



THE MODERN CLASSIC

A TRANSLATION & EXPLANATION OF ALFIYYAT IBN MALIK



Makkuwdiyy^[m], Ibnun-Naadhim^[son], Ibn ^Aqil^[^], Khudariyy^[kh], Zayni Dahlaan: Shaykh Ahmad^[a], As-Suyuwtiyy^[e], Awdah Al-Masaalik^[hm], Sharhul-Qatr^[hq] by Ibn Hishaam, Sharhul-Qatr^[fq] by Al-Faakihiyy, Sharhul-Mutammimah^[ff], Shaykh Bahraq^[b] Sharhul-Mulhah^[fm] by Al-Faakihiyy, Sharhul-Aajurruwmiyyah by Shaykh Ahmad^[aa], Sharhul-Aajurruwmiyyah^[ga] by Al-Ghumaariyy^[g], Matnul-Qatr^[q], Shadhal-^Arf by Al-Hamalaawiyy^[hs].

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

This is a translation and explanation of **‘Alfiyyah Ibn Maalik**. Its main references are by such masters as As-Suyuwtiyy^(S), Ibn Hishaam^(H), Al-Faakihiyy^(F), Al-Makkuwdiyy^(M), and others. Those references are:

1. *Sharh Al-Makkuwdiyy*, counting 999 lines [Daar Al-Mashaari[^]].
2. *Sharh Ibnun-Naadhim*, “the composer’s son^[son]”, counting 1,002 lines [Daarul-Kutub Al-^Ilmiyyah].
3. *Sharh Ibn ^Aqil*^[^], counting 1,002 lines [Daarul-Kutub Al-^Ilmiyyah].
4. *Haashiyat Al-Khudariyy*^[kh], counting 1,002 lines [Daarul-Kutub Al-^Ilmiyyah].
5. *Sharh Zayni Dahlaan*, “Shaykh Ahmad^[a]”. Daarul-Haramayn did not count their lines.
6. *Sharh As-Suyuwtiyy*. Maktabat Nur As-Sabaah did not count their lines.
7. *Awdah Al-Masaalik*^[hm] by Ibn Hishaam [Maktabat Al-^Asriyyah].
8. *Sharhul-Qatr*^[hq] by Ibn Hishaam [Maktabat Al-^Asriyyah].
9. *Sharhul-Qatr*^[fq] by Al-Faakihiyy [Daarul-Kutub Al-^Ilmiyyah].
10. *Sharhul-Mutammimah: Al-Fawaakih Al-Janiyyah*^[ff] by Al-Faakihiyy [Daarul-Mashaari[^]].
11. *Sharhul-Mulhah* by Shaykh Bahraq^[b] [Daarul-Mashaari[^]].
12. *Sharhul-Mulhah*^[fm] by Shaykh Al-Faakihiyy [Daar Mustafaa].
13. *Sharhul-Aajurruwmiyyah*^[aa] by Shaykh Ahmad [Daarul-Mashaari[^]].
14. *Sharhul-Aajurruwmiyyah*^[ga] by Al-Ghumaariyy^(G) [Daarul-Mashaari[^]].
15. *Matnul-Aajurruwmiyyah* by As-Sinhaajiyy.
16. *Matn Mutammimat Al-Aajurruwmiyyah* by Al-Hattaab the Maalikyy.
17. *Matnul-Mulhah* by Al-Haririyy.
18. *Matnul-Qatr*^[q] by Ibn Hishaam.
19. *Shadhal-^Arf* by Al-Hamalaawiyy^[hs].

This information could be greatly summarized, but for a text like this, we should take advantage and document plenty of benefits. May Allaah make it beneficial and clear, and enable its completion. Amin.

أحمدُ ربِّي الله خيرَ مالِكِ
وءاله المستكَمِلينَ الشَّرَفا

قال محمدٌ هو ابنُ مالِكِ
مصلِّيًّا على النبي المصطفى

1

2

1. Said Muḥammad - he is Ibn Maḥlik: ﴿I praise my Lord, Allāh, the Best Owner,
2. As one who makes ‘ṣalāh’ upon the selected Prophet, ﴿ And his family who command perfect nobility.”

What was put forth in the past, “**said**”, figuratively refers to the present or future: “says”. Such usage is present in Arabic, like the first verse of Surāt An-Nahl:

﴿أَتَى أَمْرُ اللَّهِ﴾

What literally would be “the Command of Allāh (Judgement Day) came” means “shall come”.

Muḥammad is the composer’s name. Then he referred to himself in third person; “**he**”, interjecting a complete sentence between the speaker’s given name; “Muḥammad”, and what he said: “I praise my Lord”.

He informed that he is the one and only “Ibn Maḥlik”, to give his book credibility and make it appealing, since he is known as a great shaykh and imam^S in language [and other diciplines^{KH}] - and to applaud his work. **He is** Jamalu-Dīn, [Abu ^Abdillāh^M,] Muḥammad Ibn ^Abdillāh **Ibn Maḥlik**, At-Ta’iyy, Al-Andulusiyy, Al-Jayyaniyy, [Ad-Dimashqiyy^M,] [the Shafi’iyy^S]. Maalik is his grandfather^{KH}. [He passed away in Damascus on Sha’ban 12, 672 AH, at the age of 75^M].

[His “**ḥamd (praising)**” of his Lord is the commencement of ‘*maqul al-qawl (the said statement)*’, which lasts until the end of the poem. It is his describing Him with generosity to glorify Him. He means here not to state a declarative sentence^(S), but to actively exalt God. His Lord is **Allāh**, and Allāh is **the Best; Greatest** or Noblest^(KH) **Maalik (Owner)**. The composer does his praises while making ‘ṣalāh (special supplications)’ on the pure^(M) Prophet.

The description of [مالك (Maalik)] for Allaah came in the Faatihah; <(مالك يوم الدين)> <... **Maalik (Owner) of the Day of Recompense.**> One of the Ninety Nine Names is [مالك الملك] “Maalikul-Mulk (Owner of the Dominion)”. Another is [الملك] “Al-Malik (the King; Sovereign)”, without an alif. Al-Maalik – with an alif – was reported as a Name of Allaah, cited in Al-I’tiqaad by Al-Bayhaqiyy. His Mulk (Dominion) is His eternal Attribute; its meaning is *sulṭaan* (possession; ownership).

