلَ (Jh, T); its o. f. being ُّتْوَّأَم ُّتْوَّلَجَ [above] from entered (Jh); while its derivation is from ْتَّلَادَ َّتْوَّلَجَ, as though the child ُّتْوَّأَم في آلّتيِّان غَيْرُه َّتْوَّلَجَ agreed with another in coming, i.e. ُّتْوَّلَجَ (T); and ُّتْوَّلَدَ (M) old property, vid. what was born in thy possession, contrary of طَّارِف newly-acquired; and ُّتْلَد ِّتْوَّلَجَ, 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 ُّتْلَدَة birth (IY): (b) a ل (M), in (a) ُّتْلَدَة [277] (M, R), orig. ُّتْلَدَة [234, 307]; but transferred from ُّتْوَّلَجَ to ُّتْوَّلَجَ, like ُّتْوَّلَجَ [646] (IY): and [similarly (IY)] [277] (M, R), ُّتْوَّلَجَ, being orig. ُّتْوَّلَجَ [234, 307, 667], on the measure of ُّتْوَّلَجَ, like ُّتْوَّلَجَ pen; and then transferred to ُّتْوَّلَجَ, like ُّتْوَّلَجَ [646] (IY): (α) this final ُّتْوَّلَجَ, and in ُّتْوَّلَجَ also, is a rad. َّت [below], existing in continuity and pause [646] (D); [for] the َّت is substituted for their لs (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 s of feminization is [only (IY)] pronounced with Fath (D, IY), like the م in فاطمة \(\text{Fatima}\) and the ر in شكرية [254] (D), the s 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 l, like the l in قطاة [254] and قمة [683]: and, since the letter before the w in بنت and أخت is quiescent, and is not an l, this proves that the w in them is rad. (D): (8) it is objected against H's saying "is a rad. ل" [above] that the ل 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 ج of the word; or [that it is] quasi-rad., because it is for co-ordination with such as قفز [or قفز] (CD): (γ) the sign of feminization in بنت and أخت is their formation in these two shapes, and their transfer from their first formation [307]; and, for that reason, the shape and the s of feminization are interchangeable in بنت [667], where the shape of بنت corresponds to the s of feminization in بنت (IY): (8) the dial. var. more often used is بنت, with which the Kur speaks in
LXVI. 12. And Mary, the daughter of 'Imran, and in Shu'aib's address to Moses

XXVIII. 27. Verily I wish to marry thee unto one of these my two daughters; and to which the saying of Abu-l'Amaithal conforms, vid.

[I met Zainab, the daughter of the Sahmi—a rel. n. from Sahm, a clan of Kuraish, and in Bāhila also—after a period, or time, when we were entering upon the state of pilgrimage, on the evening of the tenth of the first ten (days of Dhu-l-Hijja): and I spoke to her two (words, one) 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 بَيْنَتَ and the like to be the sign of feminization, for which reason, says he, it is elided in the perf. pl. and أَخْرَائِها [234, 307]; while the quiescence of the preceding letter is because the بَيْنَتَ is meant to be co-ordinative (IY): (b) [263, 277, 307]
(1349)

(M, R), where also the ُ is a subst. for ُ, because of the pl. ُعُنَوَّط [234], as

أَرَى أَبْنِ دِراَرٍ قَدْ خَفَانَى رَمَلْنِي ٌ عَلَى عَنْوَٰنٍ شَآئِنَا مَنتَابِعٍ

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, like ُبَكَر Bakr and ُعَمَر ‘Amr (IY): (c) ُكِلَا (M), which S [307] holds to be ُفَعَلِى, like ُذَكْرَى [272], orig.

ُكِلَوىٌ, the ُ 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 ُكِلٌ (IY): (d) ُأَسْتَنْوُا (M, R), i. e., They experienced drought (IY), from [the crude-form of (IY)] ُسَنَٰة [234, 244, 260, 265, 275, 306] (IY, R), according to those who hold its ل to be a ُ, and ُسَنَٰة سَنَوَآ ٌ a hard year and ِإِسْتَنْوُتْ ُمُسْعَأَة I hired him by the year: the ُ is said to be a subst. for (α) the ُ, which is a ل: (β) a ُ, because the ُ, when it occurs fourth, is converted into ُ, as in ُعَرْبَيْتُ [685, 727]; and then the ُ is substituted for the ُ, which [opinion] is more agreeable with analogy (IY): (c) ُكِتَّانِ (M, A), orig. ُكِتَّانِ [spelt by YH with Fathas (Sn)], because it
is [فعل] from كثنت آلواحد I was a second to the one, [of the conj. of زمن (Sn),] inf. n. كثّن (A), i. e., I became with him a second: so in the Msb (Sn): (α) the ث in it is a subst. for the ى, as is proved by its being from كثنت 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 كثّن, like ﷾ا [above], as is proved by their making its pl. كثنة [307], like بنتا [307, 667] and ﷲ [260, 307]; but they transfer it from فعل to فعل, as they do in بنت [above]: (γ) as for the ث in بناتا [307, 313, 667], it is like that in ابنان du. of بنّة [above]: whereas بنتان is like كثنتان [above] (IY): (f) كثّت and ذلت [277] (M, A), orig. كثّة and ذلت [277], because they say كان من الأمر كثة وذلة and ذلة وذلة [227] (IY, A), transmitted from the Arabs by AU (IY), the ى of feminization being elided; and a ت substituted for the [last (A)] ى, which is the ل (IY, A), of the word (A), by way of co-ordination, as in بنتان [above]: so that they say ذلت and كثّت: (α) these [forms] have three dial. vars., being uninfl. upon Fath, as ذلت and كثّت; Kasr, as كثّت and ذلت; and Damm, as ذلت and كثّت: whereas كثة and ذلة have only one form, which is uninfl. upon Fath: (β) if it be said
"Why do you not say that the  is a subst. for , the o. f. of being being  being converted into  and  [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  [4, 685, 698], whose  is a  and  (IY): (γ) [Jh, however, says in article that possibly] the o. f. of  is upon [the measure of]  , quiescent in the it being elided, so that  remains bil.; and [its final] being therefore doubled, as [the final of]  is doubled when you make it a name [275]; and the  being then put as a subst. for doubling: so that, if you elide the  , and put the  , you must restore the doubling; [and thus] you say  or  : (δ) if you form the rel. n. of  , you say  , like  rel. n. of  [307] (Jh): (3) the  , in (α)  basin [below] (M, SH, A), alone [below] (SH), orig.  (IY, Jrb), because [its dim. is  , and (IY, Jrb)] its [broken (IY)] pl. is (IY, R, Jrb)  (IY) [and]  (R, Jrb), not  [below] (R): (a) Fr says "Tayyi say  , and others  : the former are those who say  for [below]; and, according to them, the pl. is  [above] and  [below]" (Jk): (b) if it be said "Its pl. is also: then why do you decide that the
is original, and the ب a subst., and not the converse?”, we say “Because it is established that the ب 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 وَسَت [below], because the substitution in the latter is for incorporation [682] (R): (b) the num. (A) وَسَت [307, 316, 671, 682, 758] (M, R, A): (a) its o. f. is صَدْسِس (IY, A), because it is (IY) from [the crude-form of (R)] صَدْسِس making six (IY, R), since they say [in its dim. (Jh, IY)] صَدْسِسّ [282] (IY, A), and in the pl. آسْدَاس (Jh): but they convert the last س into ب , in order that it may approximate [in outlet] to the د [732] before it; while [they choose the ب because], together with that [proximity to the د ], it is surd, like the س [734]: so that سَدْس ٰ becomes constructively صَدْس ٰ (IY); and then, [since the د and ب are combined, and they approximate in outlet (IY),] the د is changed into ب , [because of their agreement in surdity (IY),] and incorporated (IY, A) into the ب , so that they say وَسَت (IY): (c) the saying of the poet

يَا قَاتِلُ اللّهِ بَني الْسَعْلَةِ ﷺ عَمَّروُ بْنُ مُسْعَودُ شَرَّارَ آتَاتٍ

غَيْرٌ أَعْفَاءٌ وَلَا أَكْيَابٍ

(M, R), meaning ﷺ أَكْيَابِ (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 ح 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 لَصَتْ [below] (M, SH, A) and لَصَتْ (IY), for لَصْ (IY, R, A) and لَصَتْ [682] (IY), the ح being a subst. for the ص, as is proved by their saying تَلَصَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ He committed robbery upon them and هُوَ نَيْسٌ الْمَصْوَصِيَّةٍ It is plain robbery (IY, Jrb), with _DMAm and Fath of the ج (Jrb), and أَرْضٌ مِّلْصَةٍ land infested by robbers (IY): (a) the pl. is لَصُوْصٌ [above], as نَتَرَكُنَّ نَهَدًا عَيْلاً أَبْناءً وَعَا، فِنْي كَانَتْ كَالْثَّصْوَاتِ أَلْمَرْ (IY, R) Then they le.ت Nahd—a clan of AlYaman — with its children destitute, and the Banū Kināna like insolent robbers (MAR); and those who say that make لَصَتْ a dial. var. [682], because the ح is substituted for the ص [in its variations also]: (b) its derivation is from لَصُصْ, 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 Sahāḥ that [according to Fr (Jh)] ُلَصَتْ, with Fath of the ج, is i. q. لَصَتْ in the dial. of Tayyi, who say ُلَصَتْ [above] for لَصْتُ; and that the pl. is ُلَصْتُ: (d) it is mentioned in the CHd that ُلَصَتْ is said with all three vowels of the ج, Kasr being the chastest; and ُلَصَتْ with Fath of the ج [682], pl. ُلَصْتُ, like بَيْتُ, بَيْتَ, بَيْتُ pl. بَيْتَ [242, 256] (Jrb): (5) the ب, in دَعَالِيْتُ (M, SH, A) and دَعَالِيْتُ (IY), for دَعَالِبُ (M, A) and دَعَالِبُ (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., دَعَالِبُ (R), the ت being a subst. for the ب (IY): (a) IJ says “They ought to be two dial. vars.; but”, says he, “it is not improbable that the ت is substituted for the ب, since it is sometimes substituted for the ج [above], which is the partner of the ب in [having its outlet from] the lip [732]”: this is his language; and the better [opinion] is that the ت [in دَعَالِتْ] is orig. ب, because دَعَالِبُ is more often used, i. q. دَعَالِبُ [below], which are bits of worn-out rags (R): (b) دَعَالِبُ
and \( \text{ذَعَالِبَات} \) \( \text{(A)} \) are \( \text{bits of rags, and of} \ \text{(IY)} \) \( \text{worn-out clothes} \) \( \text{(M, A)} \), as

\[ \text{مَنْسَرَحاً} \ \text{عَنْهُ} \ \text{ذَعَالِبَات} \ \text{الْخَزَقَرٌ} \]

With the bits of rags stripped off him [below] \( \text{(IY)} \): (c) the sing. is \( \text{ذَعَالِبَ} \) \( \text{(IY, R, A)} \), like \\text{غُصْفُور} \ [253, 396] \\
\( \text{(Sn)} \): (d) \( \text{Jh} \) mentions in the \( \text{سَاهَٰح} \) that \( \text{(Jrb)} \) \( \text{ذَعَالِبَات} \) are \( \text{bits of rags} \), as \\text{مَنْسَرَحاً} \ \text{عَنْهُ} \ \text{الْحَكَمِ} \ [\text{above}] \: \text{and [that} \\
\( \text{(Jrb)} \] \( \text{IAl} \) says “And the ends of garments are called \\text{ذَعَالِبَات} \ \text{،} \ \text{سَجَّرُدَ} \” \: \text{and cites by} \ \text{Jarîr}

\[ \text{وَقَدْ أَكْرُنْ عَلَى} \ \text{الْحَاجَاجَاتِ} \ \text{ذَا لَبَّٰثٍ} \]

\[ \text{وَأَحْزَايًا} \ \text{إِذَا أَنْقَمْتُ} \ \text{ذَعَالِبَاتِ} \]

And indeed I am possessed of patience against needs, and am active when the ends of the garments are tucked up \( \text{(Jh, Jrb)} \): all of that is mentioned in the \( \text{سَاهَٰح} \): (e) hence one knows that \( \text{ذَعَالِبَات} \) \( \text{ذَعَالِبَ} \) \( \text{[above]} \) by conversion of its \( \text{[sing.’s s]} \) letter of prolongation into \( \text{ى} \), as is the rule, like \( \text{ذَعَالِبَات} \) \( \text{ذَعَالِبَات} \) \( \text{pl.} \) of \\text{قُرْطَالَس} \ [253, 685] \( \text{(Jrb)} \):

(f) the substitution in \( \text{ذَعَالِبَات} \) and \( \text{لَصَت} \) [above] is weak \\text{(SH)}: (6) the \\text{فُسْتَاط} \ [with Damm of the \\text{ف} \ , the \\text{tent} \ (\text{Sn}),] \text{orig.} \\

\[ \text{فُسْتَاطُ} \ [385] \ (\text{R, A}), \text{because they say} \]

\[ \text{ضِبَاءً} \ [390], \text{not} \ \text{ضِبَاءً} \ \text{ضِبَاءً} \ (\text{Sn)} \], \text{not} \ \text{ضِبَاءً} \ \text{ضِبَاءَتُ} \ a \ \text{tractable she-camel, orig.} \\
\text{ذَرَّبُوتُ} \ i. \ e., \ \text{broken in}, \)
because it is from 騣 (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 Tashîl that the 他 is seldom substituted for the ٧. The ex. of it is the interpretation put by some upon the saying [of Abû Wajza asSa'dî, praising the family of AzZubair Ibn Al'Awwâm (AKB),]

ألعاطفونت جبين ما من عاطفٍ ونُصّبٍ رمّان أين المنطَمٌ

[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 أعلاطفونت with the ٧ of silence; and afterwards changes it into ٧, 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 [٧ نعيمت جنت ورحمت] [646], because they hold the ٧ to be [the] original [sign of femininization in the n.] (A).

§. 690. The ٧ is substituted for [six letters (A).] (1) the Hamza (M, SH, A), as before mentioned [682] (A),

(a) when aug. (IY), as in (a) [٦٤٦ (M, Jrb)]

I poured out [658, 679, 682] (M, SH) the water
(M, Jrb), i. e., أَرْجَعَت (IY, Jrb): (α) in أَعْرَقْتُ [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 أَرْجَعَتُ [671, 680, 682] (IY): (b) أَرْجَعْتُ (M, R, Jrb) [658, 682] (M, SH), i. e., أَرْجَعَتْهَا (IY, R, Jrb), meaning I brought the beast back to the nightly resting-place (Jrb): (c) كَتَرَتْ آلَتُوَبَ I put a woo to the cloth, or an ornamental border to the garment (M, R), i. e., لَآ أَتَرَتْ (IY, R), أَتَرَتْهُ from نَأَيَّرْتُ (IY): (d) أَرْجَعْتُ I wanted the thing [682], transmitted by Lh (M, R), i. e., أَرْجَعْتُ (IY, R), aor. أَرْجَعْتُهَا with Fath of the s, like أَرْجَعْتُ, aor. أَرْجَعْتُهَا [349] (R): (α) those [four exs.] are all transmitted by ISk (IY): (b) when rad. (IY), as in (α) لَآ أَرْجَعَنَ (IY, Jrb), whence فَهَيَّانُ أَوْلَٰٰدُ الْأَلْفَ (IY, R) [60], thus cited by Akh; and the reading مِلْعَانُ تَعْبِدُ وَهُيَّانُ نَسْطِعِينُ I. 4. [Part I, p. 39A] (IY): the s being a subst., because مِلْعَانُ is more frequent (R): (α), it is transmitted from Ktb that some say مِلْعَانُ, [which is read in I. 4. (K, B),] with Fath of the Hamza; and then substitute the s for it, saying مِلْعَانَ (IY): (b) مَلْعَانَكَ [521, 682] (M, SH), orig. لَلَّدُكُ لَلَّدُكَ (IY, Jrb), whence مَلْيَا بَيْنِيَّةً آلَعْ (IY): (α) when the ل of inception is prefixed, they alter the Hamza into s, because the ل is not combined with إِنْ.
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 لَّنَّدَ كَانَ كَذَا) Now, by God (M, R), assuredly such a thing did indeed happen! (M), meaning أَمَّا وَآللٰهِ [551] (IY, R): (d) [تعَلَّت (M, Jrb)] If thou do (M, SH), I will do (M, Jrb), meaning إن (IY, Jrb), in [the dial. of (M, Jrb)] Tayyi (M, SH), who convert the Hamza of the cond. إن into ُهُدَا ُذَذ (SH): the poet says (R, Jrb)

وَأَتَى صَوَاحِبَهَا فَقُلْنَ هِذَا ُذَذ ُمَنَعَ اَلْمُبَدَّةِ غَيرًا ِحِفَاقًا (M, R, Jrb), cited by Akh M, R), And he came to her (his beloved's) companions; and they said "Is this he that bestowed affection on others than us, and forsook us? (Jsh), i. e., ُذَذ (M, SH), the Hamza in *being interrog. (Jrb); while Ktb transmits هُرِيْدُ مُنطَلِق Is Zaid departing? in interrogation: (f) ُكِيَّا for the voc. [p.] *أَيِّا [554] (R): (α) they [justly (IY)] change the Hamza into * [in these cases (Jrb), by way of alleviation (IY)], because the Hamza is a rigid, independent letter, and the * 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 *
(IY): (b) the substitution of the s for the Hamza is confined to hearsay (SH): [for] this substitution, though often transmitted from them, according to what has been mentioned, is inconsiderable, trifling, in comparison with what is not changed, for which reason it may not be copied; so that you do not say ُعَبْسَة for ُأَحمَد, nor ُعَبرِيم for ُأَبرِيم ُأَبَرام, nor ُعَبرِية for ُعَبرِية ُأَصِرَن; but you follow what they say, and stop where they end (IY): (2) the l, in (a) َأَنَأَ [648] (M, SH, A), where the s may be (IY, R, A), (a) as is said [here] (R), a subst. for the l in pause [upon َأَنَأَ; which is most likely (IY)], because [َآَنَأَ with (IY)] the l is more often used [in pause (R)] than [َآَنَأَ with (IY)] the s (IY, R), which is rare (IY): (b) as we have mentioned in the chapter on Pause [and elsewhere], the s of silence, as in َنَأَ and َنَأَ [615, 644, 671, 679] (R), affixed (A) in pause (Sn), like the l [161, 497, 647] (IY), to make the vowel [of the n (IY, Sn) in َأَنَأَ (IY)] plain (IY, A); and not a subst. for the l (IY, Sn): (b) ُحَبَلَة (M, SH, A): (a) the l in ُحَبَلَة is to make the vowel plain: and (IY) the [last (A)] s [in ُحَبَلَة ] is a subst. for the l (IY, A) in ُحَبَلَة [615, 648] (A); or may be [affixed, like the l, ] to make the vowel plain, as is allowable in َأَنَأَ [above] (Sn): (c) َمَأَ in interrogation 147
(SH), and *o# (Jsh), as in (R) the poet's saying ْقَدَ زَرَّتِ اَلْحُجَّةُ [175, 181, 646] (M, R, A), where he substitutes ّمَّنَ ُهُنَا (IY): while [مَّةَ in] ّمَّةَ may be an instance of that [substitution of ّمَّ for اَلْحُجَّة] (Sn), i. e., *أَكْفِ "Then what (shall I do)? [below], or ْنَا أَصْنَعُ Then what (is the good of my waiting for them)?; or may be i. q. *أَكْفِ [187], i. e.; They have come to water from every side, and have become numerous: then, if I quench not their thirst, do not thou blame me, but hold off from me (A): (a) ْقَتْةَ admits of two alternatives:—(α) that he means ْنَا أَصْنَعُ Then what?; but that, pause upon the اَلْحُجَّة being disliked, on account of its faintness, he substitutes the ّمَّ for it, because of their proximity in outlet [732]; what is meant being ْنَا أَصْنَعُ [above], or the like [181]: (β) that ْقَتْةَ is a chiding, i. e., Then hold! (O man), as though he addressed, and chid, himself (IY): (b) [on the supposition that ّمَّe here means مَا ] the better [opinion] is that the ّمَّ is a subst. for the اَلْحُجَّة: but it may be said that the اَلْحُجَّة is elided from the interrog. مَا not governed in the gen., as it is elided from the one governed in the gen., as in ْقَدَ زَرَّتِ اَلْحُجَّةُ [181, 615, 648]; and that the مَا is then strengthened with the ّمَّ of silence, as [the ّمَا and قِيَّمِ are] in ّمَا زِدْ رَبِّي اَلْحُجَّةَ [above] (R): (d) يَا ُهُنَا (SH), [as] ْقَدَ زَرَّتِ اَلْحُجَّةُ [Part I,
p. 15A], where the s is substituted for the l converted from the , [appearing] in ُعَنْوَاتٍ [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 ُعَنْوَاتٍ (W)] is a subst. for the , [below] (W, IY, R), which is the l of the word (IY), in [ُعَنْوَاتٍ and (W, IY)] عَلَى ُعَنْوَاتٍ [16, 234] (W, IY, R), [as] in عَلَى ُعَنْوَاتٍ [689] (IY); its o. f., [according to them (R),] being ُعَنَّا (IY, R), ُفَعَالٌ from ُعَنِي [14]; but the , being then changed into s (IY); so that the s, being a subst. for the l of the word, may, for that reason, be pronounced with Damm [48]: while AZ says on مَرْحَبَةٍ [616] 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. l, is converted into l [below], the s being a subst. for that l (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 l, for pause, on account of the faintness of the l, as it is affixed in lamentation, as in زَا رُضِدَاتِهَا [55, 615]; and that it is mobilized by assimilation to the rad. s, [as he says on مَرْحَبَةٍ above]: and this saying is transmitted from Akh also: while, according to them, the l [not the s] is a subst. for the , which is the l of the
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in the cat. of َكَسَأٍ [683] and َغَطَا covering (Sn) : (4) the ِي (M, SH, A), in (a) َعَذْةٍ [648, 671] (IY, SH, A), with quiescence of the [last] ِس (Sn), for َعَذْةٍ [174] (IY, A), [as] in َعَذْةٍ أَمْةَ أَلْلَهِ [648] (M) : (a) the ِس of َعَذْةٍ is a subst. for the ِي in pause, according to the Banū Tamīm (R), who say َعَذْةٍ with quiescence of the ِس, which is substituted because, in pause after the Kasra, the ِي is faint, the ِس being more apparent than it; while the ِس is approximate [in outlet] to the sister of the ِي [697], i.e., the ِل [732] : but these [Arabs], when they continue, restore the ِي, saying َعَذْةٌ ِيُنَدَ This is Hind, because the ِي is made plain by what follows it : (b) Kais and the people of AlḤijāz make pause and continuity alike, [saying َعَذْةٍ] with the ِس, as Tayyi make pause and continuity alike in َعَذْةٍ أَفْعَى [686] (R on Pause) : (c) this [substitution] is not regular in every ِي, [as conversion into ِي is regular, according to Tayyi, from every ِل (R on Pause);] so that َعَذْةٍ أَلْدَى [176] (R) : (d) this ِي is mostly converted into ِس, in order that it may be assimilated to the ِس of the masc. [pron.] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as in ِغَلَامِهِ ِبَهِى [161, 648], and be therefore conjoined [with ِي] : (e) the [conj.] ِي is elided in pause : (f) َعَذْةٍ with quiescence is allowable in continuity and pause, but is rare
[in the former] (R on Pause) [for] some of the Arabs make this ُ quiescent, like the ُ, in continuity and pause: while some assimilate it to the ُ of the pron., because it is attached to a vague indecl. n.; so that they pronounce it with Kasr in continuity, saying ُ. This is Hind [and ُ. (IY on §. 648)], as you say and [as ُ. (648),] to make the Kasra of the ُ plain; but [even] those who say this pause upon the ُ quiescent: (g) one proof that the ُ is [affixed] to make the vowel plain, and that the ُ is not for feminization [648], is that, if you named a man ُ, you would inflect, and pronounce with Tanwīm, as ُ. This is Dhīh, لَرَأىتُ ذِهًا I saw Dhīh, and مَرَّتُ يَدِه I passed by Dhīh, eliding the ُ, because rendered unnecessary by the vowels and triptote declension; whereas, if the ُ were for feminization, you would not decline it as a triptote, as you do not decline ُ and طَلْكَة [18] as triptotes (IY): (b) for ُ. [277] (A), which is the tripling thing (Sn): (5) the ُ (M, SH, A), in (a) the cat. of ُ. [682] (SH), i.e., the n. containing the ُ of feminization [646] (MASH), [e.g.] in [such as (IY, A)] ُ (M, A) and ُ (M), in pause (M, SH, A), according to the opinion of the BB (A): (a) some treat
continuity like pause, saying تَلْخِيْصَةٌ أَرْبَعَةٌ [647, 663]; and some treat pause like continuity, saying بَلْ جَوَّرَ تَيَّهَاءٌ آلِهَةٌ [183, 640, 646] (IY): (b) كَيْفَ أَلْبَنْوَةُ وَأَلْبَنَاةُ [646], transmitted by Ktb from Tayyi (M, A), which are anomalous: (c) تَابُوتُ "chest" (IY, A), which also is anomalous; "but," says IJ, "is read" [in إِنَّ آيَةَ مُلْكِهِ أَنَّ يَاتِيكُمَّ تَابِعَتُ II. 249. Verily the sign of his kingship is that the ark should come to you, where Ubayy and Zaid Ibn Thabit read the التَابِعَتُ with the $ (K)$, meaning "among the anomalous [readings]" (A): (a) [many hold that] تَابِعَتُ [with the $ (Jh, K, IY)$] is [a dial. var. (IY),] the dial. of the Anṣār (Jh, K, IY, KF); and تَابِعَتُ the dial. of Kuraish: KIM says that [the dials. of (Jh)] the Anṣār and Kuraish do not differ about anything in the Kur except تَابِعَتُ (Jh, IY): (b) the measure of تَابِعَتُ is رَحْمَةٌ تَأْبِعَتُ (K, IY, B), like [678] (IY), from returning, because [it is a receptacle wherein things are placed, and deposited; so that (K)] what is taken out of it does not cease to return to it (K, B), and its owner returns to it for such of his deposits as he needs (K): not تَأْبِعَتُ (K, B), because such [formations] as فَلِيْقَ [above] are rare; and because تَابِعَتُ is an unrecognized crude-form, for which the recognized [crude-form تَوبُ] may not be abandoned
(K): (c) it is like طَاغِر تُ فُلْعْر أُت devil (IY), which is formed by exceeding in wickedness (KF); formed by transposition, because it is from طَغَار (Jh); [orig.] فَعَّلْتُ it from طَغِيْانَ [686], its ع and ل being transposed (B): (d) its o. f. is تُنْبُوْتُ, the [first] of which they convert into [684] (IY): (e) as for those who read [ التُّابِر ] with the s (K, B), it is فُرُولُ, according to them, except among those who make its s a subst. for the ت (K); [and] perhaps they [may all] substitute the s for the ت (B), because these two letters participate in surdity [734] and augmentativeness [671], for which reason the s is substituted for the of femininization [above] (K, B): (d) أَلْلَه أَلْلَه said by some, who pause upon أَلْلَه أَلْلَه AlLūt with the s (IY): (e) عَلَى أَلْفُرَأَة [646], which some one was heard to say, meaning عَلَى أَلْفُرَأَة (6) the ح ج made the thing remote, i. q. طَلَّكَة حِرَّة لَكِشِي, i. e., ج مَنْحَة أَلْدُوْر (A), which is said in the Msb to mean إِسْتَخْرَجْهَا (Sn): (c) مَدْعَة praised him, i. q. مَذْحَة: (a) some distinguish between ح مَدْحُ with the ح and مَذْحُ with the s, holding مَذْحُ to be [praise] in absence, and مَدْحُ to be [praise] to one's face; but the correct [opinion] is that they are synonymous, except that مَذْحُ 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 أصيَّلَانَ (A), which [substitution] is [very (S)] rare, as أصيَّلَانَ (S, SH), which is [orig. (R) only (S)] أصيَّلَانَ (S, R), whence

وقفت فيَّها أصيَّلَانَا أَسأَتْهَا ِعَيْبَة جَوابًا وَمَا بَالرَّيْعِ مِن أَحَدٍ [682] (M), by An Nābigha adh Dhubyānī (IY, MN), praising AnNu'man Ibn AlMundhir, I stopped in it a short time at evening, questioning it (about its inmates): it was unable to answer, nor was any one in the abode (MN), said by Khl to be recited with أصيَّلَْ (ABk), meaning أصيَّلَانَا (IY), an irregular dim. of أصيَّلُ [285, 286] (IY, MN); the [second (Sn)] ل being a subst. for the ن (ABk, IY, MN, Sn): (a) I asked Khl about your saying آتيِك أصيَّلَانَا I will come to thee for a short time at evening: and he said “It is only أصيَّلَانَ, for [the ن of] which they substitute the J; and that is verified by the saying of the Arabs آتيِك أصيَّلَانَا” (S): (b) [R says that ] أصيَّلَانَ is dim. of أصلانَ: and [that], if أصلانَ be pl. of أصيَّلْ, like رغفانَ pl. of زَيْفُ [246], which is apparently the case, then أصيَّلَانَ 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 أصلانَ be a sing., like رمَانَ
and oblation, notwithstanding that it is not used, then is anomalous in one respect, vid. the conversion of the ١ into ٣ (R): (c) [according to ABk,] whoever fancies that is dim. of [أُصِيْلَانَ,] the pl. of ُأَصِيْلٍ, makes a mistake, because it is a pl. of multitude, which does not form a dim. [285] (ABk); and [IY holds that] ُأَصِيْلَانُ is only a sing. n., peculiar to the dim., like ُعُشْـِّيْشَةَ (KF) and ُأَبِنُونَ [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 ُأَصِيْلِلَ as a name, it would be declined as a diptote, because the ١ is quasi-retained, being indicated by the retention of the ٣ in the dim., as in ُسَكِيْرَانُ [274]; and similarly ُهَرَائِقَ [690], when you use it as a name, is diptote, because the Hamza is virtually retained (R): (2) the ض (M, SH, A) in ُإِضْطَطْـَحَعْ (A), as ُإِضْطَطْحَعْ, which is corrupt (SH), whence

ماَلَ إِلَى أَرْتَمَةٍ حَفَفَ ُأَلْطَحُعٍ

[647, 682] (M, R), meaning ُإِضْطَطْحَعْ [692, 756], the in which is changed into ٣: (a) there is a version ُأَلْطَحُعْ (IY, MN), according to the o. f. (IY); and ُأَلْطَحُعْ (IY, MN), where a ُ ط is substituted for the ض,
and then incorporated into the ی، because of their connection in vocality and covering [734] (IY); and یَاوُسَّحُ یا also: so IJ mentions (MN).

§. 692. The ی is substituted for [two letters (A),] (1) the ٰ (M, SH, A), (a) regularly (IY), necessarily (SH), in یَسْتَعَالُ after the letters of covering (A), [i.e.,] when the ی of یَسْتَعَالُ is one of the [elevated (R)] letters of covering, which are [four (IY),] the ص، the ض، the ی، and the ی [734] (IY, R), as in یَاوُسَّحُ یا had patience [671, 682, 756] (M, SH), یَاوُسَّحُ یا collided, یَاوُسَّحُ یا was regular, and یَاوُسَّحُ یا put up with wrong (IY), as [will be] mentioned [756] (A): (a) that [substitution] is because the ِ is surd [732], with no covering in it; whereas these letters are vocal, covered: so that they choose an elevated letter [632, 734], having the same outlet as the ی، vid. the ی; and put it in place of the ی، because it is akin to the ی in outlet, and to the ص، the ض، and the ی in covering [682] (R): (b) anomalously (IY, SH), in [the attached nom. pron. of] every [pret.] v. of the 1st or 2nd pers., whose ی is one of the letters of covering (MASH), as in یَاوُسَّحُ یا [below] (SH), یَاوُسَّحُ یا I waded, یَاوُسَّحُ یا I surrounded, and یَاوُسَّحُ یا یَاوُسَّحُ یا I kept (MASH): (a) this is the dial. of the Banū Tamīm (R, MASH), and is not frequent—I mean making the pron. a ی
when the ج of the word is a ص or ص, and similarly after the ط and ط, as in حَصَّط عَيْيَة̆ I sealed its eye [above] (R), and حَصَّطْ ٌرْجُلِي I scraped a hollow with my foot [693] (M, R), and حَفْظُت اَحْطَ and حَفْظُت [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 ط 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 ط of اَفْتَعَل [above] (R): (2) the د: Ya'kūb transmits from As مَطَّ أَلْفَرْ He prolonged the letter, for مَطَّ, and إِبْعَاطُ removing to a distance for إِبْعَانَ (A).

§. 693. The د is substituted for [three letters (A),] (1) the ط (M, SH, A), (a) in اَفْتَعَال after the د, the د, 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 IAl 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 ذ (R),] the ت of is converted into د (IY, R), as and [above], orig. and and (IY): and the د и ذ 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 ذ and ز in vocality, and to the ت in outlet [782], is intermediate between the ت and them; while the ذ , but not the ز , is incorporated into the د because the outlet of the ذ 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 [above] or [671, 682], and sifted, winnowed, those are not instances of what we are considering, but only of incorporative substitution (IY): (δ) conversion of the ت into د after the ذ 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 \textsuperscript{[756]} (R): 

(b) anomalously (SH), in \textit{they gathered together} and \textit{cut} [below] (M, SH), in some \textit{dials}. (M):

(\alpha) conversion of the \textit{t} of \textit{إِجْدَمُوا} into \textit{د} after the \textit{ج} is anomalous, because, though the \textit{ج} is vocal, and the \textit{ت} surd [734], still the \textit{ج} is nearer than the \textit{ز} and \textit{د} to the \textit{ت}, since the articulation of the \textit{ت} is easy after the \textit{ج}, and difficult after the \textit{ز} and \textit{د} (R): (\beta) they say \textit{إِجْدَّرُوا} and \textit{إِجْتَرُرُوا} for \textit{إِجْدَمُوا} and \textit{إِجْتَرُرُوا} \textit{إِجْدَمُوا} [above] (IY).

the poet [Mudarris Ibn Rib'i alAsadi (MN, Jsh), according to IBr (MN)] says

(\text{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 \textit{تَحْبَسُنا} is in the shape of the \textit{د}. by poetic license, the \textit{سِيَن}. being meant by it (Jsh); for [Jh says that (MN)] sometimes the Arabs address the \textit{سِيَن}. with the form of the \textit{د}. as says the [other (Jh)] poet [Suwaid Ibn Kurä' al'Ukhî (MN, Is), addressing 'Uthmân Ibn 'Affân (Is)].

\begin{align*}
\text{فَأَن تُزَجْرَانِي} & \text{ يَا أَبَن عَفْانَ أَرْدَجْرَ} \\
\text{وَإِن تَدَعَانِي} & \text{ أَحِمَّ عَرَضًا مُّسنَعَا}
\end{align*}
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 ِّا أدِّرَ أِقَّة is not said [for venturing (IY, MAR)], nor أدِّرَح (IY, R) for أدِّرَح earned (IY, MAR): (b) anomalously (SH), in (α) [such as (SH)] (α) نَزَّد I succeeded, prospered (M, SH), like نُكَّضَط [692] (R), the o. f. being from [331], where they substitute ا for the ت because of the influence of the ذ (IY); (β) أَدْبُ I was liberal for أَدْبُ, where its conversion after the د is likewise anomalous (R): (b) كُلَّج (M, SH), for كُلَّج [689] (IY, Jrb), from كُلَّج (R, Jrb), the [first] كُلَّج, being converted into كُلَّج, and the كُلَّج then converted into كُلَّج (R), as though, seeing the كُلَّج to be surd, and the كُلَّج vocal [734], they substituted the د for the ك, because it is the sister of the ك in outlet [732], and of the ك in vocality; so that homogeneity of sound is attained (IY): (α) that [theory] is [advanced] because كُلَّج is more used than كُلَّج (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 ك into ك in أدِّرَح أَدَّرَح [above] is from affinity of sound, as in سُوِيق [695] (R) for سُوِيق meal,
gruel (MAR); contrary to ذُوَبْجِ (R): (2) the ُب: they say ُمْرَطْيُ (MAR) [248, 272], which is where the hair is plucked out round the navel (A); but, in the KF, a kind of running: while ُمْرَطْأ: 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 ُمْرَطْأ: with Kasr; and the arm-pit: and ُمْرَطْى, with abbreviation, is the uvula (Sn): (3) the ُذَكْرَة: in ُذَكْرَة: pl. of ُذَكْرَة: remembrance (A), like ُعُبْرَة: pl. of ُعُبْرَة: admonition, as SBd says: (a) the author of the KF transmits from Lth that the ُذَكْرَة: is changed into ُذَكْرَة: in [A] for ُذَكْرَة: pl. of ُذَكْرَة: when synarthrous; but that, when anarthrous, ُذَكْرَة: with the ُذَكْرَة: is said (Sn).

§. 694. The َجِ 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 َفْقَيْبَيْنِ [643] (SH), for َفْقَيْبَيْنِ [311], a rel. n. (MASH): (a) the َجِ 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 َجِ 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 ُجِ (IY, R): Ya'kub says “Some of the Arabs,
when they double the ی, make it become ی ج, as گَّاَنَّ [below], meaning ی ۜاَلَّذَّيْلِ ۜلِّا۱۸۸۲] (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 حبلُوُرُ بُعلیَّ with the ی and حبلُوُرُ بُعلیَّ with the ج, are said [643, 685, 686] (R): (b) this substitution is orig. [employed] in pause upon the ی, because of its faintness and resemblance to the vowel (IY), as عُفُونُی علیْ علیْ عُفُونُی علیْ علیْ 'Ali and عُفُونُی علیْ علیْ 'Aufi (S): IAl says "I said to a man of the Banu Hanzala 'Of whom art thou?,' and he said فقٰیبیم فقٰیبیم 'Fukaimi (IY); ] then I said 'Of which of them?,' and he said مَرْحَ " (M, Jrb), i. e., مَرْحَ " Murri (IY), which is anomalous (SH): (b) not in pause (R), [but] in continuity when treated like pause [647] (M, R on Pause), according to the GG (R on Pause), as in [the saying of the 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 Abû '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 [البرني] (S, IY, MN) and (IY, MN), [اليعش] (S, MN) and [اليعصي] (IY, MN), which is more anomalous (SH); and the saying [of Abu-nNajm (MAR)]

كَانَ فِي أَذْنَابِهِنَّ الْشُّرْلَِ مِنْ عَبْسِ الْعَصِيفِ قُرُونُ أَلَّا يَجِلَِ

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

لَا هُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ قَبِلْتُ حَتَّى يَجِلَِ فَلا يَزُّلُ شَاهِجٌ يُبَيِّنُ بِجَعِ

[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., حَتَّى, and فَيّ
(Jrb, M N, Jsh), which is [still] more anomalous
(SH), because the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) is more akin to the double \( \ddot{\text{J}} \), as we have said (R): (a) some of Tamim substitute the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) for the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) in pause, whether the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) be double or single, because of the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \)'s proximity to the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) in outlet [732], together with its being plainer [above] than the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) (R on Pause): (b) that also is to make the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) plain in pause (R on Substitution): and (b) [not in pause (R),] as in

\[
\text{حتى إذًا} \quad \text{أمَّسَّكْتَ} \quad \text{وُمُسَّكْكَة}
\]

(M, SH) Until, whenever she entered, and he entered, upon the time of evening (Jsh), i. e., \( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَّي}} \) and \( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَت}} \) (R), orig. \( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَي}} \) (IY, Jrb, Jsh) and [\( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَي}} \), which, with the letter of unbinding, becomes] \( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَي}} \) (Jrb, Jsh): (a) since the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) is converted into \( \ddot{\text{J}} \), it is not converted into \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) [684, 719], nor elided because of the two quiescents [607, 663], like the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) in \( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَت}} \) and \( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَت}} \) respectively (R); [or] the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) [of \( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَي}} \)] is restored to its o. f., vid. the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \), which is afterwards converted into \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) (Jsh): (b) [in either case] the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) is a subst. for the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) (IY, Jrb), and is then mobilized with the vowel that the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) had in the o. f. (Jrb): (c) this [substitution] is more anomalous [again] (SH), because the general rule is that the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) should be substituted in pause, to make the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) plain, whereas the \( \ddot{\text{J}} \) in the like of \( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَكْتَ}} \) [and \( \ddot{\text{أَمْسَكْكَة}} \)] is not paused upon (R); [and] because they treat the supplied
The ٌ is sometimes said to be a subst. for the ٌ of َأَمْسِى; for, although the َأَمْسِى is not [ordinarily] substituted for the ٌ, that is permissible [here (IY)], because the ٌ is substituted for the ٌ [684, 719] (IY, Jrb). This [substitution of ٌ for َأَمْسِى (Sn)] is named the عبَّاَبَّة of ٌُكُلَٰذَا (A), who transmute ٌٌ into ع [when it occurs] with [immediately before it], saying This is a herdsman that has come out with me, i. e., ﷲ رَّأَع خَرَج مَعِى (Jh).

§. 695. The ٌ is [allowably (M, SH)] substituted for the س (M, SH, A) before (1) a غ (M, SH, Sn), as وَأَسْبَع عَلَيْكُمْ نَعْبَةXXXI. 19. And hath fully bestowed His benefits upon you (M, SH), orig. وَ أَسْبَع (Jrb), read with the س and ص (K); and سالَع (M), for سَأَلَع (K) shedding the tooth that is behind the سِدِيس , which takes place in the sixth year (Jh): (2) a خ (M, SH, Sn), as صُكْر صَلَح stripped off (M, SH), for سَلَح (K, Jrb); and صَكْرَ being i. q. تسْكُرَ (KF): (3) a ق (M, SH, Sn), as مَسْ صَكْر LIV. 48. The touch, or feel, of Hell (M, SH), for سَكَر (K on XXXI. 19., Jrb), a proper name of Hell [18], from سَكَرَةُ الْنَّار The fire scorched him or لَوَحَتْهُ (K on LIV. 48., B);
VIII. 6. [516] and I drove; stripped I out-

stripped; [below] (M): (4) a ط (M, SH, Sn), as [below] [693] (M, SH, A), orig. سرط (Jrb); radiating; and مسيطر (M), for مسيطراً 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 مسيتر with Fath of the ط in the dial. of Tamīm, on the ground that مسيتر set in absolute authority is trans., according to them, as is indicated by their saying مسيتر 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 ﺲ for the س (IY, R, Jrb), allowably (Jrb), whether these letters be second, third, or fourth, as مسيطر hunger, سكحب clamour, سكحب [253] for سقّط, and سرط and بسط spreading (Sn), because the س 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 مَثْأَت I measured (IY, R, Jrb), nor يَخْسَرَ for He loses the commodity (IY), nor بَنْخُصُ for deficient, inadequate. But there is no difference between the س’s being adherent to these letters, and its being separated from them (Jrb): [so that] the conversion is allowable with these letters, whether they be conjoined with the س, as in صَتَر [above]; or separated [from it] by one letter, as in صَلْح [above]; or two, as in صَلْح for صَلْح level plain (MAR)] and صَرَاط [above]; or three, as in مَسْلاَقُ (R) for مَسْلاَقُ pl. of eloquent (MAR). This conversion is regular, but not necessary. And, in such [positions], the س may not be converted into a pure ؤ; except in what has been heard, as زَرَاط [682], which is [allowable] because the ؤ resembles the
The pure \( \mathfrak{M} \) on §§ 695, 696\] \( z \) is substituted for \[ two letters \( \mathfrak{A} \),\] the \( s \) and \( c \), \[ allowably \( \mathfrak{Jrb} \) on the \( s \), \( \mathfrak{M} \) on the \( c \), \] in the \textit{dial.} of chaste speakers among the Arabs \( \mathfrak{M} \) on the \( c \), \] when \[ these two letters occur \( \mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{SH} \)\] quiescent before a \( d \), as in \( \mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{Jrb}, \mathfrak{A} \) loosens \( \mathfrak{IY}, \mathfrak{Sn} \) his garment \( \mathfrak{IY} \); and \( \mathfrak{Jrb} \) for \( \mathfrak{A} \)\] \( \mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{A} \) \textit{The camel} \( \mathfrak{A} \) \textit{becomes dazed} \( \mathfrak{IY}, \mathfrak{A} \) \textit{from the intensity of the heat} \( \mathfrak{A} \): \( a \) \( \mathfrak{s}dla\) \textit{with the} \( l \) \textit{is of the} \textit{conjugs.} \textit{of} \( \mathfrak{A} \) \textit{and} \( sdr\) \textit{with the} \( r \) \textit{is of the} \textit{conj.} \textit{of} \( \mathfrak{h} \) \textit{so in the} \textit{KF} \( \mathfrak{Sn} \): \( b \) the cause of this [substitution] is that \( \mathfrak{IY}, \mathfrak{Jrb} \), the \( s \) \textit{being a surd, and the} \( d \) \textit{a vocal} \[734\], letter, they dislike the transition from one letter to another incompatible with it \( \mathfrak{IY}, \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{Jrb} \); 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 \[697\] \( \mathfrak{R} \); while incorporation is not possible \( \mathfrak{IY} \): and therefore they approximate \( \mathfrak{IY}, \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{Jrb} \) one of them to the other \( \mathfrak{IY}, \mathfrak{Jrb} \), \[ vid.] \textit{the} \( s \) \textit{to the} \( d \) \( \mathfrak{R} \), \textit{by substituting} \( z \) \textit{for the} \( s \), because the \( z \) \textit{is from the same outlet as the} \( s \) \[732\] and is like it in sibilance,
while it agrees with the ؤ in vocality; so that the two sounds become consonant (IY, R, Jrb): (c) S says that simulation, i. e. (M), imbuing [the س (IY, R)] with the sound of the ؤ, is not allowable (M, R) here (R), as it is in the ص (IY, R), as مصدَر issue, way out [733] (R), because in the ص there is covering [734], so that they simulate in order that the covering may not be taken away [by the conversion (R)]; whereas the س is not like that (IY, R): (2) يصدَع يَقْدُعَ for يَقْدُعَ speaks truth; لم يَحْرُمَ [with a ق (Sn)] for تَصَدَّعَ course (A); آلرفَدَة [مَن فَرَّدَ 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 مصدَر, the ص being made quiescent (IY, A), for alleviation, as in ضرب for قَبِلْ قِبْلَ accepted [368, 402] (IY), and [afterwards (IY)] changed into ؤ (IY, A); the saying of حاتم [below] (M, R) at تأْثُرُ هُكَدَة فَرَدَى آنَةْ (R) Thus is etc. [648] (M, SH); and مذَرُ, and for أُصِدَرتُ أَرْدَرْتُ I issued [trans.] (IY): the poet says

درَعُ ذا الْهُوَى قَبِلَ الْقِلَى تَرْكُ ذِي الْهُوَى
مَتَيِينَ الْقُوِى حَيًّا مِنَ الصَّرِمِ مَرْدَرًا
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 ج [above] (IY, R, Jrb), as in ُهُدًا قَرْدُي أَنَّهُ [648], said by Hātim [above] when he had slaughtered a she-camel [for a guest (IY)], and it was said to him “Wherefore didst thou not bleed her?” (IY, Jrb): (a) that [change (IY, R) of the ص into a pure ج (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, 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 َإِفْتَعَالُ [692], because it is not ang., like the ت [671] (IY, R, Jrb), which is therefore more fit for alteration: so that they alter the first [of the two incompatible letters, vid. the ص ], because of its weakness, in consequence of the quiescence, by approximating it to the د (R); and therefore they change the ص into a pure ج, whereupon the sounds become consonant, because the ج is from the same outlet as the ص [732], and is like it in
sibilance, while it is akin to the ظ in vocality (IY, R, Jrb), and openness [734] (R); so that the ظ and ظ coalesce (IY, Jrb), and that recoil ceases: S says "We have heard the chaste-speaking Arabs make it a pure ظ" (IY): (2) as a ص simulating, i.e., imbued with [something of (IY, Jrb)], the sound of the ظ (IY, R, Jrb); so that it becomes betwixt and between, i.e., becomes a letter whose outlet is between the outlets of the ص and ظ (IY, Jrb); inclining towards the ظ, but not changed into a [pure (R)] ظ, [as in the preceding way (IY),] for preservation of the [excellence of (R)] covering (IY, R), in order that the sound of the ظ may not be altogether gone, and so the covering in it be gone (IY, Jrb), the covering in the ص being an excellence, the removal of which would be a mutilation of this letter: whereas the ص in يَسْكَرْ [above] is not like that, because in it there is no covering to be taken away by conversion; for which reason simulation is not allowable (IY), as we mentioned (R): (a) this is indicated by the saying of [Z and] IH (Jrb) "But the ظ is sometimes simulated by the ص" (M, SH), meaning that the ص is made to simulate the ظ, vid. through the ص's being inclined towards the ظ (R); "not by it" [below] (SH), i.e., by the ص, which is not made to smack of the sound of the ظ, but is converted into a pure ظ (R), this simulation not being allowable in the ص, (a) because the ظ and ص
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 ز; whereas there is no covering in the س (Jrb): (b) because [of what we have mentioned, vid. that (R)] there is no covering in it (R, Jrb) to be preserved (R), which would be taken away by conversion: (α) thus is said, with the ص made to smack of the ز; but not ص, with the س made to smack of the ز: (b) the pron. in IH's saying "not by it" [above] relates to the س: but some commentators fancy that it relates to the ز, the sense being that the ز is simulated by the quiescent ص, but not the ص by the ز; which is a mistake, the sense being what we have mentioned, as is proved by what IH mentions in the CM, and another [authority] in the CHd (Jrb): (c) if the ص [before the د (R)] be mobile, (α) it is not changed (M, R, Jrb) into a [pure (R)] ز (R, Jrb), (α) because a barrier, vid. the vowel, occurs between the ص and د (IY, R, Jrb), since the place of the vowel, in respect of the consonant, is [said to be (Jrb)] after it [667, 697] (IY, Jrb): (β) because this substitution here belongs to the class of incorporation, since it contains an approximation of one sound to another, for which reason they mention it with incorporation.
[733]; and therefore, as the vowel prevents incorporation [731], so here [it prevents substitution] (IY) : (γ) because the consonant is strengthened by the vowel (IY, R, Jrb), so that it is not converted (IY, R), since the consonant is not converted, except after its being weakened by quiescence (IY) : (b) nothing, therefore, remains [as an alternative to sounding the ص plain], except simulation because of [the ص's] vicinity [to the ز in outlet] (R) ; [and accordingly they sometimes make it simulate the ز (M), [so that] the ز 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 صَدَّر issued, emanated, and صَدَّق 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 ز 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 مُصادِر; and [similarly] صَرَاط [733] (M, R), because the ص is like the د (IY, R): (d) such as مَسْرَّتْ (SH), which means that, if the ص be mobile, it is not changed into ز except in the dial. of Kalb (Jrb); [for] the clan of Kalb convert the ص occurring before the ق into ز, as others convert it into ص [695], because, since the ص and ق are incongruous, the ص being surd, and the ق vocal [734], they change the ص into ز , which is akin to the ص in outlet [732] and sibilance [734], and to the ق in vocality (R): (e) like the ص in simulation are the ج and ش, as

He is more worthy and أُشْدُقُ wide in the corner of the mouth (M), for أُشْدُقُ and أُجَدَّ (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):
and жд . with simulation [of the sound of the 
by the  and  occurring before the  (R)] are rare 
(SH): but this is contrary to what is stated by S, who 
says, about imbuing the like of this  with the sound 
of the , that sounding plain is more frequent and 
recognized; while this is [good] Arabic, [and] frequent 
(R): (c) [Jrb takes "with simulation" to mean] with 
simulation of the  by the , and of the  by the , 
there being no real difference between them, since the 
pronunciation [of the  and  ] in  and  [733], when simulation is employed in them, is one 
(Jrb): (d) the  and  may not be made a pure , like 
the  and  above, because they are not from the outlet 
of the two latter, [which have the same outlet as the ] 
(R): (f) the sum of the matter is that this substitution 
and approximation are [found in letters] of three kinds, 
(a) a letter wherein substitution and simulation are 
allowable, vid. where two causes are combined, as in the 
, which they (a) make to simulate the , but do not 
change into [pure] , in order to preserve the covering; 
(β) change into [pure] , from the strength of the affi-
nity between the  and , the former being from the 
same outlet as the latter [732], and like it in sibilance 
[734]: (b) a letter wherein only substitution is allowable,
vid. the س, because there is no covering in it to be preserved [by simulation]: (c) a letter wherein only simulation is allowable, vid. the ش, which they do not change into ذ, because of the distance between it and the outlet of the ذ; and similarly the ج (IY): (3) as a pure ص, which is the أ. f. (IY, Jrb); and, says S, is the most frequent (IY): (a) this is indicated by the saying of [Z and] IH (Jrb) “S says that simulation is more frequent and racy than substitution” (M), meaning “with the quiescent س” (IY): “while sounding plain [below] is more frequent” (M, SH) “than both” (SH), i. e., than simulation and substitution (R, Jrb); or [in some MSS (MAR)] “in both”, i. e., in the quiescent س, and the quiescent or mobile 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 ذ (R): (d) in the quiescent س also, sounding plain, as يَسْدُلُ, is more frequent than substitution, as يَرْدُلُ (Jrb). This is the end of what is mentioned by [Z, IH, and] IM in the chapter on Substitution (A).

§. 696A. Substitution occurs in other letters also; but is not common. And I have thought fit to supplement what has been previously mentioned by an exhaustive,
but concise, discourse upon the substitution of all the letters, arranging them according to their order in outlets [732] (1) the Hamza [683]; (2) the l [684]; (3) the s [690]; (4) the e is substituted for two letters, (a) the ح, as ضب يُلفِس [(A): (a) one says ضب يُلفِسَ] The horse snorted, like منع, i.e., uttered a sound not a neigh, nor a whinny (Sn) (b) the Hamza, as عنَّ زيدًا [قائم: 527, 580, 682], i.q. أَنَّ عَنْعَنَة, which is the عَنْعَنَة of Tamīm (5) the غ is substituted for two letters, (a) the غُطِرَ بِیدِیٕ. He swung his arms up and down, aor. غُطِرَ, i.q. خَطْرَ [682], aor. خَطْرَ, transmitted by IJ (b) the غ, in لعَنْ لغَنَّ (A), a dial. var. of لعَنْ لغَنَّ [537, 688] (Sn): AlFarazdak says تُفَايقِكِ بَیْحَبَی بنَا لفَنَا الْوَرْسَاتِ أَوْ أَئَرُ الْخَیَامِ [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 رُبْحَ [682], which is rare: (7) the خ is substituted for the غ, as أَغْنِ أَخْنُ [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 ق is substituted for the ل, as رَکْنَةٌ [682], transmitted by Khl: (9) the ل is substituted for two
letters, (a) the ق, as for تُمَعُّ [682]: (a) reciprocity therefore occurs between them; but substitution of the ل for the ق is more frequent than its converse: (b) the ل, in [129, 169, 682]: (10) the ج [694]: (11) the ش is substituted for three letters, (a) the ل denoting the fem., as أَكْرَمْتُكَ I honored thee for ج, which is the كَشْكَشْة of Tamīm [617, 680, 682]: (b) the ج, in the saying

إِذْ دَالَّ إِذْ حَبَّلَ الْوَصْلَ مُدَمِّش

At that time, when the bond of union was strong, i. e., مُدَمِّش: (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 جُعَمْش for جُعَمْش, which is despicable, mean; and forms its pl. جُعْمُشُ (Jh)] with س, not ش, by which the substitution is known [682]: (12) the ض [685]: (13) the ض is substituted for the ل, in جُلْدُ جَضْدٍ, i. e., جُلْدُ جَضْدٍ [682] (A): (a) some MSS have "the س is substituted for two letters, the س in جُرَاطْ سِرَاطَ, and the ل in جُلْدُ جَضْدٍ, i. e., جُلْدُ جَضْدٍ"; and, according to this version, A's saying below "the س is substituted for the س, as جُرَاطْ جُرَاطٍ" [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 ص here, and the ص below, because in order of outlets the ص is the 13th letter, and the ص the 20th:] (b) the two versions are opposed in رَجلُ جَضْءٍ, which the first requires to be with the undotted ص, and the second with the dotted ص: therefore examine it carefully: for I have not found in the books on lexicology, after consulting [them], anything about the two expressions (Sn): but Sn’s saying “I have not found etc.” requires consideration, because the author of the KF writes [١٣٩٢ i. q., جُلْدَ جَضْءٍ, where they change the ل into ص (KF), distinguishing] it with the red color indicating that it is one of his additions to the سَاهَةَ; while his Glossator objects that it is found in the سَاهَةَ, i. e., where Jh says, in the crude-form جَلْدَ, “And sometimes they say رَجلٌ جَضْءٍ, making the ل, with the ج, ص, when it is quiescent”; and I have seen that the author of the Mr, in the 32nd chapter, on [the Recognition of (Mr)] substitution, transcribes from the DAd [by Frb (H.Kh)] the like of what is in the سَاهَةَ: and God is the guide! (Note by Naṣr alHūrinī on the margin of the Sn): (14) the ل [691]: (15) the ل is substituted for the ل in i. q. لَعْلَنْ i. q. [682], and لَعْلَ مَلَّنْ [537]: (16) the ن [688]: (17) the ط [692]: (18) the د [693]: (19) the ت [689]: (20) the ص [695]: (21) the ز
(1393)

[696] (A): (22) the س [below] is substituted, [say they (R),] for [three letters (A),] (a) the د in إستَكَذَ (671, 682, 759) (R, A), according to one of the two accounts [759] (A), its o. f. being إنتَكَذ (R, A), from تَكَذُ (702) (R), i. q. أَخْدُ (MAR): (a) its o. f. is also said to be إستَكَذَ [759]; but in that case it contains no proof [of substitution of the س ]: (b) it is the like of إستَكَذَ that Z lays hold of [as evidence that the س is a letter of substitution]; not إسع مَسْدُودٌ [a man (R)] bound fast for مَسْدُود (R, A), and سِدَة for نِسَة [337], where the س is original, because it is more often employed (R): (c) the ل, in إستَقْطَة picked it up, for إتقْطَة, 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 د is substituted for two letters, (a) the د, in the reading فَضْرَدَ بَيْحُم VIII. 59. [682]: (b) the ض, in the reading تَلْعَدَمْ أَلْرَجُل for meaning The man was slow, or backward, in answering [682] (A): (a) IH does not reckon the س [above] of such as إسع, nor the د إلَهَمَ إدَكَرٍ and ط [above] in إلَهَمٍ إدَكَر [682], among the letters of substitution, because the substitution in these things is not intended for itself; but, since the س، د، and ط are
approximate to the ٤ in outlet [732], they intend incorporation, which is not possible in two approximate letters until they are made alike [735]; so that the ٤ is converted into ٠, ٠, and ٤ respectively; and, since the substitution is for the sake of incorporation, he does not take it into account (R): (25) the ٤ is substituted for two letters, (a) the ٥, in مَغَفَر [676]; (b) the ٣, in مَغَفَر for a brand from the fire: (26) the ٥ is substituted for two letters, (a) the ٥, in قَامَ ثُمَّ عَمَّرَ [540, 682], transmitted by Ya'kūb: (b) ٥, which is wheat (K, B on II. 58); and is said for bread (B), whence نَفِّمَوا لَنا Make bread for us (K, B), i. e., إِخْبِرُوا (K); and is said to be (K, B)] i. q. ٥ garlic (A), which is indicated by the reading of [ 'Abd Allāh (Jh) Ibn Masʿūd ُثُومِهَا وَعَدْسِهَا وُصِلِّهَا II. 58. And its garlic, and its lentils, and its onions, being more congruous with the "lentils" and "onions" (K): (b) the ٢, in ٣ُذُبِّهِ بَيْانًا Take it in its time, i. e., بَيْانًا [meaning ٣ُذُبِّهِ (Sn)]: (27) the ١ is substituted for two letters, (a) the ١ in بَا آسِمَك [682], meaning ْمَا آسِمَكَ: (b) the ٢ in ٥ُسَكَلْ meaning ٥ُسَكَلْ (A), like ٥ُنَفِّذَ male hedge-hog and ٥ُنَفِّذَ [392], the horse that
comes in last in the race; whence رَجُلٌ فَسْكُلُ, like زَنْجِرٌ, a low man (Sn), for which the vulgar say فَسْكُلُ with Damm (Jh): (28) the م [687]: (29) the ٔ [686] (A).
CHAPTER X.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE UNSOUND.

§. 697. Unsoundness is the liability of the affected [letter or formation] to alteration from its [original] state. The meaning of transformation is alteration [708] (IY). Transformation [in their conventional language (R)] is [peculiar to (R)] alteration of the unsound letter, [i. e., the 1, ، or شيء، 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 أسِبَّلْ [691], are excluded; and, when he says "for alleviation", then such [a substitution] as [in] عَالِمْ [683] for عَالِمْ is excluded. Thus between alleviation of the Hamza and transformation there is a total dissimilarity: but between transformation and substitution there is a community in one respect, since both are found in such as قال [684, 703]; while transformation without substitution is found in يُقُولُ [below], and substitution without transformation in أسِبَّلْ [above] (Jrb). Alteration of the Hamza by one
of the three [modes], as in [658] رَاسُ مُسَلَّةٍ, and مَرَأةٌ مُسَلَّةٍ, 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 [690] and [694] for إِيَانٍ and عِلْجٍ إِيَانٍ; nor their elision, as in [275]; nor their quiescence, as in إِيَالٍ إِيَالٍ [368]. IH's saying "for alleviation" is to exclude the alteration of the unsound letters in the six ns., as إِيَالٍ إِيَالٍ [16], إِيَالٍ إِيَالٍ; and in the du. and perf. pl. masc. إِيَالٍ إِيَالٍ and إِيَالٍ إِيَالٍ [16, 228], إِيَالٍ إِيَالٍ [16, 234]: that being for inflection, not alleviation (R). Transformation includes [three things (Jrb),] conversion, [as قَالَ (Jrb);] quiescence, [as يُقُولُ (Jrb);] and elision (SH), as قُلْتُ [703] (Jrb). The expression "conversion" is peculiar, in their conventional language, to substitution of the unsound letters and the Hamza [278, 682], one in place of another: while, in the case of letters other than the four [just mentioned], the well-known expression is "substitution", which is likewise used in the case of the Hamza also (R). Transformation by elision is of two kinds, regular and anomalous (A). The [regular (A)] elision, [which is what IM addresses himself to mentioning in this section (A),] is of three sorts (Aud, A), [only the second of which properly belongs to this chapter, while that deals only with
elision of the ف:-] (1) what appertains to the aug. letter (Aud, Sn), when the v. is on the measure of أَفْعَلُ, in which case the Hamza is elided [347, 428, 661, 699] in the paradigms of its aor. and act. and pass. parts., as مْكَرِمِ, تَكْرِمِ, يَكْرِمِ, نَكْرِمِ, أَكْرِمِ; while the saying [of Abū Ḥayyān al-Fākāṣi (Tsr)]

فَانَةَ أَهْلَ الْأَحْلَانِ يُؤْدِمْهُمَا

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 فَانَةَ أَهْلَ الْأَحْلَانِ [above]; or in a word deemed extraordinary, as أَرضٌ مَوْرِبَةٌ with Kasr [or Fath, as in the KF (Sn),] of the ن, i. e., land abounding in hares, and كَسْمٌ مَوْرِبٌ i. e., wrapper whose wool is mixed with fur of hares, according to the saying that the Hamza of أَرْبَبُ is aug. [672], which is the more obvious [hypothesis]: (b) if the Hamza of أَفْعَلَ be changed into َب, as مَنْهَلٌ for أَرْبَبَ [690], or ع, as دَانُهُنَّ [690], or ع, as دَانُهُنَّ watered the camels for دَانُهُنَّ, it is not elided, because the motive for elision is lacking: so that you say يَحْرُقُ [with Fath of the ُد (Sn)], and [similarly (Sn)] مُهْرَقٌ and مُهْرَقٌ, act. part. مَعْنَهُ, pass. part. مَعْنَهُة (A): (2) what appertains to the ف (Aud, Sn) of the v. [699] (Aud): (3) what appertains to the ع
(Aud, Sn) or \( \textbf{j} \), 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 \( \textbf{i} \) of عَصَمًا and the \( \textbf{y} \) of قَامِي [16, 643]; and "curtailing elision", or ["arbitrary elision", i. e.,] "elision for no cause", to denote irregular elision, like the elision of the \( \textbf{j} \) of يَد and \( \textbf{d} \) [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 \( \textbf{e} \) 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 إِسْتَفْعَالٌ (Aud, Sn), as أَتَوَمُ إِسْتَفْعَالٌ [338, 703] (Aud): (4) [the form (Aud)] مَفْعُولٌ إِسْتَفْعَالٌ [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 يَقُولُ يَبِعُ [703, 704, 721], orig. and يَقُولُ يَبِعُ, like وَقَنُلُ يَبِعُ [482]; (2) convert it into a letter akin to that vowel, if it be not homogeneous therewith, as يَخَأَتُ [703, 704, 721] and يَخَفُّ [aor. of خَفَ tense] frightened (Tsr), orig. and يَخَفُّ.
Transfer of the vowel is, therefore, subsidiary to quiescence, with or without conversion; and is not an independent mode of transformation.] The letters of transformation are the ُّ, ُّ, and ى [253, 643, 663] (M, SH), which are so named because of the regular alterations that occur in them (Jrb). These [three (R)] letters are [also] named "unsound letters" [below], because they [often (IY)] alter (IY, R), and do not remain in one state; like the invalid disordered in constitution, and altering from one state to another (R). And, for that reason, some make Hamza [below] one of the unsound letters; but the majority do not reckon it, since, in many cats., that invariable regularity, which obtains in the unsound letter, does not obtain in it (Jrb). The alteration of these [three] letters, however, in quest of lightness, is not because they are extremely heavy, but because they are so extremely light [671] that they do not tolerate the least heaviness: and also because they are frequent in speech, since, if a word be free from any of them, its freedom from their constituents—I mean the vowels [below]—is impossible; while every [letter] frequent [in occurrence] is deemed heavy, even if it be light (R). The vowels [663] are really parts of the unsound letters; to pronounce a consonant with Դ畈, ڪ, or ڳ being really to put, immediately after it, part of the ﷲٰ
or ٌ, respectively. For mobility and quiescence are qualities of corporeal substances, and do not reside in sounds: but when, immediately after a consonant, you put part of a letter of prolongation [663], the consonant is named "mobile", as though you moved it to the outlet [732] of the letter of prolongation; while "quiescence" of the consonant is opposed to that. The vowel, therefore, is after the consonant [667, 696, 719, 731]; but, from the excess of its attachment thereto, is fancied to be with, not after, it. And, when you implete the vowel, which is part of the letter of prolongation, it becomes a complete letter of prolongation (R on IH upon Inflection). Syt says, on the authority of the Author of the Basît and others, "The vowels are six:—(1—3) the well-known three; (4) a vowel between Fâtha and Kasra, which is the one before the ٌ pronounced with Imâla [626]; (5) a vowel between Fâtha and Damma, which is the one before the broad ٌ in Warsh's reading of such as ُمُسَكَّنٌ, ُحَبَّةٌ, and ُحَبَّةٌ ُقَبِيلٌ; (6) a vowel between Kasra and Damma, which is the vowel of Ishmām [436, 668, 706] in such as ُقَبِيلٌ ُغَيِّصَ, and ُغَيِّصَ ُقَبِيلٌ in XI. 46. [436], according to the reading of Ks" (Sn on the Pro-Agent) and Hishām (M.Kh). All three [letters (IY)] occur in the three kinds [625], [ns. (IY),] as ُمُلُكٌ ُنَابٌُ [703], [حِرْوَضٌ ُسُوْطُ ٌ بَيْتٌ ُتَنَّطٌ ِسَتَرُّ [674], and [ ِتَنَّطٌ ِتَنَّطٌ ِتَنَّطٌ tent and (IY)) eggs; [vs., as (IY)] ُكَارُلٌ ُقَالَا ُتَنَّطٌ tried to get,
and [683, 698]; and [ps., as م and (IY)] َلُ[546, 547], َنِمْ [585], and َكِ [595] (M). The ِ, however, (1) in [decl. (IY, SH)] ns. and in vs., is not rad., but [only (IY)] either (Jrb) aug. or converted (M, Jrb)] from a [rad. (IY)] َوُ or (M, SH), because, (a) in the decl. n., (a) when tril., it is impossible to begin with ِ[673], while the final is the seat of the inflectional vowels [16], and the medial is mobile in the dim. [274]; so that it is not possible to constitute [any of] them an ِ, [since the ِ is quiescent] : (b) when quad., the first, second, and fourth [cannot be ِs], because of what has been mentioned [about the initial, medial, and final] in the tril.; while the third [also] is mobile in the dim. [274]: (c) when quin., the first, second, and third [cannot be an ِ ], because of what has been mentioned [about the 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 ِ in ُحَلَّي ُعَامَّيْتُ and [674] is unconverted (R): (2) in ps. [673, 686] is [only (M)] rad., because they are prim. [and (Jrb)] aplastic (M, Jrb), no o. f. being recognizable for them other than this apparent one, which is therefore not to be deviated from without proof: so that the ِ of م or ُ [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 *cjs.* [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 *مْرَّتْل* [671, 675]; or formed with Hamza, as *مِصْطَبَلْ* [283, 672]. The *quad.*, however, is reduplicated, on condition that a *rad.* letter be interposed between the two likes, as *خَرَّلَل* [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 *بَيْطَرَحَوْنَاء* [482, 483] and *يَضْرِبُ[404, 674]. By the
"unsound letter" IH means the ۡ, 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 اۢمَرۢ commanded, سَّالُ asked, and تُّرَا read; and sometimes unsound, as ٰٰٰۢۢ and ٰۢ۷ٰ [357]: and similarly the latter, as ضَرَب٢ ٰٰٰۢ [482, 671] and رَعد١ [699]: (2) reduplicated and unreduplicated, the former being either sound, as مِدۢ extention [731]; or unsound, as أفٰٰٰٰٰۢۢ affectٰٰۢة, ح٢ٰٰٰٰ living [698, 728], and قَرٰٰۢة [685 (case 1, a, a)]: and similarly the latter, as ضَرَب١ ٰٰٰۢ ٰٰٰٰٰۢ [331] and رَعد١ [698, 699]. But IH omits these two divisions. And similarly the reduplicated is either formed with Hamza, like ٰٰٰۢۢ ٰٰٰٰۢ ٰٰٰٰٰۢ [rousing and inciting (MAR)]; or not so, like م٢ٰٰٰٰ [above]. The "formed with Hamza" is what has a Hamza for one of its ṭa’d letters, like سَّال٢ٰٰٰٰ, أُمَر١ٰٰٰٰ, and تُّرَا [above]. And the "reduplicated" is what has its ع and ل alike, which is the frequent [formation, like م٢ٰٰٰٰٰ above]; or its ف and ع, like د٢ٰٰٰٰٰٰ [357], which is extremely rare [672, 674, 683]: or has
two rad. letters repeated after two rad. letters, as َِّلاَّزٛ (332, 674). As for what has its ِّف and َّل alike, as ِّقِّلَقٛ (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) ِّف, (b) an َّع, (c) a َّل: (2) multiple, (a) two, (a) conjoined in the (α) ِّف and َّع, as ِّيِّبَلٛ َّوَّلٛ and َّيِّبَلٛ َّوَّلٛ day [698], from which [division] no v. is formed [41]: (3) َّع and َّل, as ِّتَرَّلٛ وَرَّلٛ [728]: (b) separated, [as ِّرَّلٛ and ِّرَّلٛ below]: (b) more than two, as ِّنَّأَرٛ َّوَّلٛ and َّيِّآٛ [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 َّع َّرَّدٛ and ِّيِّسَرٛ [663, 699], contrary to the hollow and defective [below]: (a) it is named after the quality of the pret., because the aor. is a deriv. of the pret. in form, since it is a pret. augmented by the aoristic letter [369, 404, 671], and altered in its vowels [404, 482]; so that the pret. is the primary paradigm of the vs. in form (R): (2) in the َّع, is [named] (R, Jrb)] (a) hollow (SH), by assimilation to the thing whose inside we have taken, so that it remains hollow, because its َّع is often gone, as ِّبَعَتٛ وَقِّلَتٛ [703], َّلٛ وَقِّلَتٛ [663, 703], ِّلٛ وَقِّلَتٛ [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 قَبَتْ 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 قُفْتُ and قَعَتْ [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 تَعْرَ اخْشَانَا [428, 431, 719], وَأَرَامَ, and اخْشَانَا [404, 719], لا تَعْرَ (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 قُرِرتُ I raided and قَمِيتُ I shot] (Jrb): (a) their being named "tril." and "quad." [above] is from regard to the v., not the n. (R): (4) in the ف and ع, [as يوُم and يوُم mercy (R),] or in the ع and ل, [as نَوَى purposed, حُبِّي lived, and قَوّة (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 گزی was governor and گزی guarded (R),] is [named (J.b)] complex-separate (SH), 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 ل, its matter has been mentioned; and that it is not rad. in decl. ns., nor in vs. [697]. But, as for the ز and ی, they are sometimes rad.; and occur as ف, ع, or ل (IY). The [unaug. (M)], and ی agree [in their positions (M),] in that (1) both occur as (a) ف s, as گز [683, 697, 699] and یسر [368, 689] (M, SH), وصل یبس was dry (IY): (b) ع s, as گز and یسر [663] (M, SH), قارم, یسر [683] (M, SH), ینعم [713] and یسر [683, 697] (IY): (c) ل s, as یسر [719] (M, SH), یسر یسر [697, 719] (IY): (d) ع and ل (M, R), together, as یسر [697] and ینعم serpent (M); [and] as گز [729] and یسر [a she-camel’s young one (MAR)], یسر [697, 730. A] and ینعم incapable: (a) both [double ، and double ی] are as rare as a double guttural for ع and ل, like یسر [stuck together (MAR)], یسر [vomited (MAR)], and یسر [200]: (b) double Hamza is not used for ع and ل; and double s for them is extraordinary, as یسر [failed, broke down, in his speech (MAR)] and یسر ( ) 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 زيل and يوم [697] (M, SH): (a) precedence of the ع is more frequent; as though they disliked the transition from the ع to what is heavier than it, vid. the ع (IY): (b) the ف as a ع and the ع as a ف have not been heard [together], except in يوم and يو [a name of The sun (Jh on بح, KF)]; nor the converse, except in زيل, زيب, زيح woe or mercy [41, 200] (R). And they differ in that (1) the ع precedes the ع (M, SH) as [ ف or] ع and ل respectively (SH), as [ تقيت I guarded and (M)] تقيت I folded (M, R, Jrb), where they put the ع before the ع (IY), which is frequent, as [ وليت I was governor and وليت I fulfilled.] تقيت [I perished (MAR)] and وليت (R) I erred (MAR): whereas [the converse (SH)] precedence [of the ع before the ع (M, Jrb)] does not occur (M, SH), with the ع as [ ف or] ع, and the ع 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) ع and ع for ع and ل respectively, as in تقيت [above], are more frequent than double ع, as in تقيت [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. كرَى [293] (R): (b) the ی in حُيْوُان [and حِيْرُة (M)] is a subst. for a ی (M, SH), according to S and his school (R), like the ی in جبَّارة [668] (M), orig. جَبَيتة (IY), the o. f. being حُيْيَان [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 حَيْيَان should be حَيْيَان, because the [first] ی is mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 703]; but they let [the ی in] it remain mobile, in order that the word may correspond with what it signifies, [vid. animal,] in mobility, like جُرَّان [331, 684 (condition 11, a), 703] and حَفْقَان fluttering; while in مُرَتَان inanimate object [703] they make opp. conform to opp.: (b) for the same reason they do not incorporate [the two یs] in حَيْوُان o. f. of حُيْوُان; 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 حَيُوُان is [not substituted, but (IY)] original (IY, R); nor is there in حَيْيَت 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 \( \text{حَيَّان} \) were made original, \( \text{حَيَّة} \) would have no counterpart in their language (R); and the [correct] opinion is that of S: (d) there is no word, says S, like \( \text{حَيَّة} \) [4, 685 (case 7, c, b, \( \gamma \)), 689, 716] in their language, i. e., none whose \( \text{ع} \) is a \( \text{ى} \), and \( \text{ل} \) \( \text{أ} \); while the [itself] is orig. \( \text{حَيَّة} \) [above], because it is from \( \text{حَيَّة} \) [697, 728]:

(e) the substitute a \( \text{ى} \) for the last \( \text{ى} \), irregularly, for a kind of alleviation, through the difference of the two letters, because they deem reduplication, and uniformity of the two letters, to be heavy (IY): (2) the \( \text{ى} \) occurs as (a) \( \text{ف} \) and \( \text{ع} \) [together (M)] in \( \text{يَيَّس} \ Yain \) [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 \( \text{كُرْدُم} \) and \( \text{ذَن} \) [674, 697] in the sound (IY): (b) \( \text{ف} \) and \( \text{ل} \) [together (M)] in [\( \text{يَد} \), orig. \( \text{يْدْنَت} \) with quiescence of the \( \text{د} \), its being proved to be a \( \text{ى} \) by their saying (IY) \( \text{يْدْنَت} \) (M, SH), i. e., \( [\text{I hit on the hand, or (R)}] \) I bestowed a favor (IY, R, Jrb): the poet [of the Banû Asad (T)] says

\[ \text{يَدْنَتُ عَلَى أَبِي حُسَسَخَاسِ بَنِي رَهْبٍ} \]

\[ \text{بِآسَفِل ذِي الْجَيْدَةِ يَدَّ الْكَرَمِ} \]
[I bestowed upon the son of Ḥassās, or in one version Ḥassās, Ibn Wahb, in the lowest part of Dhu-l-Jidhāt, the favor of the generous (T)]: and in the du. they say بَذَّيْانِ بَيْضَارَانِ آخَرُ. 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) لُوُلَ [357, 683, 699], according to the soundest [opinion] (SH), i. e., that its ف and ع are، s: (a) the truth is that the ، and ا 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 بَذَّيْرُ [with two ب s, which I think to be exotic, not of the speech of the Arabs, a kind of wild beast, which the Persians name بَذَّرُ 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 كَوْكُبُ [373]; or by the existence of a cause necessitating incorporation، as in لُوُلَ[above] (R): (b) لُوُلَ [683 (case 1، c، a), 697، 723], according to one account (SH) : (a) F holds that its o. f. is لُوُلَ، from dislike to forming the word of [three] ب ، s، which [sort of formation] does not occur [even] in the sound letter، except in the single word بَذَّرُ
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 \( \text{بَبَّة} \), because the \( \text{ى} \) does not precede the \( \text{ة} \) as \( \text{ع} \) and \( \text{ل} \) respectively [above] (R):

(b) if we say that \( \text{جُرْرَ} \) is composed of \( \text{كٍ} \), \( \text{ى} \), and \( \text{ل} \), because the cat. of سلسم [below] is more numerous than that of بَبَّة [above], then the \( \text{ة} \) is like the \( \text{ى} \) in occurring as \( \text{ف} \) and \( \text{ل} \) [above]; but, if we say that it is composed of \( \text{كٍ} \), \( \text{ى} \), and \( \text{ل} \), then the \( \text{ة} \) is like the \( \text{ى} \) in occurring as \( \text{ف} \), \( \text{ع} \), and \( \text{ل} \) [below]; (c) the reasons for saying the latter are (\( \alpha \)) that, in the dim. of أَرْزَهُ, they say أَرْزُهَا, by converting the \( \text{ف} \) into Hamza, because it is the first of two initial \( \text{s} \) [683, 699]; whereas, if its \( \text{ع} \) were a \( \text{ى} \), then أَرْزُهْ would be said; (\( \beta \)) that the \( \text{ع} \) is a \( \text{ى} \), as in حَال shifted, was transmuted, more often than a \( \text{ى} \), as in بَعَع sold [684, 703]; while conformity with the more numerous [cat.] is better (Jrb): (\( \delta \)) you say, according to the opinion of F, I wrote \( \text{أَرْزُ} \) and I wrote \( \text{أَرْزُ} \), converting the last \( \text{s} \) into \( \text{s} \) [685 (case 4), 727], as in َألْيَتْ and َألْيَتْ: but according to the opinion of Akh, َألْيَتْ; while Th says َألْيَتْ, which is rightly rejected by IJ, because the heaviness in َألْيَتْ is more than in َألْيَتْ [683, 699], on account of the combination of [three] \( \text{s} \) (R); (e) they say that in Arabic there is no word whose \( \text{ف} \) and \( \text{ل} \) are \( \text{s} \), except جُرْرَ [above]; and
for that reason they prefer the fray to be written with (M), lest the ف and ل become : (f) similarly we decide that the I in I fraternized is substituted for the Hamza in آخْبِتْ, not that they are two dial. vars., because, the ل in أَخْبِتْ [16] being a, as is proved by the du. أَخْحَرَانِ [231], the decision that the ف is a, 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 سَلَسْ قَلِيقَ and سَلَسْ [674, 685, 690, 697] (R): (3) the ى occurs as ف, ع, and ل [together] in I wrote a ى (Jrb)], contrary to the ى, except in [above], according to one account (SH): (a) the opinion of F is that the o. f. of ى یَبِيتْ [697] is I wrote a beautiful ى; but, according to others, its o. f. is ى: (b) there is a similar dispute between them about all the names of the letters of the alphabet whose second [letter] is an ی, as ۵۵, ۶۶, ۷۷, and ۸۸: so that the others say I wrote a یَبِيتْ, یَبِيتْ, یَبِيتْ, یَبِيتْ, etc.; but F says یَبِيتْ, یَبِيتْ, یَبِيتْ, etc.: while their pl. [234], according to F, is یَبِيتْ and یَبِيتْ; but, according to others, یَبِيتْ and یَبِيتْ: (c) the reason why the others decide that [the ی'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 ́s are original, like the ́ of مَا and ُا [697]: while their ́s are judged to be converted only when another ́ is added at their end, and made into Hamza, by analogy to such as َكَسَأْ [683 (case 1), 723], vid. when they occur constructed, infl., in which case their ́s are co-ordinated with the ́s of the rest of the infl. ns. [697] in being [regarded as] converted [from a َ، or ُى ]; and then these names are not pronounced with Imāla: so that their being pronounced with Imāla before construction contains no proof that after construction their ́s are orig. ُى : (d) the reason why F decides their ́s to be [orig.] َى ، and their ل to be ُى ، is that the cat. of طَوٍيَتْ [above] and نَوْيَتْ [697] is numerous, and more prevalent than the cat. of حَيْيَتْ and قَرْتَة [697, 728]; while the َ of حَيْيَانْ is [orig.] ُى ، according to the sounder [opinion], as before mentioned: (e) as for those names [of letters] which have an ́ for their second, followed by a sound letter, like كَافْ، صَادْ، ذَالْ، دَالْ، لَامْ، and َليم، their ́, before their construction and inflection, is original, because they are orig. indecl., as before mentioned; and, after their inflection, should be regarded as orig. َ، rather than a ُى ، because the cat. of كَأْر is more numerous than that of كَبْ [684, 703, 711]: so that we
say I wrote a ل, and I wrote a د, while the pl. is أَكْرَفُ, أَصْوَانُ, and دَوْلَتُ دَالًا (f) as for سِبْنُ, جَيْمُ, َعْيَنُ, and اَدْوَالُ, their ع is a ى, like that of ِبْيِتٍ [674, 697], since the ى is present, and there is no proof of its being [converted] from و; and, according to S, جَيْمُ may be orig. فَعَلَ with Damm or Kasr of the ُب, contrary to the opinion of Akh [710] (R).
§. 699. The ج (1) remains sound in such as 
[663, 697] and ج لُدّ begot; and ج لُدّ [683, 697, 698] and ج لُدّ [below] (M), pl. of ج لُدّ child (KF): (a) the ج in all of that is sound, because nothing to necessitate alteration or elision is found in it: (b) hence ج لُدّ رَجَحَة هُوَ مُؤْلِبًا 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 ج لُدّ or ج لُدّ whose ج is pronounced with كسر, literally, as in ج لُدّ promises [333, 482, 671] and ج لُدّ loves; or constructively [below], as in ج لُدّ يَضُع puts, lays [333, 482, 700] and ج لُدّ يَسَع is ample, where the o. f. is كسر, the فتح being on account of the guttural letter (M): (a) the o. f. of ج لُدّ and ج لُدّ يَزَرّ weighs is ج لُدّ [333, 482] and ج لُدّ يَوْزَّن (IY): (b) the ج is elided [from such as ج لُدّ begets and ج لُدّ (SH)] because of its occurrence [quiescent] between a ج [pronounced with فتح (R)] and [an original (SH)] كسر [below] (IY, SH), expressed, as in ج لُدّ يَقِع and ج لُدّ ; or supplied, as in ج لُدّ [below] and ج لُدّ (R): (α) the ج is then elided (IY, R), from desire of alleviation (IY), because combined with the ج in such a way that incorporation of one into the
other, as in ٢ُؤُلُي [685 (case 7, a, b)], is not possible: and especially [is elision necessary] when the , is followed by Kasra, which is part of ك697]; and preceded by a vowel not congruous with it, as in ٢ُؤُعُدُ [below], aor. of threatened (R): for the , is homogeneous with Damma, being considered as equivalent to two Dammas; while the Kasra after it is homogeneous with the ك 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 ك, is elided, because the , is the heavier of the two, while the ك 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 ك 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 ٢ُؤُعُدُ [above], because it is orig. not between a ك and Kasra, but between a Hamza and Kasra since the o. f. is ٢ُؤُعُدُ [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 ُوزَنَّا weighed it, aor. ُنَزَّنَة, and (IY),] in the intrans. [۷حَلَّ fell into the mud, aor. (IY)] ُوَحَنُّل, and [۷حَكَّل feared, aor. (IY)] ُوُحَنُّل [333, 700] (IY, R). but that [theory] is vicious, because the ُوَحَنُّل is sometimes elided in the intrans. of this cat., as ُوَحَنُّل. The tent, or house, dripped with rain-water, aor. ُيَكُفُ, and ُوَدَمَ الْدَبَّابُ ُيَكُفُ. The fly dropped excrement, aor. ُيَحَجَّد, and ُوَخَدَ أَلْبَعْرُ ُيَحَجَّد. The camel went along, throwing his legs out like an ostrich, aor. ُيَحَجَّد; 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 ُوَحَنُّل would not be elided from ُوُجَدُ aor. of ُوُجَد associate q. ُوُطَرُ ُيَفَعَل. ُيَفَعَل griev ed (R); and one proof thereof is that there are some vs. whose aor. occurs on [the measure of] ُيَفَعَل with Kasr and Fath, in which case the ُوَحَنُّل is elided from ُوُجَدُ ُيَفَعَل, and retained in ُوُحَنُّل ُيَفَعَل. His breast was filled with rage, aor. ُيَحَرُّ ُيَحَرُّ and ُيَوْحَنُّل ُيَوْحَنُّل [482]; which proves the truth of our reason, and the falsity of theirs: (5) if the letter after the ُوَحَنُّل be pronounced with Fath in the aor., as in ُيَوْحَنُّل and ُيَوْحَنُّل [above], the ُوَحَنُّل remains, and is not elided, because one qualification [for elision], vid. Kasr, is removed, as in the pass. ُيُوْزَنُ ُيُوْزَنُ is promised and ُيُوْزَنُ is weighed, whence CXII. 3. [404], where the ُوَحَنُّل.
is elided from يلُدُ because the letter after it is pronounced with Kasr; but remains in يوَلدُ, on account of the Fatha (IY): (η) IH's saying "an original Kasra" [above] comprises such as يُقَعُ [above] and يَقَعُ [362, 482], orig. يَقَعُ (R): (θ) as for يَقَعُ [above] and يَقَعُ [482], the reason why the is elided from them is that the o. f. is يَقَعُ and يَقَعُ, since the aor. of نَعَلُ in this [cat., whose ف is a و, ] occurs [orig.] only on [the measure of] نَعَلُ with Kasr [482, 671], being pronounced with Fath in يقَعُ and يقَعُ 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 يَسَعُ [above] and يَسَعُ [482, 671, 700], [whose prets. are on the measure of نَعَلُ,] it is plain to us, by the elision of the، that their ع [also] is [orig.] pronounced with Kasr [in the aor.], being pronounced with Fath because of the guttural letter; while these two expressions have no third (R): and for that reason Z says "literally ....... or constructively" [above], the lit. being in يَقَعُ [and يَقَعُ], because the Kasra is [actually] pronounced; and the constructive in يَقَعُ and يَسَعُ, because the ع is virtually pronounced with Kasr,
though literally with Fath (IY): (c) the  is elided in leaves [482] for conformity with  [above], because it is syn. therewith: (κ)  finds with Damm, according to the Banū 'Āmir [482], is anomalous, the  being elided from it either because it is orig.  with Kasr, or because  is deemed heavy between the  pronounced with Fath and the Damma in a conjug. other than that of  , aor.  , with Damm of the  in both (R): (c) the remaining variations of the aor. (IX, R), [being] the congener of  (SH), are made to accord with it [in elision of the  (MASH)], as  ,  , and  [Note on p. 246, l. 19] (IY, SH), the  being elided, 'although it does not occur between a  and Kasra (IY),] in order that the conjug. [of the aor. (IY)] may [not vary, but (IY)] be uniform (IY, R), and because of the alleviation that is [found] in elision (IY); and [similarly] its imp. mood [428, 482, 667, 668] (SH), because derived from the aor. whose  is elided, as  (R): (b) such inf. ns. as  [482] and  (M): (α) the o. f. of  [and  (IY)] is  (IY, Jrb, Tsr) and  (IY), with Kasr of the  and quiescence of the  , as they distinctly declare (Tsr): (α) the  is elided because of the heaviness found in the Kasra upon the , together with [the fact] that the v. is transformed; so
that the Kasra of the , is transferred to the , 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 يعُدٍ and يُزَنَ [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 قام and يركبت inf. n. of كَرَت [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 رَعُدٍ [above] and يُزَنَ , where, since the , is pronounced with Fath, and Kasra is removed, elision does not ensue, although the v. is transformed in يعُدٍ and يُزَنَ; and as رَدَأ inf. n. of رَأَدَتْهُ I loved him in return for his loving me and رضَوْنَ 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 لَنَهْ [above], the , is not elided: (ε) the transformation of such as عدّة and نَتْنَ is only by transfer of the Kasra of the ف, which is the , to the ع: 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 ی [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 ِیعّٰنّ, with a ی 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: (ظ) it is said [by some] that, since transformation of ٨َعَدّ and ٨َنْهّ 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): (ب) [some say that] the o.f. of ٨َعَدّ (MASH) is ٛرْبَع (A, MASH) and ٨َمْقَّ (MASH), on the measure of ٛرْبَع [without a ی] (A);
and [this description of the o. f. seems to be more consistent with the statement that] the ́s of feminization is inseparable [from such inf. ns.], like a compensation for the elided [265 (reason 11, a)] (IY, Jrb): (α) its ٌ is elided for conformity with the aor.; and its َ м mobilized with the vowel of the ُ, vid. Kasra, in order that the Kasra may remain as an indication of the [elided] ُ; while the ́s of feminization is put as a compensation for the ُ, for which reason the two are not combined (A): (β) if it be said that the ُ is not elided in II. 143. [above], notwithstanding that this involves a combination between the compensation and what it is put as a compensation for, the answer is firstly that ُ is not an inf. n. conformable to the ِ. [331], but a simple substantive denoting the direction turned to; while the ُ remains in the simple substantive, like ُلَدْ [above], pl. of زَلْيَث meaning boy and slave: and secondly that it is an inf. n.; but remains sound for a notification of the o. f., like إِسْتَنْبِكَ ٌ to and [635 (case 6, c), 703]; and this is the saying of Mz (Jrb): (γ) the ́s as a compensation is necessary here (A); so that its elision is anomalous, according to the preferable opinion (Sn): but some allow it to be elided, on account of prefixion, [because this supplies the place of the ́ (Sn),] relying upon ٌ َ أَحَلُّفُكُل ُٰ أَنْحُ ِ [331, 338], which is the
opinion of Fr; whereas some explain عَدَدَةٌ here as عَدَدَةٌ pl. of عَدَدَةٌ i. q. صَبَا، 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 عَدَدَةٌ to be عَدَدَةٌ, 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 فِيْعَام above; or [when] it corresponds to the v. in initial augment, like وَقّامَةٌ and وَقّامَةٌ [703, 714]: and, for this reason, the عَدَدَةٌ in the inf. n. of عَدَدَةٌ may be elided, as عَدَدَةٌ; or retained, as عَدَدَةٌ; since it does not contain any cause for elision, nor the correspondence mentioned: and, when anything is elided from the inf. n. by transformation, the elided is not quietly forgotten; but the s of femininization is put at the end as a compensation for it, as in عَدَدَةٌ and عَدَدَةٌ [265 (reason 11, a, b), 338], because the transformation in it is not according to the general rule, since it is an imitation of the deriv. by the original: (α) the عَدَدَةٌ, which is orig. عَدَدَةٌ, is pronounced with Kasr, because the quiescent, when mobilized, is generally pronounced with Kasr [664]; and also in order that it may be like the عَدَدَةٌ of the v., to
which ٌعَدَةٍ is made to conform: and therefore the conj. Hamza is not imported after elision of the ف: (β) when the ﺪ in the aor. is pronounced with Fath because of a guttural letter, it may be pronounced with Fath in the inf. n. also, as ُيُسَع [above], inf. n. ﺪُعَةٌ [306]; or not, as ُيَهِب gives [482, 671], inf. n. ﺪُعَةٌ: (γ) صَلَةٌ junction, union, is anomalous: (δ) when the ﺪ is guttural, the inf. n. of ﻓَعُل, aor. ﻓَيْتَع, with Damm for ﺪ صَلَةٍ is anomalous: (ύ) when the ﺪ is guttural, the inf. n. of ﻓَعُل, aor. ﻓَيْتَع, with Damm of their ﺪ, is sometimes treated like the inf. n. of ُيُسَع [above], as ُدُوُدُع was tranquil, aor. ُيُوُدُع, inf. n. ﺪُعَةٌ [306]; and ُدُوُرَ was level, aor. ُدُوُطُر, inf. n. ﺪُعَةٌ and ﺪُطَةٌ: this being to notify that the ﺪ of its aor. ought to be elided, because its occurrence between a ﺪ 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 ﻓَيْتَع denotes inseparable natures [432, 484], continuing in one state: and likewise [to notify] that the ﺪ of its aor. ought to be pronounced with Fath, because the ﺪ is guttural: (ε) لِدَةٌ born at the same time as another [234] is orig. an inf. n.; but is made a simple substantive to denote the ﺪَرِبَ ﺪَلَمَرَ born, as ﺪَرِبَ آﻟِمْرَ struck, or coined, by the sover- reign means ﺪَرِبَ: (ζ) as for ﺪُهَةٌ direction and ﺪُرَةٌ coined silver [234], they are anomalous, because they are
not inf. ns.; so that their s is not a compensation for the ḫ: (研究院) the ḫ is not elided in such as یُبُعَدَ [a fictitious word (MAR)], on the model of یَقْطَیَنَ an acaulous plant, from یَعَدَ, because the reason for elision is weak (R): (3) converted [below] in what has been mentioned under substitution [683, 685, 689] (M), as [مُیِزَانُ آَوَاسْلُ, یَمَکُّهُ [below], and the like (IY). The ی is like the ḫ, except in elision (M). The ی remains where the ḫ is elided (IY); [so that,] when ی occurs in the aor. between a ی pronounced with Fath and a Kasra, it is not elided, like ḫ, because the combination of two ی's is not so heavy as the combination of ḫ and ی (R). You say یَنَعَ یَسْرَ [played at hazard with unfeathered and headless arrows (IY)], aor. یَسْرُ [482], retaining it, [because of its lightness (IY),] where you drop ḫ (M) in یَعَدُ, etc. (IY). The ی is not elided from such as یَسْرُ because it is homogeneous with the Kasra: nor from such as یَسْرُ یَبْقُس also, for the same reason; though here elision of the ی does occur, because two ی's are deemed heavy with Hamza (Jrb). S relates that (IY) some of them say یَبْقُس [482, 684], aor. یَبْقُس, like یَمَقُ, aor. یَمَقُ [above] (M); and یَسْرُ, aor. یَسْرُ [482], [like یَعَدُ, aor. یَعَدُ;] eliding the ی, as they elide the ḫ, since ی, though lighter than ḫ, 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 ْ in [only] two words, [divided the limbs of the camel (MAR)], aor. َيِّسُ بَسِّرَهُ; and َيِّسُ, aor. َيِّسُ: and both are anomalous (R). Its conversion [686, 689] is in such as [٦٩٨, ٦٩٧] and [below] (M). The ُ is converted into Hamza [683], (1) necessarily in such as َؤُوُخَلُ [٧٣٠. A], َؤُوُخَلُ، 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 ُبَرَّي (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 َٰ ِبَرُ and ٰٰ َدَّٰنُ [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 ِذَرَّي [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 \( ^{1} \), and because the prolongation relieves some of the heaviness: (b) conversion of the first into Hamza is [therefore] necessary, if the second be (a) not a letter of prolongation, whether it be converted from an *aug.* letter, as in \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} [above] \); or unconverted, as in \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} [above] \); (b) a letter of prolongation, but [either] not converted from anything [below], as in \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \); or converted from a *rad.* letter, as Khl says \( ^{أُرْبِي} \) for \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) from \( ^{أُرْبِي} \) [716], when [its Hamza is] alleviated [by conversion into \( ^{أُرْبِي} \)]: (a) hence the opinion of the KK on \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) [357], which, according to them, is *orig.* \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \), then \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \), then \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) [683]: (b) Mz refutes Khl with [the argument] that the [second] \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \), in the like [of \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) alleviated from \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \), o. f. of \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) is adventitious, not inseparable, since alleviation of the Hamza in such a case is unnecessary [658]; and he says that \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) for \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) is allowable because of the *Damma* of the \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \), like \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) for \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) [below], not because of the combination of two \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) s: (c) original, not converted from anything [above], whether it be a letter of prolongation, as in \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) [357, 688], according to the BB, *orig.* \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \); or not a letter of prolongation, as in \( ^{أَرْعَان} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} ^{أُوْيِلُ} \) [357, 688, 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 ٣١ krist [above]: while F also says "When two \( s \) are combined, the first of them is changed into Hamza, as in ٢٩٨٢ّ"; and then says "and hence their saying ٣١ krist for the fem. of ٢٩٨٢٢"; and afterwards says "but, if the second be not inseparable, it is not necessary to change the first of them into Hamza, as ٣١ الروى" [above]: and S says "When you form a \([n.]\) like ٢٩١ ٢٩٢, you say ٢٩٣ krist [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 ٢٩٤ \([above]\) is unnecessary; and that the [first] ٢٩٢ ٢٩٤ o. f. of ٢٩٥ is necessarily converted into Hamza [only] for conformity of the sing. to the pl. [٢٩٦ below]: (d) the ٢٩٥ deemed heavy is converted into Hamza, not into ٢٩٧, because of the excessive affinity between the ٢٩٨ and ٢٩٩, whereas the Hamza is more remote; for, if the ٢٩٨ were converted into ٢٩٩, that combination of two ٢٩٨ ٢٩٨, which is deemed heavy, would be, as it were, remaining (R): (2) allowably, [with unbroken regularity (R),] in such as ٢٩٠ أجرة [683] and ٢٩١ ٢٩٢ for the mentioned (MASH)]; and, says Mz, in such as ٢٩٣ [683] (SH), for ٢٩٢ لدّة, إمّا, and ٢٩٤ ٢٩٥, because in Kasra also there is heaviness, though less than in ٢٩٦ Damma (R): (3) invariably in ٢٩١ ٢٩٦,
[notwithstanding the quiescence of the second (Jrb, MASH),] for conformity with [its pl. (MASH)] أَوَّلَ [above]: (4) irregularly, [by common consent (R, MASH),] in أَحَدُ for أَحَمُّ (R) morose, looking down from intensity of grief (MAR), and أَسْبَاهُ (SH), because a single , pronounced with Fath is not heavy at the beginning of the word (MASH): (a) S says that أَسْبَاهُ is orig. أَسْبَاهُ from أَسْبَاهُ meaning beauty of face, diptote because of the ١ of feminization [18]; while Mb says that it is pl. of أَسْبَاهُ [667], its measure being أَفْعَالُ, diptote because of the quality of proper name and id. femininization: but the first is more obvious, because eps. are used as names more often than pls.; and because, if used as a name for a masc., it would still be diptote (Jrb): (b) some GG say that أَحَدُ took is orig. أَحَدُ, on the evidence of أَحَدُ [702], like أَتَسْتَنَدُ [689]. No word, whose initial is a , pronounced with Kasr, occurs in the language of the Arabs, like words whose initial is a , pronounced with Damm, except يَسَارُ a dial. var. of يَسَارُ left hand [701] and يَفْقَاطُ pl. of يَفْقَطُنَّ awake [and يَعَارُ (248)]. Sometimes they escape the combination of two , s, at the beginning of the word, by converting the first of them into ت , as in تَرْزَعُ and
which is rare; as a single \( \text{تَولَج} \), at the beginning of the word is escaped by conversion into \( \text{تُرَاتِ} \), as in \( \text{تَقوَي} \) [689]. The \( \text{ت} \) occurs as a subst. for the \( \text{ت} \), frequently, as \( \text{تُنَبِّه} \) and \( \text{تُرَاتِ} \) [689], [above], and \( \text{تْنُرُيَ} \) \( \text{تَولَج} \), and \( \text{تْنُرُيَ} \) \( \text{تْنُرُي} \), the last, according to the BB, being \( \text{تُرَاتِ} \) [689], since the Book of God is a Light; but not regularly, except in the conjug. of \[689\] (R). The \( \text{ي} \) and \( \text{ي} \) are [necessarily, regu-
larly (R),] converted into \( \text{ت} \), [and incorporated (Jrb),] in such as \( \text{اتْنُعَدَ} \) and \( \text{اتْنُعَدَ} \) [played at hazard (Jrb, MASH)], where the unsound letter is not converted from a Hamza (Jrb); contrary to \[689, 702\] (SH), orig. \( \text{ُيَتَرَزَ} \), where the second Hamza, being quiescent, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is con-
verted into \( \text{ي} \) [661], which is not converted into \( \text{ت} \), because it is accidental, being removed in continuity, as \( \text{ُيَتَرَزَ} \) and wore a waist-wrapper (Jrb). The [quiescent (Jrb)] \( \text{ي} \) is converted into \( \text{ي} \) [685], when the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, as \( \text{مَيْبَات} \) [above] and \( \text{مَيْبَات} \) [above]; and the [quiescent (Jrb)] \( \text{ي} \) into \( \text{ي} \) [686], when the letter before it is pronounced with Damm, as \( \text{مُرَتِّظ} \) awakening and \( \text{مُوسِر} \) [above] (SH).
§. 700. What differentiates ِيَوْجَعُ aor. of ِرَجَعْ had a pain and ِيَوْجَعُ aor. of ِرَجُلَ [699] from aor. of ِيَسَعْ ِوَسَعَ and ِيَسَعْ ِوَسَعَ [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 ِيَوْجَعُ the Fatha [of the ُع] is original, like that in ِيَوْجَعُ [333, 699] (M), where the Fatha is original, because ِرَجُلَ, aor. ِيَوْجَعُ, belongs to the conjug. of ِفَعَلَ, aor. ِيَفَعَلُ, with Kasr of the ُع in the pret., and Fath in the aor., like knew, aor. [482, and drank, aor.] ِيَفَعَلُ ِيِشَرَبُ (IY): whereas is ِيَسَعُ it is adventitious, imported on account of the guttural letter (M), because ِيَسَعُ, aor. ِيَسَعُ, that ِيَسَعُ and ِوَسَعَ ِوَسَعَ [482, 671, 699], belong to the conjug. of ِفَعَلَ, aor. ِيَفَعَلُ, like accounted, aor. ِيَفَعَلُ, and the Kasr in ِوَسَعَ. The antagonism of the two [Fatḥas mentioned] is therefore like that of the two Kasra of the ُر in and ِبَجَارِبُ (M). The Fatha in ِيَسَعُ [and ِيَسَعُ (IY)] is likened to the Kasra in rivalry, competition, where the Kasra is adventitious, the o. f. being ِبَجَارِبُ [332]. For they convert the Damma into Kasra [724] (IY,
Jrb), because of its occurrence before a final ى (Jrb), in order that the ى may be sounded true, since, if Damma occurred before the final ى, the latter would be converted into ; and you would arrive at a paradigm unprecedented among [decl.] Arabic ns., in which there is none whose final is preceded by Damma [721]. And, since the Kasra in is adventitious, the paradigm is not accounted a preventive of triptote declension [18], because it is [not त्, but] virtually त् with Damm of the ] [256] (IY). And the Fatha in योगेल is likened to the Kasra in tryals, where the Kasra is original, because त्कार्ब [339] is pl. of त्कार्ब [332] (Jrb).