مَقاصِدُ النَحْوِ بِهَا مَحْوِيَّةٌ

وَأَسْتَعِينُ اللَّهَ فِي أَلْفِيَّةٍ

3

3. And I seek Allāh's help in a millennial poem. ❖ The most important cases of nahw therein are contained.

He seeks - in present tense - **Allāh's help**, proving that when he said: "Said Muḥammad," he meant "Says Muḥammad" - in the present. Therefore, the meaning is: *Muḥammad Ibn Maalik says, while sending supplications upon the Prophet ﷺ: "I praise Allāh, my Lord, the Greatest one to be called a "Maalik", and I seek Allāh's help in composing a poem of a thousand lines."* This poem is in the rajz meter and covers **the most crucial cases** in nahw; those of greatest importance.

Nahw is the field called, "the knowledge of the Arabic language"^(F). The linguistic meaning of nahw is *qasḍ* (goal; target; intent). Technically it is^(FM):

علم بأصول يعرف بها أحوال أواخر الكلم إعراباً وبناءً

The knowledge of a set of rules by which would be known the states of word endings, variable or invariable.

Arabic is an original language. **Its rules** were derived from researching the speech of the Old Arabs, not by the assignment of the grammarians; they were merely like people who came to an existing structure and simply described it as it was. **Its goal** is enabling understanding of the Speech of God and of His Messenger, and **its benefit** is knowing proper speech from improper speech^(FM).

4 تَقَرَّبُ الْأَقْصَى بِلَفْظٍ مُوجَزٍ وَتَبَسَّطُ الْبَذَلِ بَوَعْدٍ مُنْجَزٍ

4. Bringing the distant into proximity by condensed expression, ❖ And generous in its givings, by a fulfilled promise.

By its brevity, **this millennial poem facilitates comprehension** of what was beyond **one's grasp**. It also comprises the most important subjects in the science. **It generously gives** plenty of benefits, and **assuredly promises** swift achievement of one's goals because its words are few.

5 وَتَقْتَضِي رِضًا بِغَيْرِ سَخَطٍ فَائِقَةُ أَلْفِيَّةِ ابْنِ مُعْطِي
6 وَهُوَ بِسَبْقٍ حَائِزٌ تَفْضِيلًا مُسْتَوْجِبٌ ثَنَائِي الْجَمِيلَا

5. It dictates approval without any scoffing, ❖ Surpassing the millennial poem of Ibn Mu^{ti}.

6. Though he is, by precedence, deserving merit, ❖ Entitled to my generous praises.

It grants satisfaction to its reader who will have **no objection** to it. The scholars do have, though, some criticisms and comments for a few of the composer's choices. **It is superior to the millennial poem of Abu Zakariyya Yahya Ibn Mu^{ti} ^Abdun-Nur Az-Zawawiyy Al-Maghribiyy, the Hanafiyy, called Ad-Durrat Al-Alfiyyah, because this poem is all of one meter while that is of two; rajz and sari[^]. It also has more cases.**

Makkuwdiyy^[m], Ibnun-Naadhim^[son], Ibn ^Aqil^[^], Khudariyy^[kh], Zayni Dahlaan: Shaykh Ahmad^[a], As-Suyuwtiyy^[e], Awdah Al-Masaalik^[hm], Sharhul-Qatr^[hq] by Ibn Hishaam, Sharhul-Qatr^[fq] by Al-Faakihiyy, Sharhul-Mutammimah^[ff], Shaykh Bahraq^[b] Sharhul-Mulhah^[fm] by Al-Faakihiyy, Sharhul-Aajurruwmiyyah by Shaykh Ahmad^[aa], Sharhul-Aajurruwmiyyah^[ga] by Al-Ghumaariyy^[g], Matnul-Qatr^[q], Shadhal-^Arf by Al-Hamalaawiyy^[ha].

Shaykh Ahmad says that As-Suyuti's alfiyyah has many more cases than Ibn Malik's, and Al-Ajhuriyy the Maliki's has more than As-Suyuti's.

However, since Ibn Mu^{ti} (d. 628) was about 50 years earlier than the author and was first to compose an alfiyyah in nahw, he has an advantage; he deserves the author's applause because the author benefitted from him and imitated him. As for documenting the rules of nahw in verse, Imam Al-Haririyy (d. 516) preceded Ibn Mu^{ti} by a century, in 379 lines of his famous Syntactical Witticisms, *Mulhat Al-T'rab*, which is said to be the first poem in nahw, and completed in one night.

7 والله يقضي بهباتٍ وافرةً لي وله في درجات الآخرة

7. May Allah grant abundant gifts, ♣ To me and him, in the echelons of the Afterlife!

He specifically mentioned the levels and ranks of the Afterlife because that is what is important to the intellectuals^(KH).



الكلام وما يتألف منه

Speech and That from Which it is Composed

This is the chapter about “*kalaam* (speech)”, and its units for composition:

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 8 | كَلَامُنَا لَفْظٌ مُفِيدٌ كَأَسْتَقِمُّ | وَأَسْمٌ وَفِعْلٌ ثُمَّ حَرْفٌ الْكَلِمُ |
| 9 | وَاحِدُهُ كَلِمَةٌ وَالْقَوْلُ عَمٌ | وَكَلِمَةٌ بِهَا كَلَامٌ قَدْ يُؤَمُّ |

8. Our *kalaam* (speech) is an informative pronunciation, like [أَسْتَقِمُّ]. ❖

Nominal, verb, and particle are the ‘*kalim* (three words)’.

9. Its singular is ‘*kalimah* (word)’, and ‘*qawl* (saying)’ is most general: ❖
And (the word) ‘*kilmah*’, by it, *kalaam* (speech) might be intended.