§. 701. Some Arabs [of the Hijaz are induced, by desire for alleviation, to (IY)] convert the [unsound letter, whether (IY)] و or ى, in the aor. of फें, into ى (M), notwithstanding that it is quiescent [684, 703] (IY), saying क्तितेः and क्तितेः [below] (M), because the combination of ى with ى is lighter, according to them, than its combination with , for which reason they say क्तितेः , substituting an ى for the quiescent , as they substitute it for the ى in क्तितेः (IY). Some inhabitants of the Hijaz do not regard the difference between , and ى in the formations of the v., saying [pret.]] क्तितेः and
not and because the and are deemed heavy between the pronounced with Fath and the [next] Fatha, as in and [below]: act. part., and [below]: imp., and [689]. This, according to them, is an universal rule (R). And, agreeably with it, and occur in the dial. of [the Imam (Jrb)] Shf (SH), who used to pronounce so in speaking (Jrb). Some convert the occurring [in the aor.] between the pronounced with Fath and the [next] Fatha, as in [333, 699, 700], into , as [below], because there is heaviness in this , though not so much as to cause it to be elided [699]; and others convert it into , because is lighter than ; while some, disapproving conversion of into for no apparent cause, pronounce the of the aor. with Kasr, in order that the conversion of the into may be because of its occurrence after Kasra [685 (case 5), 699] (R). There are [thus] four dial. vars. in the aor. of [ , aor. , whose is , as (IY)] : — (IY) [aor., , and , aor. , and , aor. ] (1) [above] (Jh, M), the most excellent of them, and the one used in the Kur, as . X V. 53. They said, Fear thou not, because the does not occur
between a ٍ and Kasra [699], and therefore remains (IY); (2) ^ٍبَّٰٰجُل (3) [333, 674, 684, 703]; (3) ٌبَّٰجُل [333, 685]; (4) ^ٍبَّٰجُل [404] (Jh, M), with Kasr of the [aoristic] ٍ (Jh). But ^ٍبَّٰجُل , ٍبَّٰجُل , and ^ٍبَّٰجُل , [which is the most outrageous of them (Jrb),] are anomalous in the aor. of [below] (SH), the chaste [form] being ٍبَّٰجُل [above], according to analogy (Jrb). This Kasra is not like the Kasra in [the dial. of those who say (M, Jrb)] ُئَلْعَمُ (M, R, Jrb) and ُئَلْعَمُ (R), since they [who pronounce the aoristic letter there with Kasr (IY, R)] do not pronounce the ٍ with Kasr (IY, R, Jrb), as ُئَلْعَمُ [404] (IY, R), because they deem beginning with a ٍ pronounced with Kasr to be heavy; for which reason no n. is found whose initial is a ٍ pronounced with Kasr, except ٍبَّٰجُل [699] (IY): whereas here the ٍ is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the ٍ may be converted into ٍ [above]. Jh says in the ٌضَّٰع (Jrb), ُئَبْجُل with Kasr of the ٍ is according to the dial. of the Banu Asad, who say َنَصْنُ ُئَبْجُل I fear, َأَنَا ُئَبْجُل We fear, and َأَنْتُ ُئَبْجُل Thou fearest, all with Kasr; and, while not pronouncing the ٍ with Kasr in ُئَلْعَمُ, because they deem Kasr upon the [initial] ٍ to be heavy, pronounce [it] with Kasr in ُئَبْجُل, in order that one of the two ٍs may be strengthened by the other (Jh,
Jrb). And its imp. is لابَّجَل، the ل becoming a ل from the Kasra of the letter before it (Jh). The language of Sf and F appears to indicate that conversion of the ل in كَوَّلَج [above] and كَوَّلَج [699, 700] into ل or ل is regular [713], even though it be rare. Sf says "They convert the ل into ل in كَوَّلَج and كَوَّلَج and what resembles them, saying كَوَّلَج and كَوَّلَج"; and F says "As for [the aor. of] كَوَّلَج, كَوَّلَج, كَوَّلَج, كَوَّلَج, كَوَّلَج, كَوَّلَج, كَوَّلَج, كَوَّلَج; it has four dial. vars."; [while the language of Jh and HY 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 كَوَّلَج" [above], which imports that the forms mentioned are peculiar to [the aor. of] this word (R). And some of the Arabs say كَلَس [above] and كَلَس [684] (M, R), for كَلَس and كَلَس [482] (M), converting the ل that occurs in the aor. between the ل pronounced with Fath and the [next] Fatha [into ل], for conformity with the ل [above]. This [conversion], like [that in] such as كَوَّلَج and كَوَّلَج [above], is [found] only in the [aor.] pronounced with Fath of the ل; and, says S, is not regular. The [initial] ل is not pronounced with Kasr here, as in كَيَبَّجَل [above], because that is [done], in the aor. whose ل is ل, with the intent that the cause
for conversion of the, may appear, as before explained.

§ 702. When انتُغلُك is formed from [a v. whose أَمْرُ أَكْلَل انتُغلُك is Hamza, as (IY)] انتُغلُك انتُغلُك commanded, [and was safe (IY),] in which case انتُغلُك was eaten away, corroded, انتُغلُك obeyed, [and انتُغلُك trusted (IY),] are said (M), ی being substituted for the Hamza, because quiescent and preceded by the conj. Hamza pronounced with Kasr [661], on the principle of its conversion in ذَبْبٌ and بُيْر [658, 685] (IY), the ی is not incorporated into the ت, [as انتُغلُك and انتُغلُك (IY),] as it is in انتُغلُك [689, 699], because here it is not permanent (M). As for the انتُغلُك whose ین is Hamza, as انتُغلُك put on, or wore, a waist-wrapper [below] and انتُغلُك [above] its ی is not converted into ت, because, though conversion of its Hamza into ی 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 [پْوْنْا أَنتُغرَرُم pronounced] قال أَنتَغرَرُم He said "Put on a waist-wrapper", in which case the Hamza returns to its o. f., the general rule of
Hamza [738] is observed (R). In ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ from ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ you say ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ [above] (Aud), by changing its Hamza into ٤٥٠٠٠ (Tsr); but change of the ٤٥٠٠٠ into ٤٥٠٠٠, and incorporation of the latter into the ٤٥٠٠٠, are not allowable, because this ٤٥٠٠٠ is a subst. for a Hamza, and is not original (Aud). The saying ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ [from ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ (Tsr)] is wrong (M, Tsr): so says Sd (Tsr). And ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ [661] from ٤٥٠٠٠ is anomalous (Aud), which IM indicates by his saying [in continuation of the passage quoted in §. 689] (Tsr) "But this [change of the ٤٥٠٠٠ of ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ into ٤٥٠٠٠ (A)], in the case of Hamza, as in ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ and ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ for (A) [and ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠, with the ٤٥٠٠٠ changed into ٤٥٠٠٠, and then incorporated into the ٤٥٠٠٠, and similarly in ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ for (661, 689), with the ٤٥٠٠٠ changed into ٤٥٠٠٠ (A)], is anomalous" (IM): whereas in the Tashīl 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 Tashīl, says "The ex. of it in the ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ is the saying of some ٤٥٠٠٠, and in the ٤٥٠٠٠ is the saying of some ٤٥٠٠٠" (Tsr). The chaste dial., in all of that, makes no change [of the ٤٥٠٠٠ or ٤٥٠٠٠ into ٤٥٠٠٠], otherwise two transformations would occur consecutively (A). And the saying of Jh that ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ took for himself [699] is ٤٥٠٠٠ ٤٥٠٠٠ from ٤٥٠٠٠ is a mistake (Aud,
A), because, if it were from أَحَدٌ, then أَتَّخَذَ without [change and (Sn)] incorporation would necessarily be said: so says Sd (Tsr, Sn), as [is stated] in the Tsr (Sn). Its [first (Sn)] تٌ is original; [not a subst. for a i] being from تَخَذَ [took for himself (Tsr)], like أَتَّخَذَ from تَخَذَ followed (Aud, A): so says F (Tsr). Zj contests the existence of the crude-form تَخَذَ, asserting that is orig. أَتَّخَذَ, [أَحَدٌ from تَخَذَ, as Jh asserts; or from أَحَدٌ, as A transmits below (Sn);] but is cut down (A), the conj. Hamza and the تٌ of إِنْتَعَالٌ being elided from it; and, the تٌ, which is the فٌ of the word, being pronounced with Fath, and the خٌ with Kasr (Sn). But F's opinion is verified by their saying, transmitted by AZ, aor. تَخَذُ, inf. n. تَخَذَ [696A] (A), of the conjug. of تَعَبُ; though the خٌ of the inf. n. is sometimes made quiescent: so says Fm in the Msb (Sn). Some [of the moderns (A)] hold تَخَذَ to be an instance of the فٌ whose تٌ is changed into تٌ (A, Tsr), according to the chastest dial. [689] (A), because تَخَذَ has a dial. var. رَخَدَ with تٌ [699] (A, Tsr), in which case the تٌ is not original; and, according to this, تَخَذَ is said, like إِنْتَعَالٌ [689, 699] (Tsr). And, though this dial. 157 a
var. is rare, still the formation of اَنْتَعَلَ in accordance with it, [i. e., as اَنْتَعَلَ from ذَخْرُ (Sn),] is better [than making it from اَتِعَلَ (Sn)], because they unequivocally lay down that اَنْتَسَنَ [661] is a corrupt dial. var. (A). But [some of (R)] the Bdd [are reported to (T'sr)] allow conversion [of the ﯽ into ﯽ (R)] in the case of Hamza, [transmitting certain words (Tsr)] as [instances of that, vid. (Tsr)] اَنْتَذَلِلَ , اَنْتَسَنَ (R, Tsr), اَنْتَزَرَ (Tsr), and اَنْسَى took example (R), whence the tradition [661]: so in all the versions of the Muwatta (Tsr) on Tradition, by the Imam مِلَان (HKh). And فَلْيُؤَدِّ الْذَّي أَتْسَنَ أَمَانْتُهُ II. 283.] Then let him that hath been entrusted repay his trust [658] is [reported to be (K)] anomalously read (R) by 'Āṣim (K), with incorporation of the ﯽ [in اَلْدِينِسَنَ] into the ﯽ (K, B), by analogy to اَنْسَرَ (K); but it is wrong, because the [� (K)] converted from the Hamza is in the predicament of Hamza (K, B), and is therefore not incorporated [738] (B). And اَنْتَزَرَ [above] is vulgar; and so is رُيَّا [685, 716] for رُيَّا [272, 658] (K).
§. 703. They are transformed, elided, or preserved (M). Transformation is alteration [697] of form (IY). The transformation occurring in the  \( \varepsilon \) is by conversion, by transfer of the vowel and quiescence, or by elision. As for the first [mode], it has three divisions, conversion of  \( \iota \) and  \( \varepsilon \) into  \( \dot{i} \) [684]; conversion of both into Hamza [683]; and conversion of one into the other, i.e., of  \( \iota \) into  \( \varepsilon \) [685], or the converse [686] (Jrb). The  \( \iota \) and  \( \varepsilon \) are converted into  \( \dot{i} \) 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  \( \dot{a} \) light and  \( \breve{a} \) [658], when alleviated; and “permanently”, to exclude such as  \( \breve{a} \) جَرَّاتُ and  \( \breve{a} \) بَيْنَاتُ [240], according to the Banù Tamîm (R), or rather Hudhail (MAR). They are then converted into  \( \dot{i} \) 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  \( \iota \) or  \( \varepsilon \) into  \( \dot{i} \), 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 ٓ, and ً, ٔ and ٖ, and two ٔ, respectively; while the predicament of the ٕ is similar: and, the combination of unsound letters being deemed heavy, they convert the ٓ or ٕ into ١, 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 ١ is not very substantial, since they are converted into ١ because deemed heavy; whereas, when the letter before them is pronounced with Fath, their heaviness is lightened, even if they also be mobile; while Fatha does not require ٢ to occur after it, as Damma requires ٔ, and Kasra ٕ, since such as ٤٠٥ and ٥٠٥ [below] are frequent, while such as ٥٠٥ and ٥٠٥ with Damm, and ٨٠٥ and ٨٠٥ with Kasr, of the ٠ are not to be found [713]: but, nevertheless, they, though lighter than all the sound letters, are converted into ٠, 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. ١; and especially when they are heavy, by reason of the vowel; and when a cause for alleviating them, by conversion into ٠, is ready at hand, through
the preceding letter's being pronounced with Fath, since Fatḥa is akin to ٍ [697]. And, from the infirmity of this cause, (1) they are converted into ٍ only when they are at the end, i.e., when ُس [719, 723, 728]; or near the end, i.e., when َعِس; not when ُفِس, as in ُدُرْعُلْلٌ [663, 683], although the vowel [on them here] is permanent after [its] supervention: 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 ]] 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 ]] is not converted into ٍ when the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr, [as in ُلْوَى hungered and َحيى lived (M.A.R),] the َع [also] is not converted into ٍ [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 \textit{v.} [667, 684 (condition 11, a), 711, 712], to which, because of its heavi-
ness, alleviation is more suitable. And in the \textit{v.} this transformation is of two kinds, (1) original, \textit{vid.} where the \(\ddot{\text{w}}\) or \(\text{i}\) is mobile, and preceded by a letter pro-
nounced with Fath, as 
\[\text{تَولَّبُّ بَعُّ} [684]: (2) conform-
able to the original, \text{\textit{vid.} where the \(\ddot{\text{w}}\) or \(\text{i}\) is pronounced}
with Fath after a letter pronounced with Fath in the \textit{tril. pret.}, which occurs in (a) the \textit{aor.}, (a) \textit{act.}, like 
\[\text{يَكَافُ feas} [697, 704] \text{and} \textit{يُهَابُ reverence} [704]; (b) \text{\textit{pass.}} like \textit{is feared} and \textit{is reverence}:
(b) the \textit{pret. of two conjugs. in the augmented tril.}, \text{\textit{أَفَعَلَ}}, \text{\textit{اتَفَعَلَ}}, as \text{\textit{set upright}} and \text{\textit{أَبَانَ}}, \text{\textit{اتَفَعَلَ}}, as 
\[\text{اِسْتَقَامُ appraised} \text{and} \textit{يَسْتَبَانَ made plain}: \text{and their}
\textit{pass. aors.}, as \textit{يُقَالُ} \text{\textit{is set upright}} and \textit{يَبَانُ} \text{\textit{is separated},}
\textit{يُسْتَقَامُ appraised} \text{and} \textit{يَسْتَبَانُ is made plain}. \text{Only}
\text{the \textit{aor. whose \(\ddot{\text{w}}\) or \(\text{i}\) is [\textit{orig.}] pronounced with Fath,}
[as \text{\textit{and}} \textit{يَكَافُ}, \text{\textit{not the one whose \(\ddot{\text{w}}\) or \(\text{i}\) is [\textit{orig.}] pronounced with ذ.ف.م, as \textit{يَقُومُ}, or \textit{ Kasr, as \textit{يَبَع} and 
\[\text{يُقَيمُ}, \text{\textit{is conformable to the \textit{tril. pret.} in this conversion,}
because the inducement to transfer [697], in the whole of that, whether the \(\text{ة}\) be pronounced with Fath, ذ.ف.م, or Kasr, is imitation of the original by the \(\text{deriv.} \text{in quiescence of the} \text{ة}, \text{together with indication of the mode of formation, which [indication]} \text{is not possible}]}
with conversion of the whole into ١ [below]. The نس. 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 ١], not being strong, is more suitable to the v. — (a) that [tril. n.] which is commensurable with the v., as (a) ٍبَاب and نَلُب [278, 684],.orig. ٍبَب and مَال (b) a wealthy man [278, 682, 683] and نَلُل liberal, orig. مَوُل and نَلُل with Kasr of the ع; and similarly ٍكَبَش صَاب 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 مَفَعُل [712, 714] is on the measure of يَفَعُل, though its augment is not that of يَفَعُل; and نَعَل [708] is commensurable with يَفَعُل [343, 712, 714], though its augment is not that of يَفَعُل, nor is the place of its augment that of the augment of يَفَعُل: (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 جَعَفر [392], as جَعَفر [374], where the , being co-ordinative [712], because the و and ی 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 \( \text{ا} \) or \( \text{ي} \) 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 \( \\
\text{استقلام} \\
\) and \( \\
\text{استقلام} \\
\)
\[338, 697, 699, 709, 714\], 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 \\
\text{ر} \) and \( \text{ي} \) to the preceding letter, and converting them into \( \text{I} \): (3, 4) two sorts of ultimate pl. [256], vid. the cat. of \( \\
\text{بواقع} \\
\) [715], and the cat. of \( \\
\text{عصائب} \\
\) [246, 683 (case 3), 717], which, though they do not resemble the v., are subjected to the transformation mentioned, because of the \( \text{I} \) of the pl. in one of them, and the intention to distinguish in the other [708] (R). That [conversion into \( \text{I} \)] is [found] (Jrb) in (1) a tril. n., as (a) \( \\
\text{باب} \\
\) and \( \\
\text{ناب} \\
\) [above] (SH): (b) \( \\
\text{лежل} \\
\) and \( \\
\text{مال} \\
\) [above], and \( \\
\text{لع} \\
\) (M) cowardly, which is \( \\
\text{لد} \\
\) جَلْدُ 
\[348, 368\], from \( \\
\text{لاع} \\
\), which is \( \\
\text{لد} \\
\) حَذَر 
\[348, 368\], from \( \\
\text{فعل} \\
\) was cowardly, aor. ٍِيِلَعَ; though ISk transmits ٍِيَلَعَ I was cowardly, aor. 
\[348, 368\]: (2) a v., (a) tril., as \( \\
\text{أنا} \\
\) and \( \\
\text{اباع} \\
\) [684]: (b) conformable to the tril., as \( \\
\text{أقام} \\
\) and \( \\
\text{أباع} \\
\) [above] and \( \\
\text{أباع} \\
\) offered for sale (SH), \( \\
\text{استتقام} \\
\) and \( \\
\text{استتقام} \\
\)
\[above\] (R): (a) hence ٍِيِلَعَ [was humble,
submissive (H)], contrary to the opinion of most (SH), because it is ُكَانَ ِإِسْتَفْعَلَ ِإِسْتَسَكَالَ ُكَانَ from was (Jrb), meaning came to have a being contrary to his being, like ِإِسْتَسَكَالَ ِإِسْتَسَكَالَ altered from state to state, except that ِإِسْتَسَكَالَ ِإِسْتَسَكَالَ is general, applicable to every state, while ِإِسْتَسَكَالَ ِإِسْتَسَكَالَ is peculiar to alteration from a particular being, vid. the contrary of humility and submission; or from ِكَيْسَل clitoris, because it is in a most low and humble position, meaning became like it in contemptibleness (H): not ُسُكُونَ ِإِفْتَعَلَ ِإِفْتَعَلَ from quiescence (Jrb), with ُأَضْفَأ added for impletion of the Fatha (H), because [such] addition [of the letter of prolongation, as in ُمُنْتَزَأَ (Jrb), whence

فَأَنَّت مِن الْغَوَائِلْ حِينَ تَزْمَى ُوَ مِن ذَمْ الْلِّيْلَ بِمُنْتَزَأَ (H), by Ibrāhīm Ibn Ḥaroma, lamenting his son, Then thou from the calamities, when they shoot, and from the blame of men, art far removed (Jh), i. e., بِمُنْتَزَأَ (H),] is improbable; and because they say ِإِسْتَسَكَانَة (SH) for its inf. n. (Jrb); and, says F, ُمُسْتَكْيِن for its act. part, as in the saying of Ibn Ḥimār

فَلا تَسْلَى بِمَطْرُقٍ إِذَا ما ُسَرَى فِي الْرَّمْحَ أَصْحَبَ مُسْتَكِيِنًا

Then put not up with a flabby man, who, whenever he journeys by night among the folk, is humble in the
morning; and also يستَكِينُ [for its aor.] (H): (b) the tril. v. is sometimes conformable to the tril., as يَحَافُ [above], يُقَالُ يَهَابُ [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 قَامَةٌ and إِسْتِقْتَامَةٌ [338, 697] (SH), conformable to آنَامٍ and إِسْتِقْتَامَةٌ respectively (Jrb); and مَقَامٌ and مَقَامٌ [712] (SH), conformable to آتَامٍ and آتَامٌ respectively (Jrb): contrary to (1) قَولٌ and بِعْ [663, 684 (condition 1), 698] (SH), where the and ي are quiescent (R, Jrb); طَبَأَتِي [298, 311, 684] and يَأُجْلُ [333, 674] being anomalous (SH): (a) we have mentioned that such as يَأَجْلُ is regular, though weak [684, 701]: (b) similarly some of the Hijázis regularly convert the quiescent and في in the aor. of such as إِنْسَرَ إِتْعدَ [701]: (c) some of the Banû Tamîm regularly convert the [quiescent] in such as أَوْلَادُ children, i. e. the pl. of that [n.] whose ف is a و, into و, as أَوْلَادُ: (d) when و is mobilized with an uninflectional Fatha, and is final, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, Tayyi [regularly] pronounce the letter before the و with Fath, in order that the و may be converted into و, [as بَقِيَ] and بَقَى.
and \( \text{رُضَى} \) (349, 482, 724) (T, MAR), because the final is the seat of alteration and alleviation; (a) Fatha of the \( \text{س} \) 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 Banû Baulân, of Tayy (T),] says

\[
(\text{R}), \text{orig. } \text{بَنَيْت} (T, \text{MAR}), \text{the } \text{ن} \text{ being pronounced with Fath, and the } \text{س} \text{ then changed into } \text{i}, \text{which is elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents (MAR),}
\]

Making the arrows strike fire from the stones in the depressed ground at the bottom of the mountain, and hunting souls formed in honor meaning that the \( \text{حَرَب} \) [in the preceding verse] was doing that (T): (c) if the \( \text{س} \) be intermediate, because of the inseparable \( \text{s} \) [266], as in [above] [349, 482] for \( \text{نَاصِئَا} \), [and for \( \text{بَادِيةٌ} \) desert (T),] such conversion is rare, not regular (R): [683 (case 1, a)], conversed
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) \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft تَفَارَلُ} \) and \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft تَفَارَلُ} \), etc., are not made to conform to the tril., as are \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft إِسْتَقْوَمَ} \) and \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft إِسْتَبْيِسَ} \), because we stipulated [above] that the quiescent before the mobile or is should be pronounced with Fath in the tril. pret.: (b) if you say "Do you not transform the act. part. in \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft تَفَارَلُ} \) and \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft بَانَعُ} \) by converting the or into \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft تَفَارَلُ} \) [683, 708, 712], notwithstanding that it is preceded by an !, 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 \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft تَفَارَلُ} \) and have the sense, and government, of the v., and belong to the conjug. of the [unaugmented] tril. [343], contrary to \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft تَفَارَلُ} \) and \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft بَانَعُ} \)": (c) if you then say "But \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft تَفَارَلُ} \) and \( \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft إِسْتَقْوَمَ} \) belong to other, [i. e..] non-tril., conjugats. ", 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 \( تَقَارَلَ، بَأْيَعَ، تَقَارَلَ، بَأْيَعَ، تَقَارَلَ، بَأْيَعَ، تَقَارَلَ، بَأْيَعَ \) and \( تَبَيَّعَ، تَبَيَّعَ، تَبَيَّعَ، تَبَيَّعَ، تَبَيَّعَ، تَبَيَّعَ، تَبَيَّعَ، تَبَيَّعَ \), because incorporation of the \( ع \) in the [first] two conjugs. is necessary (R). Such as \( صِيَدَ تَوَّدُ أَطْيَبَ أَطْيَبَ أَطْيَبَ أَطْيَبَ أَطْيَبَ أَطْيَبَ أَطْيَبَ أَطْيَبَ \) [684], and [ \( أَعُوْلَ أَعُوْلَ أَعُوْلَ أَعُوْلَ أَعُوْلَ أَعُوْلَ أَعُوْلَ أَعُوْلَ \) \( أَخْيَيْتَ أَخْيَيْتَ أَخْيَيْتَ أَخْيَيْتَ أَخْيَيْتَ أَخْيَيْتَ أَخْيَيْتَ أَخْيَيْتَ \) [It (the sky) became rainy (R)], [ \( أَغْيَيْتَ أَغْيَيْتَ أَغْيَيْتَ أَغْيَيْتَ أَغْيَيْتَ أَغْيَيْتَ أَغْيَيْتَ أَغْيَيْتَ \) It became cloudy], and [ \( Aَغْيَيْتَ Aَغْيَيْتَ Aَغْيَيْتَ Aَغْيَيْتَ Aَغْيَيْتَ Aَغْيَيْتَ Aَغْيَيْتَ Aَغْيَيْتَ \) She sucked notwithstanding pregnancy (R)], are anomalous [711, 707] (SH); and similarly \( دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ \) deemed right, \( دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ \) smelt the odour], and [ \( تَسْتَحْكَوُنَ تَسْتَحْكَوُنَ تَسْتَحْكَوُنَ تَسْتَحْكَوُنَ تَسْتَحْكَوُنَ تَسْتَحْكَوُنَ تَسْتَحْكَوُنَ تَسْتَحْكَوُنَ \) [707]. AZ allows the conjugs. of \( دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ \) and \( دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ دَهْتَ \) to be treated as sound unrestric, regularly, when they have no tril. v., like [ \( تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ \) [became a she-camel (MAR)]: but, according to S, such as [ \( تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ تَسْتَنْوَقَ \) also is anomalous, analogy requiring it to be transformed, for uniformity of the conjug., as the rel. ns. [ \( سَكَّفُ سَكَّفُ سَكَّفُ سَكَّفُ سَكَّفُ سَكَّفُ سَكَّفُ سَكَّفُ \) [312] and [ \( سَيْفُ سَيْفُ سَيْفُ سَيْفُ سَيْفُ سَيْفُ سَيْفُ سَيْفُ \) sword and \( حُيْلُ حُيْلُ حُيْلُ حُيْلُ حُيْلُ حُيْلُ حُيْلُ حُيْلُ \) horses.
(MAR) are transformed, although no transformed \( v. \) comes from them, for uniformity of the cat. of \( نَعْدُ \) [683, 708]; and, since \( نَعْدُ \), and \( نَعْدُ \) are made uniform [with \( يَعْدُ \)], this [opinion] is more probable. S. says that the whole of the anomalies mentioned have been heard transformed also, according to rule, except \( صُلُّدَة \), and \( أَغْلِطُتُ \), 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 \( ج \) and \( ظ \) are made quiescent, their vowel being transferred to the preceding letter, in such as \( يَقُولُ \) says and \( يَبِيعُ \) sells [697, 704, 721], because of their liability to confusion with the conjug. of \( يَنْخَافُ \) [below] and \( يَهَابُ \) (SH), if they were made to accord with the pret. in conversion of their unsound letter into \( ج \) (MASH). When the \( ج \) and \( ظ \) 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 \( ظ \) [through conversion of \( ج \) or \( ظ \) into \( ج \)], or in a \( n. \) conformable to such a \( v. \), the \( ظ \) 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 $\v$ or $\v$ 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 $\v$ stands and $\v$ is plain, orig. $\v$ and $\v$ with Damm of the $\v$, and Kasr of the $\v$, the vowel of the $\v$ and $\v$, and $\v$ being transferred to the preceding quiescent, vid. the $\v$ of $\v$, and the $\v$ of $\v$; so that the $\v$ and $\v$ become quiescent (A). In the augmented conjugs. [also] of these tril. vs. unsound [in the $\v$], when the letter before the unsound letter is orig. quiescent, and is not an $\v$, $\v$, or $\v$, you make the unsound [letter] quiescent, transferring its vowel to the quiescent; and that is regular in their speech, as $\v$ [below] and $\v$ deemed tardy and $\v$ sought protection: but, when the letter before the unsound [letter] is mobile, it is not altered, as $\v$ [706, 707], $\v$ became accustomed, and $\v$ was measureable (S). And, when the vowels are transferred to the letter before the $\v$ and $\v$, then, (1) if the vowel be Fatha, the
and ی are converted into ی, as یهاب یکسای [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 دامما, their conversion into ی is not possible, because follows only Fatha: so that they remain unaltered, as یبیع یقروم [above]; except the ی pronounced with Kasr, which is converted into ی, as یطیع [below] and یقیم [above], orig. یبیع یطوبر and یقروم یطوبر, because it becomes quiescent [and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 5)] (R). The ی [therefore], if homogeneous with the transferred vowel, [being a ی when the vowel is دامما, or a ی when the vowel is Kasra (Sn),] is not altered by more than quiescence after the transfer, as above exemplified [in یقروم یبیع (Sn)]: (2) if not homogeneous with the vowel, is changed into a letter homogeneous with it, as (a) یبیع یبیع [above], orig. یبیع یبیع, where the ی, 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) یقیم [above], orig. یقروم یقروم, where the ی, when the Kasra is transferred to the quiescent, remains not homogeneous with it; and is therefore converted into ی, because quiescent, and preceded by a
letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 5)] (A).
Although the pret. is the o. f. of the aor., تَيْقُمْ and تَيْقَم عَنْ 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 تَبَعْ and تَبَعَ عَنْ، because, if so treated, they would be confounded with the conjug. of تَيَخَافُ [above] (R). And تَقَعْ and مَقَعْلاً and مَقَعْلٍ are similar (SH), as مَقَعْلٌ [333] (Jrb); and so is مَقَعِّلٍ [697, 714], as مَقَعِّلٌ and مَقَعِّلٌ [347, 709] (SH). The n. conformable to the v. in this transfer is of two sorts, (1) the augmented triِل. 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 م of مَقَام [712]; or used as an aug. in the v., [but] mobilized with a vowel not used as its vowel in the v., like [the ت of] تَيَبَع [712]: (a) مَقَعْلٍ [above] is orig. مَقَعْلٍ [347, 712], which is commensurable with يَعُلْ [436]; and, but for that, it would not be transformed: (b) as for the rest of the pass. parts.; they are commensurable with their pass. vs., while differing [from them] in the initial م [347]: (2) a regular inf. n. equal to its v. in keeping its augments in the same relative positions as those of the v., like 159a
and [above] (R). In [such] vs., and ns. connected with vs. [330], where the \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{ى} \), when \( \text{ع} \) is mobile, and the preceding letter is quiescent, [but] mobile in the o. f., [vid. the tril. pret.,] the vowel of the \( \text{ع} \), even if it be Fat\( \text{ح} \), 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 \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{ى} \)], because, in such [words], regard for the mode of formation is possible in those pronounced with Fat\( \text{ح} \) of the \( \text{ع} \), as in those pronounced with Damm or Kasr; contrary to [those words which have] the [\( \text{ع} \) orig.] pronounced with Fat\( \text{ح} \) and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fat\( \text{ح} \), as \( \text{ن ت} \) ق\( \text{ال} \) [705]. For here the \( \text{ف} \) is quiescent; so that, when it is mobilized with Fat\( \text{ح} \), and the \( \text{ع} \) is made quiescent, that [Fat\( \text{ح} \) on the \( \text{ف} \)] is known to be the vowel of the \( \text{ع} \): and here the distinction between the cats. of \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{ى} \) 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 \( \text{ي} \text{ط} \text{ي} \text{م} \text{ع} \) [above], which, according to Khl, is orig. [704]? And you say \( \text{م} \text{ق} \text{أ} \text{م} \) \( \text{ي} \text{ط} \text{ر} \text{ح} \) and \( \text{م} \text{ق} \text{أ} \text{م} \) [above], \( \text{م} \text{ق} \text{أ} \text{م} \) \( \text{م} \text{ع} \text{ون} \) \( \text{م} \text{ي} \text{ق} \text{م} \) and \( \text{م} \text{ق} \text{أ} \text{م} \) [above], \( \text{ي} \text{ب} \text{ا} \text{ع} \) \( \text{ي} \text{ق} \text{ي} \text{ل} \) and \( \text{ي} \text{ه} \text{اب} \) \( \text{s} \text{l} \text{e} \text{e} \text{p} \text{s} \text{a} \text{t} \text{m} \text{i} \text{d} \text{d} \text{a} \text{y} \) and \( \text{ي} \text{ب} \text{ع} \) [above].
and مَقَالَ مَقَالٍ [333]. Thus you see how, when they are obliged to transform the إ, 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 Fatḥa to the preceding letter; and do not mind confusion of the cat. of إ with that of ي (R on the Preterite). This transfer has conditions:

1. that the quiescent, to which the vowel is transferred, be sound, there being no transfer to it if (a) an unsound letter, as in جَأْرَأْ جَأْرَأْ [above], hindered and بَيْنَ بَيْنَ (b) a Hamza, as in يَأْيُسَ aor. of أَيْسَ despaired, because it is liable to transformation by conversion into [for alleviation; so that it is, as it were, an 'l', while does not receive a vowel (Sn)]: (a) that is categorically declared in the Tashīl 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 أَقْوَمَ مَا أَقْوَمَ أَلْشَىْ How plain the thing is! and مَا أَقْوَمَ مَا أَقْوَمَ أَلْشَىْ How upright it is!, and أَقِمْ أَقِمْ and أَقِمْ أَقِمْ because they make it conform to the n. corresponding to it in measure and indication of excellence, vid. the أَنْفَعُ 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 لُفُعلُ of superiority is only مَا لُفُعلَةُ لُفُعلٍ, not مَا لُفُعلَةُ لُفُعلٍ; but the latter is made to accord with مَا لُفُعلَةُ لُفُعلٍ: (b) Frd says “AH transmits from Ks that transfer is allowable in [the v. of] wonder, such as أَقُومُ بِيَتْ, where you say يَقُومُ بِيَتْ; but it is weak” (Sn): (b) reduplicated in the ل, as in إِبْيَضَ was white and إِصْرُودَ was black [707], which sort they do not transform, lest one paradigm be mistaken for another, because, if أَبَيْضَ were subjected to the transformation mentioned, فَبَأَسُ would be said, which one might suppose to be لُفُعلُ [with Fath of the ع (Sn)] from بَضَاطَةُ delicacy of complexion: (c) unsound in the ل, as in أَهْرَى fell down, where transfer is not introduced, lest two transformations occur consecutively. And IM in the Tashil adds another condition, vid. that the v. do not agree [in sense (Sn)] with إِنْفَعَلَ [by indicating constitution or color (Sn)], as in يَفْعَرُ and يَفْصِدُ, aor. of خَبِرَ and صَبِيدَ [707]; and similarly their variations, as أَعْرَبَ أَلْلَهُ 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 of إِنْفَعَلٍ and إِنْفَعَلٍ, when possessed of أَنْفَعَلٍ ..... 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 ٌ(Sn). The ٌ and ی 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 ٍ I said and َ They I sold [403, 697], َ They [fem.] said and َ They [fem.] sold: (α) the initial is pronounced with Kasr, if the ٍ be [either] a ی, [as in َ (Jrb);] or [α ِ (Jrb)] pronounced with Kasr, [as in َ (Jrb);] and with Damm in other cases (SH), as in َ [403, 484, 626, 705] (Jrb): (β) this, however, is not done by them in لست I am not, [which, notwithstanding that it belongs to the conjug. of ٌ with Kasr of the ٍ (456, 707), does not have the ی pronounced with Kasr (R),] because it resembles the p. [403] (SH) in aplasticity (Jrb): for, since it is aplastic [447], the Kasra is elided as forgotten, and is not transferred to the letter before the ی; so that َ َ َ َ َ becomes like َ ََ َََ [516, 533] (R): (γ) for the same reason they make the ی quiescent [707] (SH), i. e., do not convert it into ٍ, because that is a variation, as is transfer of the vowel of the ی 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): (b) apocopation, as
in did not say and كم يُقال did not sell [697]; or quasi-apocopation, as (Jrb) in تلب say and *بَعث sell [663, 697], because they are [derivs. (Jrb)] from تلب تقول and [428, 431] (SH), and therefore do not differ from them in Damma or Kasra [of the ف ] (Jrb): (b) in [such as (Jrb)] استقامَة and استقامَة [above] (SH), orig. إقَرَامِ and استقامَم [697], where they convert the ء into ل for conformity with أَقَامَ and استقامَم [above]; and, since two ءs, the ل that is [converted from] the ء, and the aug. ل, then concur, the first is elided (Jrb): (a) what IH mentions as to elision of the ل converted from the ء, or د is the opinion of Akh [338]; while, according to KhI and S, the elided is the aug., as they say on the د of مفعول [709]: but the saying of Akh is more suitable, by analogy to other cases where two quiescents concur [663] (R): (b) some Commentators state that the mention of استقامَة and استقامَة is a repetition; but the answer is that they are mentioned above because of the conversion of the ء into ل, and here because of the lision (Jrb): (2) allowably, in such as (a) سيدُ ميَتُ and ميَتُ [251, 685 (case 7, a, a)] (SH), which then remain سيدُ and ميَتُ, with a single د (MASH); the second د being elided from them for alleviation, because of the combination of two دs and a Kasra (Jrb): the poet [‘Adi Ibn
ArRa’lā alGhassānt (Jsh)] says, [combining ميت and ميت in one verse (Jh),]

ليس من مات فاستراح ينام * إنما اليميت ميت الأحياء (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) قُبُولَةٌ [331] and كِينُونَة (b) 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 كينونه [below] (R); since ns. like قُبُولَة and كِينُونَة 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 فعلونة [331] in their language, except extraordinarily, like غيرفة swerving, deflection, [an inf. n. of كينونة The arrow swerved, or deflected, from the butt, aor. كينونة (Jh, KF)] but the BB say that it is altered from كينونة[331], the ع being
elided, as is proved by its reversion in  حَتَّى يَعْرُدُ أَلْحَمْ [above], and by the existence of  حَيْتَنَعَرَ ٰبٰنَيِّلَ ٰلاَّلَٰ [398]; while the KK say that it is altered by changing the ٰتَمَّامَةَ of its initial into  فَثَا, being orig.  كُنُوتْةَ [below], like  سُرَّجُجَةَ nature, which is weak, because, if it were so, there would be no reason for changing the ٰثَى into  ى, and the ٰتَمَّامَةَ into  فَثَا (Jrb): (c) according to S, such as  مِيَّتِ َسِيدٍ and ْيَبْعَلَ َسِيدٍ are with Kasr of the  ى [251, 373, 685, 716]; while  كُنُوتْةَ and َكُنُوتْةَ are  كُنُوتْةَ and َكُنُوتْةَ, with Fath of the ى, on the measure of  عَيْضُوْرَ [old woman (KF)], except that the ٰنِّ is repeated, and the ٰس inseparable: (d) since neither ْيَبْعَلَ َسِيدٍ with Kasr of the ى, nor the inf. n. ْيَبْعَلَة ى [331], is found in any formation other than the hollow, some judge  سِيدٍ صَرِيْفٍ ْيَبْعَلَ َسِيدٍ with Fath of the ى; like  بِصْرِيْفٍ [373]; but pronounced with Kasr irregularly, like  بِصْرِيْفٍ with Kasr of the  ف, and  ذَخْرِى with ٰتَمَّامَةَ [311]: (α) S, however, says that, if they were [orig.] pronounced with Fath of the ى, they would not be altered; [but would be] like  ثَيْكَانٌ and  هَيْبَانٌ [390]: and the use of ْيَبْعَلَ ٰلاَّلَٰلَٰ] would be commonly allowable, whereas no ْيَبْعَلَ has been heard from the hollow, except  ما بَالٍ عَيْسَنٍ, as ِعَيْسَنٍ ْيَبْعَلَ ٰلاَّلَٰلَٰ [251]: (e) Fr, also endeavouring to avoid the formation ْيَبْعَلَ ٰلاَّلَٰلَٰ with Kasr of the ى, says that  ْيَبْعَلَ ٰلاَّلَٰلَٰ [251] is
orig. ٍٍّٓٗٔ ٍٍّٓٗٔ [348]; but that, the ٍّٓٗٔ (pronounced with Kasr) being transferred to the position of the ٍّٓٗٔ, and the [quiescent] ٍّٓٗٔ to the position of the ٍّٓٗٔ, [as ٍّٓٗٔ,] the ٍّٓٗٔ is converted into ٍّٓٗٔ, and [has the quiescent ٍّٓٗٔ] incorporated [into it]: (α) he says that ٍّٓٗٔ 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 ٍّٓٗٔ be not an ep., like ٍّٓٗٔ a wailing, it is not subjected to this transformation: (f) he says that ٍّٓٗٔ and the like are orig. [as] ٍّٓٗٔ [above], like ٍّٓٗٔ [252, 390] and ٍّٓٗٔ chest, coffer: but that, since most of these inf. ns. are scions of ٍّٓٗٔ, as ٍّٓٗٔ became, inf. n. ٍّٓٗٔ [331], and ٍّٓٗٔ journeyed, inf. n. ٍّٓٗٔ, they pronounce the ٍّٓٗٔ with Fath, so that the ٍّٓٗٔ may be preserved, because the cat. belongs to ٍّٓٗٔ [below]; and then make the scions of ٍّٓٗٔ conform to those of ٍّٓٗٔ, converting the [first] ٍّٓٗٔ [in ٍّٓٗٔ] into ٍّٓٗٔ for conformity with ٍّٓٗٔ: (α) this is as he says that ٍّٓٗٔ [247] is orig. ٍّٓٗٔ; like ٍّٓٗٔ [247]; but that, deeming the double ٍّٓٗٔ heavy, they make it single, and put the ٍّٓٗٔ as a compensation for the elided letter: (g) the saying of ٍّٓٗٔ, 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 فَعَلُ with Kasr of the ع to the hollow, and of فَعَلُ with Fath of the ع to [the n.] other than the hollow; and since, according to Fr, putting the ی [of the ep. فَعَلُ] before the ع, and, according to those others, transfer of فَعَلُ with Fath to ِ فَعَلُ with Kasr, may be peculiar to the hollow, there is nothing to prevent the formation ِ فَعَلُ from being peculiar to it: and similarly there is nothing objectionable in peculiarity of ِ فَعَلُةَ [331] to the inf. n. of the hollow, or ِ فَعَلَةَ [247] with Damm of the ن to the pl. of the defective; while the saying of Fr that they make ی predominate over ع, because the cat. belongs to ی [above], is of no account, since inf. ns. of this measure are rare, and, in those which occur, the scions of ع, like کَبِنْوَةَ [above], ِ فَتْرَةَ leading, and ِ حِمْلَةَ intervening, are near, or equal, in number to the scions of ی: (h) the reason why elision is necessary in such as ِ کَبِنْوَةَ and ِ سَيْرُرَةَ, contrarily to ِ سَيْدَ and ِ مَيْتُ, is that the extreme number of letters reached by a n. through augmentation is seven [368], while these contain six, to which the ی of feminization is invariably attached; so that, since alleviation is allowable in what has fewer letters, like ِ سَيْدَ, it is necessary in what has many, like ِ کَبِنْوَةَ: (3) rarely, in ِ فَعَلَانَ, as ِ رَيْبَكَانَ sweet basil for ِ رَيْبَكَانَ, orig. ِ رَيْبَكَانَ
from ^R (R). The and are preserved in other cases, vid. where the causes of transformation and elision are (1) absent (M), as in ^Tol and ^Bi [above], and what resembles them (II) : (2) present, except that something intervenes, which prevents the execution of their behest, as in [684 (condition 11, d), 711] and [272, 684], [331, 684 (condition 11, a), 698, 711] and [inf. n. of َحَالَة walked, swaying his shoulders, aor. َحِيْلَة ْيَعْبُد [273] (M). Such as َحُيْرَان [above], َحَبَّدَى [684 (condition 10, a, b), 698] and َحُيْكَان [and َحُيْكَان], are [treated as] sound, (1) to notify, by their mobility, the mobility of what they signify; while َمَرْتَان is [conformable to َحُيْرَان (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 َعَتْمَة and َعَتْمَة [above] (R), to the v. (R, Jrb), which is obvious (Jrb); nor agreeable (SH) with it in mobility and quiescence (Jrb), i. e., commensurable with it, like َمَقْدُوم and َمَقْدُوم.
Moreover and چولاً and فلیبًا and دوزًا [931, 719], in which the unsound letter is [treated as] sound, though it is a ج, which is weak, susceptible of alteration; so that the ع, which is stronger than the ج, because protected [by the subsequent letters of the word], should a fortiori be [treated as] sound. Similarly حیکلًا and ترباً are not transformed, because of their remoteness from the formations of the ع, by reason of the two ل's of feminization at their end; and, even if no ل of feminization occurred at their end, their formation would still necessitate their being treated as sound, like جُلْلُ سوَلَة [711] and an inquisitive man, because of its remoteness from the formations of the ع. (IY).

§. 704. The tril. vs. unsound in the ع, (1) if the ع be ء, are of three kinds فعل, فعل, and فعل [482], like the sound: (2) if the ع be ى, are of two kinds, فعل and فعل; not فعل [705], as though they discarded this formation in this cat. [of the hollow], because of that conversion of the ى into ء [686 (case 1)] which would ensue in the aor. (IY). One word of this conjug., however, does occur in the ى cat. of the hollow, vid. جَعِبرُ الْرُجُل meaning The man became possessed of goodly appearance [705, 707], the ى of which is not converted into ل in the pret., because, if it were, then transformation of the aor., by
transfer of the vowel of the ی to the letter before it and conversion of the ی into ى, would be necessary, because the aor. follows the pret. in [undergoing] transformation; so that you would say یُبُحَرُ، aor. یُبَحَرُ، and thus transition from a lighter to a heavier [formation] would be produced (R on the Preterite). The formations of the ی، (1) in the [cat. of] ی، are on [the measure of] (a) یُعَلُ، aor. یُعَلُ، as یَقَالُ، aor. یَقَوَلُ [697, 703] (M); not یُفَعِّلُ with Kasr, as [sometimes] occurs in the sound [482], lest, the ی becoming ی [685 (case 5)], the scions of ی be confounded with those of ی (IV): (b) یُفَعِّلُ، aor. یُفَعِّلُ، as یَخَصُّ، aor. یَخَصُّ [697, 703] (M); not یُفَعِّلُ with Kasr, except in two words، یَطَلَحُ، aor. یَطَلَحُ، and یَطَلُحُ، aor. یَطَلُحُ [below] (IV): (c) یُفَعِّلُ، aor. یُفَعِّلُ، as یَطَلَحُ، aor. یَطَلُحُ; and یَكَطَرُ، aor. یَكَطَرُ; i. e., became tall, and bountiful: (2) in the [cat. of] ی، are on [the measure of] (a) یُفَعِّلُ، aor. یُفَعِّلُ، as یَبْعُ، aor. یَبْعُ [697, 703]: (b) یُفَعِّلُ، aor. یُفَعِّلُ، as یَبْعُ، aor. یَبْعُ [703]. And یُفَعِّلُ with Kasr does not occur in the [cat. of] ی، nor یُفَعِّلُ in the [cat. of] ی [below]. But Khl asserts that یَطَلَحُ، aor. یَطَلَحُ [703], and یَطَلَحُ، like یَحْسِبُ، aor. یَحْسِبُ [482, 700]; both being from ی، because they say لَشْتِهُ I caused to
perish and I caused to lose the way, and He is more apt to perish than he and  more apt to lose the way [below] (M). And [IY agrees that], since they are from ٌ، their pret. is َفعلٌ with Kasr of the َعُ, (1) because you say I perished and I lost the way, with Kasr of their َفُنْث; whereas, if their pret. were َفعلٌ, then َتَهْطُبُ َطَلَّخُتُ would be said, with َذَامِم; and, since that is not said, they are proved to be of the class of ِحَفْظُ [403, 484]: (2) because the aor. of َفعلٌ, in the cat. of ٌ، is only َيَفعَلٌ [above] with َذَامِم; so that, since they say َيَبْيَطُحُ َبَتْبَهْ and ِبَتْبَهْ, what we have said is proved. The o. f. of ِبَتْبَهْ َيَبْيَطُحُ and ِبَتْبَهْ َيَبْيَطُحُ [703] and ِبَتْبَهْ َيَعْقُرُ, the Kasra being transferred from the َ, to the preceding letter; so that, the َ, being quiescent, and the preceding letter pronounced with Kasr, the َ, is converted into َى [685 (case 5)] (IY). But, according to him that says َتَهْطُبُ َطَلَّخُتُ and ِبَتْبَهْ َيَعْقُرُ, they are [from َى (below), being َفعلٌ َيَفعَلٌ (IY),] like َبَعَأ, aor. ِبَيْبَعُ [above] (M). IH says that (R) َطَأْخُ, aor. ِبَيْطُحُ, and َبَتْبَهْ, according to those who say َتَهْطُبُ َطَوَّحُتُ and َأَطْوَحُ َتَرَهْطُتُ and َأَطْوَحُ [above], are anomalous (SH), on the ground that the pret. is َفعلٌ with
Fath of the ٤, the aor. of which, in the hollow belonging to the cat. of ٤, is pronounced only with Damm of the ٤ (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 ٤, aor. یطوطوح ٤, belonging to the cat. of ٤, and the aor. یطوطوح ٤, belonging to the cat. of ٤ [above].

But the یطوطوح mentioned by Jh has not been heard: and, if it were authentic, ٤, aor. یطيطيح ٤, would not be compounded [of two dial. vars.]; but ٤, aor. یطوطوح ٤, would be like ٤, aor. یططئل ٤; and ٤, aor. یطوطح ٤, like ٤, aor. یطيحي ٤ [above]. Nor is what IH says about anomalousness of any account, since, if ٤ were like ٤, then ٤ [above], like ٤ [403, 703, 705], would be said, with Damm of the ٤, 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 [یططئل with] Damma on the [٤ when a] ٤ occurs in ٤ یطيطئل aor. of ٤ یطيطئل [above] (R on the Preterite)

§. 705. Upon attachment of the [mobile] pron. of the ag., [vid. the ٤ of the 1st or 2nd pers., and the like
(IY),] they transmute فعل, [when it is] from [the cat. of (IY)]، and, [when it is] from [the cat. of (IY)] ی, into فعل: and then the ةدَمْمَة and كَسْرَة are transferred to the ف, [after removal of the vowel orig. belonging to it (IY);] so that فعل, تَلْثُ, and فعل, تَلْثُ, and [403, 703] are said (M). If you say “Why do you not assert that the o. f. of قَالُ is فعل with ةدَمْمَة of the إ, and dispense with the trouble of altering [the conjug.]?”; one says [in reply] “That would not be correct, because فعل occurs only intrans. [432, 484]; whereas you say عُلِّدَتُ الْمَريضَ I visited the sick and زُرِّتُ الْصِدِّيقَ I visited the friend, so that you find فعل to be [sometimes] trans.” (IY). IH’s saying about “the conjug. of سَدّتُه” [484] is an answer to the objection that سَدّتُه I ruled him and قَلْتُه I said it are orig. فَعَّلَتُه, and سَدّتُه, with ةدَمْمَة of the إ, as is the opinion of Ks [below]; the ةدَمْمَة of the إ being transferred to the ف, and the إ [then] elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; so that فَعَّلَ does occur trans.: and the answer is a denial that they are orig. pronounced with ةدَمْمَة of the إ, because the unsound, when its case is dubious, is made to accord with the sound; while no فَعَّل with ةدَمْمَة occurs trans. in the sound, so that they are orig. with Fath of the إ.
The learned differ about the manner of the transition [from \( \text{فعلت} \)] to that [form \( \text{فعلت} \)]. Some say that \( \text{فعلت} \) and \( \text{فعلت} \) are orig. \( \text{سودت} \) and \( \text{هعت} \), with Fath of the \( 
abla \); but that, since it is known that the \( 
abla \) would be elided, because of the concurrence of two quiescents [663], upon its conversion into \( \text{أ} \) [684, 703], and the cat. of \( \text{i} \) would [then] not be distinguishable from that of \( \text{ي} \), [\( \text{فعلت} \) being, in either cat., reduced to \( \text{فعلت} \),] they transmute the former into \( \text{فعلت} \) with Damm, and the latter into \( \text{فعلت} \) with Kasr; and then the vowel of the unsound letter is transferred to the \( 
abla \), and the \( 
abla \) elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents; so that \( \text{سدن} \) and \( \text{هعت} \) are said (Jrb on the Preterite). This is the opinion of many [described by R in § 484 as "S and the majority of the GG,"] and among them Ks [above]; and is adopted by [Z in the M, and] IM in the Tashil (A). But IH refutes this by his saying "not because of transfer" [484], meaning "not because of transfer from the \( 
abla \), as some mention", since that would entail transfer from one conjug. to another differing from it in form, as is obvious; and in sense, because of the difference in the meanings [484] of the conjug. [\( \text{فعلت} \), \( \text{فعلت} \), \( \text{فعلت} \): and he points out that the Damm and Kasr are "for explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of the \( 
abla \)," [484] and \( 
abla \),
respectively (Jrb). What is meant by "scions of ϲ (Jrb)" is (Jrb, Sn) its derivs. (Sn), [i. e.,] the unsound [words] belonging to the cat. of ϲ or ϯ (Jrb), [here] meaning the words whose ϲ is ϲ [or ϯ] (Sn). His argument is that the ϲ and ϯ, being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, are converted into [684, 703] and elided [663]; and afterwards the ϯ is pronounced with Damm in the cat. of ϲ, and Kasr in that of ϯ, 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 [403, 703], between the ϲ and ϯ, they say that, if the vowel were for explanation [of the v. as one] of the scions of ϲ, Damm would be necessary in خفَتْ: but, in reply to that, IH says that they pronounce [the ϯ] with Kasr in خفَتْ 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 ϲ or ϯ, 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 خفَتْ and بَعَتْ, from fear of missing the object altogether, because, if they pronounced the ϯ 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
ی; contrary to حَفَتْ and ُميَتُ, 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 و in تَوَلَّ [403], طَوْلَ, and the ی in بَيْعَ and ُميَبْ, being
mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath,
is converted into ی [684, 703]; so that they become
خَانَبَ and ُميَبَ and بَيْعَ: and, while the
ی remains, it is impossible to notify the mode of forma-
tion in these conjugs., and that they are orig. [on the
measure of] نَطِعَ [704], فَنِعَلْ, and فَنْعَلْ; because the ی
must be preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath;
but, when the mobile nom. prons. are attached to them,
the ی must be made quiescent, for the reason known [20,
403, 607, 692]; and, the ی being then elided in all of
them, because of the two quiescents [663], what pre-
vented the notification of the measure, i. e., the ی,
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 ب 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 َنَعَلُ with Fathā of the ү, as ُبَعَتَ ُتَوَّل, where the vowels of the ُنْ and َع are alike, they omit it; and notify the mode of formation in َنَعَلُ and ُنَعَل only: so that in َحَانَ ُنَعَل, as and ُهَمْبُ ُحَفَتُ ُحَفَتْ ُهِبْتُ [721], equalizing the cats. of ُن and ى [in Kasr of the ُنْ], because the important [object] is to notify the mode of formation; and in َنَعَل, as ُطَلْتُ, they say ُحَفَتْ [721], the Damma being for explanation of the mode of formation, not for explanation of the [v. as a scion of], because of what we have [just] mentioned, and [because] in this conjug. no hollow [v.] belonging to the cat. of ى occurs, which they might equalize with the cat. of ِ in Damm [of the ُنْ], as they equalize the two [cats. in Kasr] in [the conjug. of] ُنَعَل, as ُحَفَتُ and ُهِبْتُ [above], except َعُيُبُوُ [704], the ى of which is not converted into ِ, as we mentioned: and, since they have finished notifying the mode of formation in the conjug. of َنَعَل and ُنَعَل, while the like of that [notification] is not possible in َنَعَل, they intend in its case to notify the cats. of ِ and ى, and the distinction between them, as the saying goes ًبَوْلَ ٌمَّ ِبْيُكَنَّ ُحُلْلَ ُفَخَضَر If there be not any vinegar, then wine; so that, after elision of the ِ because of the two quiescents, they import Damma into ُفَلَ, putting it in place of the Fatha [on the ُنْ], and similarly Kasra
into بَعِّ, in order that the first may indicate the, and the second the ٰ (R on the Preterite). Mz asserts that they transmute قُومَ بَعِّ and قَامَ بَعِّ, as they transmute in قَبَعُ ٰ and قَبَعُ ٰ [above] (IY). And Akh told us that some of the Arabs say كَبِّيَّ رَبَّىٰ يَعْفَأٰل Zaid was near doing and ما رَبَّىٰ يَعْفَأٰل ذَات Zaid has not ceased doing that, meaning رَّأَىٰ and كَانَ (S). But [Z says that] they do not transmute without the [mobile] pron. [of the ag.] (M), because نُفِّلٰ بَعِّ and قَوْلَ أَلْفَوْلٰ The saying was said, in the dial. of those who say that [436, 706] (IY); except in the sayings ما رَبَّىٰ يَعْفَأٰل ذَاتٰ and كَبِّيَّ يَعْفَأٰل كَانَا [above] transmitted from some of the Arabs (M), whence

And the hyenas of the high ground, or of AlKūff [a valley of AlMadīna (Bk)] were near devouring my body, and Khirāsh was near being fatherless after that, which As says that he heard some one recite. For كَانَ is [463, 626], and so is رَأَىٰ, that being proved by the aor. يَكَانُ [482] and يَرُوَّل [447]: but they transfer the Kasra from the ع to the ن, after eliding the vowel of the ف, so that the word becomes كَبِّيَّ and رَبَّىٰ; and
they do not fear its being mistaken for نَعْلَ, because both [vs.] are intrans. (IY).

§. 706. When the e of the pret., [either] tril., like قال [in the cat. of و (Tsr)] and بَاعٌ [in that of ى (Tsr)], or on [the measure of (Tsr)] اختار or انفعل, like chose [in the cat. of ى (Tsr)] and انقاذ submitted [in that of و (Tsr)], is unsound, then [in the pass.] you may pronounce the preceding letter with (1) Kasr, (a) pure, [which is the dial. of Kuraish and their neighbours (Tsr)]; (b) smacking of دامم, [which is the dial. of many of كaisy and most of the Banu Asad (Tsr) : (a) the ِ is then, in either case, converted into ى : (2) pure دامم, the ِ being then converted into و, as لَيتَ وَقَلْ (436), which [dial. (Tsr)] is rare; but [is found in the speech of Hudhail; and (Tsr)] is attributed to [all of (Tsr)] Fak'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 داببة; 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 إنفعل and إنفكذ (Aud), like اختار and إنقاذ, which exceed
three [letters]; so that اَنْفُرَ and اَحْتَمْرَ are not said (Tsr): but [the well-known saying is (Tsr)] the first, [which (Tsr)] is the saying of IU, AlUbbadî, and IM (Aud). The cat. of قِلد and بِعَبٌ, [i. e., the tril. pret. pass. (Jrb),] has three dial. vars., (1) [pure (MASH)] ی (SH), which is the chastest of them (MASH): (a) بِعَبٍ is orig. بِعَب: then they make the ی quiescent, from dislike to Kasra upon it after Damuа; so that, a quiescent ی preceded by Damuа being produced, the ہ is pronounced with Kasr, in order that the ی may be sounded true: (b) then تِئِلِ is made to conform to بِعَب: (c) by this the saying of S is strengthened against that of Akh [710], since they alter the vowel, not the conso- nant [below] (Jrb): (2) Ishmám (SH), i. e., making the ف smack of Damm, for notification of the o. f.: (a) this dial. var. is chaste (Jrb): (3) [pure] ئ (SH): (a) تُؤَل is orig. تُؤَل: but, disliking Kasra upon the ئ after Damma, they elide it, so that تُؤَل becomes تُؤَل: (b) then they make دَوَعِتِ 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 com- mentary on the IH [721] (R). They are orig. تُؤَل 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, قُوْل and بِعَّا remaining, (a) some convert the quiescent ی into َُّ, because of the داممة of the preceding letter, saying وُؤُعَ and بِعَّا [436], which is the rarest of the dial. vars.: (b) the better [course] is to convert the داممة into Kasra in the cat. of ی, so that بِعَّا remains, because alteration of a vowel is less [disturbing] than alteration of a consonant [above], and also because بِعَّا is lighter than وُؤُعَ; and then to make قُوْل conform to بِعَّا, because, like the latter, unsound in the ع; so that, its َ being pronounced with كسر, the quiescent َََ is converted into ی: (2) according to جز, (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, بِعَّا and قُوْل remaining, the quiescent َََ is converted into ی, because of the Kasra of the preceding letter, as in مِيْرَان [685 (case 5)]: (b)
some of them, says he, make the quiescent, but do not transfer the Kasra to the preceding letter: so that the \_ \_ remains in its [original] state; while the \_ is converted into \_ , because of [its quiescence and] the Damma of the preceding letter [686 (case 1)]: but this is the rarest of the dial. vars., because Damma and \_ are heavy; and the first is better, because Kasra and \_ are light. The saying of Jz is more probable, because transformation of the word from regard to itself is more proper than conformity to another in transformation: and the reason why IH prefers elision of the Kasra is only that transfer of the vowel to a mobile is deemed strange; whereas there is no strangeness in it, as we have explained. And, as for Ishmām, it is chaste, though rare (R on IH upon the Passive). "Ishmām" here is not [used] in the sense mentioned at the beginning of [the chapter on] Pause [640] (Jrb). As to the manner of pronouncing with Ishmām, (1) RSht says "There are three ways, vid. compressing the lips (a) while pronouncing the \_ , so that its vowel is between the vowels of Damm and Kasr, which is the well-known, notorious [way], used in reading [the Kur]; (b) while making the Kasra of the \_ pure; (c) a little before pronouncing the Kasra of the \_ , 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 \( \mathbf{y} \) of the word with a complete vowel compounded of two vowels, separably, not indivisibly, a preceding portion of Ḍamma, which is the smaller, followed immediately by a portion of Kasra, which is the larger, whence the \( \mathbf{y} \) becomes clear" [436] (Tsr). The essence of this Ishmām [436, 668, 697] is your directing the Kasra of the \( \mathbf{y} \) of the v. towards Ḍamma, so that the subsequent quiescent \( \mathbf{y} \) may incline a little towards \( \mathbf{y} \), 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 \( \mathbf{y} \); 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 \( \mathbf{y} \); 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 َDamn" (R on IH). But, if that [mobile nom. pron. (Jrb)] which makes the ل quiescent [403] be attached to the cat. of ِنَـبَأَتَ and َيبعَ Thou wast sold, O slave and َفَلُتَتْ يَا تَوَّلَ Thou wast said, O saying [below], then [also three dial. vars. are allowable (Jrb),] Kasr [of the ُف (Jrb)], Ishmān, and َDamn (SH). The ِع is elided (R, Jrb), because of the concurrence of two quiescents (Jrb) : while the ُف remains, as before the elision, pronounced with (1) pure Kasr, which is the best-known [dial. var.]; (2) Kasr smacking somewhat of َDamn; (3) pure َDamn (R). IM asserts that what is ambiguous, whether Kasr, as in ُعَقْتُ and َيبعَ, or َDamn, as in ُعَقْتُ, [when they are in the pass. (Tsr),] is disallowed (Aud), which he indicates by his saying "But, if ambiguity be feared in any form, it is avoided" (Tsr). The o. f. of the phrase [before the vs. are put into the pass. (Tsr)] is ِخَانَـنْـيُي َزَبَند Zaid feared me and َبَايَعَنَى ِلْعَمَرُ sold me to 'Amr and ِخَانَـنْـيُي َعَنْ كَدَا hindered me from doing such a thing: then you [suppress the ag., and (Tsr)] put the vs. into the pass., [substituting a َت for the ِي of the 1st pers. (Tsr)]; so that, if you said ِعَقْتُ I was feared and ُعَقْتُ I was sold with Kasr [of the َخ and ِب (Tsr)], and ُعَقْتُ I was hindered with َDamn [of its initial (Tsr)], you
would convey the idea that they are *v.* and *ag.* [signifying *I feared* and *sold* and *hindered,*] and the [intended (Tsr)] meaning would be reversed: and therefore only *Ishmām* or *Damm* must be allowed in the two first, [i.e., 
\[b'at (Tsr);\]] and *Ishmām* or *Kasr* in the third, [i.e., 
\[hatt (Tsr);\]] while the ambiguous mode [of vocalization], [vid. *Kasr* in the two first, and *Damm* in the third (Tsr),] must be disallowed. But the Westerns hold it to be [merely] less approvable, not disallowed (Aud), saying that [in the pass.] the Arabs prefer *Kasr* of the 
\[\text{ٰ} \] when pronounced with *Damm* in the *act.,* and *Damm* of the 
\[\text{ٰ} \] when pronounced with *Kasr* in the *act.,* for distinction between the two [voices], which is obvious (Tsr). What IM mentions as to the necessity of avoiding the ambiguous form, according to what he apparently [below] says here, and expressly states in the CK, is not noticed by S, who seems to say that the three modes are allowable unrestrictedly (A). S does not regard ambiguity [in that (Tsr)], because [ambiguity is no preventive, since (Tsr)] it exists in [\[n. and v. (Tsr, Sn),\]] such as 
\[\text{مُخْتَأَر} \] *choosing,* or *chosen,* [an *act.* or *pass. part,* its *ي* being converted from a *س* pronounced with *Kasr* or *Fath,* respectively (Tsr, Sn),] and 
\[\text{تَضَأَر} \] II. 233. *shall harm,* or *be harmed* (Aud, A), orig. 
\[\text{تَضاَر} \] (K, B), *act. or pass.,* the first *ي* being pronounced [before the incorporation (Sn)] with *Kasr* or *Fath,* respectively
(Tsír, Sí). Sí, [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 (Sí). 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 ُقْت أَبْنَدُ and ُقْت أَبْنَلُ [above] and ُقْت أَبْنُلَّ 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 Ishmá in the first, and Damm [or Ishmá] in the two others (R on SH). And the cat. of ِإِخْتَيْرَ and ِإِنْقُيَدَ, [i.e., of ِأَنْفُعِلَ and ِإِنْفُعِلْ from the hollow (R),] is like that of ُنَيَلَ and ُبِعَ [in allowability of the three modes (R)] in both (SH) cases mentioned under ِنَيَلَ, i.e., absence, and attachment, of “that which makes the ج quiescent” [above], the sense being that, in both cases, ِإِخْتَيْرَ and ِإِنْقُيَدَ, like ُنَيَلَ and ُبِعَ, have three states, [vid. in the first case] pure ى, which is the chastest; and Ishmá; and [pure] ج, like ِأَخْتَوَرَ and ِأَنْقُرَ [436]: and similarly [in the second case] pure
Kasr, which is the best known, like and
and Ishmām; and [pure] Ḍamm, like
(MASH): contrary to the cat. of (SH),
because Ḍamm and Ishmām are allowable only in
consequence of the Ḍamm of the letter before the, and
whereas in and , orig. and , the letter before the unsound letter is not pronounced
with Ḍamm; so that only pure Kasr is allowable (R).
And [in the three states (MASH)] the [conj. (MASH)]
Hamza is pronounced (A, Tsr, MASH) like the third
letter (Tsr), [i.e.,] with a vowel (A), vid. Ḍamm, 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 Ḍamm, absolutely, because he
first lays down, unrestrictedly, that the initial of the
[pass.] v. is pronounced with Ḍamm [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:—
, [i.e., the v. of wonder (MASH), as ]
How well Zaid speaks! and (R, Jrb),
How well he sells! and (Jrb),] because
transformation is principally in the v., on account of its heaviness; whereas the cat. of wonder, though, according to the soundest opinion, a v., resembles ns. by reason (R)] of its aplasticity [477] (SH), so that it becomes like the أَفْعَلُ of superiority [351, 703] and the ep. أَفْعَلُ [348] (R) : (2) أَفْعَلُ مِنْهُ (SH), i. e., the أَفْعَلُ of superiority (R, Jrb), as زَينُ أَفْعَلُ مِنْ عَمَّرُ Zaid is a better speaker than 'Amr and أَبْعَعُ 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 إِنَالَةُ imputing a saying and of the أَفْعَلُ of superiority from قَوْلُ saying, but for the transformation [in the former], would agree; so that they treat the n. as sound, and transform the v.: that being more proper than the converse, because transformation, in whichever of them it be, is explicable only by conformity to the tril. pret. v., as قَالَ [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 أَفْعَلُ, when a n., complete, in order to
distinguish it from the plastic v. [آ فعل، فعُل] and [703] (S): but he makes the v. of wonder conform to it (Jrb), [saying that] the مَ أَنْفَعَلَ in and of لا أَنْفَعَلْ مَنْكُ the greatest doer of mankind; and similarly أُنْفَعَلُ إِلَّا أَنْفَعُلُ أَنَّاسِ a greater doer than thou and the greatest doer of mankind; and similarly أُنْفَعَلُ يُه (S): whereas IH first does the reverse, by making the n. of superiority conform to the v. of wonder; and then mentions for the n. of superiority this cause, which is mentioned by S (Jrb): (b) there is no reason for his saying “because conformable to it” [above], since the أَنْفَعَلُ of superiority is a n.; while the n. is generally not transformed in this way, [i.e., by transfer and conversion,] as we have mentioned [703]: and, though the [two] kinds of ns. [there] described are [so] transformed, as already explained, still the condition of the augmented kind commensurable with the v., when we intend its عَلَيْهُ to be transformable, is that it should be different from the v. in some respect [703, 712]; whereas this [n.] does not differ from the v. in anything: (c) [if any excuse for the omission to transform were required,] his [second] saying “because it might be mistaken” would suffice (R); (3) إِجْتَبَرْوُا إِزْرَجْوًا [492, 684 (condition 9, a)], because i. q. [703] (SH), i.e., تَفَاعَلْوَا تَزْرَجْوَا and تَفَاعَلْوَا (Jrb): (a) if the sense of تَفَاعَلْ be
not intended in إِنَّهُ الذَّكْرَ, you transform [the  in] it, as
[sought out (MAR)] and [703, 706]: (4) [the
cong. of] [684 (conditions 7, 8, b)], [703],
and had the disease termed [below], because
the transformation of such as ٍ and [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
cong. 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 con. 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-transforma-
tion requires to be excused only where a cause [of trans-
formation] 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 ٍ and
ٍ and ٍ are not transformed, so that ٍ and ٍ might be made conformable to
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them; nay, the case is reversed [below]: (b) if indeed it be asked "How is it that إسْوَانِ and إَعْوَارِ 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 إسْوَانِ [or إسْوَانِ] (R); (6) the conjug. of (MASH) _عُورُ became blind of one eye and سُوَى became black [and صِيدُ (S, Jh, M)], because i. q. إسْوَانِ and إَعْوَارِ (SH) and إسْوَانِ [above] (Jh), since the original conjugs. for colors and external defects are إفَعالُ and إِنْعَلَ [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) لِيْسَ [447] is made quiescent [in the ع] from لِيْسَ صِيدُ [456, 703], as they say عَلْمُ knew for عَلْم [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) صِيدُ, [where the ع is sounded true (IY),] or حَابَ, [where the ع is transformed (IY);] but into the form of what is [a ꞉ ꞉ ꞉ ꞉ ꞉ ꞉ (IY),] not a v., as لِيْتَ: (b) for the same reason they do not transfer the vowel of the ع to
the ل in لُسَنَت (M), لُسَنَا (IY): (c) the proof that the ع [of لَيِسَ] is [orig.] pronounced with Kasr is that فَاثْنَاء of the ع is not elided, ضَرَب not being said [for ضَرَب], as is said for عَلِم [Note on p. 246, l. 2]; and that the conjug. of نَعَلُ with ئَامَن [of the ] does not occur in the ى cat. of the hollow, except [704], which is anomalous (R): (7) the variations of those [vs. (Jrb)] whose ع is sounded true, like (a) أَعْرَتْهُ I made him blind of one eye and أَسْتَعْرَتْهُ (SH), if you were to form أَصْدَادَ اللَّهُ نَعَيِّرَة (M), and أَصْدَادَ الله نَعَيِّرَة أَسْتَنْفَعَلَتْ from عَرِ (M), and أَصْدَادَ الله نَعَيِّرَة أَسْتَنْفَعَلَتْ God caused his camel to have the disease termed صِيدُ (S, M), because their o. f. [صَيْدَة or صَيْد] is not transformed, so that they might be conformable to it in transformation (R); and [similarly (R)] (b) مُقاَوِلُ and مُبَاعِ [683 (case 1, a), 703] (Jrb), and عَارِ [683 (case 2), 708] (SH), because the transformation of such as قَارِل and بَيْعَ is for conformity to its transformed v. [684, 703], whereas the vs. of these things are not transformed (R); and (c) أَسْوَيْنَ [348, 712] (SH), the ep. أَنْعَلُ [above] from سُوْدَ (MASH). But sometimes the conjug. of نَعَلَ from [inf. ns. denoting] defects is transformed, as
She questions about Ibn Almar those who have seen him, whether his eye have become blind, or have indeed not become blind (R), as though it were لِمْ تَعْلَنَّ with the single corrob. ن, for which the poet substitutes the ١ of pause [614, 649, 684] (IY). And he that says عَار says اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ and اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ (SH), its derivs. also being then transformed (R). Such [formations], however, as اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ I made good (M), whence صَدَّتْ اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ I estab. [338], whilst اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ [703] [IY], اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ [565] (IY), اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ [338, 685] (case 6, c), 699] (M), as اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ عَلَيْهِمْ السَّيَّاتُ (SH), LVIII. 20. The devil hath gotten the mastery over them (IY), اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ and اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ I found pleasant, اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ and اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ in HB's reading اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ X. 25. [Until when the earth taketh its garniture, and becometh possessed of adornment (K, B)] on the measure of اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ (IY), and اَعْلَمَ اِسْتَعْمَرَ 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 and ی, when near the end [of the word], and preceded by an aug. ۱, are converted into ١, provided that, to the cause requiring conversion [684,
703], another requirer be adjoined, because the cause is then weak through the separation of the  and  from the Fathā by the 1, 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  [343] and  [below]: (2) enclosure of the 1 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  [703, 715], and  pls. of  ,  , and  : (3) the  and  's being in the ultimate pl. in whose sing. they are aug. letters of prolongation, as in [717] and  [661], because of the intention to distinguish the two aug. letters of prolongation from the  and  that have a vowel in the sing., whether they be rad., as in  and  pls. of  and  [717]; or aug., as in and  , pls. of  and  [253], pls. of  and  [374]: since that [o or ] which has an original vowel, being hardier and stronger, is not converted. But, when the  and  are far from the end, as in [pl. of  peacock (KF)], they are not converted into  [715]. According to this, it is plain to you that the Hamza in such as  and  [683 (case 1), 723], and  and  .
[683 (case 2)], َوَحُمْلٌ [683 (case 4), 715], and َكَبَّارٌ [683 (case 3), 717], is orig. ٰ converted from ِّّّّ and ِّّّّ. For, since mobilization of the ِّّّّ is needed, [in order to avoid a concurrence of two quiescents,] while its conversion into ِّّّّ or ِّّّّ is disallowed, because we have only just escaped from them, it is converted into a letter that, after ِّّّّ and ِّّّّ, is most akin to it, vid. Hamza, because both are guttural [732]. The first ِّّّّ is not elided [723], for avoidance of] the two quiescents, as is necessary in the like [663], because the ِّّّّ of such as َقَتَّلَّ is the sign of the act. part., and the ِّّّّ of such as َكَبَّارٌ and َكَبَّارٌ is the sign of the pl.; while such as َدَا ِّّّّ, if the ِّّّّ were elided, would be confounded with the abbreviated. But, as for the Hamza in such as َكَبَّارٌ ٰسَتَّلٌ [246, 683 (case 3, a), 717], it is a subst. for the ِّّّّ in the sing., not for the ِّّّّ converted from ِّّّّ or ِّّّّ (R). The ِّّّّ and ِّّّّ are converted into Hamza [below] in [the act. part. of the unaugmented tril. (Jrb),] such as َقَتَّلَّ and ُبَاحَعٌ [683 (case 2), 703, 712], whose v. is transformed; contrary to ُصَبَّ وَ عَالِر وَ وَ عَالِر [below] (SH). The saying of the GG, in this cat., “The ِّّّّ and ِّّّّ are converted into Hamza” [above] is not in accordance with reality, because the ِّّّّ is converted into ِّّّّ [683 (case 2, e)], which is then converted into Hamza; so that the ِّّّّ and
ی seem to be converted into Hamza (R). The o. fs. of 
َنَأَلْ and ِبَاعِجُ تَأَلْ, vid. َتَأَلْ and ِبَاعِجُ، are meant to be trans-
formed, because of the transformation of their vs.: but trans-
mreration 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 ی 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 † equi-
valent 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 mobiliza-
tion 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 ی representing] the Hamza, as H dots it, in the "Speckled Epistle", in such as َنَأَلْ, where he says َنَأَلْ, is a mistake (Jrb). As for ٌعَارِز [683 (case 2), 707]
[above], and the like, the  are not converted into Hamza, because sounded true in the v., as and  since the act. part. is conformable to its v. in respect of sounding true and transformation [683 (case 2, b)]; and, for the same reason, the  is sounded true in , and the like [707], because sounded true in [703] (IY). Some of the Arabs transpose the  and  in some act. parts. of the hollow, and then subject the act. part. to the same transformation as [16, 719], as

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

(R), by Tarīf Ibn Tamīm al'Ambarī (S, I Ath) at Tamīmī (I Ath), Then seek to know me: verily I, or that I, this one, am such that sharp is my weapon in mishaps, am a bearer of the cognizance, or badge, or device, of the valiant (MAR). This is what has beguiled Khl [below] into venturing upon transposition in the whole act. part. of the hollow whose  is a Hamza. For he says that, since they transpose the  and  of the hollow sound in the , from fear of a single Hamza.
after the ل، they are more inclined to escape from the combination of two Hamzas. And similarly, since he sees them say [شَوَّأَعُ] "dispersed", he says that in such as [حَطَابَيَا] and [جُرَأَيَا] [661, 726], and [شَوَّأَعُ] [248, 726], transposition is more appropriate. But the answer is that they resort to transposition in لَّاَكُ and only from fear of Hamza after the ل; whereas, in such as [جَاءُ] [below], one Hamza after the ل is inseparable, whether the ل and ع be transposed, or not (R). And [S says that (R)] most of the Arabs say لَاتُ and شَلَّل (S, R), by elision of the ع (R). But such as شَلَّل and شَلَّل are anomalous (SH). شَلَّل is from شُوَّأَعُ، i.e., vehemence of prowess or valour (IY, Jrb), and point or edge, and weapon (IY); or [from] يَشَلَّل، [aor. يَشَلَّل (Jh, KF),] inf. n. شَوَّأَعُ، 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) [شَتَالِكُ] [276], with Hamza, according to rule (IY, Jrb), like [تَتَأْهَ] and [بَتَأْ] [above] (IY): (2) [شَلَّل] [276, 278], by relegation of the ع to the position of the ل، [its measure being لَّاَلُ (Jrb), of the class of the defective (IY),] like [١٦] (IY, Jrb) and [٦٨٥] (IY): 164a
(a) similarly [278], from * latino * He wound the turban upon his head, aor. *يَلْوَثُ * (IX, Jrb), inf. n. *لَوَثُ * (Jrb) ; and *نَحَرَ *, as IX. 110. [276], i. e., *تَأَكَّرَ * (IX) : 3 and [276, 278], by elision of the [above] (IX, Jrb). Z says in the K [on IX. 110.] (Jrb), *سُحَرُ * is [i. q.] *تَأَكَّرَ *, i. e., cracked, on the point of being demolished and falling: but its measure is *فعلُ *, abbreviated from *خَلْفِ فَعْلٍ * [pregnant she-camels (Jh, KF)] from *خَلْفِ خَالِفَةٍ * ; while its counterparts are [711] and *صَائِل ضَائِلٍ * and *صَائِلٌ ضَائِلٌ *; and its * is not the * of *فَعْلٍ *; but only its *ع , the o. f. being *حَوْرَ * شَوْكٍ * , and *صَوْرَت ضَوْرَتُ * (K, Jrb). And [R says that] *لَتَسُحَرَ * and may be orig. *لَدْيَت لَوَتْ * and *شَوْكٍ شَوْكٍ لَوَتْ * intensive forms of *أَطْلَسْ عَامِلٍ عَامِلٍ * [343], like *لَدْيَت ضَأَّلٍ ضَأَّلٍ * and *لَدْيَت ضَأَّلٍ ضَأَّلٍ * [312], in which case they are like *كَبَشْ ضَافِ ضَايفٍ * [703] and *يَوْم رَأَحِ * *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 *سُحَرُ * may not be *فعلٍ *, because Z lays down that a letter is elided from it; nor transposed, because its predicament would be like [that of] *ةَعْلِ. *
[above], where the \( \text{\textdegree} \) is quasi-expressed, its elision being accidental, as [you see in] \( \text{\textdegree} \) I saw a little judge; so that it must be \( \text{\textdegree} \) \( \text{\textasterisk} \) \( \text{\textdegree} \) \( \text{\textdegree} \), its \( \text{\textdegree} \) being elided: while this [conclusion] is corroborated by what is mentioned in some of the Glosses (Jrb). The o. f. of \( \text{\textdegree} \) and \( \text{\textdegree} \) is \( \text{\textdegree} \) \( \text{\textdegree} \) and \( \text{\textdegree} \) \( \text{\textasterisk} \) \( \text{\textdegree} \) \( \text{\textdegree} \); so that the \( \text{\textdegree} \) is irregularly elided; the rule being to convert it into Hamza [above], as \( \text{\textdegree} \) \( \text{\textasterisk} \) \( \text{\textdegree} \) \( \text{\textasterisk} \), which also occur, on the measure of \( \text{\textdegree} \) (Sn on the Diminutive): [or] it seems that they convert the \( \text{\textdegree} \) into \( \text{\textdegree} \), and then elide the \( \text{\textdegree} \) because of the two quiescents; and do not mobilize [it], in order to escape from Hamza: the elided \( \text{\textdegree} \) 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, \( \text{\textdegree} \) [by elision of the \( \text{\textdegree} \), considered as \( \text{\textdegree} \) or \( \text{\textdegree} \) or Hamza, from \( \text{\textdegree} \). Some say that the aug. \( \text{\textdegree} \) is elided, and the \( \text{\textdegree} \) converted into \( \text{\textdegree} \), because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath. Their measure is then \( \text{\textdegree} \) with quiescence of the \( \text{\textdegree} \) from regard to its state after conversion, and with Kasr of the \( \text{\textdegree} \) from regard to its state before conversion. But A proceeds on [the assumption] that the elided is the \( \text{\textdegree} \), since he says "And \( \text{\textdegree} \) 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 ُخَأَّ [661] there are two sayings:—(1) Khl [above] says that it is transposed, like ُشَالِّ: (2) it is said [by others] to be [formed] according to rule (SH). But ُفَأَعَّلَ [247, 373] is treated as sound, like what is not a *n.* [on the measure] of a *v.* [703, 712]: you say ُقَأَرُلَ and ُبَأَعُ (S).

§. 709. When [the *pass. part.* (MKh)] مَفْعُولُ is formed from the *tril.* (MKh) *v.* whose ُعَ is unsound, ُى or ُء, the same transfer and elision are necessary as in ُإِفْعَالِ [338, 697, 703, 714]; so that from ُإِفْعَالِ and ُبَأَعَ you say مَبِيعُ and مَقْوَلُ [347, 703]. The *o.f.* is مَبِيعُ and مَقْوَلُ: but the vowel of the ُعَ is transferred to the preceding quiescent; and, since two quiescents, the ُعَ and the ُء of مَقْوَلُ, then concur, the ُء of مَقْوَلُ is elided (IA), according to S (MKh) مَبِيعُ ought to be said for مَبِيعُ (IA), like مَيِّقَنُ for مُيِّقَنُ [686] (MKh); but they convert the Êamma into Kasra, in order that the ُى may be sounded true (IA). The elided, (1) according to S, is the ُء of مَقْوَلُ [703] (SH): (a) S elides the second of the two quiescents, not the first, although the rule is to elide the first, when two quiescents are combined, and the first is a letter of prolongation [663]: (b)
he decides upon this because, seeing that, after the transformation, the ی in the *pass. part.* [of the hollow] belonging to the *cat.* of ی remains extant, as میع، he opines that in it the ی مَفْعُولُ [of مَفْعُولُ] is the [quiescent] elided, and then extends this decision to the hollow belonging to the *cat.* of ی: (c) the process of [avoiding] the concurrence of two quiescents is varied here, according to him, because the word becomes lighter than by elision of the first [quiescent]; and also in order that a distinction may be produced between the two *pass. parts.*, in the *cats.* of ی and ی respectively, which, if the first [quiescent] were elided, would be liable to confusion, one with another: (d) when the ی مَبْعَعُ is elided, the ُ دَامَمَة is pronounced as كَسْرَة, in order that the ی may be preserved, by analogy to the saying of S on such as بیع [710] (R): (2) according to Akh, is the ی: [that is plain in the *cat* of ی (MASH);] while [in the *cat.* of ی (MASH)] the ی مَفْعُولُ is, according to him, converted into ی because of the Kasra [below] (SH) on the letter before it (MASH): (a) as for Akh, he elides the first quiescent in the *cats.* of ی and ی, as is the rule in a concurrence of two quiescents: (b) it being said to him “Then, according to thee, مَبْعَعُ ought to remain: so what is this ی in میع؟”, he said “When the ُ دَامَمَة 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 دامم 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 دامم is converted into Kasra, and the ی converted into ی, for a distinction between the cats. of ی and ی” (R). Each [authority], therefore, contravenes his own rule (SH), ș because he elides the second of the two quiescents; whereas his rule, and that of others, is to elide the first [663]: and Akh because his rule is that the quiescent ی is converted into ی, on account of the preceding letter’s being pronounced with دامم [710], though the ی [so converted] is going to remain; whereas here he converts the دامم 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 یاوج. [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 مَضْوَن preserved]
(A), which (Tsr)], according to S, is مَفْعُول [with ِDamM of the ب , and quiescence of the ع (Sn)]; and, according to Akh, is مَفْعُول (A, Tsr). And the utility of the dispute is displayed in such as مَسَوَء vexed, [orig. مَسْؤُول on the measure of مَفْعُول (Sn),] when alleviated [658] (A), by changing its Hamza into , and then incorporating the ِ of مَفْعُول 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 مَسَوَء , I said “According to the saying of Akh, I say رَأَيْتُ مَسَوَءا I saw a vexed, as you say ِبُ مَقْرَوْرُ for مَقْرَوْرُ [658], because, according to him, the ِ of مَسَوَء [of مَفْعُول] is the ِ of مَفْعُول; but, according to the opinion of S [above], I say حَبِّ رَأَيْتُ مَسَوَءا , as you say حَبِّ [by elision of the Hamza after transfer of its vowel to the ب (Sn)] for حَبِّ [658], the ِ being mobile, because, in his opinion, it is the ع” : and F then said “So it is” (A), i. e., the alleviation of مَسَوَء , because the mobile Hamza, when the [quiescent] ِ before it is a non-co-ordinative aug., is converted into ِ, and has the [preceeding] ِ incorporated into it; but, when the [quiescent] ِ before it is a rad., has its vowel transferred to the ِ, and is elided [658] (Sn). But ِمَشْيِب for ِمَشْوَب mixed, [as
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),] fromشعب, aor. [inf. n. شرب mixing (MAR),] and for منول given, from نال gave, aor. ينول, and لمول blamed, as though formed according to [the pass. (Jh)] was mixed [436, 706], دليل was given, and ليام was blamed, are anomalous; as likewise is مهوب [for مهيب dreaded (Jh), as

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 خيبة dread, as though formed according to [the dial. of those who say in (IY) the pass. (Jh, IY)] [436, 706] (R). The Banu Tamim treat the cat. of ي as sound; [but not the cat. of و, because ي is lighter to them than و (Tsr):] so that they say مبسوط sold and مستور sewn (Aud), as they say مصارب [347]; and that is regular,
according to them (Tsr). A [Tamīmī (MN, Tsr)] poet says, [describing wine (Tsr),]

\[(\text{IY, Aud, A})\]

which As says that he heard IA recite (IY), And it is as though it were a scented apple (MN), by rule \(\text{مِبَّعَة} (\text{Tsr})\), but pronounced according to the o. f. (MN, Tsr); and the poet [Al‘Abbās Ibn Mirdās (MN, Tsr, Jsh) as Sulamī (Jsh)] says

\[\text{قد كان تَوَّمَك يَكَحْسِمُونَك} \quad \text{سَيَدًا} \quad \text{ّيُإِحَالُ أَنَّكَ} \quad \text{مُعِيبٌ} \quad \text{[below]} \quad \text{(Aud, A)}\]

Thy people have been accounting thee to be a chief; but I fancy that thou art a chief smitten by the evil eye (MN, Jsh), by rule \(\text{عَنْتُ الْرَجُل} \quad \text{مَعِينٍ} \quad \text{I smote the man with the evil eye, act. part.} \quad \text{مَعِينً} \quad \text{pass. part.} \quad \text{مُعِيبٌ} \quad \text{according to rule, and} \quad \text{مُعِيبٌ} \quad \text{according to the o. f. (MN, Tsr); and the poet [‘Alkama (IY, MN, Jsh) Ibn ‘Abada (MN, Jsh), describing a male ostrich (Jsh),] says}

\[\text{حَتَّى تَذَكِّرُ بِبَيْضَةٍ} \quad \text{وَهَٰٓيَّةٍ} \quad \text{يَوْمٍ رَدَّاهُ} \quad \text{عَلَيْهِ} \quad \text{الْدِّجُ} \quad \text{مَغْيَمُ} \quad \text{[below]} \quad \text{(M, A)}\]

Until he remembered eggs (belonging to him); and a day of light rain, whereon was cloud covering the sky, overclouded, aroused him, by rule \(\text{مُغِيم} \quad \text{مَعِيبٌ} \quad \text{Mūṣib} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{مُعِيبٌ} \quad \text{165a}
upbraided, like their counterparts in the Kur xxii. 44. [and a palace plastered with gypsum, or raised high (K, B)] and LXXIII. 14. [And the mountains shall be a sand-heap strewn (K, B), and made to run down (K), from inf. n. or a man indebted and overlooked, i.e., that the evil eye has smitten, are anomalous; and hence

[below] I have been told that thy people assert thee to be a chief; but I fancy etc. [above] (D). But the case is not as H says: for have been heard from the Arabs, contrary to rule; while the KF has or He is upbraided, and also or It is sold; and all of this is according to the o.f., so that what H mentions is only from crabbedness. And or is said, as [above] (CD). And they say or food dressed with olive-oil, [the like of] which is frequent (IY). Mb says that the pass. part. in the cat. of may be complete in poetry, citing the saying of 'Alkama
as an instance of that (CD). But this is a Tami-
mī dial. (A). ISh says "The Arabs differ about the
pass. part. in the cat. of ی: for the Banū Tamīm make
it complete, saying مَكِبَّلٌ, مَمْخَيرُطٌ, مَعْمُوبٌ measured, and
مَزِبْرُت; while the inhabitants of the Hijāz say مَعِيبٌ,
مَكِبَّلٌ, مَمْخَيرُط، and مَزِبْرُت [above]. But both parties
agree upon making it defective in the cat. of ی, except
what occurs anomalously, vid. تَوَّبٌ مَضْرُوعٌ [below],
لَفظ مَقُولٍ, خَرَس مَقْوُون, مُمْسَك مَدْرُوف a word said;
where the better-known [form] is مَقُول, مَدْرُوف, مَضْرُوع,
and مَقُولٌ " (CD). Some of the Arabs treat a few pass.
parts. in the cat. of ی, as sound, whence تَوَّب مَضْرُوعَ a
garment preserved, [from صَان, aor. يَضْرَعَ (Tsr); and
مُسْك مَدْرُوف (A, Tsr), i. e., moistened musk (Tsr, Sn)];
and خَرَس مَقْوُون a led horse (Aud, A), from قَانَ, aor. يَفْقُود;
and قَوْل مَقْوُول a saying said, from قَالَ (Tsr); which have
been heard (Aud). And Mb allows completion of مَقْعُول
from [the cat. of ی] وَ, as مَرْيَض مَعْوَدَ a sick man visited;
that, says he, not being heavier than سَرَت inf. n. of سَرُور
I leaped and غُروُر inf. n. of غَار غُروُر [683], because سَرُور
contain two s and two َDammas; whereas مَضْرُوع
[above] contains, with two s, only one َDamma (IY).
But that is not regular, contrary to the opinion of Mb
(A).
§. 710. The opinion of [S (IY),] the author of the
Book [11], in the case of every َّ being a quiescent َ preceding by a letter pronounced with َّم, is that the
َّم is converted into َّس, in order that the َّ may be preserved (M). But Akh differs from him in this rule, and substitutes َّ for the َّ (IY). S converts
the َّم into َّس, in order that the َّ may be preserved; and does not convert the َّ into َّ, because the first [method] involves less alteration [706]. But
Akh reverses the matter, adducing as evidence their agreement upon conversion of the َّ, when a ف, into مُرسَرَمْ,
because of َّم on the preceding letter, as in مُرسَرَمْ [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 َّ is near the end, as in what we
are discussing (R). Therefore, when such [a َّع (IY)]
as [the sing.] ُبرَدْ a kind of striped garment is formed
from [ُبَيْضَة sale and (IY)] ُبَيْضَة whiteness, S says [ُبَيْضَة and (IY)] ُبَيْضَة: but Akh says [ُبَيْضَة and] ُبَيْضَة; and
restricts conversion [of the َّم] to the pl., such as ُبَيْضَة pl. of ُبَيْضَة [686 (case 1, a, γ), 718 (M), where, the pl.
being heavier than the sing. [below], he substitutes
َّس for َّم, in order that the word may not
increase in heaviness (IY). Similarly such [sings.] as
ُنْعَلْ saying and َدِيَكَ cock, according to S, may be َّع or
but Akh differs from him in that, holding that their measure must be [٢٠١٠٢٠١٠٢٠١٠٢٠١٠٢٠١٠٢٠١٠٢٠١٠٢٠١٠٢٠١٠٢] according to the apparent [form] (BS). And مَعْرِشَةٌ [٣٣٣, ٦٨٦], (1) according to S, may be (a) مَفْعُولاً (M), in which case it contains transfer and conversion, transfer of the Damma to the ف, and its conversion into Kasra, 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)] مَعْرِشَةٌ مَفْعُولاً; while, if it were مَعْرِشَةٌ مَفْعُولاً, you would say مَعْرِشَةٌ (M).