In the language, *kalaam* is the name of anything spoken, informative or not^[^]. It may also be the name of anything giving a meaning. By “our *kalam*”, the author means: “*The Arabic grammarians’ speech*”; what they mean by it technically, not linguistically. Their study is restricted to informative Arabic *lafdh* (pronunciation), not writing, sign language, constructs, other languages nor cues, as said by the composer’s son, and Shaykh ‘Ahmad^[aa].

Shaykh ‘Ahmad, Ibn Hisham and others defined a *lafdh* with a simple expression: “an utterance consisting of letters”. As-Suyutiyy was more meticulous:

صوت معتمد على مقطع الفم

A sound relying on an articulating spot of the mouth.

It therefore includes two things:

1. What is *muhmal* (meaningless; unused), like reversing the name Zayd: [ذيز].
2. The *qawl* (saying). An opinion or conviction might be called a *qawl*^(S), but here, it is an utterance that indicates a meaning^(H). It is most general because it is *maquwl*^(F) (what is said) while *musta^mal* (used), whether *kalimah*, *kalim*, or *kalaam*:

A *kalimah* (word) is an utterance with a single, independent meaning by the sum of its letters, like [زيد (Zayd)].

- If made of one letter, a word’s name is the name of that letter, spelled out entirely, like [الباء (the baa)].
- If it is made of more than one letter, its name is its pronunciation, like [من (min/man)] and [هو (huw{a})] and [دارب (darab{a})].

Ibn Hisham and Al-Hattaab called it a *qawl mufrad* (said unit). The meaning of *mufrad* (unit) here is: “that which there is no meaning in its individual pieces”^(F). Had

its individual pieces contributed to part of the meaning, those pieces would be words, and that total would be a type of compound, like: [غلام زيد (Zayd's lad)]; each is a *kalimah* for contributing a meaning, not a mere letter, [so each has its own position in the sentence^(son)].

- The word *kalimah* is a singular by the *ta' marbutah*, and may be pronounced *kilmah*. Stopping on a *haa'* is better than *kalimat* or *kilmah*. Al-Faakihiyy^(FM) adds as less eloquent: *kalamah* and *kalmah*. By removing the *ta'*, it becomes a collective noun (*ism jam^*): *kalim* ([at least 3] words).
- *Kalimah*, in the language, not in the terminology, may be [frequently^(H)] meant for a complete sentence or more, like the *shahadatayn*. That would be: '*naming an entire thing after part of itself*'^(M/SON).
- It does not include what has a **dependent meaning**, like *the four mudari^ letters*, or *the ta' of femininity*, or *the yaa' of attribution* - lists Al-Faakihiyy^(FQ); those are not *kalimat* (words), those are *^alamat* (signs).

Kalim (three or more words), even if a subordinate clause, like [إن قام زيد (If Zayd stood)], which is a *jumlah* (clause), but it is not:

Kalaam; what is *mufid* (informative)', like [قام زيد (Zayd stood)]¹. Here are Arabic's six informative formulas:

1. Two nominals: [زيد قائم (Zayd {is a} stander)].
2. A verb with a nominal: [قام زيد (Stood Zayd)].
3. A verb with two nominals: [كان زيد قائما (Zayd was a stander)].
4. A verb with three nominals: [حسبت زيدا قائما (I reckoned Zayd {a} stander,)] and [أعطيت زيدا مالا (I gave Zayd money)].
5. A verb with four nominals: [أريت زيدا عمرا قائما (I showed Zayd ^Amr standing)].
6. A complex sentence, which is of two types:
 - a. a *qasam* (swear) with its *jawaab* (subject): [والله لأفعلن (I swear) By God, I shall ...];
 - b. a *shart* (condition) with its *jawaab* (consequence): [إن تقم أقم (If you stand, I stand.)]

When an Arabic sentence is part of a greater sentence, the broader sentence is the "major (kubraa)" sentence and the inner sentence is the "minor (sughraa)", such as: [زيد قام أبوه (Zayd, his father stood.)] This number six can be an answer for the question in Al-Hariri's line:

يا سائلي عن الكلام المنتظم حداً ونوعاً وإلى كم ينقسم

O you who asks me about orchestrated² speech; ♣ In definition, in type, and into how many does it divide?

¹ It is clear from what is here that *jumlah* truly translates as "clause", because of the mere link of the subject and predicate, whether independent or subordinate. *Kalaam* is therefore a sentence or more, because every sentence is a clause and not every clause is a sentence. However, herein, "sentence" and "clause" will be translations for *jumlah*, and the context must be observed.

The single word and incomplete phrase are excluded by describing *kalam* as *mufid* (informative). Therefore, *kalam* is restricted to *composition upon which it is suitable for the speaker to be silent without leaving the listener waiting*³. According to Al-Makkudiyy, the “informative” fosters a meaning that the listener did not previously have, so it excludes saying [النار حارة; (Fire is hot)], and As-Suyuwtiyy attributes that position to the author, and to ‘Imaam Sibawayh himself. Others said this is also *kalam*, even if it were known prior, due to the clausal relationship between the words.

By stating that *kalaam* is an informative pronunciation, the author mentioned two of the four^(F) elements that make *kalaam*:

1. The first is the type of thing it is: a pronunciation. But that alone includes what is informative and what is not, so it needs further description:
2. Being informative.

Two descriptions remain:

3. Composition:

He did not complete the definition by explicitly mentioning *tarkib* (composition), maybe taking advantage of speaking in verse. Some said he signaled to that condition by the example: [استقم] (straighten-up {you}). Al-Makkudiyy: “It is not that he completed the definition and then gave an example; he completed the definition by an example.” Ibn ^Aqil: “He sufficed with an example.” However, As-Suyuwtiyy says why the composer did not mention composition: “... Because there was no need to mention it; we do not have any informative utterance without composition.” Ibn Hisham^(HM) explicitly counted two things for the grammarians’ *kalaam*: pronunciation and information.