But Akh contravenes this rule in such [pass. parts.] as مَيِّبَع [٧٠٩], where the elided, according to him, is the ع of the word, because it is the first of the two quiescents [٦٦٣]: so that [first] the Damma [of the ى in مَيِّبَع and مَيِّبَع] is transferred to the [ع and] ب [respectively], for transformation [٦٩٧, ٧٠٣]; then Kasra 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] ٦, coming immediately after Kasra, is converted into ى [٦٨٥ (case 5)]. Therefore the measure of the word, according to him, becomes مَفْيَلٌ; and this demolishes what he sets up [above] as a rule (IY). And, when a [٦] like تَّرْبَٖ [٢٧٤, ٦٧٨] is formed from تَّرْبَٖ, S says تَّرْبَٖ [٧٠٩, ٧١٢];
but Akh says [712] (M), changing the ֵל into ܒ, because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with ܕ and ܡ ֶסֶר [above] and ܡ ַָּר [686], because Kasra is not substituted [by him] for Damma in what is a sing. [above]. And, but for the saying of the Arabs ܡ ָﬠ ֶﬠ [above], Akh’s rule would be sound, strong; but hearsay furnishes cause for dissatisfaction with his rule (IY). And ܒ ֶﬠ ַﬠ ֶﬠ in the saying [of Abù Jundab alHudhalli (DH, Jh, MN)]

[And I was wont, when my neighbour called me for a matter that was feared, to tuck up my waist-wrapper until it went half-way up the shank (MN), which contains a confirmation of Akh’s opinion, because it conforms to his rule (IY),] is, according to S, [anomalous (IY),] like ֵל ִָﬠ ַﬠ ֶﬠ [684, 703, 711] and ֶﬠ ַﬠ ֶﬠ [685 (case 6, c), 725] (M), by rule ֶﬠ ַﬠ ֶﬠ (IY); but, according to Akh, regular (M). ֵל ַﬠ ֶﬠ ַﬠ ֶﬠ is from ֵל ֶﬠ ֶﬠ ַﬠ ַﬠ ָﬠ [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 ֵל ֶﬠ ַﬠ ֶﬠ ַﬠ, i. e., I feared, or was cautious of, the matter, meaning a matter that one is afraid [or cautious] of: and in it they do
not convert the ּDamma into Kasra, but the ּא into ּו (Jrb). This verse, however, is [said by Skr to be (Jh)] related in three ways, with ּסָמָּתֶה [above], ּמֹסָמָּתֶה, and ּמֹסָמָּתֶה (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 ּבָּקָּב door and ּדָּאָר house [684, 703], שֹּׁקֶרֶת שַׁאָכָּתֶה thorny tree and ּרַגִּל מָּאָל [703], [and the like, which, being of the same formation as the v. (IY),] because on [the measure of] ּוֹעָל ּוֹעָל [with Fath of the ּע], and ּדָּאָר on [the measure of] ּוֹעָל ּוֹעָל [with Fath of the ּע], and ּיָשְׁקָּכָּתֶה [708] and מָּאָל on [that of] ּוֹעָל ּוֹעָל with Kasr of the ּע, have their ּע converted [into ] , because mobile and preceded by a Fatḥa; so that they become among ns. like ּוֹתָל and ּבָּאָג 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 ּוֹתָל and ּבָּאָג , and ּבָּקָּב and
Kar, into a letter, vid. 1, with which one is absolutely safe from a vowel [703]; for which reason 1, according to them, is equivalent to a mobile letter, because it is incapable of receiving a vowel, as the mobile letter is incapable of receiving another vowel (IY). Such [trils.], however, sometimes remain sound, [as though serving to notify the o. f. (IY),] like (1) 
\[\text{\textit{684, 703, and 247, 684 and pl. of 684 acting wrongfully (KF), which belong to the cat. of 684 and 247 (IY)}}\];

(2) \textit{a timid man and 684, 703 (below) (M), which belong to the cat. of 684, 703 and 247 (IY). Their sayings 684, 703 (MAR), and 684 [above] are anomalous; and so are 684, 703 an artful man and 684 [above]. But }\textit{a much much (IY),} and 684, 703 (M) one that upbraids people much, where the formation becomes [a preventive of transformation,] like the augment in 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): [684, 713], [685, 713] (M), [below], and tether, all of which are [treated as] sound because their formation differs from that of vs.: (a) moreover, if we transformed such [ns.] 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 and , since the preceding letter is pronounced with Damm; and at in such as and , since the preceding letter is pronounced with Kasr; contrary to such as and , where we arrive at , a letter with which one is safe from a vowel (IY). They transform [685, 713] only because it is an inf. n., i. q. ; [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 [removal from one place to another, which is a simple substantive (Jh, KF)] in 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. حَالَ, aor. يَحُولُ, you would say حِيْلُ, 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 لِیِّبَلُ inf. n. of لَا[713], and لِّوَالُ inf. n. of ۡلَرَتُ [685 (case 2, b), 699, 711], because of the connection between them (IY): while حَوْلُ inf. n. of حَالَ [685 (case 2, d), 713] is [explained] by Z as anomalous (IY),] like ۡكَوَنُ [above] (M); though the [better] account is what we have premised, [vid. that حَوْلُ is a simple substantive, not an inf. n.,] because it is [then] regular (IY). And ۡنَعِلُ, (1) if from [the cat. of] و , has its ۡعُ made quiescent, because of the combination of two دَامَم and the و , as ۡنُورُ [712, 721] and ۡعُطَانُ, pls. of ۡنَوَّارٌ and ۡعَوَانٌ [246]; but in poetry is uncontracted, [according to the o. f. (IY),] as ذِئَبُ ۡعَمِّيْرَ ۡعَلِّمُ ۡعَلَيْهِ ۡنُكَبُ [246, 712] (M) and ۡعَرَفُ أَلْتَنَاَا ۡعَلِّيْهِ ۡنُكَبُ [246]: (a) the use of the o. f., vid. دَامَم [of the و ], 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 و is pronounced with دَامَم (IY): (2) if from [the cat. of] ۡیِّ , is like the sound: he that says بَيْضُ and رَسَلٌ says غَيْرِ and بَيْضُ in the pl. of غَيْرُ [246, 348] and بَيْضُ [246]; while he that says كَتَبُ and رَسَلٌ says غَيْرِ and بَيْضُ [246] (M), because, being
\( \text{نَعَلُ} \), it is subject to the same [transformation] as the pl. of \( 
abla^{6} \) [686 (case 1, \( \alpha \), \( \gamma \), 718) (IY)].

§. 712. The condition of transformation of the \( \text{ع} \) in the n. [of more than three letters, like \( \text{نَعَلُ} \text{ مَفَعُولٌ} \) (Jrb),] not tril., [like \( \text{بَابٌ} \) and \( \text{نَابٌ} \) (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 \( 
abla^{6} \text{ مَفَعُولٌ} \) (MASH),] or a mode of formation, [like \( 
abla^{6} \text{ نَعَلُ} \) (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 Tanwîn [17]; whereas the tril., even if a proper name, is distinguished from the v. by its Kasra and Tanwîn. By “conformable” [248, 252, 331, 343, 349] IH means (1) the inf. n.; such as \( 
abla^{6} \text{إِقَامَةٌ} \) and \( 
abla^{6} \text{إِسْتِقَامَةٌ} \) [703]: (2) the act. and pass. parts. from the tril. and non-tril. [703, 708, 709, 714]:

(a) they may be said to contain commensurability, \( نَعَلُ \).
being on the measure of ُيَفْعَلُ [343, 703, 714] in respect of vowels and quiescences; and the َمُفْعَلَ in َيَفْعَلُ being contrary to the ḥ. ṣ., which is ُيَفْعَلُ [347, 703, 714]. IH's saying "such as has not been [hitherto] mentioned" is not needed, because, for conversion of the َع into َل [703], every ṣ., whether such as has, or such as has not, been [hitherto] mentioned, must possess the agreement specified [above], in the case of [both] the ṭrīl. [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 َع of the augmented to the preceding quiescent, except in such as ِإِسْتَقَامَةٌ [697, 699, 703], which, notwithstanding [their] lack of the agreement specified, contain transfer and conversion, because of their perfect affinity to their ṣ.; and except in the cat. of ُبَوْآَيْنَعُ [703, 708, 715], which also, notwithstanding [its] lack of agreement, contains conversion, because of [its] extreme heaviness. In the augmented ṭrīl., then, together with commensurability with the ṣ., difference from it in some respect is prescribed, like the aug. letter (1) not used as an aug. in the ṣ., like the َمَقُومُ and ْمَقَامٌ [703]; for in the ḥ. ṣ. [مَقُومٌ and ْمَقَامٌ] they are like ْتَحْمَدُ Thou praisest, and ْتُحْمَدُ Thou art praised, but in the initials of the ṣ. َ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 تَبْعَعُ on the measure of تَفْعَلُ with Kasr of the ت and Fath of the ع; for it is commensurable with [the imp.] إِعْلَمْ Know thou, but in the initial of the v. there is no aug. ت pronounced with Kasr, such [a formation] as تَعْلَمُ being [merely] a dial. var. of some people [below], and withal not being general [even among them, but confined to particular classes of vs.], as before explained [404]. Sometimes the augmented tril. is transformed because of a difference other than the two mentioned, as تَبْعَعُ and بَعْعُ [683 (case 2), 703, 708]: for they are commensurable with تَفْعَلُ [above]; but their aug. is not in the same place as, nor identical with, its aug. (R). Therefore, if from تَبْعَعُ you formed [an augmented tril. n.], (1) like مَضْرِبُ [361] and تَحْلِيلَي [372, 678], you would say تَبْعَعُ مَضْرِبَ and تَبْعَعُ مَضْرِبُ, transformed (SH), because of their agreement with the v. in vowel and quiescence, together with [their] difference [from it] in مَضْرِبَ through the augment م which is not used as an augment in vs.; and in تَبْعَعُ [below] through the Kasr of the ت, since ت, though used as an augment in the v., is not pronounced there with Kasr together with Kasr of the ع [404]: so that no confusion [of the n. with the v.] results from transformation (MASH): (2) like تَضْرِبُ [678], you
would say تَبْعَعُ, 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 and consonants and vowels, shares with the v. [703] in the necessity of transformation by the transfer mentioned, provided that it contain a mark distinguishing it from the v. (A), to avert its being mistaken for the v. (Sn). Two sorts [of augmented tril. n.] are included in that [cat.]:—(1) what agrees with the aor. in its measure, but not in its augment, like مَقَامُ standing-place [above]: for it agrees with the v. in its measure only, [because orig. يَفْعَلُ (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 مُبِيعُ setting upright and مَبِيعُ separating: (b) if from بيع you formed مُفَعَّلة with Fath [of the ع], then you would say مَبَاعَة; if مُفَعَّلة with Kasr, then مَبِيعَة; and if مُفَعَّلة with Damm, then also مَبِيعَة according to the opinion of S, but مَبَاعَة according to the opinion of Akh[710] (A): (a) مَفَعَّلة is transformed on account of its resemblance to the aor. in measure, but not in augment; because the s of femininization,
being virtually separate [266], does not prevent [agreement with] the measure (Sn): (c) such as (M) مَكْرَةٍ Makwaza [4, 716] (M, R), مَزِيدٍ Mazyad, and [below] (M), among (R) proper names (IY, R) of human beings (IY), and مَزِيدٍ [below] (M), a name of a place (IY), and مشْرَة consultation, counsel, مَصْيَدْهُة snare, trap, net, [with Fath of the م (R), as مَفَاكَّهْهُةٍ The game fell into our trap (IY),] and [مَقْرَةٍ, as مَفَاكَّهْهُةٍ الْإِلَى الْآذَى The jest is a means of leading to annoyance, [among ns. not proper names (IY),] are anomalous (M, R), by rule مِكْرَةٍ [Part I, Note on p. 8, l. 1]; مَقْمَال, مَدَان, مَرَام, مَرَان, like مَقْمَال saying [366] and [above]; and مَقْمَال, مَصَادَة, and مَقَادِيح like saying and help (IY): and مَكْرَةٍ II. 97. [591] is read (M), like مشْرَةٍ [above] (K, IY, B), by Katada and Abu-sSimāk, by rule مَكْرَةٍ; while AZ transmits هَذَا شَيْء مَطْبِيْة لِلنَفْس This is a thing giving pleasure to the soul and هَذَا شَرَاب مَبْوَلّ This is a diuretic drink: (d) this in the n. is like أَعْجِبَت الْمَرَأَة and and اسْتَمْهَدْ 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 مَرِيمٌ مَدَّيْن [above] (R, A), if you make them نَعِيب ْمَفَعَلٌ, there is no anomaly, since the ي is co-ordinate [703]; whereas, if you make then مَفَعَلٌ, they are anomalous (R): [but] it has been already mentioned [674] that their measure is نَعِيب ; not مَفَعَلٌ, otherwise transformation [by transfer and then conversion (Sn)] would be necessary; nor نَعِيبٌ, 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 تَحْيَلٌ تَوَلٌ بْيَعُ a n. on the model of تَحْيَلٌ بْيَعُ with Kasr of the ُمُتَحَلَّلِ, in which case you say بْيَعُ تَقيِيلٌ and تَقيِيلٌ بْيَعُ [above] with two Kasras followed by a quiescent َمُتَحَلَّلِ [original in تَقيِيلٌ بْيَعُ, and converted from in تَقيِيلٌ بْيَعُ, the transformation of بْيَعُ بْيَعُ being by transfer only, and of بْيَعُ تَقيِيلٌ by transfer and conversion (Sn)]: (a) when you form from بْيَعُ a n. on the paradigm of تَرْتِب ِتَزْيِعُ, you say, according to the opinion of S, بْيَعُ بْيَعُ with Damm and then Kasr; but, according to the opinion of Akh, تَزْيِعُ [710]: (b) the mark distinguishing this sort [of augmented tril. n.] from the v. is its being on a measure peculiar to the ِتَزْيِعُ, because بْيَعُ بْيَعُ with Kasr, or Damm, of the ُمُتَحَلَّلِ [and َمُتَحَلَّلِ 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 مَدْيَنُ and مَرْيَمُ [above] are not transformed; and, according to him, are not anomalous: nor are تَقْوِيلَ and تَبْيَعُ 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 أَسْوَدُ and أَبْيَضُ [348, 707] (A), which are eps. on the measure of أَحَمَّرُ [249, 372, 671, 672], but resemble [the aor.] أَعْلَمُ I know in measure and augment (Sn); [and are therefore treated as sound,] because, if transformed, they would be fancied to be vs. (A). If the augmented [tril.] n. be not different from the v. in any respect, as أَدُونُ منْكُ أَسْوَدُ أَبْيَضُ [above], أَذْوَرُ مَنْكُ lower than thou and أَدْبَعُ إِبْيَعُ [707], أَبْيَعُ [above] on the measure of أَضْبَعُ [372], and أَذْوَرُ تَبْيَعُ [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)] [242] أَغْيِنَ and أَغْيِنَ [M, SH], p.l.s. of دَارَ and عَجَنَ (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 إِمَارَة making to turn round and إِعانَة reaching a spring in digging for water, if they were transformed by conversion of the and ا ك into ٰ, 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 دَار turned round and عَان [683 (case 2)], if أدُرُز and أَعِينُ were said (MASH): or (2) because not conformable [above] (SH) to the v. (Jrb, MASH), which is obvious (Jrb); nor different (SH) from it [MASH] in the prescribed mode, which means that, though their agreement with the v. [in measure] is realized, still the condition of its being taken into consideration is that they should be different from the v. in some respect, while in default of such difference the condition of transformation is missing (Jrb). And أَعِينْهُ (M, R) and أَصْرَنَّهُ (R), pls. of جَخَوَنَ [713] and قَصَوْنَاَ [685, 713] (MAR), and أَعِينَة (M), pl. of عَيْبَانَ [246] (KF), where, though the ٰ at the beginning, makes them different from the v., transfer is not employed, because the ٰ, though necessary here [265], is constitutionally separable [266]; so that, being here like the ٰ in أَسْرُدُهُ fem. of أَسْرَدَهُ serpent [685 (case 7, d)], it is [virtually] non-existent. Nor is transfer employed in such as أَعِينَا and أَعِينَة [251, 714], because the [prolonged] ٰ of feminization,
being inseparable and like part of the word, excludes them from commensurability with the v., as the [abbreviated] ahkan ḫādī ẓawrī, and the ḥ and in ḥyālan ẓiyān [684 (condition 11, a, d), 703]. Some of the Arabs transfer the Kasra of the ʿābīnāʾ, saying ʿābīnāʾ [714], not because of resemblance to the v., otherwise they would also transfer [the Kasra of the ʿāhūnāʾ]; but because of dislike to Kasra on ʿāhūnāʾ, they being similars [697]; as the [second] Damma is elided in ʿnūr [for ʿnūr] pl. of ʿnawār [246, 711, 721], because Damma on ʿnūr is deemed heavy: so that such as ʿābīnāʾ exclusively, notwithstanding the lack of the commensurability mentioned, is transformed by transfer because of the extreme heaviness. But [even] in such as ʿābīnāʾ non-transformation is more frequent: nay, transfer is anomalous, contrary to ʿnūr [above], where quiescence is more frequent, because pronounced with Damm is heavier than ʿāhūnāʾ pronounced with Kasr; so that the ʿāhūnāʾ and Damma in ʿāhūnāʾ [246, 711] are anomalous (R). As for such as ʿyāzīd Yazīd [4, 18], when a proper name, [which resembles the aor. in measure and augment (Sn),] it was transformed when a v., and afterwards transferred to the cat. of proper name (A, MASH). And [similarly (MASH)] ʿābān Abān (R, MASH),
when a proper name, if said to be ḥāfiz (MASH), according to those who decline it as a diptote, is transferred from a transformed v. (R); whereas, if said to be ḥāfiz, [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 ẓābāt 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 ẓābāt 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 ẓābāt ought to be transformed, because its augment is peculiar to دت.; while it resembles ẓālum [404], i. e., with Kasr of the aoristic letter in the dial. of some people [above]: but that it is made to accord with ẓābāt 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 ẓālil [above] would not be transformed, because it resembles ẓālil [with Kasr of the ث (Sn)] in its measure and augment (A); while the reply that Kasr of the أ in ẓālil [482] is anomalous is effective only in ẓālil exclusively, not
in other aor. vs. regularly pronounced with Kasr of the 
\( \text{ع} \), like 
\( \text{تَعَْفُ} \), 
\( \text{تَضْرََبُ} \), and 
\( \text{تَجْلََسُ} \), with which, according 
to the dial. of those who pronounce the aoristic letter 
with Kasr, 
\( \text{تَكَْلََيُ} \) is commensurable without any anomaly 
in respect of Kasr of the 
\( \text{ع} \) (Sn). And moreover, if it 
were admitted that transformation was obligatory because 
of what they mention [about the resemblance of 
\( \text{مَخْيَط} \) to 
\( \text{تَعَْمُ}\)], it would not be obligatory upon all [of the 
Arabs (Sn)], but only upon those who pronounce the 
aoristic letter with Kasr. IM indicates this second 
[sort], [which differs from the aor. in measure and 
augment, like 
\( \text{مَخْيَط} \) (Sn),] by his saying "But 
\( 
\text{مَفَعُوَل} \) is 
treated as sound, like 
\( 
\text{مَفَعَال} \) ", meaning that 
\( 
\text{مَفَعُول} \) being 
different from the 
\( \text{v} \), i. e., not resembling it in measure 
or augment, is entitled to be treated as sound, like 
\( 
\text{مَسْوَأَن} \) 
\( \text{tooth-stick} \) and 
\( 
\text{مُكََيََل} \) 
\( \text{corn-measure} \); and that 
\( 
\text{مَفَعُول} \) is 
made to accord with it in being treated as sound, because 
resembling it in sense, like 
\( 
\text{مَقُول} \) [252] and 
\( 
\text{مَقُول} \) 
\( \text{loquacious, eloquent} \) [714]. 
\( 
\text{مَخْيَط} \) and 
\( 
\text{مَخْيَط} \) [above] (A). By 
analogy, such as 
\( 
\text{مَقُول} \) and 
\( 
\text{مَقُول} \) should be transformed, 
since they are on the measure of 
\( 
\text{إْلَم} \) [above]: but \( 
\text{كُل} \) 
says that they are not transformed, because contracted 
from 
\( 
\text{مَفَعَال} \), which is incommensurable with the 
\( \text{v} \); the
proof that \( מִשְׁחִית \) is the o. f. of \( מִשְׁחִית \) being that they are often associated, as \( מִשְׁחִית \) and \( מִשְׁחִית \) [366], \( מִשְׁחִית \) and \( מִשְׁחִית \) adz (R). The obvious [conclusion], however, is what I have mentioned before, vid. that the cause of \( מִשְׁחִית \)'s being treated as sound is that it differs from the v. in measure and augment, because, being contracted from \( מִשְׁחִית \) [366], it is [identical with] the latter; not that it is made to accord with \( מִשְׁחִית \); and many etymologists are of this opinion (A). And such as \( חָדַרְל \) [369], \( חָרַע \) [374], and \( עֲלִיּ \) [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 \( מִשְׁחִית \) [272, 375, 673], does not spoil the measure; while elision of the final consonant, on account of Tanwin [643, 683], as in \( מִשְׁחִית \), is like no elision, because Tanwin is not inseparable from the word [609, 731 (condition 1, f, b, \( \alpha \))]: (a) \( עֲלִיּ \) [374], according to Akh, is co-ordinated with \( גְּדָב \) [392]:
and, according to S also, is due to co-ordination, like سَرِّدُ [331, 718]; although فَعَلْلُ [392], according to him, does not occur (R): or (2) because of pure quiescence (SH), since the quiescence before the unsound letter is permanent; and in that case the preceding letter is neither pronounced, nor virtually pronounced, with Fath [703] (Jrb): (a) this is the true excuse, not the first, because ِ and ى preceded by a quiescent are converted into ِ only on account of that quiescent’s being pronounced with Fath in the o. f. of that word [703]; whereas, in what we are discussing, no vowel exists in the o. f. (R).

§. 713. The mobile ِ preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr ought not to be converted into ى, except at the end of the word [301, 721], like رَأَيْتُ أَلْغَارِي I saw the raider [16, 685 (case 1), 720, 724], as the mobile ى preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm is not converted into ِ [even at the end], like الْثَّرَامِي competition in shooting, [orig. عَيَامُ أَلْثَرَامِي (MAR)], ٦٨٦ (case 1, α, α), ٧١٤, ٧٢٤], and عَيِّبَة [703, ٧١١, ٧٢٤], because Kasra’s requirement of ى after it is like Damma’s requirement of ِ after it; while, the ِ and ى being strengthened by the vowel, the Kasra and Damma, respectively, of the letter before them are not powerful enough to convert them. And, when they are doubled [716], they are
still stronger, as إِحْلَوْاٰ [332, 685 (case 5, b), 716] and إِحْلَاٰدَعٰ [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 ی, vid. conformity to another [word], as ُقِيَّامُ inf. n. of ُقَانَمٌ [below]. That does not occur in the non-final mobile ی preceded by a letter pronounced with ِذَمَم which therefore remains in its o. f. (R). The ی [mentioned, then (R)], preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is converted into ی in [three things (R),] (1) such inf. ns. as ُقِيَّامٌ [685 (case 2), 699, 724], ُقِيَّامٌ [inf. n. of ُعَانَ sought protection (R)], ُقِيَّامٌ [685 (case 2, d, a), 711], [and ُقِيَّامٌ inf. n. of ُعَتَمَّ led, attracted (R),] because their vs. are transformed (SH): (a) we do not mean that the v. is transformed in this way; but in some way, as the ی in ٓعِيَادَ is converted into ی because ُعَانَ is transformed by conversion of the ی into ی; (b) if it be said "How is it that such [an inf. n.] as ُعِيَادَ is, and such as ُطَيْبُرَانٌ [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 ُعِيَادَ,
it is so in "تخیران؟", I say that Kasra's demand for conversion of after it into ى is stronger than Fatha's demand for conversion of ى and ى after it into ى, since such as بيع قول and بيع قول are frequent, while such as بيع قول is rare, and such as قول with Kasra of the ى and quiescence of the ى 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 ى into ى, because of the preceding letter's being pronounced with Kasr, since the incentive to such conversion is strong (R): (c) جول inf. n. of حال [685 (case 2, d), 711] is [anomalous (R, Jrb),] like قول [703, 711] (SH), the regular form being جبل (Jrb); contrary to the inf. n. of such as لازم [685 (case 2, b), 699] (SH) and قول [698], which have لوان and قول (Jrb), because [the ى, in (Jrb)] the v. is [treated as (R)] sound (R, Jrb), whence الذين يتسَللون منكم ليودا; whereas, if the v. were لدا took refuge, لبادا would be said [711] (Jrb): (d) [the ى, of] such as عوض [684, 711] is not converted, because it is not an inf. n.; while in VI. 162. [368, 711] is orig. an inf. n. (R): (2) such [pl. (R, Jrb)] as چیاون and دیار [685 (case 3, a, and b, d],
\( \alpha ), 724 [\text{below}], \text{because}[\text{the } \varepsilon \text{ of } (R)] \text{the sing. is transformed } (SH) \text{by its conversion into } (a) \text{ } \alpha \text{ time, pl. } [238]; (b) \text{, as in } \text{Tārā' \text{ of } } \text{ below, } \text{pl. } [238, 278, 685 (case 3, a)], \text{and } \text{Rīḥ } \text{, pl. } [238] (R): (a) \text{the proof that the } \text{ of } \text{ is } [\text{orig.}] \text{, is their saying } I \text{returned to him time after time and } \text{The people return time after time;} \text{and } [\text{also}] \text{what } \text{ mentions, vid. that the } \text{ is substituted for } \text{, its derivation being from } \text{, which is a messenger between people: but the } [\text{opinion}] \text{ mentioned in the Jh is that it belongs to the } [\text{cat. of }] \text{ below} \text{, similarly } \text{ is } \text{, because it is from } \text{ continued, aor. } \text{ : this is mentioned by one of the learned in his commentary on the Taṣrif of IM;} \text{and is implied by the words of IH and Z : but the } [\text{opinion}] \text{ mentioned in the Jh is what we have stated in the chapter on the Plural (Jrb), [vid. that] it belongs to the } [\text{cat. of }] \text{, because of their saying } \text{ The sky rained continually, inf. n. } \text{ : so he mentions in the Jh; whereas the truth is that it belongs to the } [\text{cat. of }] \text{(Jrb on the Plural): (c) } [\text{pl. of } \text{ (R)} \text{ in } \text{b, d, } \alpha ] \text{ (SH), by rule (Jrb), since [the } \varepsilon \text{ of } (R)] \text{ its sing. is not transformed } (R, Jrb); \text{and by usage also, since}
the most frequent [form] is ُطُوُالٌ (Jrb): (d) ُرُوْاٰ [685 (case 3, b, d, b)], pl. of ُرُبَّانٌ; [notwithstanding that its sing. is transformed in the َع (R),] is [treated as] sound, [like ُعُوُي (R),] from dislike to [the combination of (Jrb)] two transformations [728]: and [so is (R, Jrb)] ُنَوْى pl. of َنَوْى (SH), i. e., fat [camel (Jrb, MAR), from ُنَوْى meaning distance; though it is regular (Jrb)], because the َع of its sing. is not transformed (R, Jrb); while even if it were transformed, still transformation of the pl. would not be allowable, because two transformations would be combined (R): (3) such [pl. (R)] as ُرِيَاضٌ [685 (case 3, b), 724], ُثِيَابٍ [242, 279, 724] (SH), and ُحِيَاضٍ [242, 685] (R), because the , is quiescent in the sing., and followed by an َل [in the pl.]; contrary to ُعُرَّدَة [685 (case 3, b, c), 711] and ُكُرْرَة, [because the َل is missing (Jrb)]: whereas ُثِيَرَة [685, 724] is anomalous (SH), by rule ُثِيَرَة [below], because the َل is missing; but, like ُإِسْتَخْوَدَة [703, 707], it is anomalous [only] by rule, not by usage (Jrb): (a) this is the weakest of the three things; and therefore needs another condition, vid. that the , occurring after Kasra should be followed by َل; because the , of the sing. is not transformed, but [merely] contains a quasi-transformation, vid. its quiescence, which makes it dead, so that it is, as it were,
transformed: (b) the condition mentioned is effective because between Kasra and ı is like a combination of three unsound letters [697]; so that the heaviest of them, i. e., the ı, is converted into what is homogeneous with the preceding vowel, vid. ı: (c) although this condition is not prescribed for the two first [things], as in [the inf. n.] 9 3iyim [above], and [the pl.] 9 3im [below] and 9 3im [above], still it strengthens them; and therefore 3umul [above], though an inf. n. of a transformed ı, may be treated as sound: (d) 9 3im, together with 9 3im [above], is allowable, for conformity with 9 3mran [685 (case 3, b, c, 8)]; (e) 9 3m [712] and 9 3m [685 (case 5)] are [treated as] sound, because they are not pl. (R). But [Jh says that] 9 3im [238] is contracted from 9 3i2ar; and is [so] altered only on account of the unsound letter, [which he holds to be ı (above)]; while, but for that, it would not be altered, since they say ırab, and not ırab, as pl. of ırab [238, 254] (Jh).

§. 714. The [augmented tril.] n., when not like ı and ı estqama [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 ı is quiescent (M); so that, if the, and ı were made quiescent, two quiescents would
concur, and elision or mobilization [of one of them] would be necessary, in which case the formation would be obliterated (IY). That \([n. (IY)]\) is [of three kinds, being treated as sound because of the quiescence of (IY)] (1) [the letter before the \(ع\), like (IY)] [experienced (IY)] and [expérience (IY)] [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 [رجل خيَّار من قوم] خيَّار, A good man, come of good people (IY)] : (3) the letter before, and the letter after, the \(ع\), like (IY) [ophthalmia and great seller (IY)]; and [place where beasts are exhibited and copious, excellent, in speech (IY)]; and [فعَّال and (IY)] [تَفَعَّال [Tawwal \(تَفَعَّل\)] from جَوَّلَ and I said much, like [332, 334], denoting multiplication: (a) the preventive of transformation here is the unsound letter's being enclosed by two quiescents [below]; so that, if it were converted
into ٍ, 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 أَبْيَنَىٰ، أَيْبَنَىٰ، however, the ى 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], أَصِبَ being like ٌيَأَهِرَنَ. I should strike; while the ٍ 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 ى, as حَمَّامٌ and حُنْفِسَاٰٰ from حَمْرَآٰٰ and حُنْفِسَاٰٰ [274, 282, 283]: although they do say أَعْبَىٰ and أَعْبَىٰ for أَعْبَىٰٰ [728] and أَعْبَىٰٰ [712], the Kasra of the ى being thrown upon the preceding [quiescent] letter. As for إِسْتَقَامَةٌ and إِسْتَقَامَةٌ [699, 763], we transform them, as we transform their vs., because إِفْعَلٌ and إِفْعَلٌ are as inseparable from [the inf. ns. of] أَفْعَلٌ and أَفْعَلٌ [332] as يَفْعَلٌ and يَفْعَلٌ 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

\[ \text{وُؤُول} \], like \( \text{غُرُور} \) [above], is (IY). Such [ns.] as \( \text{kُوَل} \) gift and \( \text{sُبِل} \) a species of mimosa or acacia, [above],

\[ \text{ذَيْل} \] and [348, 684, 685] and \( \text{تْقُولُ} \) eloquent [730. A], and [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 \( \text{كُنْنُ} \) and [708]: but this is reputed by [the fact] that transformation is proper if its cause be existing, as in the \text{exs.} mentioned (R). \( \text{تْقُولُ} \) and [though \text{inf. ns.} of transformed vs. (R, MASH), i. e., تَلَ السَّارِ said and سَارِ journeyed (MASH),] are [treated as] sound, because of ambiguity [above] (SH); and are not made to conform to their vs., as \( \text{فَأَمَّا} \) and [703, 712], lest, after transformation, they be mistaken for [below] (R). The generality of Commentators say that, if the \( \text{غ} \) here were converted into \( \text{ل} \), after mobilization of the \( \text{ف} \), two \( \text{l} \) s would be combined; and, after elision of one of them, سَارِ and تَقُولُ would remain, which might be mistaken for the pass. of تَقُولُ and تَقَسِّمُ: but this is [unsatisfactory,] as you see, since the \( \text{ت} \) 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 ب being fancied to be rad. (MASH). This [suggestion of ambiguity as the cause] is the saying of IH (R): but [R says that (MASH)] the [true] reason is what has been mentioned before, vid. that the غ 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 سقاء and إستقمامة [699, 703]; whereas مقول and تسيار are not so (R, MASH). And مقال [above] and بخیاط [366, 712], (1) because of ambiguity (SH), since, if they were transformed, بقال and بخاط would be said; so that one would not know whether they were مفعل or مفعل (Jrb): (a) IH means that, being instrumental ns. [366] conformable to the v. [331], they would [naturally] be treated, as regards transformation, in the same way as the v. [703]; but that they are not transformed, because they might be mistaken for مفعل 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 ʿ after the ʿação: (3) because the unsound letter here is enclosed by two quiescents [above]: while that necessitates sounding [it] true [even] in the v., as ʾsawād [707]; and a fortiori, therefore, in the n. (Jrb). And [252, 712] and مَخْيَطٍ [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 إَحْمَدٌ Praise thou and إِذْهَبَ [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 مَفْعَالُ, they are treated like their o. f.: or we may say that, though they are not derivs., but o. fs., مَفْعَالُ is made to conform, in omission of transformation, to مَفْعَالُ, because syn. with it; and this is more appropriate, since agreement of مَفْعَالُ with مَفْعَالُ in meaning does not prove it to be a deriv. thereof (R). But such [pass. parts. (Jrb)] as مَقَوْمٌ ʿمَقَوْمٍ undertaken (Jrb)] and مَبْعَعٍ are transformed by another [process] (SH), not by conversion of their ʿ into ʿ (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 مَبْعَعٍ and مَقَوْمٌ would be said, for conformity with ʿa. ʿa. and ʿa.; but by quiescence 169a
of their UTION, and transfer of its vowel (Jrb), because of ambiguity (SH), since, if 697, 703, 709 were said, no one would know whether they were 697, 703, 712 (MASH). And such [formations] as 703, 712 (MASH), notwithstanding the unsound letter's being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath (MASH), are [treated as] sound (Jrb), (1) because [after conversion of the unsound letter into 1, two quiescents would be combined, the first of them an 1: so that, if the second were mobilized, and and 246 [above], and 5 were said (MASH), they might be mistaken for 246; or [if the first were elided, and and 246 remained, they might be mistaken (MASH)] for 246 (SH), with the UTION mobile in 246, and quiescent in the two last: while, if the second quiescent were elided, then 246, and 246 would remain, which might be mistaken for 246 mobile in the UTION; or for the pret. of 246 was liberal, aor. 246 was long, aor. 246 was jealous, aor. 246 (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 אֶלֶף and יִפָּעֵל", respectively, ["of its v." (M on §§. 343, 347)]; and, in explanation of the assimilate ep., that it is "not [one of the eps. (M on §. 348)] conformable" to the v. (Jrb): and (b) do not agree with it (SH) in vowel and quiescence [712], which is obvious (Jrb). But the truth is that they are not transformed because they do not belong to the sorts of n. mentioned by us [703] as transformed (R).

§. 715. When the ת of [the pl. belonging to] the cat. of מָסָגַד [18, 256] is enclosed by two unsound letters, the second is converted into ת, because of (1) its nearness to the end (R) of the word, for which reason it is assimilated to the ת [246, 683 (case 1, k, b)], as they say סַמָּי [below], treating it like עַעַי [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 ת, which is so faint that [for כְּרוּל] you seem to say כְּרוּל (S). And afterwards the second ["I"] is converted into Hamza, as in קְאָלָתֵל and בַּאֲנֵה [683 (case 2), 708], whether each of the two [enclosing letters] be a ו, as in כְּרָעָל [357, 683 (case 4, b), 708, 726] (R), or a י, as in בַּאֲנֵה pl. of בַּאֲנֵה seller,
chafferer [730. A.]: or the first be a ِ، and the second
a ِ، as in ِْبَطَّرَعُ pl. of ِْبَطَّرَعُ [on the measure of]
from ِْبُجَعُ; or the converse, as in ِْعَايَلُ pl. of *below*,
orig. ِْعُيُلُ, because from ِْعَلُ [had many dependents
to support (MAR)], aor. ِْعُولُ (R), inf. n. ِْعُولُ (MAR).
And, as for ِْصِيْبَنُن، [by rule ِْصِيْبَنُn with Hamza (R),] it
it anomalous (R, A) in the pl., as [ِْصِيْبَنُn is] in the sing.
[685 (case 7, c, b, َِّ، and d, َِّ)] (R): but, since the ِ،
is sounded true in the sing., it is sounded true in the pl.;
so that they say ِْصِيْبَنُn, as they say ِْصِيْبَنُn, by rule ِْصِيْبَنُn
[685, 716] (A). That [conformity of the pl. to the sing.
in lack of alteration] is, however, not universal, since:
you say ِْبَنَْتُ َلِبُن، [veins in the heart, whence comes-
tenderness (Jh, MAR)], with dissolution of incorpor-
ation, 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

ثَأْنِيُ لَهُ كَذَاَلِكْ بَنَاَتْ لِبْنِي

My heart-strings forbid, or My tenderness forbids, that
for him (Jh, MAR)]; and, in the pl. [256], ِْبَنَْتُ َلِبُن،
incorporated (R): though it is stated in the Sahâh that
(MAR), in the pl. and dim. of َلِبُن, you say َلِبُن and
َلِبُن, 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 شَايَلْدٌ is not to be taken as a precedent (A) for sounding the ، true, whenever a pl. is found resembling it in soundness of [the ، in] the sing.; though some people make a precedent of it: so in [the commentary of] IUK (Sn). Out of all those [four cases] the [only one actually] heard is where the ] of the pl. is enclosed by two ، s; while S constructs the remaining three by analogy to it, because two ا s, or ، and ا ، are deemed heavy like two ، s (R). What is mentioned [in §. 683 (case 4)] as to there being no difference, in the two soft letters, between two ، s, two ا s, and ، and ا ، 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 ، s: and (Tsr)] that [by analogy (R)] there is no Hamza in the case of two ا s, or of ، and ا [716] (R, Tsr), because their combination is not like that of two ، s [in degree of heaviness] (R); so that you say صِاَيَدٌ، سَيَارُدٌ، and صِاَيَدٌ، according to the o.f. (Tsr); while بَوَأَتْ [247] is pronounced with Hamza only because it is pl. of what has its ك converted into Hamza [708], [an argument which applies equally to صِاَيَدٌ]. Therefore, when you form the act. part. from حَيِّي [697, 728] and شَرَى roasted, saying حَيِّي with حَيِّي [685 (case 10, b, a)], like تَفَّيْصٍ [16], you say,
in its pl. for irrational objects \([247]\), (1) according to \(S\), حَوَابَة and شَوْابَة \([726]\), because the \(l\) of the pl. occurs between \(\imath\) and \(\imath\) in the pl. of حَائِي, and between two \(\imath\)s in the pl. of شَارِ : (a) you do not make the pl. of شَا روَي́d to imitate its sing., as you do in the pl. of إِدَارة \([281]\), since, if you did, you would say شَوَواَي [726], which would be a flight [back] to what has been fled from : (2) according to the opinion of Akh, حَوَابَي with \(\imath\) : (a) as for شَوْابَي, there is no dispute about it, because of the combination of two \(\imath\)s (R). Akh’s doubt is that the substitution in the case of two \(\imath\)s is only because of their heaviness; while there is a precedent for that, vid. [in] the combination of two \(\imath\)s at the beginning of the word \([683, 699]\); whereas, when two \(\imath\)s, or \(\imath\)s, and \(\imath\), are combined at the beginning of the word, there is no [substitution of] Hamza, as يِبْين and يِبْيَم [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] كَسْآ and كُسْآ \([683\) (case 1), 723\], because of its resemblance to the latter in respect of its nearness to the end; while in كَسْآ and كُسْآ there is no difference between \(\imath\) and \(\imath\), and so therefore here : (2) hearsay, because AZ transmits سَيَائِقُ with Hamza, as pl. of
stalking-animal, which is ُقِبْعَةٌ from drove, aor. يَسْوَقُ; and Jh transmits ُجَبَآئِدُ [and ُسِيَآئِدُ (Jh)] with Hamza, as pl. of ُجَبِيدُ (Tsr) and ُسِيِيدُ (Jh). Mz says "I asked As how the Arabs form the broken pl. of *عَبَلُ [below], and he said 'They pronounce with Hamza, as in the case of two ُسَ'"; 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 ُس, as in ُطَوَريِسُ [708]; or both ُى ُس, as in ُبَيْلٍعُ pl. of ُقِيْمَمُ [714, 730. A.]; or different, as in ُقِيْمَمُ pl. of ُبَيْعُ [384, 716], and ُبَوَيْمُ pl. of ُبَيْعُ [685 (case 7), 716] on the measure of ُتُرَابُ [377], from ُبَعُ, if you give these [broken] pls. to the ns. mentioned [252]. As for ُعُوَرُ [252] pl. of ُعَوَارُ [714] meaning mote, as ُكَتَبَ ِالْعِينِينِ بِالْعَوَارِ [253], [the ُ in (MAR)] it is [sounded true (MAR)] because its o. f. is ُعَوَرُ, the ُى being elided because sufficiently represented by the Kasra: while ُعَيْنِيِلُ, as ُفِيُهَا ُعَيْنِيِلُ أُسْوَدُ ُنِمْرُ [237], is [pronounced] with Hamza because its o. f. is ُعَيْنِيِلُ, the Kasra being impleted (R), since it is pl. of
(1542)

Jo[^T] (R, Aud, A), with Kasr of the ى (Aud), like َعَبْلُ [708] (B, Aud, A), having thus two pl. َعَبْلُ and َعَبْلَُ (Sn); for] Sgh says "The sing. of َعَبْلُ is َعِبَّالُ, pl. َعِبَّالُ, like َخَيْبَانُ, pl. َخَيْبَانْلِ, pl. َخَيْبَانُلْ (A): so that in both pl. َعِبَّالُ the o. f. is observed (R). And hence the transformation of صِيمُ [above] and قَيمُ [247], [by conversion of the ٰ into ى (IY)], because of [its (IY)] nearness to the end; [contrasted] with the treatment of صَوَامُ and تُوَامُ [384] as sound, [when the unsound letter is far from the end (IY);] while فَلَكُن مَن صَيْاَةَ تَوَمْه [Such a one is of the choice, or best, set of his people, transmitted by Fr (IY),] and َفَمَا أُرْقَ الْتُّيْمَ الْمَحْجُ [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 ٰ by two unsound letters] occur in the non-pl., then also S converts the second into ٰ, and afterwards into Hamza; while Akh and Zj do not alter it [683 (case 4, b)] (R).