Therefore, *kalam* is not achieved by a mere name like “Zayd”, even when it is a compound noun (*ism murakkab*), like the town of [بعلبك] (*Ba^la-Bakk*), or a woman named [شاب قرناها] (*Shaaba-Qarnaahaa* {Her two braids greyed}). This composition must be of the ‘*isnaadiyy* (clausal) type; the relationship between a subject (*musnad-‘ilayh*) and a predicate (*musnad*). This is what our shaykhs have taught us, but ‘Imam As-Sinhaajiyy called the *khavar* the *musnad ‘ilayh*:

والخير: هو الاسم المرفوع المُسند إليه

The *khavar* is the nominal that is nominative and *musnad ‘ilayh* (predicate).

Arabic has two types of clauses; verbal and nominal. Both require a nominal for its subject:

- A. If the predicate is a verb, then the *jumlah* (sentence; clause) is *fi^liyyah* (verbal): the subject is called “*faa^il* (verbal subject [doer])”, and the predicate is called “*fi^l* (verbal predicate [doing])”. In this case, the predicate initiates the sentence.

² Because as Shaykh Bahraq points out, ‘intidham’ is orchestrated composition.

³ English grammarians call this: “conveying a complete thought”.

- B. If the predicate is also a nominal, then the sentence is *ismiyyah* (nominal)’: the subject is called *mubtada’* (nominal subject [initiated]), and the predicate is called *khavar* (nominal predicate [news; information]). In this case, the subject initiates the sentence.

4. Being ‘Put Forth’

There is also the issue of *wad^*; being “put forth”. Shaykh ‘Ahmad says that they differed about the meaning of *wad^*; some said it means ‘*put forth in Arabic*’, and others said: ‘*put forth with purpose*’, which would be informing the hearer^(F).

- According to the first, anything not put forth in Arabic is not *kalam* because it is not the subject of the Arabic grammarians’ study.
- According to the second, what was uttered while sleeping or insane, or by the likes of a parrot, is not *kalam*, for not being put forth to inform the hearer. Shaykh ‘Ahmad^(AA) says that it is *kalam* due to the presence of a subject and predicate, and its lack of being informative is incidental.

The son cites *wad^* in the definition, and explains it as: ‘*what is used*’. Ibn Hishaam agrees with that, citing *wad^* as a condition for an utterance to be a *qawl* (saying) fundamentally. He said^(HQ):

وَلَمَّا أَخَذْتُ الْقَوْلَ جِنْسًا لِلْكَلِمَةِ وَهُوَ خَاصٌّ بِالْمَوْضُوعِ أَغْنَانِي ذَلِكَ عَنْ اشْتِرَاطِ الْوَضْعِ
 Since I consider a *kalimah* a type of *qawl* – which would only be something put forth - that freed me from the condition of *wad^*.

The definition that leaves nothing implied^(FM) is in Al-Ajurrumiyyah:

الكَلَامُ هُوَ اللَّفْظُ الْمُرَكَّبُ الْمَفِيدُ بِالْوَضْعِ
Kalam (Speech) is the composed, informative pronunciation, put forth.

This condition is not mentioned in some books, like how Shaykh Bahraq named three of the four:

اعْلَمْ أَنَّ حَدَّ الْكَلَامِ مَا أَفَادَ الْمَسْتَمِعَ فَائِدَةً يَحْسُنُ السَّكُوتُ عَلَيْهَا وَذَلِكَ هُوَ اللَّفْظُ الْمُرَكَّبُ الْمَفِيدُ

Know that the definition of *kalam* is: what, for the hearer, fosters information upon which it is suitable to be silent, and that is the composed, informative pronunciation.

There are three synopses:

The first is that there are four stipulations for *kalaam*: the author was explicit about two, like Ibn Hishaam. From here, some said he finished the definition, then gave an example. According to that, he is saying: “Our *kalaam* (speech) is an informative pronunciation. (That is) like [إِسْتَقَمٌ].” Some said he hinted at a third stipulation, so his line means: “Our *kalaam* (speech) is a pronunciation, is informative, is like [إِسْتَقَمٌ].”

But is that an example of *tarkib* (composition) or of *wad^* (being put forth)? Ibn Hishaam says it is an example for composition. As-Suyutiyy says it is for being put forth. So according to the first, it means: “Our *kalaam* (speech) is a pronunciation, is informative, is (composed) like [استنقم].” According to the second, it means: “Our *kalaam* (speech) is a pronunciation, is informative, is (put forth) like [استنقم].”

The second is that all speech has composition, but not all composition is speech, like:

1. **A compound**, like a mere genitive construction (*idafah*): [غلام زيد] (Zayd’s lad)].
2. **A fragment**, like Shaykh Bahraq’s example: [إن زيدا] (Indeed, Zayd)].
3. **A subordinate clause**, like the conditional clause: [إن قام زيد] (If Zayd stood)].
4. According to some, the **independent clause about what is necessarily known**, like [النار حارة] (Fire is hot)], because it does not inform the hearer.
5. According to some, **what comes from the absent minded** or sleeper, because it was not put forth to inform the hearer.

The third is that composition is confirmed by implications as strong as words, like:

1. The author’s example of [استقم (straighten-up {you})]; *the veiled pronoun* is so strongly implied that it is counted. What proves its strength is the ability to emphasize it and to link something to it by conjunction^(FF). **Precious case:** The Arabic adjective sometimes has a veiled pronoun that is not counted as a separate word, and for that reason, does not show up in the dual or plural^(FF).
2. The mere *shibh-jumlah* (prepositional phrase) demands an implication, like saying: [بسم الله] (*bi-smi-llaah*) ‘... in the Name of Allaah’ requires implying something like ‘I recite’ or ‘I start’. Saying [زيد في الدار] (Zayd is in the house)] means something like ‘he is “*kaa’in* (*existing*)” in the house’.

And Allah knows best!

The author informs that there are three types of Arabic words: the *ism* (nominal), the *fi^l* (verb) and the *harf* (particle). Al-Ghumaariyy says that this is by consensus, except who had an irregular dissention, and this division has three proofs^(GA):

1. It is confirmed by research of the likes of ‘Abu ^Amr, Sibawayh and Al-Khalil^(GA). The grammarians said: “*Had there been a fourth type, the scholars would have discovered it.*”
2. It has an ‘athar (transmitted report) from ^Aliyy Ibn ‘Abi Talib.
3. It also has rational arguments, several cited by Al-Ghumaariyy.
 - A. Al-Fakihi’s argument:** Either a word is independently intelligible or not. If it is not, it is a particle. If it is, then either that meaning is related to time or not. If it is, it is a verb, if not, it is a nominal.
 - B. The composer’s son’s argument:** Either a word is validly an integral of speech or not. If it is not, it is a particle. If it is, then either it is valid to be the indispensable integral or not. If it is, it is a nominal, if it is not, it is a verb. According to this argument, the minimum of Arabic speech is two nominals or a verb and a nominal.

These three are famously called the ‘*aqsaam* (divisions; parts) of speech. Al-Haririyy calls them ‘*anwaa*^ (types) of speech, which is compliant, according to Al-Ghumaari’s citing one of the meanings of *qism* to be *naw*^ (type):

وَنَوْعُهُ الَّذِي عَلَيْهِ يُبَيَّنُ
إِسْمٌ وَفِعْلٌ ثُمَّ حَرْفٌ مَعْنَى

Its ‘*naw*^ (type)’ upon which it is based is: ✽ Nominal, verb, then a particle of meaning.

Al-Faakihiyy was meticulous when said that these ‘*aqsaam* of *kalaam* are actually ‘*anwaa*^ (types) of *kalimaat* (words). He argues that even their being ‘*aqsaam* (divisions)’ should be that of *kalimaat*, not of *kalaam*, because *kalaam* can exist without verbs or particles. However, he justifies their calling them “parts of speech”: it is ‘*naming the details after the universal concept*’. Many Arabic grammarians start by immediately defining “**kalaam** [كلام] (speech)”, to make it easy on the beginner. Ibn Hishaam started Qatr An-Nadaa by defining the “**kalimah** [كلمة] (word)”, before the “*kalaam*”, because “speech” is composed of “words”.

The composer then commenced to enumerate the signs that distinguish each type of word from the other^(S). His son said: “*Or else there is no point in categorization.*”

10 بِالْجَرِّ وَالتَّنْوِينِ وَالنِّدَا وَالْ
وَمُسْنَدٍ لِلْإِسْمِ تَمْيِيزُ حَصْلُ

10. By being genitive, and being “nuwned”, and calling, and [أل] (‘al’), ✽ And by a predicate does distinction for the nominal occur.

An *ism* is a word that independently has an intelligible meaning unrelated to time. Al-Haririyy signaled to almost twenty kinds in a single line:

مِثَالُهُ زَيْدٌ وَخَيْلٌ وَغَنَمٌ
وَذَا وَتِلْكَ وَالَّذِي وَمَنْ وَكَمْ

Its example is *Zayd*, and *khayl* (horse) and *ghanam* (sheep or goat flock) ✽ And *dhaa* (that-M) and *tilk* (that-F) and *alladhi* (he who) and *man* (whoever) and *kam* (how much?).

Herein is what is:

1. *mu^rab* (variable ending), like [زَيْدٌ وَخَيْلٌ وَغَنَمٌ];
2. *mabniyy* (built; structured; invariable ending), like [وَذَا وَتِلْكَ وَالَّذِي وَمَنْ وَكَمْ];
3. *ghayru-mushtaq* (underived), like [وَذَا وَتِلْكَ وَالَّذِي وَمَنْ وَكَمْ];
4. *jaamid* (frozen; unshifting), like [وَذَا وَتِلْكَ وَالَّذِي وَمَنْ وَكَمْ];
5. *mutasarriif* (morphing [between forms]), like [زَيْدٌ وَخَيْلٌ وَغَنَمٌ];
6. *ma^rifah* (definite), like [زَيْدٌ] and [وَذَا] and [وَالَّذِي];
7. *nakirah* (indefinite), like [وَذَا] and [وَالَّذِي];
8. *mudhakkar* (masculine), like [وَذَا];
9. *mu^annath* (feminine), like [وَذَا];

10. *mushtarak* (shared [between masculine, feminine and/or singular and plural]), like [من] and [غنم];
11. *mufrad* (singular), like [زيد] and [ذا] and [الذي];
12. *ism jam^* (collective noun), which is singular in expression, plural in meaning, like [خيل و غنم];
13. *ism jins* (the name of the type; common noun), which can be concrete (*dhaat*) or abstract (*ma^naa*), like [خيل و غنم], and this includes the *masdar* (source)^(HS).
14. *^alam* (the name of a particular; its banner: the proper noun), which can be a “given name (*ism*)”, a *kunyah* or a nickname (*laqab*), like [زيد];
15. *ism 'ishaarah* (the demonstrative nominal), like [ذا وتلك];
16. *ism mawsuwl* (the relative nominal), like [الذي ومن];
17. *ism istifhaam* (interrogative nominal), like [من وكم];
18. *ism shart* (conditional nominal), like [من].

Other Arabic nominals include:

19. *damiyr* (the pronoun), whether connected, disconnected, or veiled.
20. '*asmaa' sittah* (the six nominals),
21. *sifah* (the adjective), which has many types, including *ism faa'il* (the doer's name), *ism maf'uwl* (the receiver's name), and *ism tafdil* (the superlative).
22. *muthannaa* (the dual),
23. *jam^* (the plural), which could be a *saalim* (sound) – masculine or feminine - or a *taksiyr* (broken) - including the “ultimate plural (*munatahaa al-jumuwa^*)”,
24. *Tasghir* (shrunk; miniaturized nominal),
25. *dharf* (the envelop; prepositional nominal),
26. *ism fi'l* (verb-nominal), and
27. other types, like the names of times, places, tools and sounds.

He started with the signs of the nominal because of its superiority over the other two types; it does not need them while they need it, and it also can be either side of a clausal link^(S). The composer, mentioning only some of many signs, means that there are five things by which the nominal is distinguished:

The first is the genitive case. It is called by the *Bisris* “*jarr*”, and by the *Kufis* “*khafḍ*”. This includes being by a genitive particle or by annexation (*'idaafah*), and some mention *tab'iyyah* (following [another word's syntax]). All three of those are in: [بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم].