§. 716. The ُ, whether [it be (MASH)] an ى, or a ل [722], or anything else, [i. e., an aug., like the ُ of مَفْعُولٌ and the ُ of the pl. (MASH),] when it is combined with ى, and the first [of them, whichever it be (MASH),] is quiescent [below], is converted into ى; 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) سیَّد [251, 747] (SH) and میت (Jrb), orig. سَید (MASH) and میت (Jh), on the measure of (MASH) and میت (Jh), on the measure of [685 (case 7, a, a), 703] (Jrb): (b) یَام [747] (SH), orig. یَام (R, Jrb): (c) دیَار [322, 499] (SH), orig. دِیار, being from I went round (Jrb); and (d) یَام [384, 715] (SH), orig. یَام (R), being (R, Jrb) from یَام, aor. یَام (Jrb): whereas, if یَام and (Jrb) were [on the measure of (Jrb)] فعال, then [دوار and (Jrb)] قرام would be said (R, Jrb), because they are from [vs. whose ی is], (Jrb): (d) یَام [377] (SH), orig. یَام, being فعال (R, Jrb) from یَام [713] (Jrb); whereas, if it were [on the measure of (Jrb)] فعال, then یَام would be said (R, Jrb): (e) یَام [278, 302, 685 (case 7, a, b)] (SH), orig. یَام, inf. n. of یَام (Jrb): (2) [when the ی is a ل (R),] دلیَّه (SH), orig. دلیَّه (R, Jrb), because dim. of دَلُو bucket [280], the ی being put because دَلُو is masc. and fem. [282] (Jrb): (3) [when the ی is anything else (R),] (a) مَرَمی [294, 347] (SH), orig. مَرمی (Jrb), the ی, being the مَرمی (R), because it is مَرمی from مَرمی; (b) مَرمی [685 (case 7), 728, 730], when a nom. (SH), orig. مَرمی 170a
(Jrb), the ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ of the pl. (R): (a) IH says "when a non." [above], because ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ and ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ are not combined in ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ when an acc. or gen. [129]: (b) ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ and ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ, 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 ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ and ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ are not so approximate in outlet [732] that one should be incorporated into the other, as in ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ and ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ 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 ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ and ُبـُلـِيْبـِيْ 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 Kulthûm atTaghlabî (EM)]

ترجمة البَخْنَة عَلَيْهِ مَقْلَدَة اِعْتِتَّهَا صُفوَّا

after

سَيْدٌ مُعْشِرٌ ۡلَدَ تَوْجُوهَ ۡلَتَّمْلُك يَحْبِي الْمَجِيجِرَّانُ (IY) And (many) a chief of a clan, whom they have crowned with the diadem of sovereignty, who defends the refugees, have we left (our) horses biding over, having their reins hung upon them, standing upon three legs and the point of the toe of the fourth! (EM). And
incorporative alleviation is encouraged in their case by the fact that their first is quiescent [above]; for the condition of incorporation is quiescence of the first [731]. Although the rule, in incorporating two approximates, is to convert the first into the second [735], the, whether it precede or follow, is converted into ى, in order that the intended alleviation may be realized, because ى and ى are not heavier than double ى [715]. You do not incorporate, however, in (1) سُویِّر (685 (case 7, b, b, 3), 730] and تُبِّریغ (a) because, says Khl, the, is not inseparable; but its predicament is that of the ى, for which it is a subst., since their o. f. is سَابِر and [703]; and therefore, as ى, which is the o. f. of this ى, is not incorporated into anything [739], so likewise the, which is a subst. for it: (a) for the same reason you do not incorporate in such as تَفْعِيل ىلُع [730, 731] and سُویِّر (b) because, if you did incorporate in such as تُبِّریغ سُویِّر and نَفْعِل ىلُع, they might be mistaken for فَعَل and نَفْعِل: (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 تَفْعِيل ىلُع and قَالُوا وأَقْبَلُوا XII 71. They said (and came forward) and فِى يَوْم XII 21. On a day [731]; not in a single word, as مَغْزَر ىلُع [301, 685 (case 8, b), 722], and مَرْطَى.
such as [332, 685] and [685, 713], because the conversion [of the first into ی] supervenes irregularly; and ceases in the pl. and dim. of ایلیواد and دواین [685], while for ایلیواد you more often say [332, 685 (case 5, b), 713]: (a) if دیوان [377], conversion of the ی into ی and incorporation of the [first] ی [into it] would be necessary, as in ایام [above]; but it is فعال [384], the [first] ی being irregularly converted into ی, as in قیراط, pl. [278, 332, 685]: ژریا (3) [685 (case 7, b, b, b)], when you alleviate ژریا and ژریا زریة by converting the Hamza into ی [658]. Some of the Arabs convert [this ی into ی], and incorporate [it into the second ی], saying ژریا and زریة [685 (case 7, c, a), 702]. That is nowise allowable in سییر and بیع [above], because confusion with the conj. of نعَل would be produced, contrary to such as ژریا and زریة [above]. But, by analogy to it, some of the GG say قَى in lightening قَى [685 (case 7, b, b, γ)] (R). As for حیَّة [685, 715], حیَّة [689, 698] is converted into، in the proper name
exclusively, because proper names are often altered to a form different from that which the word must assume, like [4, 712], for a notification of their exclusion from their original application; but, according to Mz, the of حَيْرَةُ is original, as we mentioned in the case of حَيْرَانُ [698] (R). The Damma is changed into Kasra in مُسْلِمِيَّ and مُرْمَيَّ [above], lest a quiescent ی preceded by Damma should occur (Jrb). But ی with Kasr and Damm 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 زْرَیةٌ [above] and نَرْی trench dug round a tent, to keep out rain-water [by converting the Hamza into ی ], and [then convert this ی into ی , and] incorporate [it into the second ی ], Damm and Kasr are allowable [in زْرَیةٌ and زْنَیّ ], as in ی [above]: and so, when you form فُعَّلُ from یآیتُ I promised [699], and alleviate the Hamza by conversion [into ی ], you say یُرَی ; and similarly شُی for صَیمِّ from شِرَتُ I roasted (R). But صَیمِّ and قَیمُ [Qīm] and ی on §. 715),] are anomalous [247, 685 (case 10), 715, 722] (SH), because they convert the ی into ی notwithstanding the lack of motive (Jrb). IH means
that the property of  is to be converted into  when it is combined with , and the first of them is quiescent [above]: whereas here two  s are combined, the first of which is quiescent; and are then converted into , which [conversion] is therefore anomalous. Such anomalies, however, should rather be mentioned after the section on  and  [722]; for double  [713], though approximate to a sound letter, is still converted into  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 , 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  [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  before the  [715], then the unsound letter (Jrb), [whether], or  (R), occurring after the  (R, Jrb) of the [ultimate] pl. [18, 256] (R), (1) if rad., as in  and  [246, 279, 683 (case 3, e, b), 708, 714], remains [unaltered]; (2) if
aug., as in ضَحْكَانُثِق، رَسَامْلُ [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 مَقَاوِمُ [above] and مَرَابِبُ, or aug., as in جَدْوَلُ [253, 374, 708], [pl. جَدْوَلٌ and جَمَال،] 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 دُخُنَةٌ جَمَالُ [661, 708], and رَسَامْلُ [above] (R). But [sometimes (R)] مَعَاَتْشُ with Hamza [246, 683 (case 3, e, b, β)] occurs (SH), by assimilation to ِتَعْبِيلةٌ (R); and Ibn Ṭabbān (K), [like] Nafi' [683] (B), is reported to have pronounced it in VII. 9. [714] with Hamza, by assimilation to [the pl. where the ی is aug., like (B)] ضَحْكَانُثِقُ [above] (K, B): though it is weak (SH); and Hamza is oftener eschewed. And similarly ِضَحْكَانُثِقُ pl. of مَنَأْرُ [683 (case 3, e, b, α')], by assimilation to مَنَأْرُ ; though the chaste [form] is مَنَأْرُ (R). And مَصْانُثٌ [683] is constantly pronounced with Hamza
(SH), (1) by assimilation of مَسْبَل to نَعِيَلَة, as channel of a torrent, [pl. مَسْبَل (Jh),] has [also (Jh)] for its pl. [Maslān (Jh), and (Jh)] [irregularly (Jh),] by assimilation to مَيْل (R), like رَغِيف, pl. رَغْيف, and رَغْفان [246] (Jh); or (2) by imagination (R). As for مَصَائِب [above], it is a blunder of theirs, because they imagine that مَعَيَلَة is مَعِيَلَة, whereas it is only مَعَيَلَة; but they do say مَصَائِب [683] (S). Jh says that all the Arabs pronounce it with Hamza, (1) because they imagine that مَعَيَلَة is مَعِيَلَة; so that they pronounce it with Hamza, when they pluralize it, as they pronounce the pl. of سِبْيَنَة with Hamza, saying سَفَانَم [246]: or (2) [because] they assimilate the [rad. (Jh)] كِ in مَعِيَلَة to the [aug. (Jh)] كِ of صَعِيَفَة, since it is substituted for و; and is not original, as the كِ of صَعِيَفَة is not original. But the regular form is مَصَائِب, [which also is used (Jh),] because the كِ [of the sing.] is mobile in the o. f. [below]. And Zj used to hold the Hamza in مَصَائِب to be converted from the كِ pronounced with Kasr in مَصَائِب, as in شَيْاح [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 I [715]; for which reason the rule requires it to remain, as in منبوب [above]: but that they constantly pronounce this pl. with Hamza, irregularly, for a notification that it is not pl. of مَعَالَةٌ or مَفْعُولَةٌ, like and مَعَالِيَّةٌ, since the o. f. [above] is , the vowel of the being transferred to the ص, and the , [then] converted into الس 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 منصبات, since, in such as مِنْفَر [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 مَفْعُولَةٌ, but of مَفْعُولَةٌ or مَفْعَلَةٌ, with Fath of the and Fath or Kasr of the ء; and therefore the , is converted into Hamza, for a notification that it is pl. of مَفْعَلَةٌ with Damm of the ء, and Kasr of the ء, contrary to the general rule that the pl. of the latter should be sound (Jrb). But مَعَاكِشٌ, مَصَائِبٌ, and مَعَاكِشِينَ, with Hamza are anomalous (R).
§. 718. The َى [serving as the َع (IY)] of َنَعْلَىُ, when a substantive, is converted into َى (M, SH), because quiescent and preceded by a letter pronounced with َدَمَم [686 (case 1)] (IY), as َكُوسَى ُطُرُبَى and َكُيوُسَى ُطُرُبَى (IY). َطُرُبَىُ is either an inf. n., like َرُجَعُى [248, 272], as in XIII. 28. [686 (case 4, a, a)], i. e., َفَتْحَى لِهِمُ َطِبَىُ, like XLVII. 9. [62]: or fem. of َأَلْطُرَبَىُ, in which case it ought to be َأَلْطُرَبَىُ with the art. [356]. But [even in the latter case] its predication is that of substantives [686 (case 4, b, e, ِى), 725], as S says "This is the cat. of what has its َى converted into َى, vid. َنَعْلَى when it is a substantive" (R), as َأَلْطُرَبَىُ (S, M) from َكِيسُ َطِبَىُ happiness and َكِيسُ َكُوسَى shrewdness (M). The author of the CHd mentions that َأَكيُسُ َطُرُبَى and َكُوسَى ُطُرُبَى are fems. of َأَطُب* and َأَكِسُ; but that, though orig. eps., they are treated as substantives, because without an art. they are not quals. (Jrb). The reason why َنَعْلَى without the art. is not a qual. is that it is not used with َمِن, as is known [356]: while, with prothesis, the post. explains the qualified, because the َمَنُ of superiority is part of the post. [118]; so that you do not say َعْنِدِي جَارِيَة َحَسَنى َالْجَواَرَى In my possession is a girl, the most beautiful of the girls [with the intention
of making an ep. of مَهْسُوَى, because [the ep. would then be pre. to its qualified (121), since] فَعْلَايِ indicates the qualified. And, since الْفَعْلِ without an art. is not an ep., nor is it so freely employed in qualification as the rest of the eps., it is treated as a substantive. And, because of the small sense of qualification in the أَفْعَلُ of superiority, this أَفْعَلُ is triptote, by common consent, when made indet. after being a proper name, contrary to the cat. of أَحْمَرُ [18], as to which there is a dispute (R). In the ep., however, the أَيَ is not converted; [but the letter before it is pronounced with Kasr, so that the أَيَ is preserved (SH),] as قَسَمَةُ ضِيَرَى and مَشِيَّةُ حِيْكِى [686 (case 4, b, c)] (M, SH), which are [judged to be (Jrb)] فَعْلِىَ (R, Jrb), orig. ضِيَرَى حِيْكِى (IY, Jrb), with Damm, [not فَعْلِىَ (R, Jrb) with Kasr (Jrb)], because, [says S (R),] there is no فَعْلِىَ [with Kasr (IY)] among eps. (IY, R, Jrb), except مَعْتَقَى [272] (Jrb), while مَعْتَقَى is with ٍ [272]; though some authorize رَجُلُ كِيَضُى [272], which may, however, be فَعْلِىَ with Damm, co-ordinated with جَبْحَدُ [392], like سُودُ [331, 712] and مَعْطُ [said by Ks to be (Jh) pl. of عَائِطُ (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 ُبَلَّلَى (IY, Jrb) and ُضَلَّلَى [272] (Jrb). They do not convert the ی into ٌ here (IY, Jrb), as they do in ُكُرْسَى [above] (IY); but convert the Ḍamma into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved (Jrb), to distinguish the ep. from the substantive (IY, Jrb); and do not reverse [the procedure], because the substantive, on account of its lightness, is more fit for conversion of the ی into ٌ (Jrb).

And so in the cat. of ُبِيْسُ [686 (case 1, a, γ), 710, 711, 728] (SH), i.e., the pl. ُنَفَّلُ, from the heaviness of the pl. (R). ُبِيْسُ is orig. ُبِيْسُ with Ḍamm of the ُبِيْسُ, because pl. of ُبِيْسُ, like ُحُمَرُ pl. of ُأَحْمَرُ [249]. They convert the Ḍamma into Kasra, in order that the ی may be preserved, because the pl. is deemed heavy; so that, if they converted the ی into ٌ, the heaviness would be excessive (Jrb). But sometimes the Ḍamma is left unaltered in the cat. of ُبِيْسُ pl. of ُأَبيْسُ, and the ی then converted into ٌ, because of the lightness of the measure [ُنَفَّلُ] (R).
THE, AND ِ AS J S.

§. 719. The ج and ِ, when جs, are more unsound, and weaker in state, than when ِs, because (1) they are consonants of inflection, which become altered by the vowels of inflection [16, 404, 720]; (2) the ِ of prothesis [129], which causes the preceding letter to be pronounced with كسر, is affixed to them; and (3) the ِ of relation [294] and the sign of the du. [228] are affixed to them: while all of that necessitates their alteration. The e-fore, when جs, they are weaker than when ِs [703]; and when ِs, are weaker than when s [699]: so that the further they are from the end, the stronger they are; and the nearer they are to the end, the more inseparable is transformation from them. Transformation contains a kind of alleviation [697], and is therefore lighter than the use of the ِ. (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 ! [684]; (b) of one of them into its fellow [685, 686]: (2) quiescence (M). They are converted into , 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 l (Jrb)], as 

\[403, 663, 673, 684\], is strong and lives [728, 730 A]; and \[16, 300, 328, 673\]; contrary to (1) and \[403, 697, 698\], and and \( \text{س} \) (SH), where the  and  are quiescent (R): (a) and \( \text{s} \) and \( \text{s} \) are [2nd or 3rd pers.] pl. fem., their measure being [406]: or [663] and \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{s} \) are 2nd pers. sing. fem., orig. \( \text{س} \) and  

like [405], their l being converted into 1, 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: while the  [before the  , whether this  be the l of the v... as in the two pls. fem., or the pron. of the ag., as in the sing. fem.,] is not converted into 1, because it is quiescent (Jrb): (2) \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{s} \) [684 (condition 5), 698] (SH), where the  and  are preceded by a quiescent (R): (3)  and \( \text{س} \) [663, 684 (condition 6, b)] — with which \( \text{s} \) and \( \text{s} \) \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{s} \) [229, 684] are made to accord — because of ambiguity [684 (condition 6, g, a), (727)] (SH), unrestrictedly in the [pret.]
and on [elision of the ُ for inflection or] prothesis [405, 228] in [the aor. v. and] the ِ, [respectively,] since the ِ converted [from the ُ or ى] would inevitably be elided, on account of the concurrence of two ِs: (a) the attached pron. and the ِ of the du. are, each of them, the "cause necessitating Fath" [of the ِ] (MASH): (b) these affixes, as [will be] mentioned, necessitate return of the ِs [converted in the sing. from ِ and ى] to their o. ِs. [below], lest ambiguity be produced; and, after restoration to the o. ِ, the ِ and ى are not converted into ِ, lest such conversion be a return to that [ambiguity] which has been escaped (R): (4) إْخْشَيَا [663], because it belongs to the cat. of لُن تُخْشَيَا. Ye two shall not dread (SH), since the imp. is derived from the aor., and in [each of] them the ِ is followed by the ِ of the pron.; so that, since the ِ is not transformed in [the subj.], such as لُن تُخْشَيَا, lest it be elided, and the du. be [then] mistaken for the sing., it is not transformed in [the imp.] إْخْشَيَا also, although ambiguity would not be produced [by its elision], because إْخْشَا with ِ would then be said, and in the sing. إْخْشَ without ِ [428, 431] (Jrb): إْخْشَيْنَ (5), because of its resemblance to that, [which means that the ُ affixed to the v., without intervention of a pron. between them, is like the ِ; so that إْخْشَيْنَ is
like ٨٤٠١ (R),] contrary to ٨٥١١١١ [below] and ٨٥١١١١١ [610, 663, 664], ٨٥١١١١١ [below] and ٨٥١١١١١١ (SH), orig. ٨٥١١١١١١١ [664] and ٨٥١١١١١١١١١ , where the ٠ is converted into ٠, and elided, because elision of the ٠ does not produce ambiguity here, as it would in ٨٥١١١١١١١ [663], where the ٠ is therefore not elided; while ٨٥١١١١١ [above] is made to accord with the latter, because it is a deriv. thereof, though ambiguity would not be produced; and ٨٥١١١١١١١ [also], because the ٠ in such [a position] resembles the ٠ [of ٨٥١١١١]. But, [in the chapter on the Corroborative ٠ ] 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)] ٠ , when it is after the prominent pron., [as in ٨٥١١١١١١١١١ ,] becomes like a separate word, because the pron. is a separative; but, when there is no prominent pron. [before it, as in ٨٥١١١١١١١١١], 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 ٠ [in ٨٥١١١١١١١١١ ] ; but also the ٠ and ٠ in ٨٥١١١١١١١١١ [663], with which you do not retain
the $j$, as you do with the $l$; so that his saying "like an attached [nom.] pron.", unrestrictedly, is not true (R on IH). And the better [opinion] is that the non-conversion, (1) in [ْعُلْقُمْسُيْنَ] and (R on IH) [ْعُلْقُمْسُيْنَ لاَ تُرْضَيْنَ], is because the $j$ is restored [to its place], on account of what we mentioned there (R), [vid. that] its elision [in ْعُلْقُمْسُيْنَ] was [a substitute] for apocope [404] or quiescence [428, 431]; whereas, when the $v.$ is intended to be uninf. upon Fath [402, 406, 610, 663, 664], because compounded [with the corrob. $ن$], there is no apocope or quiescence (R on IH): and, if it were then converted, its elision would be necessary; so that its restoration would not be evident: (2) in ْعُلْقُمْسُيْنَ, is because it is a deriv. of ْخُقْسِيْنَ [663]. And we do not maintain that [in these formations the non-conversion is because] the vowel is accidental; since, if the vowel in such [a position] were not taken into account, the $ع$ would not be restored in ْحَانَسَ and ْحَانِسَ [663]. We have mentioned the predicament of such as ْعُلْقُمْسُيْنَ and ْعُلْقُمْسُيْنَ and ْعُلْقُمْسُيْنَ [above] in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two Quiescents [663]. And in such as ْعُلْقُمْسُيْنَ and ْعُلْقُمْسُيْنَ [above] the $y$ and $ى$ 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 ِرْضٖن and ِرْضٖن] (R). IH's saying "[when] they are mobile" [above] means "with a permanent vowel" [684 (condition 2)], to exclude such as ُغَزْرٌ and ِرْضٖن [above], ِرْضٖن [and ِرْضٖن] and ِرْضٖن [below]: while, in such as ُغَزْرٖ and ُغَزْرٖ, although the inflectional vowel is accidental, the ِ and ِ are converted, because, though its sort is accidental, [being regulated by the op.], its genus is permanent, since every n. infl. with vowels, whether nom., acc., or gen., must have some [inflectional] vowel [16] (R on the ِ and ِ as ِ). The ِ and ِ, when ِs, are converted into ِ, when they are mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, even if they be in a n. not conformable to, nor commensurable with, the v., as ِرَبَّى gain and ِرَبَّى [pl. of ِرَبِّى a kind of small beast or reptile (MAR)]; or in a n. commensurable with, but not differing from, the v., as ِأَحْرَى [black (MAR)] and ِأَشْقَر more wretched: for the conformability, or the affinity mentioned, is prescribed only in the ِ [703, 711, 712], not in the ِ, because the ِ is the seat of alteration; so that the weak cause, i. e., its being mobile, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [703], is effective in converting it
(R on the , and ى as ل s). And the reason why such as ٌعَلْيَانُ ٌنَرْزَانُ [331] are not transformed is only that the ٌ and ٍ، being inseparable [from the word], exclude the ل from the end; so that the ، and ى become [medial,] as in ٌعَرْاٰرُ and ٍطَيْرَانُ [684 (condition 11, a), 703]. If it be said "Why does not the inseparable ى in such as ُخُرَاٰرَةٰ [247] and ُنُقِّاةٌ [689] prevent transformation of the ل [into ٌ], as the inseparable ى in such as ٌعَنصَرَةٰ and ٌمَخْمَدْرَةٌ [721] prevents conversion of the ، into ى?", I say "Because ، preceded by a letter pronounced with دَامَن is not converted into ى in any position except when final, contrary to the conversion of ، and ى into ل، which is often found in the medial also, as in ٌقَالْ [684, 703] and ٌمَقَالٌ [712]; so that the ى، which is orig. not inseparable [266], is not taken into account; contrary to the ل and ٍ، which are constitutionally inseparable ". And, from the affinity of conversion to the end of the word, the ، and ى، when final, are subject to this transformation, even if they be preceded by ل، provided that the ل be aug., because then it is virtually non-existent, as ٌرَدَآءٌ ٌكَسَآءٌ [683 (case 1), 720, 723]; whereas, when it is rad., as in ٌرَآي ٌثَلَٰثٌ [723], they are not transformed, because the [ٍ intervening as a] separative [between the mobile ، or ى and the preceding Fatha] is strong by reason of [its] originality. But, from the
weakness of this cause—I mean mobility of the  or  and precedence of a letter pronounced with Fath [703]—in necessitating conversion, the  is restored to its o. f. [above] of  or  and admits of being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, when omission of restoration would lead to ambiguity in the v. or n., vid. when the  is met by a subsequent quiescent letter, with which the  if retained unaltered, would be elided, and so ambiguity would be produced. The v. is such as (1)  and  [above], where the  of the pron. is attached to the transformed  and  [above]: so that, if the  [converted from the  or ] were not restored to its o. f., it would be elided because of the two quiescents; and [then] the [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)  [and  above], because the  would be elided in the [subj. and] apoc. [405]: (3)  or  because it is a deriv. of  [above]. And the n. is such as (1)  prayers [726] and  damsels [234], where, if the  [converted from the  and ] were elided because of the two quiescents, the pl. might be mistaken for the sing.: (2) two staves [above] and  two youths [684 (condition 6, b)].
where, if it were not restored, the du. might, on pre-
fixion, be mistaken for the sing.; while [عَصْرِيَّةَ and]
ضَيْرَةُ and [عَصْرُونَ ] and [عَصْرُونَ ] and [رَجِيْنَ ] and
[above]. And, with the ى of relation, the ى elided in
[643, 683, 697], when pronounced with Tanwin, is restored [to its place], because the [concur-
rence of] two quiescents, the ى and Tanwin, 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)] ى ى ى ى ى [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 Fath, (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
ُهَلْ تَرِى and ُتَرِى ُتَرِى , it is not from
fear of ambiguity, but for conformity to ُهَلْ تَغْرُرَنَّ and
The J is restored [to its place] in such as لا تَرْضَى ان and similarly [above], and similarly لا تَرْضَى ان, and because with the the v. is not quiescent [in the final] nor apocopated, while elision of the J is only [a substitute] for apocope [404] or quiescence [428, 431]. And, after restoration of the J [to its place], the لا تَرْضَى ان [above] is not converted into ۱, lest elision of the I be entailed thereby, which would lead to what one has fled from, [vid. elision of the J without apocope or quiescence] (R on the ۱ and ۱ as ۱s). But, in the dial. of Tayyi, according to what Fr transmit from them, the ۱ that is a J is elided in the sing. masc., after Kasr or Fath, in the infl., [i.e., aor. (AKB),] and uninfl., [i.e., imp., the Kasra or Fatha remaining unaltered (AKB),] as بِلَٰلِهِ ۳۲۰ ۱۲۰ By God, assuredly Zaid shall shoot and ۱۲۰ ۱۲۰ Do thou surely shoot, O Zaid, لَیْخُشَنَّ ۳۲۰ ۱۲۰ assuredly Zaid shall dread and لَیْخُشَنَّ ۱۲۰ ۱۲۰ Do thou surely dread, O Zaid: and hence [119] (R on IH), where there is another version meant to be with the single ۱, which, says IY, is suppressed by poetic license [614]; and ۱۲۰ ۱۲۰
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 and [above], the and  are not converted, (1) because the vowel is accidental [684 (condition 2)], as we mentioned [under and ] in the chapter on the Concurrence of Two Quiescents [663]; (2) because the  and  [here] are independent n.s.; (3) because  and  are not converted into  except when the preceding letter pronounced with Fath is part of their own word [684 (condition 4)], while here the  [or  ] is another word; (4) because, if altered by conversion, they would be elided without any indication of them, such as is [provided] in  [663, 664] and  (R on the and as ), where the indication of the elision is the Damm and Kasr, respectively [610] (MAR); [since and would both be reduced to ]. But IM says that elision of the  of the pron. after Fatha, as from  [663], is a Tāʿi dialectic variation (R on IH). If, however, elision of the  on account of two quiescents, do not lead to ambiguity, the  is not restored, as
They are pleased

Thou [fem.] art pleased

They are raided, and

They shot,
and this [combination] is [found] in the n., as ُرُمِيِّي [in the gen.]; and in the v., as ُرُمِيِّي (R). The ُم and ُي are elided in such as (M, SH) لا تَعْرُ ُرُمِيِّي (1) Raid not and لَأ تَعْرُ ُرُمِيِّي Shoot not [404, 697], ُمُرُثَن ُرُمِيِّي Raid and Shoot [428, 431, 697] (M): (2) They [masc.] raid and ُُرُمْرُن ُرُمِيِّي They shoot (SH): (a) ُُرُمْرُن ُرُمِيِّي is orig. ُُرُمْرُن [above], to which the ُم of the pl. is affixed; so that the first ُم is elided, because of the two quiescents: (b) ُُرُمْرُن ُرُمِيِّي, to which the ُم of the pl. is affixed; so that the ُم is elided, because of the two quiescents; and the ُم is then pronounced with ُمُمِلِّي, in order that the ُم may be preserved, since it is a complete word, which must not be altered (R): (3) ُُرُمْثَن and ُُرُمْثَن [above], ُُرُمْثَن (SH): (a) ُُرُمْثَن ُرُمِيِّي is orig. ُُرُمْثَن [663], to which the double ُم is attached; so that the ُم is elided, because of the two quiescents: and ُُرُمْثَن is similar [mutatis mutandis]: (b) ُُرُمْثَن and ُُرُمْثَن [663, 664] are like ُُرُمْثَن and ُُرُمْثَن, because orig. ُُرُمْثَن and ُُرُمْثَن [663] (R): (4) ُُم دَمَي ُم ُي and ُُم دَمَي ُم ُي (M). But such as ُُم ُي ُّدَم and ُُم دَمَي ُم ُي [687, 697, 698], ُُم إِمَسَّ ُم ُي and ُُم إِمَسَّ ُم ُي [667], ُُم أَخْ أَخ and ُُم أَخْ أَخ [260, 307, 689], are not regular (SH), which means that the elision of the ُم in these ns. is not for any regular cause; but for bare alleviation, on which account the inflection 173 a
rests on the final of what remains (R). Analogy requires retention [of the J] in some of them, like يُن and هم and اسم ظبٕ [643, 720] and قنٕ [667]; and change [of the J into I] in others, like أبٕ and آخٕ, because the unsound letter is mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha, as in عصًا [above]: but they are docked [of the J], contrary to analogy, because frequent in their speech (Jrb). As for أخت, however, it is not docked of the J; but the ب is a subst. for its ج [689] (R). The ج and ي are preserved in such as (1) رمٕ غزٕ [above]; (2) يغزٕان (M), where the ج and ي are preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm and Kasr, respectively [684 (condition 3)] (IX); (3) عزٕا رمٕا [above] (M).

§. 720. As regards bearing the vowels of inflection, the ج and ي, (1) when preceded by a quiescent, proceed like sound letters, as in (a) دلٕ وظبٕ [16, 302, 643, 728] (M), because the origin of their unsoundness is their resemblance to ا, which they are like only when quiescent, and preceded, the ي by Kasra, and the ج by Damma, in which case they become like ا, because quiescent and preceded by a vowel homogeneous with them, as likewise is ا, 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 Fatha (IY): (b) ْعَدْرُ [643, 730] and ْعَدْيَ [299] (M), because the first ِ and ی here are quiescent, like the ِ of ْظَلَبْي [above] and the ِ of ْنَحْي [85] (IY): (c) ْبَأْرُ [683 (case 1, c), 723], and ْآَيَى [302, 683, 723, 728] (M), because ِ and ی , when final, are transformed only after an aug. ِ، as in رَدَآ َكِسَٰسِهَا and [683, 719, 723], not after an ِ، converted from a rad. letter; lest two transformations, of the ع 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 يَغْزُرَ Aٰرِئِدْ أَنْ تَسْتَقَفَ I desire that thou shouldst draw water, and shouldst summon; (b) رَأَيْتُ أَلْرَمَيْ (M) 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 ٍ يَغْزُرُ [404, 719] and ْيَدْعُو calls [727]; not in ns. [721]: (β) Kasra before ی، which [combination] occurs in ns., as ْأَلْقَابِي the judge [16, 294, 724] and أَلْرَمَيْ [719]; and vs., as ْيَسْقِي the judge [404, 719] and ْيَسْقِي waters: (b) when preceded by
a letter pronounced with Fath, ١ and ی are converted into ل [684], as عَصَمَا and ٣٧ [719]; when preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm, ی is converted into ١ [686]; and, when preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, ی is converted into ی [685]: while only Damma occurs before ١, and only Kasra before ی (IY). But [some of the Arabs assimilate the ١ and ی to ی, because of their affinity to it: so that (IY)] quiescence occurs [in the subj. or acc., which is then uniform with the ind. or nom. (IY)], (1) [among vs.,] in the saying [of 'Amir Ibn At'Tufail (IY, MN) al'Amiri alJa'đi, the chief of the Banū 'Amir in heathenism (MN).]

(1570)

(Yet clan ‘Amir has not made me chief by inheritance, (but for mine own nobility and valor): God forbade that I should rise through mother or father, properly ٠سُمُور (MN)]; and [hence (IY)] the saying of AlA'sha [Maimūn Ibn Kais, praising the Prophet (Jsh),]

قَالَ ﺑِنُوتُ لَا أُرْتِئِي لَهَا مِنْ كَلَالَةٍ وَلَا مِنْ حَفْقٍ حَتَّى تَلَّاثَي مُكَلََّمَةٌ (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 تَلَّاثِي (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 بَارِيْهَا] is an acc., because an exc. from an aff. [88]; and hence أُحْتِ أَثْرَى آَلَهَمَ (IY); and the prov. أُحْتِ أَثْرَى أَلْفَسْ بَارِيْهَا Give the bow to its maker (M), meaning Seek aid for thy work from the possessors of knowledge and skill therein (Md), where بَارِيْهَا [properly بَارِيْهَا] is obj. of أُحْتِ أَثْرَى: (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 مَعْلُوِيْ كرِّبْ [below] and كَانَ أَيْدِيهِنَّ آَلَهَمَ [215]" (AKB on أَيْدِيهِنَّ آَلَهَمَ below). Ka'b's saying [444] with quiescence [of the ] admits of two explanations, (1) that he makes the infinitival inop., as in

إِذاَ كَانَ أَمْرُ الْنَاسِ عَنْدَهُ عَجُورُهُمْ # فَلَا بُدَّ أَن يُلْقَوْنَ كُلَّ نَبْعٍ

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 يُبْنِمُ in
II. 233. [525, 572]: (a) so they say: though the latter may be explained on [the supposition] that ُنَ is op.; but that the o. f. is ُيَتَمُونَ with the ُنَ of the pl., by concord with the sense of ُمُنَ, like X. 43. [182, 581]; and that the ُن is afterwards elided [405] because of the subjunctival [410], and the ُن, because of the two quiescents [663]: (2) that he treats Fatha on ُن, like Damma, by poetic license, which, says Mb, is one of the most beautiful poetic licenses [above]: (a) that occurs even in the case of a [letter] lighter than ُن, vid. ُي, as in AlA’shâ’s saying ُتَلَاثَيْتَ آللَّهُ [above]: though ُتَلَاثَيْتَ thou shouldst meet may be orig. ُتَلَاثِيْتَ, an enallage from the 3rd to the 2nd pers. [1], which is attested by [the fact] that he addresses her in the following verse ُمَّتَى مَا تَتَلَّاجِي آللَّهُ [565]. Quiescence of ُن occurs in prose, as in the reading of one of the ancients ُأَوْ يَهْيَـَوَّلَّذِي بَيِّنَّهُ عَقْدَةُ أَلْتَكَّاح ُكِئْلَ. Or he in whose hand is the bond of marriage, [i.e., the husband, the master of binding and loosing it (B),] should remit: nay, quiescence of ُن in the n., notwithstanding that ُن is lighter than ُن, and the n. lighter than the v., occurs in prose, as in the reading of Ja’far Ibn Muḥammad ُمِنْ أَوْسَطِ مَآ تَتَطَعَمُونِ أَهَالِيكَمْ V. 91. [543] (BS), according to the dial. of those who make it quiescent in the three cases, like ُكِئْلَ.
[below] (B), for lightness, as they say مَعْدِي كِرَبٍ [above], by assimilation of ی is ꞌ (K); and also in the readings زَلَٰٰلِي حَفْتُ الْمَوَالِي مِنْ زُرَآتِی 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 فَأَذَّرُُوا أَسْمَ آللِه عَلیّهَا صَرَائِی XXII. 37. Therefore mention the name of God over them, when pure, this being with a quiescent ی, pl. of صَائِنَة, i. e., exclusively belonging to God (BS). In [the position of (IY)] the ind. or nom., the ی and ی are quiescent (M), because یامما upon them is deemed heavy; so that you say [in the v.] هُوَ يَغْرُزُ He raids and يَرْمَى shoots [719], and in the n. هِذَا الرَّآمِی 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 قَاضُی This is a judge, مُرَّت بِقاضِی 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 يَدْهُب بِالْدُنْيَا رَآیتُ قاضیا [643], and رآیتُ قاضیا I passed by a judge (IY). Mobilization [of the ی (SH)] is anomalous (M, SH) in the nom. and gen. [below] (SH), as

(M, R, Jrb) Plump darlings, like the rams of the breed of sheep called ٱلْعُوس, have wellnigh taken away (the life of) the world and its pleasure (Jsh), and مَا إِنْ رَآیتُ آلِحٍ
[below] (IY, R, Jrb): like (1) quiescence [of the, and 
(2, Jrb)] in the subj. or acc. (SH), as (a) 

[above] (R, Jrb): (b)  

; the saying

(1) attributed by IR in the 'Umda to Ru'ba Ibn 
Al'Aziz, though I have not seen it in his Diwan, As 
though their (the camels') forelegs in the level plain were 
arms of maidens taking silver dirhams, one from 
another (AKB); and the prov. 

[above] (R, Jrb): (2) retention of both [ and 
(R, Jrb), and of I, in the apoc. (SH), as (a) 
[below] (R, Jrb), i.e., (b)  

[below] (R): and, in some readings, (a) 

Send him with us to-morrow: he will feed, and play [from , aer. (K, B)], where being the correl. of the command, is 
governed in the apoc. (Jrb); while Na'fil reads 
with Kasr, and (B); and Ya'la Ibn Siyāba reads 
with Kasr of the , and . And he will 
play in the ind. by inception (K): and (b) 

XII. 12. 90. [below] (Jrb): (α) Damma is then
supplied on the ḫ and ẓ, in order that it may be elided [404] by the apocopative, because the apocopative must govern [419]; but more frequently and properly on the ẓ, because Ḍamma on ḫ is heavier than on ẓ (R): (c) لَا تَرْضَعَا اللَّهُ ٌ مَا أَنْسُنَّ لا أَنْسَاهُ اللَّهُ [below] (Jrb), and مَا أَنْسُنَّ لا أَنْسَاهُ اللَّهُ [below]: (a) to supply Ḍamma on the ḫ is more strange, because ḫ does not bear a vowel (R). In the gen. only ẓ occurs, because [the gen. is only in decl. ns., while (IY)] among decl. ns. there is none whose final is ẓ preceded by a vowel [721]. And the predicament of the ẓ in the gen. is the same as in the nom. [above]. But

فَيۡمَا يُبِحَارِيۡنَ اللَّهَٰ لَٰٓيۡضَ مَّا ضِيۡضٍ # وَيَبِيۡثُ مَّثَّى مِنْهُمْ غُوَّلًا تَغۡفُّوُ #

by Jāvīr, [And one day they reward love with an ineffective (meeting), and another day thou seest in them a she-devil that destroys (man), orig. تَغۡفُّوُ (MN),] is cited; and ['Ubad Allāh (Dw)] Ibn [Kāis (Dw)] ArRuḵayyat says لَا بَارَكَ اللَّهُ فِي ٱلْغَزَّانِيِّ ٱلْعَلِيمِ [547]; and another says

مَا إِنْ رَآيْتُ وَلَا أَرِي نَّى مُدْتِي # كَجَبَرُوۡيۡ يُلْعَبَنَ فِي ٱلصَّخْرَةِ #

[above] (M) I have not seen, إنْ 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 ẓ in the gen. [16], and triptote declension [17, 18] (IY). But [R says that] the ḫ and ẓ are treated like
the sound [letter], in a case of choice, by some of the Arabs, who mobilize the of عَلَّامَيْنِ [719] in the nom. and gen., and of يَرْمِي [404, 719] in the ind.; and similarly the of يَغْرُ [404, 719] in the ind. (R). In the apoc. they are elided [404, 697, 719] (M), because they are regarded as equivalent toDammat, inasmuch as their quiescence is the sign of the ind. [above]; so that they are elided for apocopation (IY), as the vowel [Dammat (IY)] is elided [404]. But they are retained in the saying

[Thou didst satirize Zabbân; then thou camest, apologizing for satirizing Zabbân: thou didst not satirize (him), nor let (him) alone (MN, Jsh), by rule تَهْجِ [Jsh]; and in أَلْمُ يَأْتِبَ اللَّه [503] (M), properly يَأْتِبَكَ اللَّه (Jsh); while one version reported from Ibn Kathîr is إِنَّ مَنْ يَتَقَيّ [وَيَتَضَرُّ] XII. 90. Verily the case is this, whoso feareth etc. [404]. As for the لَمْ يَخَشَ [above], it is retained, always quiescent; except in the apoc. mood [404, 697], where it is elided, like the and [above], as لَمْ يَخَشَ did not dread and لَمْ يُبَدِّع was not called. But it is retained in the saying [of ʿAbd Yaghûth (IY, Jsh) Ibn Wakṣâṣ alHarîthi (Jsh)]
And an 'Abshami [309] old dame laughs at me, as though she had not seen a Yamānī [311] captive before me, by rule [311] ٌ (Jsh); and [similarly (IY)] in

مَا أَنَسَ لا أُنَسُهُ أَنْ هُذَى عَيْشَتَى ٌ ما لَامَحْ بِالمعْزَآ رَبَّ عِسَابٍ

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

إِذَا الْعَجْرُ فَضَتْ بُطْلَتْي ٌ وَلَا تَرَمَيْتُهَا وَلَا تَمِّهَقِ

[above] (M), by Ru'ba Ibn Al'Aljāj, 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 ٌ become ḫas [684, 719]; and, if Kasra, converts it into ٍ, as in أَلْغَارَى [685, 719, 724] (IY on § 720); while there is no [decl. (Jrb)] n. whose final is preceded by Damma [686 (case 2, c, a)], that being [found] only in vs., as in يَغْرُ [727] (IY, Jrb), and indecl. ns., as ٌ [below] and ٌ [176] (Jrb). The cause of that will [now] be explained (IY). When ٌ, after an
original Damma occurs as a û, final, as in أُدُلُّ [243], or virtually final, as when followed by a separable letter, like the ë of feminization, when separable [266], as in تَّفَرَّقٍ " [336, 686 (case 2, b)], or an ë of dualization [228], as in تَّفَرَّقٍ " du. of تَّفَرَّقٍ " [727], and that [combination] is in a decl. n., the ë must be converted into û, and the Damma before it into Kasra, because ë preceded by a letter pronounced with Damm 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 أُدُلُّ [243, 685, 727] and أُحْقِرُ, [by analogy أُدُلُّ أُحْقِرَ (IY),] for the pl. [of paucity (IY)] on [the measure of] أَفْعَلُ (IY), from دُلُوُّ bucket and حَقْرُ waist; and أُفْرَقُ for the pl. of عَرْقُ [248, 723] and عُرْقَةٌ [254, 390, 723], [by elision of the ë (IY),] on the principle of تَمْرَةٌ and تَمْرَةٌ [254], as

لا صبر حتى تلتهف بيغسي أفعلي الرباط البليض والقلنس

[There will be no patience until thou reach 'Ans (a clan of AlYaman), the wearers of white mantles and of caps, cited by As on the authority of IIU (IY)): substituting Kasra for the Damma before the ë, in order that the ë may be converted into û, as in مُبْقَاتٍ مِيْرَّانٍ [685 (case 5), 699] (M); so that the word becomes of the
class of the defective, like قَامِسُ [16] (IY). [According to R, however, first] the ٰ is converted into ی; and afterwards the Damma into Kasra: and one does not begin by converting the Damma into Kasra, because alleviation of the final is more appropriate. The ٰ is not converted into ی, (1) when it is not a ل, whether it be pronounced with (a) Fath, as in قَوْيَبَا [273, 385]: (b) Damm, in which case, (a) if followed by a quiescent, as in حَوْرُلْ [inf. n. of حَوْرَلْ The year passed over him (KF, MAR)], it may be retained, or be converted into Hamza [683] (R), [as] حَوْرُلْ (KF); (b) if followed by a mobile, it must be made quiescent, as نُورُ [orig. نُور (MAR),] pl. of نُور [711, 712]: or (c) Kasr, in which case it remains unaltered, as ٰ on [the measure of] ُآَكْرِمُ from ُآَرَدُ affection: (a) as for قَيلُ, orig. قَيل [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 ٰ of feminization in عِنْصِرَةٌ [385, 399, 719, 724], and the non-dualistic ل and ن in أَنْفَعَانَ and أَنْفَعَانَ [274, 390, 724]: except when the Damma before it is upon another ٰ, in which case it is converted into ی, because of the excessive heaviness, even if it be immediately followed by an inseparable letter, as in قَوْيَةٌ and قَوْيَةٌ [730. A] on [the
measure of [254] and [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) *أَخْرَانُ فَوْلُ* thy father, *فُون* thy mouth and *أَبُوك* thy brother [16]: (b) *حُطُرُوتُنَّ* steps [238, 240]; for, though the ٰ and ٰ [234] are separable, like the َ [336] of *تَغْارِيْنَة* [above], still the Damma of the ِ is accidental in the pl., where the ِ may be made quiescent: (4) when the ُ is in a v., like *سَرْر* was liberal [729], aor. *يَسَرْوُ* [730], and [like] *يَذْعَرُ* [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 *عِبْتُ حُفْتُ and بَعْتُ قَلْتُ ، contrary to *يَعْبْتُ and *يَحْفَتْ.
and طُلْتُ [705], and to يَخْلَفُ and يَبِيعُ [697, 703], as before explained: (a) similarly they say رَمَوُ الرَّجُلُ How well the man shoots! [476, 686 (case 2, a), 724], contrary to such as الْأَلْتَرَابِيَّ [713]: (b) thus it is established that the دَلْلَاءَ of and يَذْعَرُ سْرُوَ [above] may not be converted into كَسَرَ, lest one formation be mistaken for another: (5) when it is in a n., and فَثَاء is inseparable from it, as in هُوَ [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 فَثَاء's being inseparable from its ۚ; and because it might be mistaken for the fem. ۚ ۚ she], if the ۚ were converted. And IH, notwithstanding that he is discussing the ۚ preceded by a letter pronounced with دَلْلَاء, mentions خِيَالَة ۚ [273] together with قَوْبَأٌ [above], to demonstrate the predicament of the ۚ preceded by a letter pronounced with دَلْلَاء, as respects the fact that with the ۚ conversion of the دَلْلَاء into كَسَرَ is necessary where it is necessary before the ۚ, as ۚ [332] and ۚ [336, 686 (case 2, b)], according to what we have mentioned [in connection with ۚ and ۚ]; and unnecessary where it is not necessary with the ۚ [above]. Fr says that سِيرَأ ۚ [273, 385] is orig. فَعَلَاء with دَلْلَاء, being
pronounced with Kasr on account of the "ع" and "ب" and "ح" [242], "ب" and "ئ" [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] فعلاً; with Kasr of the "ع"; except the hollow whose "ع" is a ى: but Khl says that no فعلاً with Kasr of the "ع" occurs in the language, except [368], سيرة, عنباً; and حَوَلاً حُوَلاً i. q. حُوَلاً membrane enclosing the fetus in the womb of the she-camel (R), which have no fourth (KF, MAR). They say قَتِّيَةً and قُتَيْتُةً [above]; [above] and قُنْفُونَا [283, 389, 685 (case 1, b, b), 724], where the ، is not final. And the counterpart of that is the transformation in such as رذآة and فَضْلُة [683, 723], and its omission in such as (1) نهائیة and (2) أبيّة [266, 683 (case 1, d), 723]; paternity and خِرَّة [722] (M), inf. ns. on [the measure of] فَعْولَة [331], from which the ی is inseparable in the first state of their formation in this shape [265 (case 10)] (IY); (3) مُدْرَوّان and تَنْبَلَان [228-230, 683 (case 1, f), 723, 727]. S asked Khl about their saying عَظَمَاةٌ [683 (case 1, e), 723], عَظَمَاةٌ and عَظَمَاةٌ; and he said "They only pronounce the n. un. [254] conformably to صِلَأةٌ [723], عَبْآةٌ and عَطَآةٌ (M); as they
say مَرْضِيَة مَسْنُوَى and مَرْضِيَة مَسْنُوَى [685 (case 8), 722]” (S, IY); meaning that مَرْضِيَة صَلَاة and عَبْدَة are not treated like نَهْبَة [above] and إِدَارة [281, 683 (case 1, d)], because the ش is affixed to صَلَاة and عَبْدَة after the conversion [of their ن] into Hamza has become necessary in them (IY): “but, as for those who say مَرْضِيَة صَلَاة and عَبْدَة [266], they do not pronounce the ن. un. conformably to صَلَاة and عَبْدَة; as those who say حُصْيَان [228] do not form the du. conformably to the sing. used in speech (M), whereas, if they meant that, they would say حُصْيَان” (S).