Al-Makkuwdiyy, Shaykh 'Ahmad and others said that the composer's general reference to “*jarr*” is more inclusive than mentioning the genitive particle specifically, like the author of Al-‘Aajurruwmiyyah who mentioned as signs of a nominal both *the state of khafḍ* and *the particle of khafḍ*. However, As-Suyuwtiyy points out that for the composer, all “*jarr*” goes back to the particle, so had he said it, he would still be including the *'idaafah* (annexation). Ibn Hishaam said that the genitive particle is not intended, because it can be pronounced directly before other than a nominal, like:

[عجبت من أن قمت] (I was impressed with that you stood)). This is the only nominal sign mentioned by ‘Imam Al-Haririyy:

فَالاسْمُ مَا يَدْخُلُهُ مِنْ وَإِلَى أَوْ كَانَ مَجْرُورًا بِحَتَّى وَعَلَى

So, the nominal is what comes upon it [من] and [إلى] ❁ Or could be genitive by [حتى] and [على].

Shaykh Bahraq says why:

تنبيه: إنما اقتصر الناظم في الاسم على علامة واحدة وهي دخول الجر عليه لأنها أهم علاماته

Note: The composer only limited the nominal to one sign, which is being subject to the genitive case, because it is the nominal’s most significant sign.

The second is the **tanwīn** (nuwning; giving a [ن] letter nuwn). “Nuwning” the nominal is an Arabic feature. It is to attach a [ن] nuwn to it^(F). Tanwīn is a nuwn without a vowel; represented herein merely by ‘n’, without the vowel before it. That vowel is the sign of ‘i^raab. It is added to the end of the nominal [that is neither dual nor masculine plural; they have nuwns with vowels that would replace a tanwīn^(B).] It is unwritten, so it is pronounced when continuing, not when stopping, [because the way to stop usually follows the script^(FK)]. Also, [it is not for emphasis^(H)].

Tanwīn shows a nominal’s rootedness in being a nominal^(FM), and distinguishes the nominal from what is after it^(M). Shaykh Bahraq says: “*Tanwīn signals the end of the nominal.*” Therein is the secret behind its disappearance in an annexation! Shaykh Bahraq explains: “*The mudāaf with the mudāaf ilay-hi become like a single nominal, so the tanwīn comes after the second nominal, if it is not made definite by ‘أل’ also.*”

It is of four kinds:

1. **Tanwīn of tamkīn (firmness)**; like [رجالاً/ (rajul{i|n})/ رجل (rajul{u|n})/ رجل (rijaaal{a|n})]. *Tamkīn* is the nominal’s firmness in ‘ismiyyah (being a nominal)’, and in ‘i^raab (variable ending); it neither resembles a verb nor a particle.
 - **Had it resembled a verb**, it would not accept a tanwīn or a kasrah, though its ending still changes, like: [أحمد (Ahmad{u})/ أحمد (Ahmad{a})]. Such a nominal is described as denied *sarf* (*mamnuw^ minas-sarf; ghayru munсарif*).
 - **Had it resembled a particle**, it would be structured for its end to not change at all, like: [هو (huw{a})]. Such a nominal is described as *mabniyy* (built; structured; invariable ending).
2. **Tanwīn of tankīr (indefiniteness)**. This tanwīn comes after [some^(H)] ‘structured; built (mabniyy)’ nominals to distinguish the indefinite from the definite:

- If it is a name that ends with ‘wayh’, it can be applied as a consistent rule (*qiyas*), like the difference between a particular man named [سيبويه (Sibawayh{i})] and any random [سيبويه (Sibawayh{i|n})].
- If that is an *ism fi^l* (verb-noun), the tanwin can be applied if that word were heard as such (sama^), like: [صه (sah{i|n})^(M); have a moment of silence]. That is different from [صه (sah)^(M); be silent (absolutely)]. This type of nominal has the meaning of a verb, but it is known to be a nominal for such reasons as accepting a tanwin and being a subject. Saying that this type of word is a fourth part of speech is disregarded, and the author shall mention it shortly.
- 3. **Tanwin of muqaabalah (correspondence)**. This is the tanwin in the feminine plural that corresponds with the nuwn of the masculine plural, which is the nuwn that replaces *the tanwin of firmness* present in the singular. This *tanwin* follows a *dammah* when that *nuwn* follows a *waaw*, and it follows a *kasrah* when that follows a *yaa*, so you say: [مسلماات (Muslimaat{u|n})] like you say [مسلمون (Muslim{uw|N})], and you say: [مسلماات (Muslimaat{i|n})] like you say: [مسلمين (Muslim{iy|N})].
- 4. **Tanwin of ^iwad (replacement)**. It replaces two things:
 - A letter, in the case of any *ultimate plural* that is denied *sarf* while having an unsound ending, like: [جوار (jawaar{i|n})]. Its origin is: [جواري (jawaar{iy})]; the *yaa* was omitted and the *tanwin* replaced it. This case confuses the beginners who are baffled by a word that is denied *sarf* having a *tanwin*!
 - A **mudaaf ‘ilay-hi**. Shaykh Bahraq said: “The intent is that these words are bound to annexation, verbally or in meaning; such words severed from annexation are compensated with a *tanwin*.” Sometimes that *mudaaf ‘ilay-hi* is:
 - a. A word, like: [كل (kull{u|n})] all of; each of; any of; every of].
 - b. A sentence, like: [يومئذ (yawma’idh{i|n})] “on the day of; the day when”].