§. 722. They say عَتْبَى جَثْيِ and عَتْبَى جَثْيِ [act of] kneeling upright [728], and عْتَبَى جَثْيِ [with Kasr of the ع and ص, or with دَامم of the ف (IY)], doing to the final ج after دَامم in فُعُول, notwithstanding that the letter of prolongation is a barrier between them, what they do to it in بَذْلِس and بَذْلِس [721], as they do in كَسَا [683, 723] the like of what they do in عَمَا [684, 719] (M). The ج is converted into ش 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
were, immediately after the Damma, \( \overset{3}{\text{عُصَر}} \) becoming constructively \( \overset{2}{\text{عُصَر}} \); and is therefore converted into \( \overset{2}{\text{ى}} \), as in \( \overset{2}{\text{دَل}} \) and \( \overset{2}{\text{حَق}} \) [721]. Then, this \( \overset{2}{\text{ى}} \) being combined with [the preceding] \( \overset{2}{\text{و}} \), the \( \overset{2}{\text{ى}} \) is converted into \( \overset{2}{\text{ى}} \) [685 (case 7)]. And they pronounce the \( \overset{2}{\text{ع}} \) with Kasr in such as \( \overset{2}{\text{عُصَر}} \), as they do in \( \overset{2}{\text{دَل}} \) and \( \overset{2}{\text{حَق}} \) [721] (IY). This process is invariable in what is a pl. [above], except in such an anomaly as \( \overset{2}{\text{يَلَك}} \) لَنْ تَنْظَرَ فِى نُحْرٍ كَثِيرٍ Verily thou lookest in many directions [685 (case 9, a, a)]; but not in what is [a sing. n. (IY)] not a pl. (M), because the sing. [below] is light (IY). They say \( \overset{2}{\text{عَنْتر}} \) and \( \overset{2}{\text{مَغْرَة}} \) (M), as XXV. 23. [685 (case 9, b)] (IY); but they do say \( \overset{2}{\text{عَنْتبِي}} \) and \( \overset{2}{\text{مَغْرَيْي}} \), as

\[\text{685 (case 8, b, a, γ)}: \text{and they say } \overset{2}{\text{آَرَض مَسْنَة}} \] irrigated land [from \( \overset{2}{\text{sَسَوَت}} \) \( \overset{2}{\text{الْأَرْض}} \) I watered the land (IY)], and \( \overset{2}{\text{مَرَضِي}} \) [685 (case 8), 721]; or \( \overset{2}{\text{مَرْض}} \) [below], according to rule. S says "The proper letter in this sort", [i. e., what is a sing. (IY),] "is \( \overset{2}{\text{و}} \); but the other is [good] Arabic, [and] frequent: while the proper letter in the pl. is \( \overset{2}{\text{ى}} \)" (M). The final \( \overset{2}{\text{و}} \) 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
in which the ðamma is on another, as on the measure of $^{5}$عَلَى $^{396}$ from $^{5}$عَرْض $^{728, 730. A}$; and hence pass. part. from $^{5}$تُقَرْب $^{685}$ (case 8), 730. A:

(b) a pl. on [the measure of] $^{5}$فُعَّل $^{243, 685}$ (case 9), like pl. of $^{5}$جَائِئ $^{2}$ in kneeling upright, and $^{5}$عُصُبَى pl. of $^{5}$جَائِئ after transposition $^{243}$: (a) $^{2}$pl. of $^{5}$نَحْو $^{685}$, as Verily he looks etc. [above] is anomalous; and so are $^{2}$نَحْو $^{5}$c'oud, $^{2}$pl. of $^{5}$بَهْر $^{1}$chest, and $^{2}$أَب $^{1}$ab and $^{1}$بَهْر $^{2}$pl. of $^{5}$أَحَر $^{685}$ (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 $^{5}$قُرُون (IY, Jrb) and $^{5}$حُوَّنَة $^{684, 711}$ (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 ðamma is not on [another], but which belongs to the conjug. of with Kasr [of the $^{685}$ (case 8)], which is more frequent than $^{2}$مَرْفَع $^{5}$ [above], for imitation of the pret. v.: (3) properly omitted, in every inf. n. on [the measure of] $^{5}$فُعَّل, like $^{2}$جَنِّر $^{5}$ [act of] kneeling upright and $^{2}$عَنْتَر $^{685}$ (case 9, b); while those who convert [the $^{5}$ into $^{3}$] do so because of the transformation of [the $^{5}$ into $^{1}$ in] the v. [ $^{5}$جَنِّر and $^{5}$عَنْتَر $. If not final, the $^{5}$ is not converted, as $^{5}$أَدْبِر $^{721}$.
Conversion is extraordinary in (1) اَفْعَلْتُ أَغْرُزُ and, like اَفْعَلْتُ أَدْعِيَةُ: but اَفْعَلْتُ أَدْعِيَةُ أَغْرُزُ َّ riddle occurs; and hence اَفْعَلْتُ أَدْعِيَةُ, 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 اَفْعَلْتُ أَلِيْهُ an oath, which may be اَفْعَلْتُ أَلِيْهُ while its ل is a ل, because they say اَلِيْهُ in the same sense: (3) the pass. part. in which the َّلَّمَّا is not on [another], and which does not belong to the conj. of اَفْعَلْتُ اَلِيْهُ with Kasr, like مَغْرَّبَ [685 (case 8, b)]: but اَلِيْهُ or سَمِّيَةُ [above] is said; and the poet says

أَنَا ِلَّتْيَت مَعْدُوٍّ عَلَيْهِ وَعَادِيًا

[above] (R). The saying أَنَا ِلَّتْيَتَ الْمَحَلَّ is recited in both ways [685 (case 8, b, a, ∞)]. The cause of the transformation is disputed, being said to be (1) conformity to the pass. v. اِلْعِدَى (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 أَدْلُ أَجْرُ [243, 721], because the first مَعْدُوٍّ (Sn), being quiescent, angl, [and] fit for incorporation, is not taken into account as a barrier; so that
the ١ which is the ج of the word, is, as it were, immediately after the ظamma; and is therefore converted into ی, as in ۏ٧ ۏ ۏ٧ [above] (A). The pass. part. whose ج is a Hamza is sometimes subjected to this transformation, like مَكْرِبُ وَ مَكْرِيَاتُ orig. hidden [658]. And ۏ٧ فئ٠ occurs anomalously as pl. of فئ٠ فئ٠ youth, notwithstanding that its ج is a ی, as ۏ٧ ۏ٠ فئ٠ ۏ ۏ٠ is anomalous, except that the anomaly in ی is conversion of the ی into [243], and in ۏ٠ نَکْحٟ is non-conversion of the ی into [above]. After conversion of the ۏ into ی [and of the ظamma into Kasra], you may make the ف of فَعُولَ, whether a pl. or otherwise, imitate, or not imitate, the ی [in its vowel], as ۏ٠ [684, 685 (case 9, b, a), 730. A] and ۏ٠ ۏ٠ [243, 685 (case 9)]. And in نَعْلٟ, when a pl. of the hollow whose ی is ۏ٠, as ۏ٠ صَوُمٟ fasters [247] and ۏ٠ قَوْلٟ saysers [730. A], you may convert the ۏ into ی, as ۏ٠ صَوُمٟ and ۏ٠ تَأَلِّلٟ [685 (case 10), 715, 716], though it should rather be sounded true. That is allowable only because it is a pl. [above], and the ۏ is near the end; while ۏ٠ حَيْلٟ for حَوْلٟ [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 فَمَا أَرْقَ أَنْتُمْ آلٟ [685, 715, 716], it is anomalous, because of the remoteness from the end (R).
§ 723. The \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) and \( \ddot{\text{y}} \) are converted [into \( \ddot{\text{l}} \), and afterwards (R)] into Hamza [683 (case 1, \( k, \ddot{\text{a}} \)], when they occur as a final [below] after an \( \text{aug.} \ddot{\text{l}} \), [because, the \( \ddot{\text{l}} \) being then like the non-existent, the mobile \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) and \( \ddot{\text{y}} \) occur, as it were, after Fatha (R),] as \( \dddot{\text{j}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{y}} \) [328, 683, 708, 719] (SH), which are \( \text{فَعَالٌ} \) from \( \text{كَسْأَء} \) [327] and \( \text{فَلَانْ} \text{ّ حَسْسٌ} \text{ّ الرَّدْيَة} \) such a one is good in the fashion of wearing the cloak (Jrb); contrary to \( \dddot{\text{رَاي}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{تَي}} \) [719] (SH), where the \( \ddot{\text{l}} \), being converted from a rad. letter, [\( \ddot{\text{y}} \) in the former ex., and \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) in the latter,] is taken into account (R). It is mentioned, in the commentary ascribed to IH, that \( \dddot{\text{رَاي}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{تَي}} \) are pls. of \( \text{رَايْة} \) and \( \text{تَيْة} \): but this requires consideration; and it should rather be said that \( \dddot{\text{رَاي}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{تَي}} \) [301, 302, 305], \( \text{تَيْة} \) and \( \text{تَيْة} \) [305, 684], are [collective generic ns. and ns. un., respectively,] on the principle of \( \text{تَمْر} \) and \( \text{تَمْر} \) [254] (Jrb). The \( \ddot{\text{j}} \) and \( \ddot{\text{y}} \) mentioned are converted into \( \ddot{\text{l}} \) because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fatha [684, 719]. Then, two quiescents being combined, the first is not elided [708], notwithstanding that it is a letter of prolongation [683], lest one formation be confounded with another, [vid. the prolonged with the abbreviated]; but the second is converted into a letter susceptible of a vowel, [and] akin to \( \ddot{\text{l}} \), 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 ٠ or ی, because one has only just escaped from them (R). It is stipulated, in the case of the [٠ or ی (IY)] converted after ٠ that the ی should be aug. [374, 673], as in ٦س٠ and ٥دآ [above]: whereas, if it be rad., the ٠ or ی is not converted, as ٥٠ز [683 (case 1, a), 697, 698, 720] and ٥٠ز [below], ٥٠ز and ٥٠ز [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 ٥خٟ and ِخٟ [719]: whereas, when the ی is rad., this assumption is not permissible: (2) that the ی, when rad., is converted from another [letter]; so that, when you proceed to convert the ٠ or ی, which is a ٠, you make two transformations consecutively, which is a catachresis. And Mz exaggerates in precaution by stipulating that the ی, with which the ٠ or ی is converted into Hamza, should be [not only] aug., [but] third, to guard against ِزآ [below] and ِزآ [720]; for, though "aug." is sufficient as a safeguard, he corroborates it by "third" (IY). As for ِزآ [321, 720], its ی is converted from a ٠, and
its J is a ی, because it is from the crude-form of ژَوْبَتُ ُنَعَمْ ْمَعَتُ َرَوْبَتُ جَمَعْتُ I collected, except that its ع is transformed, and its J preserved. The general rule is that the J should be transformed, and the ع sounded true, as جَوْبَتُ ُنَوَى ْمَوَى [683, 684 (condition 10, a, a, َى)] and جَوْبَتُ ُنَوَى [683, 713]; but جَوْبَتُ ُرَآيَة ْرَآيَة [above] is co-ordinated, in anomalousness, with جَوْبَتُ ُخَلَأْيَة ْخَلَأْيَة [684 (condition 10, b)]. And, as for جَوْبَتُ ُنَأْيَة [above], the [fold or] nightly resting-place of camels, [sheep, or goats (Jh)], it is from جَوْبَتُ I abode. Similarly, if the ُ and ی be followed by the [inseparable] ِ of femininization [below], as in ِسَقَائِيَة ُسَقَائِيَة ُشَقَارَة ْشَقَارَة [266, 683 (case 1, ُدّ)], then being considered not quasi-final, but quasi-medial, because the ِ of femininization is [permanently] attached to the word, they are not converted into Hamza (Jrb). Since the َ and ی's being mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath is a weak cause for their conversion [703], and, above all, when anِ separates them from the Fatha, it is prevented from taking effect by the occurrence of an inseparable letter after the َ and ی, because their conversion into ِ 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 ِ of feminization [above], when inseparable from the word [683 (case 1, ُدّ)], as in ِنُقاَرَة ْنُقاَرَة ُشَقَارَة ْشَقَارَة ْشَقَارَة ْشَقَارَة ْشَقَارَة [266, 721];
(2) the  of dualization, when inseparable, as in 228, 230, 683 (case 1, f), 721, since  for the sing. does not occur; (3) the non-dualistic and  on the measure of 390, from  and  whereas, (a) if the  be separable, which is (α) the  distinguishing the fem. from the masc. in eps. [265], as 682, 683 (case 1, e) and  great raider, and (b) the regular  of un. [336], as in  a drawing of water and  a choice, an election, or, (b) if the  of dualization be separable, as in 230, 683 (case 1, f)], the , and  are converted, because quasi-final. And the reason why  or or 266, 683 (case 1, e), 721, or or , and  or or , with Hamza or , are allowable, although in them also the  denotes unity, as in [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 and , or [of] others, like and [254]: so that, in the three ns. [under discussion], Hamza is allowable from regard to the
separability of the َث ، since َعُبَا [721], َعُطَا , and َعَلَّة are said for the generic n.; while َي is allowable, because the َث [in the concrete n.], being generally inseparable, since, as we said, it is not regular, becomes like the َث of َنِهَايَةُ َشَقَارَ [229, 266]. And, since the َث of un. in the concrete n. is quasi-inseparable، َعَرْطَّةُ َتَلْنُسُ and َعَرْطَّةُ َتَلْنُسُ are allowable, although the generic n. is َعَرْطَّةُ َتَلْنُسُ and َعَرْطَّةُ َتَلْنُسُ [721]. But [the inf. ns.] َقَتَّلُ and َقَتَّلُ are not like [the concrete ns.] َعَطَا and َعَطَا [above], since َقَتَّلُ and َقَتَّلُ does not denote the individual, and َقَتَّلُ the genus; nay, the n. un. would by rule be َقَتَّلُ a misery [336]: so that َقَتَّلُ is not orig. َقَتَّلُ augmented by the َث ; and for this reason the َي is permanent, as ُعَبَّارٌ ، not ُعَبَّارٌ [266]. The reason why the occurrence of an inseparable letter [after the َي and َي ] prevents conversion in the cat. of َقَتَّلُ [above] and َخَرَّاجَةُ being ashamed [below], and in the cat. of َقَتَّلُ [719, 721], but not in the cat. of َقَتَّلُ and َقَتَّلُ [685, 686, 724], َنَعَلَانُ and َنَعَلَانُ ، respectively, with Kasr of the َع ، even if we hold the َن [and َن ] and the َث 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 [َي into َي ] , notwithstanding that it is separated from the Kasra by a sound letter, in
such as لَدَنَّ (724). The Hamza in such co-ordinates as جَرْبَةٌ عَلَبْبَ (248, 273, 385) is orig. 1 converted from the دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٌ [282] and دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٌ [short, fat (IY on §. 683), fleshy, whether tall or short KF, MAR]], where, the دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ (above), the دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ is not converted, contrary to دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ female chameleon (R).

§. 724. The [final (Jrb) ] دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ, preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr is [unavoidably (M)] converted (M, SH) into دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ (IY, SH), as دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ [below], and دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ [685 (case 1, a), 719, 721] (SH); [and] as دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ [below] and مَكْنَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ I bent, orig. مَكْنَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ (BS). For the دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ, in addition to being preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, is a جَرْبَةٌ, while the جَرْبَةٌ is weak as being at the end [719]; and, since they convert the جَرْبَةٌ in the like of جَرْبَةٌ دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ pl. of دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ [685 (case 3, b, c, α), 713], and دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ and دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ [685 (cases 2, 3), 713], notwithstanding that the جَرْبَةٌ is stronger than the جَرْبَةٌ, much more should the جَرْبَةٌ, which is weaker, be converted because of the Kasra before it (IY). The mobile دَعَكَّةٍ دِرْحَابَةٍ preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, being strengthened by the vowel,
is not converted into ی, except on [one of] two conditions, (1) that it be a ل, because the final is the seat of alteration: (a) it is then converted into ی, whether it be in (a) a n., as یِ کَ مَ تُ َْ[713]; or (b) a v., act., like یِ دَعِیْنِ رُضْوَانِ[685 (case 1, a)], or pass., like یِ دَعِیْنِ was called [629]: and whether it (a) become virtually medial, through the occurrence of a subsequent letter inseparable from the word, as in یُ ِکَ مَ تُ ِعُزْیٰاَنٰ upon [the measure of] یِ نِعَلِیْنِ[685 (case 1, d), 686 (case 2, c, a), 728] from یِ غَرْزُو ِعُزْیٰاَنٰ, and یِ غَرْزُو ِعُزْیٰاَنٰ upon [the measure of] یِ فَعِلَهُ[723] from the same, with inseparability of the ی, as in یِ عِنصِرٰ[385, 721]; or (b) do not become [so], as in یِ غَرْزُو[265 (case 1, a, a), 685 (case 1, b)]: (b) مَقْتَرَٰیٰ مَقْتَرَٰیٰ pl. of مَقْتَرَٰیٰ[685 (case 1, b, c)] is anomalous, being treated as sound for conformity to مَقْتَرَٰیٰ: (c) they say یِ جَنَدُو یُ ِعُلِیْلَو یُ ِعُلِیْلَو [overtopping peak of a mountain (MAR)], with ی, lest the rare یِ فَعِلْیَةُ یِ فَعِلْیَةُ be confounded with the frequent یِ فَعِلْیَةُ, as یِ فَعِلْیَةُ[385], یِ فَعِلْیَةُ [an all. seq. of یِ فَعِلْیَةُ (KF, MAR)], یِ فَعِلْیَةُ[385], and the like: (d) if you contract یِ رَعْیَة یِ رَعْیَة [above] and یِ غُرُزْیٰ یِ غُرُزْیٰ was raided, you say یِ غُرُزَیْیا یِ غُرُزَیْیا, as you say یِ عُلَمَ یِ عُلَمَ [482, 685 (case 7, b, b, γ)], and یِ عُصَرَ یِ عُصَرَ was pressed, squeezed; and the ی is not restored to its o. f. of ی, notwithstanding the removal.
of the Kasra in contraction, because its removal is accidental: (e) they say رضِّيَا They were pleased and غَيْبِيَا They were raided, taking the supplied Kasra into account as respects conversion of the ی into ی, but not as respects retention of the Ḍamma on the ی: whereas, if they took it into account in every respect, رضِّيا and غَيْبِيا would be said, because Ḍamma on the ی is deemed heavy after Kasra; and then the ی's being affixed to the contracted رضِّي and غَيْبِي would not be plain: (2) that it be an ع in a _n._ made conformable to something else, as in خَيْيَم [above], and ٌدِبْأَر and ٌرِبَاش [685 (case 3, a, b)], as before explained [713]. As for the mobile ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Ḍamm, (1) if it do not occur as a ی, then, (a) if it be not pronounced with Kasr, as عَيْيَم and عَيْيَم [713], and عَيْيَم pl. of عِيْتَان [246], it is not converted into ی, because it is strengthened by the vowel, and is also medial; (b) if it be pronounced with Kasr, as بَيْع [436], its predicament has been explained [706]: (2) if it occur as a ی, then, (a) if Fath be inseparable from it, the ی is converted into ی, on account of the preceding letter's being pronounced with Ḍamm, because the final is the seat of alteration; while, through the inseparability of Fath, a ی preceded by a letter pronounced with Ḍamm is not deemed heavy at the end, as it is not so deemed in هَوَ [161, 721]: that is [found]
in (a) the v., as ُرَمَوْ أَلْرَجُلٍ زَيْدٍ Most excellent in shooting is the man, Zaid! [468, 686 (case 2, a), 721] from ُرَمِيَ:

(α) if you contract [ُنْعُلَةَ by eliding] the ِذَمَّة of the ع, the ع is not altered, because the contraction is accidental, as ُطَرِفَ ُعَلَّرَجٍ for ُعَلَّرَجٍ [368, 476]: (b) the ع., but only when the ع is followed by an inseparable aug. necessitating Fath of what is before it, [i. e., of the ع] like [the ِن in] ُرَمُّوُّ أَلْرَجُلٌ on the measure of ُسُكْبَاُنَيٌ [α kind of tree (KF, MAR)] from ُرَمِىٌ, where ُعَنْفُوُّ أَلْرَجُلٌ is not deemed heavy, as it is not so deemed in ُعَنْفُوُّ أَلْرَجُلٌ and ُعَنْفُوُّ أَلْرَجُلٌ [389, 390, 399, 721], because the ع, is, as it were, not a ل: and like [the ُس in] ُرَمُّوُّ أَلْرَجُلٌ on the measure of ُنْعُلَةٍ from ُرَمِىٌ, when the ع is inseparable [686 (case 2, b)]; whereas, if it be not inseparable, you say ُعَمِيٌ and ُرِمٌ [686 (case 2, c, a)], by conversion of the ِذَمَّة into Kasra [721]: (α) the reason why Kasra is inseparable from the letter followed immediately by the ع in such as ُ طَلْيَبٌ with Kasr of the ع, [orig. ُ طَلْيَبٌ] on the measure of ُعَلَّلَنُ with ِذَمَّة of the ع, from [hungered (MAR)], and ُمُطْرِيَةٌ, [orig. ُمُطْرِيَةٌ] on the measure of ُمُسْرِيَةٌ [362], from the same, is only that, the last ع of such as ُفُؤُوُدُ being always converted into ُي [685 (case 1, a, a), 728], the ُي of ُطَلْيَبٌ [or ُمُطْرِيَةٌ] cannot
possibly be converted into ِ: (b) if Fath be not inseparable from it, as in ٱلسَّكَرِي rivalry, competition and ٱلسَّكَرِي disputing, one with another, the Damma is converted into Kasra [700]; and not the ي into ى, because the heaviest of the unsound letters, i. e. ى, preceded by the heaviest of the vowels, i. e. Damma, is deemed too heavy to be a seat of inflection: (a) as for يَهُرَ الرَّجُل, aor. يَهْرُ , i. q. يَهِرُ , meaning [The man] became handsome, its [original] ي, notwithstanding its being a seat of inflection [in the aor.], is converted into ى, because of what we have mentioned (R), [i. e.] on account of the Damma [in ٱفعل], because in vs. the formations are observed, never confused one with another, since the quality of ى comes into existence only by means of the formation and measure [721]; the o. f. of the ى being the inf. n. [331], which is a n., but, on being invaded by the measures, becomes a ى. (R on the Preterite): (b) similarly the Damma is converted into Kasra, when the ي that is the seat of inflection is doubled, as in ٓرعى on the measure of ٓۤیمٓل ٓۤیمٓل [375, 730. A] from ۤرَمَى (R). But ۤتَنَبِّيَة [acquiring for oneself, not for traffic (Jh)] and ۤتَنَبِّيَة [ینبی] ۤدنیا ۤدنیا He is the son of my paternal uncle, closely related [723] are anomalous (SH), by rule ۤدنَّرَا ۤدنَّرَا (Jrb); because you convert the ِ that is a ل into ى, notwithstanding its separation.
from the preceding Kasra by the quiescent. The reason of that, besides its anomalousness, is that the, is a ل, and the quiescent like the non-existent. 

[on this hypothesis] belongs to [the cat. of] the ل, because you say [I acquired for myself, not for traffic (Jh)]: but it should rather be said to belong to the property acquired for oneself, not for traffic (Jh, MAR), with Damm of the ل (R). And [similarly] صبية [246, 257, 685] is from دَنْرُ جَرْن, صَبْحَة; and دَرْنَا [above] from دُنْرُ nearness (IY). Tayyi convert the ل in the cat. of دَعَا رَضَا and دُعْيَ بَقِى and دُعْيَ بَقِى (SH), saying لَوْ رَضَا and دُعْيَ بَقِى [349, 482], because, deeming Kasra before the ل to be heavy, they convert it into Fatha; so that the ل becomes converted into ل (Jrb), as before explained [703]. This is a universal rule, according to them, whether the ل be orig. ل, as in دَعْيَ لَوْ and دُعْيَ [above]; or not, as in دُعْيَ لَوْ (R). But that is peculiar to ل, to the exclusion of ns., like أَلْقَاقِي [16, 294, 720] (Jrb).

§. 725. When the ل of قَلْقَلَى, with Fath of the ل, is unsound, then, (1) if ل, it is preserved in the substantive, as دَعْرُ [248, 272]; and ep., as نَشْوَى [fem. of نَشْوَانُ tipsy (MAZ, Sn)]: (a) they make no distinction
between the substantive and ep. in the cat. of the ُ, [below] (A): (b) its ُ, is not converted into ٰٰ, either in the substantive, as ذَعْوَى [above], or ep., as شَهَوَى. fem. of شَهَوْانْ lustful, because the beginning and the end of the word are moderate [in weight] through [the lightness of] the Fatha and [the heaviness of] the ُ; whereas, if the ُ were converted into ٰ, both ends of the word would become light (R): (2) if a ٰٰ, it is preserved in the ep., as صَدْيَا and حَزْيَا [686 (case 3, a)], fems. of صَدْيَانْ and حَزْيَانْ; and converted into ُ, in the substantive, as ُ, ُ, ُ, ُ, 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 ُ, 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 ٰٰ into ُ; and then the ep., when it is reached, is left without conversion, for the sake of distinction (R): (c) this change occurs in most cases (IM): (d) IM says “in most cases” to exclude ُ, ُ, ُ, ُ, as he expressly states in the CK; but the exclusion of these requires consideration [for reasons here assigned by A, identical with those given in § 686]. What IM mentions here
and in the CK, is agreeable with the opinion of S, [Z, IH,] and most of the GG: I mean that, in the substantive 
\( \text{ئَلَّى} \), change of \( \text{ى} \) into \( \text{ر} \) is regular, and retention of \( \text{ى} \) anomalous. But in the Tashil he reverses [the rule], saying that the substitution of \( \text{ر} \) for the \( \text{ى} \) [serving as the ل of ] \( \text{ئَلَّى} \), when a substantive, is anomalous. And, in one of his [other] compositions also, he says “One anomaly in transformation is the substitution of \( \text{ر} \) for in \( \text{ئَلَّى} \), when a substantive, like نَشْرَى Nashwā, [a district in Adhrabijān (Sn),] \( \text{نَقْوَى} \) [above], \( \text{عَنْوَى} \) [with an undotted \( \text{ع} \) and a \( \text{ن} \) in the MSS, but not found by me in the KF or Msb or any other (work on lexicology) (Sn)], and \( \text{قْوَى} \) [above], the o. f. in them being \( \text{ى} \).” Then he says “But most of the GG make this regular; and, to the four [exs.] mentioned, they append \( \text{شَرَى} \) [above], طُغْيَانَ [i. q. طُغْوَى (686, case 3, a) (Sn)], قَفَّى, [so in the MSS, with \( \text{ق} \), but not found by me in the KF or elsewhere, what is in the KF being قَفَّى with the dotted \( \text{غ} \), i. q. لَغُوى, 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 دَوْرَى [above], asserting that their o. f. is \( \text{ى} \); whereas, in my opinion, these last, [i. e., شَرَى and the three after it (Sn),] should rather be regarded as
belonging to [the cat. of (Sn)] the , in order to preclude multiplication of anomalies” (A); though this argument does not apply to “most of the GG”, because they do not profess that these four are anomalous (Sn). And afterwards he says “One thing which makes it plain that the change of ی [in نَشْوَى and the three after it (Sn)] into , is anomalous, is the sounding [of the ی ] true in رَیَّا [above], طَقْعِيَّا , and سَعْبٰیا ; for these three, which occur [with ی ] according to the o. f., and with avoidance of anomalousness, are more worthy of being considered regular”. This is his language: but a criticism on his citation of these three as proofs has already been passed (A), deducible from the criticism on their exclusion by his saying “in most cases” [above] (Sn). When the ل of فَعْلَی , with Damm of the ف , is unsound, then, (1) if a ی , it is preserved in the substantive, as a legal opinion; and ep., as جُعْلَیَّا fem. of جُعْلَی , the most decisive (A), to be distinguished, say our Master and YH, from جُعْلَی , as to which the difference between the Hijazis and Tamimis will be mentioned below, the o. f. [of the ل ] in the latter being رَوَّ ، while in this it is ی (Sn): (a) they make no distinction between the substantive and ep. in the جُعْلَی belonging to the cat. of the ی , as they make none in the جُعْلَی belonging to the cat. of the ، [above] (A): (b) its ل is not converted, in the substantive or ep., because
moderateness [in weight] is produced in the word by the heaviness of the Ḍamma at its beginning, and the lightness of the ی at its end; whereas, if the ج were converted into ّ, both ends of the word would become heavy (R): (2) if a ٌ, it is preserved in the substantive, like حَرْزَی [272], as اَدَارًا بِحَرْزَیِ الْحُم [685 (case 6, e)]; and converted into ی in the ep., as XXXVII. 6, and لِنُنْتَقِیْنَ الْحُم [685 (case 6)]: (a) as for the saying of the Ḥijāzīs َالْكُصْرَی [685 (case 6, c)], it is anomalous by rule, [though] chaste by usage, serving to notify the o. f. (A), i. e., (Sn); while Tamīm say َالْكُصْصِیَا [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 ج of فِعْلَی , when a ٍ, is converted in the substantive, not in the ep.; and make حُرْزَی anomalous [685 (case 6, f)] (A). As for the cat. of the ّ, a sort of heaviness is produced in it by Ḍamma's being at the beginning of the word, and ٌ's being near the end; while, in addition to alleviation, distinction between the substantive and ep. is intended: so that the ّ is converted into ی in the substantive, not in the ep., because the substantive is anterior to the ep., and [its excessive heaviness] is therefore moderated by conversion of its ّ into ی; and then, the ep., when it is
reached, is left without conversion for the sake of distinction between them. And َعْلَبَيَا, َلَدْنَيَا, and َلَقْبِيَا, though fems. of َلَدْنَيَا [359], َلَقْبِيَا, and َلَقْبِيَا, the mention of superiority, are mentioned by S under the substantive َلَقْبِيَا, since َلَقْبِيَا fem. of َلَقْبِيَا 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 َلَقْبِيَا [above] to be a substantive, and َغَرْزِي [685 (case 6, f)] and َلَقْبِيَا [above], fems. of َلَقْبِيَا and َلَقْبِيَا, to be eps., requires consideration, because also is fem. of َلَقْبِيَا [above]. But, says S, they say َلَقْبِيَا, [according to the o. f. (S)]; so that they do not convert its َلَقْبِيَا into َلَقْبِيَا because with the art. it is sometimes an ep. [356]. According to the opinion of S, then, َغَرْزِي, and every fem. of the َلَقْبِيَا of superiority whose َلَقْبِيَا is a َلَقْبِيَا; should by rule have [its َلَقْبِيَا converted into] َلَقْبِيَا, because treated like a substantive: Sf says "I have not found S mention any ep. on [the measure of] َلَقْبِيَا with Damm, whose َلَقْبِيَا is a َلَقْبِيَا, except what is used with the art., as َعْلَبَيَا, َلَدْنَيَا, َلَقْبِيَا, and the like; and these, according to S, are like substantives" (R). But [S adds that], when you say َلَقْبِيَا belonging to this cat. [whose َلَقْبِيَا is a َلَقْبِيَا], 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 نُلْلَى, according to the o. f., though it is a substantive (S).

"And", says Sf, "he means that نُلْلَى, when a scion of the ٌ, 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] نُلْلَى 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 نُلْلَى, with Kasr of the ٌ, from the defective, its ي is not converted into ى, nor its ى into ٍ, whether it be a substantive or an ep., because Kasra is not so heavy as Damma, nor so light as Fatha, but is intermediate between the two; so that moderateness [in weight] is produced in it with the ي and with the ٍ; while the real reason for converting the ي of نُلْلَى with Fath, and the ٍ of نُلْلَى with Damm, 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 نُلْلَى pronounced with Fath of its ٌ, when belonging to the cat. of the ٌ, and the نُلْلَى pronounced with Damm of its ٌ, when belonging to the cat. of the ى, since moderateness is produced in both? But, as for exs. of نُلْلَى, with Kasr of the ٌ, belonging to the cat. of the ٍ, and likewise of the ى, they are scarce (R).
§. 726. When the final of the ultimate *pl.* [18, 256] is a ا preceded by Hamza, its *sing.* (1) contains an (a) second, followed by (a) a Hamza, (a) original, as in من شَأَرَتُ I *preceded, outwent*; (b) converted, as in من شَأَرَتْ I *wished* : (b) a ﻓُوَيْ, as in من شَأَرِيْنَ from I *roasted* : (b) third, followed by (a) a ﻓُوْ, as in ﻓُوْ [281] and ﻓُوْ [below]; (b) a ا, as in دُوْاَيْ [a thin skin that rises to the top of milk and broth (MAR)] and ﻓُوْ [266] : (2) is not formed in any of these ways, whether its ل be a Hamza, as in خَطْيَة fault [below]; or be not, as in بْلِيْنَ trial, affliction. The general rule in the [ultimate] *pl.s.* of all these *sings.* is that the two heavies—I mean the ا 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 ا into ل, and the Kasra before it into Fatha; and (2) the Hamza into ا. For, since the ا is allowably converted into ل in such as مَدْاَرِي [below], notwithstanding that the letter before the ا is not Hamza, it is reasonable that the conversion here should be necessary, because Hamza is heavy. And the Hamza is converted into ا, not ل, because the former
is lighter than the latter, and nearer to Hamza in outlet [732]. The reason why, in such as حَمْزَاء [230, 686], it is mostly converted into ﺖ, not ی, is quest of moderation, because, ی being approximate to ﺖ, the insertion of a ی between two ﺖs would be [equivalent to] a combination of three ﺖs: so that a relief from the succession of likes is sought in ﺖ, notwithstanding its heaviness, (1) because the formation is light; and (2) because the enclosure of the ﺖ by two ﺖs in the du. is not permanent, since, the ﺖ of dualization [16, 228, 685] not being inseparable [from the ن.], the ﺖ supervening on account of it is not permanent. But, as for the ultimate pl., the Hamza in it is not converted into ﺖ, (1) because the formation is heavy; and (2) because the enclosure [of the Hamza] by two ﺖs is permanent, so that the ﺖ would be permanent, if the Hamza were converted into it. In the pl. of کَلَبِیْهْ present, however, حَدَازَی occurs, for the sake of moderation, as in حَمْزَاء; but this is anomalous, except according to Akh [below], who considers it regular, as in حَمْزَاء [above]. The general rule mentioned is contravened in two cases, (1) when the sing. contains an ﺖ [second], followed by a Hamza, as in شَاکِیْهْ from ﺖ or from شَآرَتْ [above]; in which case the Hamza and ی are left unaltered, as حَوَلَاء الشَّوْآتْی. These are the preceders or the wishers, for observance of the
sing. in the pl., as it is observed in such as ّكتبأي and ّکتبأي [248]: (2) when the sing. contains an ا third, followed by a و, [as in ّکدبأ (above) and ّکدبأ (266);] in which case the Hamza is converted, but into ّا, as أدادأي and ّكلأي, not into ّي, [this contravention] also [being] for observance of the sing. [715]. And, according to this, in the pl. whose sing. contains an ا second, followed by a و, like ّمكابي pl. of ّسبأي [above], the sing. ought to be observed, as ّمكابي [715]; but, since it is orig. ّمكابي, and then the , after the ا is converted into Hamza, as in ّمكابي [683 (case 4), 715], because the ا of the pl. is enclosed by two unsound letters, the Hamza is not afterwards converted [back] into , 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 ّي, as ّمكابي [715]. Similarly, [the general rule is observed] in the pl. whose sing. (1) contains an ا [third], followed by a ّي, like ّسبأي and ّسبأي [above]; so that, if they were given this pl., ّسبأي and ّسبأي would be said: (a) ّي is more appropriate here for two reasons, observance of the sing., and conformity to the general rule: (2) does not contain an ا followed by a Hamza, ّي, or ّا; so that the Hamza [in the pl.] is converted into ّي.
and the [after it] into ل، as خطاي and بلاي، pls. of خطيبة [below] and بلية [above]: (a) هداوى occurs in [the pl. of] هدية [above], as we have mentioned. This being established, know that (1) the ل [third] in all these pls. is imported for pluralization [256], and is not [found] in the sing.: (2) the Hamza after the ل in شوء [above], (a) from شارت is the original [Hamza], which is [found] in the sing., [being the ه of the word]; (b) from شنت is adventitious in the pl. [683 (case 4), 715], as in the sing. [683 (case 2), 708]: (3) the ل [second] in the sing. of both is converted into د [247, 686] in the pl. [شوء]; and so is the ل of شوابي from شوبت [above] in the pl., شوابي: (4) the د of the sing. [شوابي], which is after the ل [second], is converted into Hamza [in the pl.], as in أتيل [above]; and then the Hamza [pronounced with Kasr] into د pronounced with Fath, as we mentioned: (5) the ل [third] in خط is converted in the pl. into Hamza, as in رسائل [below]; and its د into د because [final and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 1, a), 724]; and then the Hamza [pronounced with Kasr] into د pronounced with Fath, [and the د into ل, as أدا م above]: (6) similarly, [mutatis mutandis,] in سقايا، [as سقايا above]:
(7) the ى in خُطْبَيْنِ [below] is converted into Hamza, according to S, as in مَكَاينِ [246, 683 (case 3), 717]: and, two Hamzas being then combined, the second is converted into ى [below]; and the first into ى pronounced with Fath, as in بِكَلِيَّا [above] and the like; and the ى after it into ل [684, 719], because the ى necessarily converted from Hamza is in the predicament of an original ى, [which is converted into ل when mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath;] while the second Hamza here is necessarily converted into ى [above], because final [661]: so that خَطْبَيْنِ is like خَطْبَيْنِ [below], the ى, i.e. the last letter, of both being converted into ل: (a) Khl [below] says that it is orig. خَطْبَيْنِ with Hamza after the ى that is [third] in the sing., [so that its measure is ُتَمَيْلُ]; but that the ى is put into the position of the Hamza, and the Hamza into the position of the ى, [so that its measure becomes ُتَعَالَى]; and afterwards the Hamza, which is the ل of the word, is converted into ى pronounced with Fath, so that its measure is ُتَعَالَى, which, by conversion of the final ى into ل, becomes ُتَعَالَى [below]: (b) IH, therefore, says "And hence خَطْبَيْنِ, 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 ى pronounced with Fath (R on
Alleviation of the Hamza). When Hamza occurs after the ٌ of the pl. upon [the measure of (Tsr)] [18, 256, 685], and that Hamza is adventitious in the pl. [below], and the ٍ of the pl. is a Hamza, ی, or ٍ, then two operations are necessary, (1) conversion of the Kasra of the Hamza into Fathā: (2) conversion of the Hamza (a) into ى in three cases, vid. when the ٍ of the sing. is a Hamza, an original ى, or a ً, converted into ى; and (b) into َ, in one case, vid. when the ٍ of the sing. is a َ, apparent (Aud) in the expression, preserved from conversion into ى: 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 (IV),] like the Hamza of َ ْجُوَأَر [248, 708] and سُوَأَه, pls. of سَكَّيْة جَانِيّة, [which are] فَعَلْتُها from جِاء came, [orig. جِبَّا] and سَأْل ْيَلَتِ illtreated, vexed, [orig. سُوَأَة ,] 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 ْ, or ى, as in the two exs. just given by Z, or be original;] so that, in the pl. of جَانِيّة جَالَى عَلَيّه, [fem.] act. part. from جَالِى عَلَيّه bit it, and of سَكَّيْة جَانِيّة [above] from شَاء preceded, outwent, him, you say شَاة ْجُوَأَر and شَاة ْجُوَأَر [248, 708], like ْجُوَأَر girls and غُرَاش coverings [18], to distinguish the original Hamza,
existing in the *sing.,* from the adventitious (IY). In order that such [a formation] as ُشَوْتُ شَآئِثٍ from شَوْتُ [above] may be excluded, IH prescribes, as a condition for conversion of the Hamza of the *pl.* into ی، and of its ی into ی، that the *sing.* should not be like that, i.e., should not have after its ی a Hamza followed by ی، [as شَآئِثٌ، like شَوْتُ، has]; since, if it were like that, the Hamza and ی would be left in the *pl.* without conversion, in order that the *pl.* might match its *sing.:* do you not observe them say حَبَّالَی as *pl.* of شَآئِثٌ آداری [248], ُحَبَّالَی as *pl.* of ُدَارُ [above], and ُشَوْتُ as *pl.* of شَآئِثٍ [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 شَآئِثٍ from شَوْتُ [above], S is bound to say شَوْبِیاً, because the Hamza is adventitious [683 (case 4), 715], according to him, [in the *pl.* ُشَوْعُ،] 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 ُشَوْتُ from شَوْتُ 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 
\[
\text{أَلْماَرَثَي} \quad \text{pl. of} \quad 
\]
[658], where the Hamza, being found in the sing., because 
\[
\text{مُقَعَّلَة} \quad 
\]
[366] from [658], is not altered in the pl. (Aud); although 
\[
\text{أَلْماَرَايَا} 
\]
with change, anomalously, has been heard (Tsr). And the stipulation of unsoundness of the \( \mathbb{J} \) excludes such as 
\[
\text{صَكَّكْتَفُ} \quad 
\]
[above], 
\[
\text{رَسَآَثْلُ} \quad 
\]
[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 \( \mathbb{J} \) is a Hamza, is 
\[
\text{حَطَبَايَا} \quad [661, 708] \quad \text{(Aud), pl. of} \quad 
\]
\[
\text{حَطُبِيَّة} \quad [above], \quad \text{مُقَعَّلَة} 
\]
committing a fault (Tsr): [for] it is orig. 
\[
\text{حَطَبَايِّي} 
\]
with a \( \mathbb{Y} \) pronounced with Kasr, which is the \( \mathbb{Y} \) of \( \text{حَطُبِيَّة} \); and followed by a Hamza, which is its \( \mathbb{J} \): then (1) the \( \mathbb{Y} \) [pronounced
with Kasr (Tsr) is changed into Hamza, as in [above]; so that the word becomes خَطَائِي  with two Hamzas, [the first substituted for the ی, and the second the ی 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 خَطَائِي ]: then (3) the Kasra of the first [Hamza (Tsr)] is converted into Fatha for alleviation, since they sometimes do that where the ی is sound, as in عَدَارَى [above] and عَدَارَى عَدَارَى عَدَارَى [248, 256], as [504] and 

عَدَآئِرَةٌ مُستَشَرَّاتٌ إِلَى الْعُلَى

نُصِبُ الْعَدَارَى فِي مُنْتَى وَمُمْسِلٍ [which also is (Tsr) by Imra alKals (MN, Tsr), The plaits whereof are piled up on high, the hair-pins being lost in hair coiled and loosened (MN)]; and a fortiori here (Aud), where the ی is unsound, because [ی preceded by] Kasra is heavy (Tsr); [so that the word becomes خَطَائِي ]: then (4) the ی is converted into ی [684, 719], because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath; so that the word becomes خَطَائِي , with two یs, having a Hamza between them: and then,
(5) since Hamza resembles ٌ [because it is from the same outlet (Tsr),] three ٌs seem to be combined; and, [that being disliked (Tsr),] the Hamza is therefore changed into ی, [not into ِ, because ی is lighter than it (Tsr)]: so that the word becomes حُرْطَبَا 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 ی, so that the word becomes حُرْطَبَا [661]; and then what has been mentioned [in operations 3—5] above, as to converting the Kasra into Fatḥa, then the ی into ِ, and then the Hamza into ی, is done here. But it is objected that they sometimes pronounce the pl. according to the o.f., since ِّ(scanner:Arabic) [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 ی, is قَضَابِّی [pl. of قَضَایِ نَعِیَلَة decision (Tsr)]: [for] it is orig. قَضَابِّی with two یs, the first the ی of نَعِیَلَة, and the second the ج of قَضَایِ: then (1) the first [ی (Tsr)] is changed into Hamza, as in صَكَٰثِرْف [above] (Aud); so that the word
becomesُ{$^3$}ضَامِئْ (Tsr): then (2) the Kasra of the Hamza is converted into Fatha (Aud); so that it becomesُ{$^3$}ضَامِئْ (Tsr): then (3) the ی is converted into ل (Aud); so that it becomesُ{$^3$}ضَامِئْ (Tsr): and then (4) the Hamza [intermediate between the two لs (Tsr)] is converted into ی, [for a return to its o. f. (Tsr)]; so that the word becomesُ{$^3$}ضَامِئْ after four operations. The ex. of the [third] case, where the ی is ٧, converted into ی in the sing., is ُ{$^3$}ضَامِئْ [saddle-camel (Tsr)]: for it is orig. ُ{$^3$}ضَامِئْ, [being] فَعْبَلا meaning back (Aud), or from مَظِيرٌ I made them extend the journey, i. e., ِمَدَّت (Tsr); but the ی is changed into ی, and the [preceding] ی then incorporated into it, on the principle of the change and incorporation in ُ{$^5$}صَبِّيُّ and ُ{$^5$}صَبِّيُّ, for which مَيْتُ ُ{$^6$}سَيدُ and مَيْتُ ُ{$^6$}سَيدُ, [685 (case 7, a, a), 716, 747] are said: and its pl. is ُ{$^6$}صَبِّيُّ [661, 708], orig. مَطَابِيُّ [with a ی pronounced with Kasr before the ی (Tsr)]; where (1) the ی is converted into ی, because final after Kasra, as in ُ{$^4$}الْغَارِي and [685 (case 1, a), 724] (Aud); so that it becomes مَطَابِيُّ (Tsr): then (2) the first ی is converted into Hamza, as in مَطَابِيُّ [above] (Aud); so that it becomes مَطَابِيُّ (Tsr): then (3) the Kasra is changed into Fatha (Aud);
so that it becomes ُمَطَاء (Tsr): then (4) the َي [is changed (Tsr)] into ِ; [so that it becomes ُمَطَاء ]: and then (5) the Hamza [intermediate between the two ِs is changed (Tsr)] into ُي; so that it becomes ُمَطَايَا after five operations. The ex. of the [fourth] case, where the ِل is a، [apparent (Tsr).] preserved in the sing., is ُهَرُّاء [big stick (Tsr)], pl. ُهَرَّوَيّ: for (1) we convert the ِ of ُهَرُّاء in the pl. into Hamza, as in سَلّي pl. of سَلّة [246, 683 (case 3, a-d), 717] (Aud); so that it becomes ُهَرْرَّوَيّ (Tsr): then (2) we change the ِ، into ُي، because final after Kasra [685 (case 1, a), 724] (Aud); so that it becomes ُهَرْرَّوَيّ (Tsr): then (3) we convert the Kasra into Fatha (Aud); so that it becomes ُهَرَّوَيّ (Tsr): then (4) the َي is converted into ِ (Aud), because mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath [684, 719]; so that it becomes ُهَرَّوَي with a Hamza between two ِs (Tsr): and then (5) we convert the Hamza into ِ، [in order that the pl. may be conformable to the sing. (Tsr):] so that it becomes ُهَرَّوَي، [which result] also [is reached] after five operations (Aud). As for ُغَدَايَا pl. of ُغَدَا in ُغَدَا ُغَدَايَا pl. of ُغَدَايَا [ُغَدَا ُغَدَايَا pl. of ُغَدَا] Such a one comes to us in the mornings and evenings, Jj in the Commentary on the Takmilat [alIdāḥ by F (Hkh)] and ISd in the Exposition of the verses of the Jumal [by Zji
(Hkh)] say that َي occurs in it only in order that it may be akin to َعَـيْـلاَيَا [pl. of َعَـيْـلاَيَا (KF)]. But the right [view] is that what is done [here] for conformity is only to give َجَـدَايَا َحَـدًا, to which it is not entitled, [its measure being ْفَعَّلَة, which does not take the pl. ْفَعَّىَلِلْ,] contrary to َعَـيْـلاَيَا, which is like ِتَمْيَيْـلاَيَا [above] and ِتَمْيَيْـلاَيَا [testament, precept, pl. َمَايَا (MAZ)]; whereas, after receiving this pl., it is entitled to َي, which is substituted for the Hamza of ْفَعَّىَلِلْ [246], not for the َل of َجَـدَايَا, which is and, because its pl. is َجَـدُوْلاَيَا, like َجَـدُوْلاَيَا [719]. For, since they give َجَـدَايَا a pl. on [the measure of] ْفَعَّىَلِلْ for affinity [to َعَـيْـلاَيَا], while every pl. on [the measure of] ْفَعَّىَلِلْ, whose َل is a Hamza or َي, or a َل, not preserved in the sing., is entitled to have َي substituted for its Hamza, like ِتَمْيَيْـلاَيَا [above], ِتَمْيَيْـلاَيَا, and ِتَمْيَيْـلاَيَا, they do that in َجَـدَايَا, because the َل of َجَـدَايَا is not preserved. If you say "Assume َجَـدَايَا to be pl. of َجَـدُوْلاَيَا [286]: then their language is correct, because, the َل being preserved in the sing., the regular form would be َجَـذَايَا َجَـذَايَا, like َعِزَـرَى ُعِزَـرَى pl. of ُعِزَـرَى [above]", I say "This is forbidden by two considerations, (1) that, since they say only that it is pl. of َجَـذَايَا, 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 عدائية is not said for affinity at all, since it is pl. of عدًا, not of عدّة; and, as evidence for the existence of عدّة, he cites the saying

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

(by 'Ubaida Ibn AlHarith 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 'Ali and Ḥamza, until they were made to visit the fates, i. e., death (MN)], by rule أبّنایا, 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 ḥآليم أَفْقَرُ الْحَوْفِ [above], with two Hamzas, by rule خطَّائِیَّة; and this is more anomalous
than the preceding: (3) changing the letter after the \( \text{ض} \) into a letter not required by rule, as \( \text{ض} \) pl. of \( \text{ض} \) [above], by rule \( \text{ض} \) (Tsr). Akh [above] holds \( \text{ض} \) to be regular: but this [opinion] is weak, [and Dm says that no reason for it is apparent (Sn)], since this word is the only instance of it that has been transmitted. The opinion of the KK is that all these pls. [mentioned above as exs. of the four cases] are on the measure of \( \text{ض} \) [272] (A), where the letter after the \( \text{ض} \) of the pl. is the \( \text{ل} \) of the word, and the [final] \( \text{ض} \) is for feminization (Sn): the \( \text{ض} \) being sounded true in \( \text{ض} \), as in the sing.; and transformed [into \( \text{ض} \)] in \( \text{ض} \), as in the sing.; while [\( \text{ض} \) or] \( \text{ض} \) is [also] on the measure of the o. f. (A), i. e., matches the sing., its \( \text{ل} \) being sounded true, like the \( \text{ل} \) of the sing. (Sn); and, as for \( \text{ض} \), it comes from \( \text{ض} \) [658], with change and incorporation, on the measure of \( \text{ض} \) (A), \( \text{ض} \) also, according to this, being on the measure of the o. f., like \( \text{ض} \) [above], \( \text{ض} \), and [\( \text{ض} \) or] \( \text{ض} \) (Sn). But the BB [above] hold that they are [on the measure of (KIAmb)] \( \text{ض} \), [which is the opinion adopted by IM (Sn)], in order to make the unsound [in the \( \text{ل} \)], [like \( \text{ض} \) pl. of \( \text{ض} \) (Sn),] conform to the sound (A), like
pl. of صِحِيفَةَ (Sn). And the correctness of their opinion is proved by the saying

\[\text{حَتَّى أَظَنْتُ أَنْ خَطَأَتَهَا} \]

[above]. As for the report [transmitted] from Khl, that the measure of خَطَأَتَهَا is خَطَأَتَهَا [above], it is not like the saying of the KK, because the [final] \(\text{I}\), according to them, is [an \text{aug. put} (Sn)] for feminization, [the \text{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 \text{subst. for the postpos. letter of prolongation} (A), i. e., for that [\(\text{i}\)] which becomes posterior [to the J] in the pl. after being prior [to it] in the sing., vid. the letter of prolongation converted into \text{Hamza} in خَطَأَتَهَا [246, 683 (case 3), 717] (Sn).

\[\text{§. 727. Every (M) [final] \(\text{I}\), occurring fourth or upwards is converted into \(\text{I}\) [685 (case 4)], when the letter before it is not pronounced with Damm [below] (M, SH), whether that letter be pronounced with Fath [below] or Kasr [685 (case 1), 724] (Jrb), as (1) أَغْرَيْتُ (M, SH), غَزَيْتُ [685 (case 4, b)], I hoped, تَغَزَيْتُ I hoped (M) and تَغَزَيْتُ I was equipped for raiding (SH), إِسْتَغْرَيْتُ [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 تَفَاعُلٍ, تَفَاعُلَ, and تَفَاعُلَتِ, has the penultimate of its aor. pronounced with Kasr [404]; so that its ل, when ن, is converted into [685 (case 1, a), 724], because final and preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr, as يَعْرِبُ and يَعْرِبُونِ: and they make the pret. accord with the aor., saying and استُعِرِبَت; (b) similarly they convert the و into [the pret. of] تَفَاعُلٍ and تَفَاعُلٌ, because نَفَعُ and نَفَعَ are quasi-pass. of نَفَعَ and نَفَعٍ [486, 487]; so that, since the و is converted into ی in the o. f., it remains so after prefixion of the ُ of quasi-passivity (Jrb): يَرْضَيُّ (2) [719] (M, SH) and يَغُرُّيِّ (685 (case 1, a), in the aors. of غَرِيَّ and جَرِيّ and مَلِيَّ (3) [229, 626, 629] (M), du. of مَلِىّ [327] (IY); [du. of مُصْطَفَّيِّ (M), du. of مُصْنَّفِّ (IY); and [similarly (IY)] مَصْتَدَعِيّ (327) (M): contrary to يَغُرُّوٍ [404, 719-721] (SH), where the ُ, though fourth, is not converted into ی, because the letter before it is pronounced with دِمٍ (Jrb). The final ُ, fourth or upwards, preceded by a letter pronounced with فَث [above], is converted into ی on two conditions, (1) that
its conversion into ٠ be not allowable because of (a)
quiescence of the ٠ [684 (condition 1), 719], as in ٠
and ٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠٠..
with Fath [482, 685 (case 4, c)], it resembles the aor. whose pret. is ُقَعُدّ with Kasr, because the normal pret. of ُقَعُدّ is ُقَعَدّ [482]; and therefore it is treated like [the aor. of] ُرَضَأّ [above] and ُشَقَقَّ was wretched, so that they say ُيَرَضَيْبٰن and ُيَشَقَقَّبٰن (IY): (c) this reason [ascribed to IHsh] is weak, as you see, since (a) it does not apply to ُأَعْلَبٰأٰن [above]; (b) if conversion of the ُو into ُي in the pret. were necessitated by its conversion in the aor., much more would it be necessitated by conversion in the pret. itself, and ُعَرْتوت ُعَرْتُيّ [for ُعَرْتوت] ought to be said because of their saying ُعَرْتٰيّ [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 ُثَان” [above], Z [followed by IH] guards against such vs. as ُيَغَّرُو and ُيَعْدُمو [above], and ns. as ُتَرَفُّوة [283, 385] and ُعَرْتِوة [248] (IY). [Z and] IH ought to say “when the letter before it is not pronounced with ُثَان, and its conversion into ُي is not allowable”, in order to exclude such as ُأَغْرَى He equipped for raiding. Nor is the saying “when the letter before it is not pronounced with ُثَان” [to be taken] without restriction; but the condition is that the letter before it should not be
pronounced with Ḍamm in the v., as يِذْعَرُ [above]: whereas in the n. the 𐤀 is converted into 𐤀, [notwithstanding that the letter before it is pronounced with Ḍamm,] as 𐤀ُداِل َذَّ [721]; [while in ُداِل َذَّ and ُداِل َذَّ تَفَازَ [721]; while in ُداِل َذَّ and ُداِل َذَّ تَفَازَ [721]; while in ُداِل َذَّ and ُداِل َذَّ تَفَازَ [721]; while in ُداِل َذَّ and ُداِل َذَّ تَفَازَ [721]; while in ُداِل َذَّ and ُداِل َذَّ تَفَازَ [721]; while in ُداِل َذَّ and ُداِل َذَّ تَفَازَ] conversion is prevented not, as iy makes out, by the Ḍamma before the 𐤀, but by the 𐤀 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 Ḍamm", [Z and] IH should rather say "when the letter before it is pronounced with Fath", [Kasr having been provided for in §. 724] (R).