POSTSCRIPT: Ibn ^Aqil says: “The author’s apparent talk is that *tanwin*, all of it, is among the particulars of the nominal, and that is not the case” ... “the *tanwin tarannum* and *ghali* are in the nominal, verb and particle.” **The composer’s son** says: “These types, all of them, except *tarannum* and *ghali*, are particular to the nominal.” But **Ibn Hishaam** says: “The two *nuwns* called *tanwin tarannum* and *tanwin ghali* are, in reality, no sort of *tanwin* in any way.” **Al-Faakihiyy** says in *Sharhul-Qatr*: “Calling it *tanwin* is figurative, not literal.” This is because of:

- a. **Being written**. Al-Faakihiyy: “Writing an additional vowel spares from writing a ن.” This means that the first of the two *harakats* is not the *tanwin*; it is the ‘i^raab sign.
- b. **Being pronounced when stopping, and omitted when continuing**. Shaykh Bahraq says about the true *tanwin*: “When stopping upon it, its end is stripped of a

vowel if it were nominative or genitive.” In Al-Kashf: “Just as it is omitted in an annexation or for the attachment of ‘أل’.” This rule includes the accusative indefinite nominal ending in a *taa’ of femininity*, like [جارية]. Shaykh Bahraq: “The nuwn of its tanwīn is replaced by an ‘alif if it were accusative, just as is confirmed in writing.”

c. **Being pronounced along with an [أل]**. Shaykh Bahraq says: “Among its conditions is that it be devoid of an annexation and from being made definite by the laam” ... “because of the heaviness of merging a tanwīn and a laam, because it is an additive, and the tanwīn is also an additive.”

d. **Appearing in verbs and particles**. Al-Faakihiyy says: “(Tanwīn) is, with all of its divisions, particular to the nominal.”

Not being for emphasis excludes *the nuwn of stress* that is written like a *tanwīn*, like [لنسبعا].

The third is [for the word to be suitable for^(S)] calling (nidaa’; vocative case) by the particle [يا [O]], or any of its sisters, like: [يا زيد (O Zayd)]. Ibn Hishaam said^(HM) “The application of the vocative particle is not the intent, because [يا], in pronunciation, may come upon what is not a nominal, like [يا ليت].”

The fourth is the prefix^(F) [أل (al; the)], like: [الكتاب (al-kitaab) the book], or its Himyariyy dialect: [أم (am)], if it can attach^(FQ). The definite article is meant when mentioned without restriction^(FQ), but there is one that is an additive in already definite names, such as: [الوليد (Al-Walid)]. Calling it ‘al’ is Al-Khalil’s expression. Al-Faakihiyy says, “That is better.” Ibn Aajurruwm As-Sinhaajiyy called it “alif and laam”. Shaykh Bahraq merely calls it the laam. Ibn Hishaam^(HA) excluded the relative nominal: [أل (al; who)] that exclusively attaches to adjectives, for it can attach to a present/future tense verb; rarely according to some, irregularly according to others.

The fifth is telling something about the word in question; that proves that the word is a nominal. Some called that *isnaad*, and they meant *having a predicate*; Ibn Hishaam^(Q) called it *hadiṭh ^anh* (being spoken about); being a subject. In the explanation, Ibn Hishaam says this is an abstract indication of the nominal, as opposed to something pronounced before or after it, and he says:

وَهَذِهِ الْعَلَامَةُ أَنْفَعُ الْعَلَامَاتِ الْمَذْكُورَةِ لِلْاسْمِ

This sign is the most telling of the mentioned signs for a nominal.

And he explains why: it is an indication of a word being a nominal even if nothing else is. Several said: this is essentially what makes being genitive or being a direct object a sign of being a nominal; both are a sort of informing about the word.

Al-Ghumaariyy, mentions dualizing, pluralizing, miniaturizing, and being an antecedent are also signs of a nominal, amongst over 20 more signs. The majority^(HQ) used being an antecedent to prove that [مهما (whatever)] is a nominal in God’s Word⁴:

⁴ Al-‘A^raaf, 132

< مَهْمَا تَأْتِنَا بِهِ مِنْ ءَايَةٍ >

{Mahmaa (Whatever) you bring it to us as a sign ...}

Also, [إنما] is a nominal because it means “when”. [إِذْ] is itself a nominal, so when [ما] was added, it should remain as it was and not become a particle^(FQ). Sībawayh says it is a particle meaning ‘if’^(HQ).

[Then the author took to discussing the signs of a verb before discussing particles, because verbs have more privilege than particles, since they can be one of the two integrals of speech^(S)]:

11 بَتَا فَعَلْتَ وَأَتَتْ وَيَا أَفْعَلِي وَنُونِ أَقْبَلَنْ فِعْلٌ يَنْجَلِي

11. By the taa’ of [فَعَلْتَ], and of [أَتَتْ], and the yaa’ of [افْعَلِي], and the nuwn of [أَقْبَلَنْ] does a verb manifest.

Linguistically, a *fi^l* (act; doing) is the attribute of a *faa^il* (actor; doer). If that doer is created, then the *fi^l* is the very occurrence that issues from it^(FM). Technically, the *fi^l* (verb) is what independently has an intelligible meaning related to one of the three times. For that reason there are three types of verbs according to most *Bisris*; an act was either before the time of speaking, during or after^(FQ). As-Sinhaajiyy said:

الأفعال ثلاثة: ماضٍ، ومُضارعٌ، وأمر

The verbs are three: *madi*, *mudaari^* and ‘*amr*’.

1. **The past** is mentioned by the *madi* (past) verb, like [قال (qaal{a}) said{he}]. This verb was named after what it refers to^(FQ): it is what was put forth to indicate a past event; some occurrence that happened and has expired.
2. **The present** is mentioned by the *mudaari^* verb that shall be mentioned in the second half of the coming line. It can be called the *haal* (present) verb, like [يقول (yaquwl{u}) says{he}].
3. **The future** is mentioned by two types:
 - a. the *mudaari^*, which could be called the *mustaqbal* (future) verb, like [يقول (yaquwl{u}) {he} will say].
 - b. the ‘*amr*’ (imperative; command) verb, like [قل (qul) say{you}].

Benefit: You know from the composer’s introduction that what is *madi* in form could come for the present in meaning, and you should know that what is present/future in form could flip to the past in meaning, like [لم يقم (lam yaqum) {he} did not stand].