§. 728. The cat. of ُداِل َذَّ تَفَاز ُداِل َذَّ تَفَاز ُداِل َذَّ تَفَاز ُداِل َذَّ تَفَاز ُداِل َذَّ Tov and ُداِل َذَّ Tov is [treated as] sound [in the 𐤀, which, though mobile and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, is not converted into 𐤀 (Jrb)], because of the two transformations (SH). For in ُداِل َذَّ Tov [729, 730. A], the 𐤀 and 𐤀 of which are 𐤀, the [second] ُداِل َذَّ Tov is unavoidably converted into ُداِل َذَّ Tov [685 (case 1, a)]; so that, if the first were converted into ُداِل َذَّ Tov, two transformations would be combined in a. tril., which is not allowable: while in ُداِل َذَّ Tov fell down [302, 713] you transform the 𐤀 by converting it into ُداِل َذَّ Tov [684, 719]; so that you have no means of transforming the 𐤀, from fear of two transformations (R). And the cat. of ُداِل َذَّ Tov [302, 703, 713, 724] and ُداِل َذَّ Tov [697, 698, 703] (SH),
notwithstanding that two transformations would not be combined in it, if they converted the \( \varepsilon \) into \( \text{I} \), is also [treated as] sound (Jrb), because it is subordinate to [the cat. of (MASH)] \( \text{حَرَى} \) [above] (SH): for \( \text{فعل} \) with Fath of the \( \varepsilon \) \( [482] \) is the principal [form of unaugmented tril. pret.], because of its lightness and frequency; and, since the \( \varepsilon \) is sounded true in the principal, it is sounded true in the subordinate (Jrb). Or [their omission to transform the \( \varepsilon \) in three of the vs. mentioned, vid. those which are on the measure of \( \text{فعل} \) with Kasr of the \( \varepsilon \), is (R)] because [every hollow v. of the conjug. of \( \text{فعل} \), whose \( \varepsilon \) is converted into \( \text{I} \) in the pret., has its \( \varepsilon \) converted in the aor., as حَافَ , aor. يَحَافُ , and حَافَ , aor. يَهُافُ: so that, if they said حَافَ , aor. يَحَافُ , and حَافَ in the pret., then (R) would have to be said (SH) in the aor.; whereas, in the aor., Damm of the \( \jmath \), when a \( \text{ى} \), is eschewed \( [720] \), even with quiescence of the letter before it, contrary to the \( \text{n.} \), as حَافَ and حَافَ [720] and حَافَ \( [723] \), because the v. is heavy. And the like may be said of حَرَى also, because every hollow \( [v.] \) of the conjug. of \( \text{فعل} \), whose \( \varepsilon \) is made quiescent by conversion into \( \text{I} \) [in the pret.], must have the \( \varepsilon \) of its aor. made quiescent, the vowel thereof being transferred to the preceding letter, as قَالَ , aor. يَفُوِّلُ , and بَاعَ , aor. \( [697, 703] \); and it would [therefore]
be necessary to say ٌ for the aor. of َ ۙ١٣٢٥٩ for the aor. of َ ۙ١٣٢٥٩; whereas a
double َ 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 ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [697, 698]. Or their omission to transform the of ۙ١٣٢٥٩ and ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [729] may, as before mentioned [703], be accounted for by the fact that transformation of their َ , 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 ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [684 (condition 10, b, c), 730. A], ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [300], and ۙ١٣٢٥٩ date-stone: while ۙ١٣٢٥٩ and ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [684 (condition 10, b), 723], ۙ١٣٢٥٩ and ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [723], and ۙ١٣٢٥٩ and ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [683 (case 1, c, b), 684 (condition 10 b, a, γ, b-δ), 723] are anomalous, by rule [e. g.] ۙ١٣٢٥٩ or ۙ١٣٢٥٩ , more properly the former, because the cat. of ۙ١٣٢٥٩ is more numerous than that of ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [698]. We call that [conversion of the first of the two unsound letters into ۯ] anomalous, because conversion of the last, as in ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [above] and ۙ١٣٢٥٩ [697], is more appropriate. Fr and many of the Ancients say of ۙ١٣٢٥٩ that it is quiescent in the ۙ١٣٢٥٩ , the o. ۙ١٣٢٥٩ being ۙ١٣٢٥٩ and ۙ١٣٢٥٩; but that the quiescent ۙ١٣٢٥٩ is converted into ۙ١٣٢٥٩, because of the Fath of the
letter before it, as in ُبَتْرَةٍ وَاِلَّيَاكِلُ [684, 703] and ُبَتْرَةٍ [pl. of ُبَتْرَةٍ α thicket (MAR)], which [conversion] is more appropriate here, because of the combination of two ُيُن*s*: while Ks says that it is orig. ُلْيَأَةٍ, on the measure of ُنِعْلَةٍ; but that they dislike the combination of two ُيُن*s*, the first of which is pronounced with Kasr; so that the first is elided. But, according to all [three] accounts, ُلْيَأَةٍ is not free from anomalousness in conversion or elision. And it is possible to account for ُلْيَأَةٍ [above], ُلْيَأَةٍ [684 (condition 10, b, α, α), 723], and ُلْيَأَةٍ in the [last] two ways (R). Incorporation is frequent in the cat. of ُلْيَبَنِ [731], because of the [combination of (Jrb)] two likes (SH), as ُلْيَبَنِ [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] ُي in [above] would have to be vocalized with ُلِمْلِمْب (Jrb), [as] ُلْيَبَنِ [above], aor. ُلْيَبَنِ [below] (KF). S says “Incorporation is more frequent; but the other [method] is [good] Arabic, frequent” (R). Most of them incorporate [the ُع into the ُل when the ُل is mobile (IY)], saying ُلْبَنِ and ُلْبَنِ with Fath or Kasr of the ُل [below], as ُلْبَنِ or ُلْبَنِ is said for the pl. of ُلْبَنِ [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. حَيَيَا حَيَيَّ, pl. حَيِّ "she lived, du. حَيَيَا حَيَّ" [R]. The Kur has وَيُحْيَى مَنْ حَيٌّ عَنْ بِيْنَةٍ حَيِّ. VIII. 44. And he that should live might live after a manifest sign; and (M) the poet (R) 'Abid (M), [or] Ibn Mufarrigh (Jh on حيّ), says

\[\text{عَيْبُوا بِأَمْرِهِمْ كَمَا عَيْبَتْ بِبَيْضَتِهَا النَّعَامَةُ}

\[\text{جَعَلَتْ لَهَا عِزَّةٌ وَدَيْنِ مِنْ ٍّ نَّسِمٍ وَأَحْرُرُ مِنْ نَثَامَةُ (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.] مُخَيِّيَّةٍ quickening and [the du.] مُخَيِّيَّاتٍ quickened, where the vowel is [imported] on account of the ِس in the ep. [below] and of the ِد in the du. [228], both of which letters are adventitious, [and] separable from the word: and similarly with the inflectional vowels [16, 404], as أَنْ يَحْسِبَ أَلْسَنَى LXXV. 40. [551] and
I saw a معی [248]. But, if the vowel be naturally inseparable, as in حَیَّ [or حَیِّ (Jh, KF)], or be [imported] on account of an adventitious, [but] inseparable, letter, as in أَحْیَّة [or أَحْیِّة (S, M)], pl. of حَیَّة vulva, where the ی is inseparable [265 (case 6, a, a)], contrary to the ی of the ep. [265 (case 1, a), 266], then incorporation or display is allowable, for which reason أَحْیَّة or أَحْیِّة is allowable in the pl. of أَحْیَّة boggler, because the ی [of أَحْیَّة] is inseparable. And, in this [second] sort also, incorporation is more proper, as it is in [the first, like] حَیَّ [above] and أَحْیَّة [below]. The reason why, for allowability of incorporation, it is stipulated in this cat., contrary to the cat. of يَرِد restores and يَس touches [731], that the vowel [of the second homogeneous letter] be inseparable, is that, in the sound [formation], a vowel of some kind is inseparable from the second, unless it be invaded by what necessitates its quiescence, as in يَرِد [402, 406] and لَمْ يَرِدْن [663]: whereas, in the unsound, as مَعِیّة [248] and مَعِیّه [above], the second is [often] made quiescent without the invasion of anything, as مَعِیّ [248]; so that they do not approve of incorporating a letter into what is quasi-quiescent [731]. And, when the [first] ی is displayed, whether necessarily, as in مَعِیّه [above], or allowably,
as in حَبِّيَّيْ [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 ي] is deemed heavy: (2) if it be pronounced with Fath, as in حَبِّيَّابِنَ [684 (condition 10, a, α, β)], its Fath may be made faint; but should rather be made plain, because it is not deemed heavy: (a) here incorporation is not allowable, because the ٰ of dualization is not inseparable. He that displays the [first] ي in حَبْسُوا says حَبْسُوا with a single ي, like هُذَا they dreaded, as

وَكَنَّا حَسِبْناَهْمُ فَوَارِسَ كَهْسِي

حَبْسُوا بَعْدَمَا مَاتُوا مِنَ الدَّهْرِ أَعْصَرًا

(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 Rabī'a Ibn Hanzala, who, after they had died, lived, in reputation for valour, through ages of time (Ish). The ف is [said to be] sometimes pronounced with Kasr [above] (SH) in the act. حَبِّيَّ (R), when incorporation takes place. Some retain the Fatha of the ف, for lightness; while others pronounce [the ف] with Kasr, for affinity [to the ي], as they say ُلِي or ُلُي, with Kasr or Damm of the ج, for the pl. of أَلْوَى [above]. But, it is said, this
requires consideration, because the Ḍamma 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 یَ 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 د is sometimes pronounced with Kasr in the act. voice] is a blunder copied by IH from the M [above]; whereas S cites only حَجْيَة in the pass., like حَجِّيَة [below], with Ḍamm and Kasr, pl. of حَجَّة [twisted horn (MAR)], in the n. (R). Similarly (M) incorporation is allowable in (SH) [the pret. of] every pass. v. [of this cat.], as حَجِّيَة فِي هَذَا الْمَكَانِ This place was lived in [below] and حُوَى وأَسْتَحْكَمَي and حُوَى , for (M) the pass. prets. (Jrb) حَجْيَة and (IY) حَجْيَة and أَسْتَحْكَمِيَّ (M, SH) and حَوْيَة (M), because of the combination of two likes (Jrb); contrary to [the act. prets. (Jrb)] أَحْيَا and إِسْتَحْكِيَا [and حَابَّا] (SH), because, when the [second] ی is converted into I, the motive for incorporation does not remain. But it is not so frequent [in أَحْيَى and the
following] as in حَيْيٌ [above], because here the letter before the two likes is quiescent; while it does not follow that أَحْيَى should be treated like حَيْيٍ, as was sent on pilgrimage is put on a par with حَيْيٍ went on pilgrimage, because incorporation in that is necessary, contrary to this (Jrb). حَيْيٌ [above] is constructed with a prep. and gen., which take the place of the [pro-] ag., since حَيْيٌ is intrans. [436, 438]. You are allowed the option of pronouncing the ح with Ḍamm or Kasr; but Kasr is more frequent, because lighter. Ḍamm is according to the o. f. [436]: and Kasr for a kind of alleviation, because the double letter is, in some positions, treated like a single letter, as in شَابَةٌ دَابَّةٌ [665], where the double ب is treated, according to them, like a single mobile letter, otherwise it would not be combinable with the quiescent ِ; 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] ى preceded by Ḍamma, at the end [of a word], is disallowed, so Ḍamm is rare here, though not disallowed; and like it is قَرْن لَيْنِ [above], where Ḍamm and Kasr are allowable, but Kasr is more frequent; the rarity of Ḍamm [in قِرْن] corresponding to the disallowance of [it in] أَذْبَئُ and أَذْبَئي gazelles [243, 721] (IY).
If any one say "How is conversion of Ğamma into Kasra necessary in [the case of formations] other than فَعَلَ [685 (case 7), 716], جُهَّى عْنَّى and جُهَّى [685 (case 9, b, a), 722], and عُوْرُي [722, 730. A], while both modes [of vocalization] are allowable in فَعَلُ?", the answer is that, فَعَلُ being liable to be mistaken for فَعَلُ, Ğamma 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 Ğamma of فَعَلُ allowable before ی is the lightness of the formation. Sf says that ی with Kasr may be said as pl. of یَلَأَى, like پِض pl. of ۡیَبِضْ [686, 718], the incorporated quiescent ی being treated like the unincorporated; and that حَّى جَّى for [above] is like بَٰعَ تَٰیٰل and بِعَ [436, 706]. Those who incorporate say أَجْيَى أَجْيَا أَجْيُى أَجْيَى أَجْيَى أَجْيَا was quickened, du. أَجْيَا, أَجْيَا, pl. أَجْيَا, أَجْبَا, أَجْبَا, أَجْبَا, أَجْبَا; and أَسْتَحْيِى أَسْتَحْيِى أَسْتَحْیِى أَسْتَحْیِى أَسْتَحْیِى was left alive, du. أَسْتَحْیِى, pl. أَسْتَحْیِى, أَسْتَحْیِى, أَسْتَحْیِى, أَسْتَحْیِى; because the vowel [of the second unsound letter] is inseparable: while those who do not incorporate say أَحْيَا أَحْيَا, du. أَحْيَا, أَحْيَا, pl. أَحْيَا, أَحْيَا, like أَرَمَى was thrown, du. أَرَمْى, أَرَمْى, أَرَمْى, أَرَمْى, pl. أَرَمْى, أَرَمْى, أَرَمْى, أَرَمْى. But Ğamma has three dial. vars.:—
(1) this, which is its o. f.; (2) incorporation; (3) elision of the first ی, as in [the act.] Ğِسْتَكَى was ashamed
[below], according to Tamīm. [The act.] استَنْكَبَّа has two dial. vars.:—(1) that of the people of the Hijāz is يَسْتَنْكِيَّة, aor. استَنْكَبَّ, act. part. استَنْكَبِيَّة, pass. part. استَنْكَبِيَّة, exactly on the measure of asked to keep guard, aor. يَسْتَنْكِيَّة: (2) that of Tamīm is استَنْكَبَّة [above], aor. يُسْتَنْكِيَّة, with vocalization of the ح and elision of one of the two یs: (a) the opinion of Khl is that it is formed from حَابَة when transformed like and [684, 703], as though [above] were said; and therefore, as you say اسْتَبَعَت I asked to sell from باع, so you say اسْتَنْكِيَّة from حَابَة: (a) the reason why it is formed from the eschewed حَابَة is that the ی of حَابَة ought to be transformed, since transformation of its ل is impossible: (b) [the pret.] استَنْكَبَّ, according to this, is orig. استَنْكَبَّ [below], like استَبَعَ: but the vowel of the ی is elided, since no ل of the pret. is found, in their speech, to be a mobile ی preceded by a quiescent; so that, two quiescents then concurring, the first of them is elided; and afterwards the quiescent ی is converted into ل, because preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as in يَا جَلٌ and [above]: (c) similarly you say of the aor. [يُسْتَنْكِيَّة] that it ought to be يُسْتَنْكِيَّة, like يُسْتَنْكِيَّة: but that the vowel of the [final] ی is elided,
since there is no precedent for it among vs. [720]; and afterwards the first \( \text{س} \) is elided, because of the two quiescents: (d) its \( \text{im} \). is \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَع} \), (e) its \( \text{in} \). \( n. \), according to this, ought to be \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَع} \), like \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَعَة} \) [338]; but is not used: (f) the \( \text{ac} \). \( \text{pt} \). is \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَع} \), \( \text{or} \). \( 
\text{يَسْتَحْبَع} \), [like \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَع} \); ] but transformed in the same way as the \( \text{ao} \).: (g) the \( \text{pa} \). \( \text{pt} \). is \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَع} \), \( \text{or} \). \( 
\text{يَسْتَحْبَع} \), the vowel of the \( \text{س} \) being elided, as in \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَعَة} \) [720]; and the word then transformed in the same way as \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَعَة} \) [above]: (h) there is a weakness, that will not escape notice, in the opinion of Khl, because of [his] venturing upon the disliked [form \( 
\text{حَاي} \): (b) others, whose opinion is adopted by Mz, say that, in all of these variations, the first \( \text{س} \) is elided, as [the first \( \text{س} \) or \( \text{l} \) is elided] in \( \text{أَحْسَسْتُ} \) \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَعَة} \) [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 \( \text{دُبِ.} \text{شَكَكَيْا} \); and they would say \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَعَة}, \) like \( \text{يَسْتَحْبَعَة} \)" (R). The verse \( 
\text{تَقُولُ} \text{يَا} \text{شَيْخُ} \text{الَّاَل} \) [329. \( \text{A}. \)] contains evidence that \( 
\text{يَسْتَحْبَعَة} \) [above], \( \text{ao} \)., like \( 
\text{يَسْتَحْبَعَة} \)
took captive, aor. یُستَحْیى, is said; while Ya'kub and Ibn Muḥaiṣin read یَلَهُ لَا یُستَحْیى أَنْ یَضْرِبَ مَثَلًا II. 24. Verily God is not ashamed to propound a parable, with a single ی, which is reported to have been read by Ibn Kathîr also, and is the dial. var. of Tanwin. The o. f. is [یَستَحْیى, aor. یُستَحْیى] with two ی s: but the vowel of the ی is transferred to the ف; and, two quiescents then concurring, the ج is said to be elided, the measure [of تَسْتَفِع in the verse] being تَسْتَفِع; or the ی, the measure being تَسْتَفِع (BS). And, as for revived, aor. یَحَارِیى, when you put it into the pass., you say حَرَیى, according to the o. f.; or, if you please, you incorporate, saying حْرَیى, because the vowel of its final is inseparable. But he that says حْرَیى and حْرِیى does not say یَنَکَيى [for their aor.], because یَDam does not enter [the final of] these rs. at all, since the ج in them takes the place of یَDam, and is not combined with it [720] (IY). In the aor. of [the pass.] یَستَحْیى أَحْیى and you say یَستَحْیى and یَحْیى, 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)] یَحْیى and یَستَحْیى, [although two likes are combined in them (Jrb),] it is [in order that یَDam 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 لَن يِعْتَبِي 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] حُيَي (R), contrary to the cat. of قَوْي (SH), although قَوْي has a double و, as حُيَي has a double ی [697]; so that قَوْ is not said, as they say حَيَي (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 أَيَّة before [and to the exclusion of] conversion of the quiescent Hamza into ! [661, 684 (condition 10, b, b, γ)] (R); and, when the final و is converted into ی, the motive for incorporation does not remain (Jrb): (2) because قَوْ with conversion of the [second] و into ی is lighter than قَوْ 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 رَضِى [685 (case 1, a), 724] is absolutely disallowed, whereas dissolution [of incorporation] in the cat. of حَبِيَّ is allowable (Jrb). And [similarly (R), or, in some MSS (MAR),] therefore, they say يَقُوَّى and يَقُوَّى [719, 730. A] (SH); not يَبَكِي [above], although they incorporate in the pret. [ حَبِيَّ], nor يَقُوَّى (R): 1) because transformation comes before incorporation (R, Jrb); and, when the [final] يَحِيَّا in يَقُوَّى and يَقُوَّى 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 قَوَّى [728] and its likes, vid. those [vs.] whose و and ل are ل, so far as concerns transformation and incorporation, IH [now] points out that double ل is peculiar to نُعْلَ with Kasr of
the ع (Jrb). They do not form from the cat. of تَوَيُّ any 
[ فَعَلَ] with Fath (R),] like قَرْبِ struck [482], nor any 
[ فَعَلَ] with دامَر (R),] like شَرْفَ was noble [482], from 
dislike to [the combination of two، s in (R)] تَوَيُّ and 
تَوَيُّ [730, A] (SH), when the nom. pron. is attached to 
the pret. [ تَوَيُّ or تَوَيُّ ] (R), because they dislike the com-
bination of two، s more than the combination of two 
ى (Jrb). As for فَعَلَ with دامَر, if it were formed 
therefrom, two، s would be produced without attach-
ment of the pron., because the [first]، which is an ع، 
would not be converted [into ٰ], since the cause of 
[such] conversion would not exist in the ج، as we men-
tioned in the case of طَرْيِ حَيْيَى [703, 728]; nor 
would the second [، ] be converted into ى on account of 
the دامَر before it, as in أَلْدُ [243, 721], since that 
[conversion] is [found only] in the n., [not in the v.] as 
you see in such as سَرَرُ [721] (R). They therefore 
deviate to فَعَلُتْ، in order that the [second]، may be 
converted into ى، and the heaviness be removed by the 
difference of the two letters, on the principle of their 
action in حَيَّانَ [698, 730, A], orig. حَيَّانَ؛ and, since 
[حَيَّانَ] they convert the lighter [letter] into the 
heavier, in order that the form may be lightened by 
removal of reduplication, a fortiori [in تَوَيُّ] they convert
the heavier into the lighter for removal of reduplication. For that reason they say ُنٌقَت ُنٌقَت I was strong [730. A], orig. ُنٌقَت, the ُل, which is a ر, being converted into ُي, because [quiescent and] preceded by a letter pronounced with Kasr [685 (case 5)]; and the ُع being [treated as] sound [728], because the ُل is transformed. This [avoidance of double ُل] is when the ُع is orig. mobile (IY). But [such as (IY, SH)] ُقَرَا [685 (case 1, a, a), 697, 698] (M, SH) and ُسُقَرَ (SH) a mark [of stone (MASH)] on the way (Jrb, MASH), ُقَرٌ [698] (M, SH) and ُقَرَ Kauw [698, 730. A, 734], a name of a place (IY), and ُخَرٌ [685 (case 3, b, d, β) (SH), and ُخَرٌ [684 (condition 10, a, a, α), 730. A] (M, Jrb), where the ُع 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 ُل] would not be allowable, as it is in the n., from the heanness of two ُل in the v., which is itself heavy (R).

§ 730. They say, (1) [in ُعُفَال (493. A) (M), like ُعُفَال (482) (IY),] (a) ُحَوَاز (493) (IY), became blackish red (M, SH), ُحَوَاز (R) from ُحَوَاز [672] (M, R), orig. ُحَوَاز (IY, R), converting the second ُل [at the end (IY)] into ُل.
(M), because mobile and preceded by Fatha [684, 719] (IY); (b) aor. (R) يَخْوَأْرُي (M, SH): (2) similarly, in [493. A], like إِحْمَرُ (R), (a) (SH) refrained (from foul conduct), from رَعَا forbore, aor. يَخْوَأْرُ (MASH), orig. like إِحْمَرُ [730. A] (R); (b) [aor.] يَخْوَأْرُ (SH). They do not incorporate (M, SH), but transform (R), (1) because transformation comes before incorporation [728] (R, Jrb); and, when the [final]، is converted in إِحْوَأْرُ و into ، and in يَخْوَأْرُ 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 إِحْوَأْرُ، would reduce them to that vocalization of، with Damm, which they eschew in such as يَخْوَأْرُ and يَخْوَأْرُ [719—721] (M); but [IY asserts that] Z's saying "because incorporation . . . . يَخْوَأْرُ " is not correct, since vowels of inflection are not heavy upon double ى، as ىَعُدُلَ. 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 إِحْوَأْرُ (M, R, Jrb)] you say (1) إِحْوَأْرُ (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 ی in 685 (case 1, a); and, by reason of its adventitiousness, is not taken into account, as the ی in 685 (case 7, b, b, 8), 716 is not taken into account, because it is a subst. for the ی [in 685 (case 7, a, a), 703, 716]: (a) properly, however, the ی 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) اَخْرَأَي (M, SH), with incorporation (Jrb), the [only (R)] form mentioned by S (IY, R), orig. اَخْرَأَي [above] and اَشْهَبَب [391, 667]: (a) they convert the middle ی into ی, because ی occurs quiescent before it, as in مَبْت and سَبْد [685 (case 7, a, a), 703, 716]; this ی being substituted for the ی [of اَخْرَأَي], because of the Kasra before it [685 (case 1, a)]: (b) the last ی is converted into Hamza, because it occurs as a final after an aug. ی, according to the rule in such as ی کَسَأ and ی 2 رَا [683 (case 1), 723] (IY). But those who say اَشْهَبَب [for اَشْهَبَب (R, Jrb), by eliding the ی (IY, Jrb) for alleviation, because the n. is long (IY),] say اَخْرَأَي (M, SH) for اَخْرَأَي [above] (R, Jrb), by
eliding the ی, because یَحَوْبَأ (Jrb); so that two ی's are combined, as two ی's are combined in یَتَسَالُ [756], although یَحَوْبَأ is not of the same conjug. as یَتَسَالُ [492] (R): and they do not incorporate (IY, Jrb), (1) because the two ی's are medial, as they do not incorporate in یَتَسَالُ, because the two ی's, though alike, are strong as being in the middle; and are not considered like the ی's in یَدَّتِلَد and یَدَّتِلَد [731], which are at the end (IY): (2) because the letter before the two likes is quiescent, as in یَتَسَالُ (Jrb). Those, however, who incorporate in یَتَسَالُ, [not regarding the quiescence of the letter before the two likes in such a formation as this (Jrb), and say یَتَسَالُ (M, R, Jrb), ought by analogy to (Jrb)] say یَحَوْبَأ (M, SH), incorporating one ی into the other; and transferring the vowel of the first ی to 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 حَوْيَاء, aor. يَحَوْيَاء, with Fath of the ی in both, and حَوْيَاء, aor. يَحَوْيَاء, with Kasr of the two ی's, [inf. n. یَحَوْبَأ, ] like حَوْيَاء, aor. يَحَوْبَأ, inf. n. یَتَسَالُ [756]. When from حَوَى and حَوَى you form a [pret.] like حَوَايَأر and حَوَايَأم [above], you
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[above], because of the ی’s being a subst. for the ی [in یخواوی], ought not to incorporate here also; but [without incorporation] it would be deemed heavy. Those, however, who incorporate in یقت麦ل, aor. یقتقبل, inf. n. یقتقال [above], say چیا [730. A], aor. یبکیی، inf. n. چیآ (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 ی, then, (a) if the first be quiescent, it is incorporated, as یباعُ بیع [714 715]: (b) if the second be quiescent, or both be mobile, each of them is in the predicament of a single [ی], as یبیبت [274, 686, 721]; and similarly ییان and یبیان, when you form words like یباع [684, 703] and یعیام [686, 714] from یییس [698]: (2) if the last be a ی, then, (a) if the first be quiescent, it is incorporated into the second, as یجی [697, 698]: (b) if the last be quiescent, both are preserved, as یییس [698]: (c) if both be mobile, then, if conversion of the second into ی be allowable, it is converted, as ییا [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 ٌ, as حَبْرَانٌ [698], where incorporation [of the first ی into the second] is not allowable, because ٰ from the reduplicated, as ٰ ردان, is not subject to incorporation [731]; nor may the second be converted into ۻ, for lack of commensurability with the v. [712]; but it is converted into ٌ, because the combination of two mobile یs 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 ۻ; the second, not the first, being converted [into ٌ], because by it the sensation of heaviness in the combination is produced; while the ۻ, notwithstanding that the final ought to be a light letter, is convertible into ٌ, because the inseparability of the ۻ and ۻ make it medial, as they say of [the ٌ in ٰعَنْفَرَانٌ] and ٰعَنْصُةٌ [721]: but S says that the regular form is حَيْبِيْاٰنٌ, so that he does not convert the second [ی into ٌ]; while حَبْرَانٌ, according to him, is anomalous: and so, in حَبْرَانٌ from ٰتُوَقٌ، he says قُرْزَانٌ [below], as will be seen (R); for the first ۻ, is like the ۻ of ۻعَرْرٌ [707]; while the last ۻ, is strong, like the ۻ in قُرْزَانٌ [719], and becomes equivalent to the sound; and they do not deem them heavy, when pronounced with Fath, as they say ٰلَوْرِی [302] and ٰاَحْوَرْی [300] (S): and so you say حَبْرَانٌ, on the measure of السِّبَعَانٌ [236, 686 (case 2, o)], from حَيْبِيْاٰنٌ; and do not
incorporate, as you do in رَدَانِ, where you say رَدَانِ [731], because transformation comes before incorporation; but S makes the regular form حِيَانُ with incorporation, because he does not convert [the second ى into ] in such [formations]: (3) if incorporation be allowable, you may incorporate or not, as حُيِّي 728, 747; and [similarly, in حَيَانُ from فَعْلَانُ with Kasr or حَيَانُ: 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 لَن يُحْيِي [728, 731], both ى [s] must be sounded true, [and] displayed; while the Kasra of the first is better made faint. When three ىs are combined, (1) if the last be a ل, 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 حَيَيَا, as حَيَيَا [281], aor. يُحْيِي, act. part. يُحْيِي, pass. part. يُحْيِي, like عَرِي denuded, aor. يُعْرِي act. part. يُعْرِي, pass. part. يُعْرِي: (α) the reason why the third ى [s] preceded by Kasra, notwithstanding that this [combination of ىs and Kasra] is deemed heavy, is not elided, as forgotten, in the v., as يُحْيِي [for يُحْيِي], as it is in مُعِيَة [below], is only that the vowel of the ى in the v. may be spared, since 183 a
through it the measures of the v. vary; while the measures of the v. must be observed, as before explained in accounting for the impossibility of converting the, of such as یُذَعْرُ into ی [721]: (β) then the part., as یُذَعْرُ, 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 ] be allowable, vid. when the double [ی ] is pronounced with Fath, and the last is final, it is converted, as یُبَا, on the measure of یُجُلُو goose [here supposed to be for یُجُلُو ، I betook myself, repaired, orig. یُجُلُو [on the measure of یُجُلُو ] , then یُجُلُو [661], [then یُجُلُو (685, case 7,) then یُجُلُو [684]; (β) if that [conversion of the third] be not allowable, either because, though the double [ی ] is pronounced with Fath, the last is intermediate, as being followed by a letter constitutionally inseparable in every position, like the non-dualistic ٌ and ُ، or because, [though the last is final,] the double [ی ] is pronounced with Damm or Kasr, then, in the first case, the third [ی ] is converted into ٌ, as ٌ حَبْوَان from حَبْوَان , on [the measure of] ٌ حَبْوَان من [above] with a single ی; but, according to S، ٌ حَبْوَان، as [implied] above: and, in the second case, the Damma [of the double ی , if it be pronounced with Damm,] is
converted into Kasra; while the third [ی, whether the double ی be pronounced with Kasr or Damm.] is elided as forgotten, because the [three] ی s, together with Kasra of the double ی, are deemed heavy at the end; as ی" [281], orig. [ی" مُعَيْنَةٍ, then] حَبَّى, on the measure of ی"[394], from ی" حَبَّى, orig. ی" حَبَّى, then ی" حَبَّى, and then ی" حَبَّى: and so, in this second [case], the last [ی] is elided as forgotten, even though it be followed by an inseparable letter, as in the dim. of ی" [fermented dough (MAR)], from ی" [inf. n. of ی" شَوَى he roasted meat (Jh, KF)], where you say ی" أَشْيَّانَ, then ی" أَشْيَّانَ, and then ی" أَشْيَّانَ: but IA1 differs from S about that [formation] which is commensurable with the v., and whose initial is an augment like that of the v.; for here he does not elide the third as forgotten, but says أَحْى as dim. of ی" أَحْرى [281], as before stated in [the chapter on] the Diminutive: (b) if the second be incorporated into the third, then, (α) if the letter before the first be quiescent, none of them is altered, as ی" تَرَبَىٰ and ی" طَبْىٰ [302] in the rel. n.; and ی" رَمْى, on the measure of ی" بَطْرِىٰ [long stone (MAR)], from ی" رَمْى: (b) if the letter before the first be mobile, then, (α) if the first (ی) be the second [letter] of the word, [all] the ی s are preserved, as حَبَّى,
like [375]; and \( \text{حَبَيْبٌ} \) [below], like \( \text{مُّتَمَّمٌ} \) [375, 724], orig. \( \text{حَبَيْبٌ} \) with Damm of the \( \text{ع} \); and \( \text{حَبَيْبٌ} \) shamefaced, bashful, modest, [like \( \text{غَنِّي} \) independent, wealthy (KF)], from \( \text{حَبَيْب} \) shame; because the word is light; (8) if the first \( \text{ي} \) be the third [letter] of the word, it is made a \( \), whether the letter before it be pronounced with Fatḥ, as when you form a [word] like \( \text{حَبَيْبِيْ} \) [274, 303], [n. un. of \( \text{حَبَيْبِيْ} \) (KF)], from \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \), in which case you say \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \), [orig. \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \) (S)], like \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \), [orig. \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \)], in [the fem. of] the rel. n. (R) from \( \text{رَحْيُ} \) [294, 300, 686] (S); and do not convert the first \( \text{ي} \) into \( \), either in the rel. n., because the vowel [of this \( \text{ي} \)] is accidental [300, 684 (condition 2), 719], or in the non-rel., because it is incommensurable with the v. [703, 712]: and so, when you form [a word] on the measure of \( \text{حَلْكُونَ} \) intensely black [below] from \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \). you say \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \), orig. \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \), then \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \) [685 (case 7)], then \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \), [like \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \) (724) and \( \text{حَبَيْبٌ} \) (above)], and then \( \text{رَمِيَّة} \): or with Kasr, as \( \text{عَمْرُوي} \) [294, 301, 686], where you convert the Kasra into Fathā, in order that the \( \) may be preserved: and, in these exs., one of the \( \text{ي} \) s is converted into \( \), because the [three] \( \text{ي} \) s are deemed heavy; but, although alteration is more appropriate in the final, the last is not.
converted, as in ُحَيْرَانٌ [above], because it is strong through the doubling; and, for this reason, the third is not elided, as in مُعْتِيّة [above]; while, in the ی of relation, elision and conversion would be more extraordinary, because it is a sign [282, 294]: (γ) if the first [ی] be the fourth [letter] of the word, then, if it be before the ی of relation, it is elided, according to the soundest [opinion], as ُتَأْصِرَى [282, 301], because of the combination of یs, together with the heaviness of the word, and the first's being the final of the word, since the ی of relation is adventitious; but ُتَأْصِرَى is allowable, as before stated [301]: whereas, if it be not before the ی of relation, it is not elided, because it is not the final of the word; but is converted into ٰ, as when it is the third [letter] of the word [case (β) above]: you say رِيْمُوَى, on the measure of خُنْثَةَرُّزِ [398] from رَمَى, orig. رِيْمُوَى, the ٰ of which is converted into ی, and incorporated into the last ی; and the ّDamma then converted into Kasra, and the ی [before the double ی] into ٰ: and similarly ُبَنْكُوِى, [orig. خَنْفِقِيّةٍ ُبَنْكُوِى], like ُخَنْفِقِيّةٍ [677], from ُبَكِى wept: (c) if none of them be incorporated, then, (a) if the third be entitled to conversion into ٰ, it is converted, as when a [v.] like إِحْمَرٍ is formed from حَمَيّ, in which case you convert the third into ٰ, as َأَحْمَيْيًا.
and then, if you incorporate, as in حَيَا [756], you say حَيَا [730]; but, if not, you convert the second into و, as in حُبَّوَان [above]: (b) if the third be not entitled [to conversion into !], as when you form a [n. حُبِّيَّ] like هُدَّايد [contracted from هُدَّاءٌ] very thick milk (MAR) or جَنَّدَل [296, 392], from حَيْيٍ, you may elide it as forgotten, because the heaviness is more than in مُعْبَّيَة [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 و, as in حُبَّوَان [above]; so that the third is preserved, because the combination of ال is ceases; and the word then becomes حُبِّيَّ or حُبَّيَّ, [acc. حُبِّيَّ], حُبَّيَّ: and similarly, when you form a [n. قَضِيَّ] like جَعْحْيَّش [401], you say قَضِيَّ, by eliding the last [ى] as forgotten, and converting the second into !; or قَضِيَّ, by converting the second into و, [and preserving the third]: (α) the third is not converted into و, [like the second in حَيْوَان,] because و is heavy, while] the end of the word is worthier of alleviation [than the middle]; and also [because], if you converted it into و, the combination of the first two ال would remain unaltered:
(3) as for the first [ی], it is not converted, because the heaviness arises from the second and third: while in ُحبیب [above], like ُجدیل, the first is not converted, because its analogue is not converted into ِ in the v., as ُحبیب [728]; so that, a fortiori, it is not converted in a ُن. not commensurable with the v. [703, 712]: (3) if the last ی be not a ل, [all] the یs remain unaltered, without conversion or elision, as ُاسبیر dim. of ُاسوار (R), which is foreign, arabicized, the archer, or horseman, of the Persians (Jk). And, when four یs are combined, (1) if the two last do not denote relation, then, in forming [a word], (a) from ُحبیب [728], (α) on the measure of ُحبیبش [401], you say ُحبیبی, incorporating the first into the second, so that they become like a single ی: and [then] (α) you convert the third into ٰ, as we said of [the second in] the [ن.] formed on the measure of ُجدیل [above]; so that the fourth is preserved, as ُحبیب, [acc. ُحبیبیا]: or (β) you may elide the last as forgotten, because it is heavier than in ُمعبیة [above]; so that the third is converted into ِ, because mobile as a final, and preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, as ُحبیا: as we said before [about ُحبیو and ُحبیا]: (β) like ُسدسبیل [368, 401, 674], you say ُحیوی ِ: (β) like ُتربتب [401], you say ُحبی, the second double [ی] not being
converted into ٍ، as [the second single ى is] in حَيَوَانٍ [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 ى is] in مُعَمِّيَّةٍ [above], because its elision would be an elision of two letters: (α) the combination of the two [double ى s] is tolerated, because their doubling strengthens them; and, since such as طِيٍّي [302] and أمَيٍّي [299] are allowable, according to one saying, notwithstanding that the two first [ى s] are the termination of the word مُعَمِّيَّةٍ [اتى and أمَيٍّةٍ ], the ى of relation being adventitious, this is more excellent: (δ) like تَدُعَبَلٍ [401], you say حَيَيٍّي، incorporating the second into the third; and [then] elide the fourth, as [you elide the third] in مُعَمِّيَّةٍ [above], which [elision] is more appropriate here; and do not convert the double [ى] into ٍ، because by the doubling it becomes strong, like a sound letter; so that حَيَيٍّي remains: (β) from تَضَى judged, decreed, on the measure of تُدُعَبَلَة [401], you say تَضَٔيٍّي: (α) Mz allows only تَضَٔيَّةٍ، [with elision of the first ى، and conversion of the second into ٍ،] as in the rel. n. تَضَٔي (299): but others, together with تَضَٔيَّةٍ، allow تَضَٔيَّةٍ with two double [ى s] more often than أمَيٍّي [above]: (β) what I hold is that only تَضَٔيَّةٍ with two double ى s, is allowable, since the two last [ى s],
being strong through the doubling, are not elided, as the third is elided in *مُعَضَّبة* [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 *أمْرَى* [299]: (c) from *شَرَى* [above], on the measure of *عَصَفَرْ* [396], you say *شُوْبُوى*; and then convert the two *س* into *ى* *س*, and incorporate them into the two *ى* *س* [685 (case 7)]; so that it becomes *شَيْبى*, the Đamma of the first double [ُّى] being converted into Kasra; and Kasr of the *ف* also being then allowable, as in *عَتْيَى* [685 (case 9, b, a), 722]: (a) *S* says *شُوْبى*, by analogy to *حَيْرُوى* and *طَلْى* and *حَيْى*; and *شَيْبى* or *طَيْبى* [302] is said: (d) from *طَلْوى* [728], on the measure of *بَبْقَرْ* *بَبْقَرْ* cattle, you say *طَيْبُوى* *كَبَّرْوى*: and then convert (a) the first *ى* into *ى*, incorporating the quiescent *ى* into it; and (b) the second *ى* into *ى*; incorporating it into the last *ى*: and then change the Đamma of the [second] *ى* into Kasra; so that you say *طَيْبَوى* *كَبَّرى* and *طَيْبَوى* *كَبَّرى*, and also, like the *رَنِى* [5*حَى* and 2*حَى*] of *حَى* [302]: (2) if the two last [ُّى* *س*] do denote relation, as in the *رَنِى* *رَنِى* [302], 2*عَلْى* 2*عَلْى* [302, 684 (condition 6, b, and *ج*, *ب*)] and 2*عَلْى* 2*عَلْى* [299], 9*عَكََى* [299] and 9*عَكََى* [301], the predicament of the four *ى* *س* has been already 184a
explained in the chapter on the Relative Noun: (a) it has also been mentioned [in the chapter on the Diminutive] that the ٰ of the dim., if the rel. formation invade the dim., is elided, as اٰلِمٰيٰ [above]; but, if the dim. formation invade the rel. n., is not elided, as اٰرِیْلَةٰ, with two double ٰ s, dim. of اٰرِیْلَةٰ [281]. All of this is the predicament of the ٰ 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 Damm, except when the second is adscitious, as in لمَّ يَزُرَّ اوُمَّ يَزُرَّ, They quenched not their thirst and مَّرَضَ زِبْلِيُّ 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 اٰلِمَلِه [v.] like كُرُوتَ or كُرُوت [729]; so that, if the two ٰ s were in one word, the first would unavoidably be pronounced with Kasr, in order that the second might be converted into ٰ , as كُرِیٰت [729]: (b) if the last be medial, their combination is allowable, as كُرُول [714]: (2) if both be mobile, then, (a) if that be at the beginning of the word, the first is converted into Hamza, as ظُرْلُ [683, 699]; (b) if it be in the middle, then, (a) if incorporation be allowable, you incorporate, as when you form ٰ فُعَلَّذٰ, with Damm of the ع, from ٰ تُرْلُ, in
which case you say 

\( \text{ضْرَان} \), according to [S and] Mb: (\( \alpha \)) the proper [course], however, is not to incorporate; but to convert the second into 

\( \text{ي} \) and the Damma before it into Kasra, as [\( \text{ضْرَان} \) ] 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 

\( \text{نَعَلَانُ} \); with Fath of the 

\( \text{ع} \), from [\( \text{ثُرَة} \) ] S says that you say [\( \text{ضْرَان} \) [above], as he says [\( \text{حَبَّانِي} \) from [\( \text{حُبَّان} \)] \( \alpha \) the proper [course], however, is to say [\( \text{ضْرَان} \) [below], because two \( \text{s} \) are deemed heavy; so that, when alleviation by incorporation is not allowable, you alleviate by converting one of them into 

\( \text{ي} \): and, since the [second] 

\( \text{ي} \) is converted into [\( \text{كِرْأَان} \) in [\( \text{حَبَّان} \)] from dislike of two \( \text{ي} \), a fortiori the second [\( \text{ي} \) in [\( \text{ضْرَان} \) is converted into 

\( \text{ي} \), because \( \text{i} \) is heavier [than \( \text{ي} \)]: (c) if you form 

\( \text{نَعَلَانُ} \), with Kasr of the 

\( \text{ع} \), [you say [\( \text{ضْرَان} \) , because (S)] you convert the second [\( \text{ي} \) into [\( \text{ي} \) 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 [\( \text{i} \), as \( \text{يَقَوْي} \) [Note on Part I, p. 908, ll. 15-17 [719, 728], and \( \text{يَقَوْي} \) stronger: (\( \alpha \)) as for [the retention of the second in [\( \text{ع} \) rel. n. of [\( \text{ع} \) [302], it is because
the Fatha of the first is accidental [684 (condition 5)]; while in قَوْيَةَ rel. n. of قَوْيَةَ strong, it is because the vowel of the second is accidental [684 (condition 2)]; (b) if the first be pronounced with Kasr or Damm, the second is converted into يَ, as قَوْيَةَ [685 (case 1, a), 728, 729], and تَقُوِّيَةَ on the measure of عَضْدَلَةٍ [368], from قَوْيَةَ: (3) if the first of the two, s be quiescent, then, (a) if they be in the middle, both are preserved from conversion, as ُقُوْيَةَ and ُقُوْيَةَ He reported [such a one] as having said [703], except in such [pl.3] as قُوْيَةَ [722], as before stated: (b) if they be at the end, then, if the word be (a) tril., they are not converted, as حُوَّرَةَ and قُوْيَةَ [729]; except when the letter before them is pronounced with Kasr, as جُبُرَةَ desert, on the measure of جَبْرَةَ ink: (b) of more than three letters, the [double, when] preceded by a letter pronounced (α) with Fathā, is sounded true, as غَزْرَةَ [on the measure of غَزْرَةَ: (β) with Kasr, is necessarily converted into [double] یَ, as غَزْرَةَ, on the measure of فِلْيَةَ [375]: (γ) with Damm, is converted into [double] یَ, allowably in the sing., as غَزْرَةَ or غَزْرَةَ, like غَزْرَةَ غَزْرَةَ or غَزْرَةَ غَزْرَةَ [685 (case 9, b, a), 722]; and necessarily in the pl., as دَلْیَةَ [243, 685 (case 9), 722]. When three, s are combined, (1) if the last be a ج, then (a) if the first be incorporated into the second, the
third is converted into (a) \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \), if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) strengthened himself and the strengthened: (b) \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \), if the letter before it be pronounced with Kasr, as \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) strengthens and the strengthener; or Damm, as \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \), on the measure of [392], from (b) if the second be incorporated into the third, the double \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) is converted into double \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \), whether the letter before it be pronounced with Fath, as \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \), on the measure of [375] or [245, 392]; or Kasr, as \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \), on the measure of [375]; or Damm, as \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \), on the measure of [375, 724], that Damm being converted into Kasr, and Kasr of the \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) being then allowable, by imitation, as in [722], from the heaviness of the \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) preceded by a mobile, contrary to such as \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) [above], since \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) is lighter [than \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \): (a) [in the preceding exs. under case (b) the first of the three \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) is the second letter of the word:] and similarly [the double \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) is converted into double \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \), when the first of the [three] \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) is the third [letter] of the word, and the letter before it is mobile, as \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \), on the measure of [above]: whereas, if it be quiescent, then, if the first \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) be pronounced with Fath, the whole are preserved, as \( \frac{\text{ذ}}{\text{ذ}} \) [below], on the measure of [397] or [401]; but, if with Damm or
Kasr, the double [و ] is converted into [double] ى , and the Damma into Kasra, as ُمْكَرِيٌ [685 (case 8), 722] and ُحَزَيٌ [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 ُكَرُوٌّ, orig. ُكَرُوٌّ on the measure of ُكَرُوٌّ [730]: and then, (α) if you incorporate, you say ُكَرُوٌّ [730, 756]: (β) if not, you convert the second [و ] into ى , on the analogy of ُكَرُوٌّ [above], which [conversion] is more appropriate here [at the end of the word]; so that you say ى , aor. (b) ى : ُكَرُوٌّ [for ] ُكَرُوٌّ , like ُجَدَيٌ or ُهدَيٌ [above], from ُكَرُوٌّ, because of the Kasra on the letter before it: (α) the first [و ] 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 ُعْمَلِ ] may be preserved, and also because resemblance to the v. is lacking [731]: (β) it is better, however, not to form such augmented ns. unconnected with the v. [330] as lead to heaviness like this: (2) if [the last of] the three [و ] be [not a ] ل , because of their being combined in the middle [of the word], they remain unaltered, as ُكَرُوٌّ, on the measure of ُسْمَحٍ [384]; and ُكَرُوٌّ [below], like ُعْدُودَنٌ [482, 483]: (a) Akh converts
the last [١] in ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ، and therefore the second also [685 (case 7)], into یٰ; but S does not mind that [combination of ١، ٢], because they are in the middle: (b) Akh ought to say ُتُؤُولٰل ُتَرِبِیٰل; but excuses himself by the plea that the، of prolongation is light: (c) Akh does not convert [the third ١، in] ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ، because the middle [٢] is like ١، for which it is a subst.: do you not see that, for a similar reason, the initial of ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ pass. of ٌزَرَی [683, 699] is not necessarily converted into Hamza؟ And, when four، هی are combined, then, (1) if the third be incorporated into the fourth, the third and fourth must be converted into ٢، as ٢ُتُؤُولٰل، on the measure of ٍوُرُایٰل [401], from ٢ُتُؤُولٰل، because ٢ُتُؤُولٰل is heavier than such as ٢ُثُرُونٰل [above]: (2) if the third be not incorporated into the fourth, the last is converted into ١، if the letter before it be pronounced with Fath؛ and into یٰ، if it be pronounced with Kasr: while the third (a) remains unaltered, according to S، as (α) َتُؤُولٰل [below], on the measure of َجَکْحَمْشٰٰل، because it is then [in the middle، like [the third ١، in] ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ [above]؛ (β) ٌتُؤُولٰل، on the measure of َجَکْحَمْشٰٰل؛ (γ) ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ، on the measure of ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ: (β) is converted into یٰ by Akh، who says (α) َتُؤُولٰل، like ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ؛ (β) ٌتُؤُولٰل، like ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ؛ (γ) ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ، like ٍثَرُوُنِّیٰ.
for, deeming the [combination of] s heavy, he converts the one near the end into ى: (α) the third ى in ى [above], like ى, [orig. ى, then ى, and then ى,] is not converted into ى, as the ى of ى [728] is not converted. And God best knows the right! (R).