The ‘verb manifestation’ of which the composer speaks is a word’s being proven to be a verb by certain known signs. He mentions four things:

The first is *taa’ the pronoun*^(M) also known as *the doer’s taa’*^(^), because it is the subject suffixed for the past verb, like [فَعَلْتُ fa^l-t{u|a|i}]. The composer’s line can be read with any of the three vowels on the *taa’*^(M); each is a pronoun particular to the

past: a *damm* for the single speaker – masculine or feminine, a *fat-h* for single masculine addressee, and a *kasr* for a single feminine addressee. This is also why it is incorrect that [ليس] is a particle; it is a verb because you say: [لَسْتُ].

The second is *the vowelless taa' of femininity*. It is also a suffix for the past verb. It is not a pronoun; it indicates the femininity of the verb's subject^(M). It is evidence that [نَعَمْ] (*ni^m{a}*) best] and [بُسْنٍ] (*bi's{a}*) worse] are not nominals, and like [ليس] (*lays{a}*) not] and [عسى] (*^asaa*) perhaps], are verbs, not particles. This is because you say: [نَعَمْتُ] (*ni^mat*) and [بُسْتُ] (*bi'sat*) and [لَيْسْتُ] (*laysat*) and [عَسْتُ] (*^asat*). Rather, these four verbs are irregular (*shaadhah*) for:

1. not indicating time,
2. irregular vowelling,
3. being frozen,
4. and other reasons.

Its sometimes being vowelled by *naql* (relocated vowel), like [قَالَتْ أَمَةٌ], or to prevent two sukuwns meeting, like [قَالَتْ أَمْرًا] and [قَالَتْ] is incidental and does not belie its name. Therefore, this is not the *vowelled taa' of femininity*. That one attaches to the nominal and is the location for the *'i'raab* sign, like [مُسْلِمَةٌ] (*Muslimat{u/n}*)), but the most eloquent is to stop with 'h'; Muslimah. That is the *taa' marbuw'ah*, regarded by some as a haa'. There is also a vowelled taa' of femininity that attaches to particles, like [لَا تَ]. It may be rarely devowelled, like: [تَمَنْتَ]^(^).

The third is *the addressed female's yaa'*. It is also called the *feminine subject's yaa'*^(^). It attaches to the imperative and present/future verb, like [تَقُومِينَ] (you stand)] and [قُومِي] (stand, you)], [not the past^(^)]. The composer did not say *yaa' the pronoun*, because that would be too general^(^); it would include *the speaker's yaa'* (me; my; mine), which attaches to nominal – like [كِتَابِي] (my book)], verb – like [ضَرَبَنِي] (he hit me)] and particle, like [لِي] (mine)]; this one is an annexation, a direct object, or an object of the preposition, and is first-person masculine or feminine. It is not specifically a second-person feminine subject.

The fourth is the *nuwn of stress* (*tawkid* or *ta'kid*). It is sometimes doubled, and sometimes not. Both appear in God's Word: <لَيْسَ جَنَّ وَلَيْكُونَا>, except that the light one here is written like a *tanwin*. Like *the doer's yaa'*, this attaches to both the present/future verb and the imperative, like the author's example. Al-Hamalawiyy says that the imperative can absolutely be stressed, the past absolutely cannot be stressed, and the *mudaari'* has six cases: necessary stress, close to necessary stress, frequent stress, sometimes stressed, rarely stressed, and denied stress.

The synopsis is that by using four examples, the composer gave each of the three types of verbs two signs, may Allah have mercy on him.

12. Besides those two is the particle, like [هل] and [في] and [لم].

He means that the particle is what does not accept any of the forementioned signs, as well as other signs that shall come. Its sign is the lack of a sign, like the sign of a [ح] is the lack of a dot. It was said that the particle must lack a sign because it is itself a sign for the nominal or the verb, so had the sign had a sign, that would lead to a beginningless circle or a beginningless chain^(FF).

A particle is what does not have an independently intelligible meaning. Nevertheless, it has a meaning, and that is why it qualifies as a “word”, even if it is made of only one letter, like the hamzah for asking or calling, and could be up to five letters, which is [لكن] (but; rather). However, its ‘alif after the laam is not written. The composer signaled to the two categories^(^) of particles - and some, by splitting the second into two, said three:

1. **A particle that is *ghayru-mukhtass* (neither special to nominals nor verbs),** like [هل (?)] for asking a question. In this case, it will not have any agency to effect a word’s ending; inactive. The conjunctions are of this type, but it is said: “they are active as intermediaries”.
2. **A particle that is *mukhtass* (special to nominals or verbs).**
 - A. The first is like [في] for envelopment. Since this is special to nominals, this must be a genitive particle, unless it has the power of both *raf*^a and *nasb*^(FF), coming upon what was a *mubtada*’ - which would only be a nominal - like [إن]. Excluded from such activity is [أل]; it has no power because of being so interconnected with the nominal to which it prefixes^(FF); a part of a word has no activity in the rest of the word. Any agent therefore oversteps it to get to the nominal.
 - B. **A particle that is special to verbs**, like [لم] for negation. Then it will be a particle of *nasb* or *jazm*.

These three occur as many types, such as:

1. *Harf istifhaam* (interrogative particle), like [إ (?)] and [هل (?)] : inactive.
2. *Harf nafy* (negating particle), like [لا (no; not)], [لن (will not⁵)], [إن (not)], [ما (not)] and [لم (did not⁶)]: sometimes active, sometimes not.
3. *Harf jarr* (genitive; prepositional particle), which links verbs to nominals and has its own chapter, including *harf qasam* (swearing particle).
4. *Harf nasb* (accusative particle), which has its own chapter.
5. *Harf ^atf* (connecting; conjuncting particle), which links nominals to each other, verbs to each other, nominals to verbs, and sentences to each other, and has its own chapter. It is not independently active; it is like a circuit.
6. *Harf shart* (conditional particle), which links sentences. Some are inactive, and some are in the chapter of *jazm*.
7. *Harf nidaa*’ (calling; vocative particle), in the chapter of calling: active.
8. *Harf istithnaa*’ (particle of exception; exclusion), in the chapter of exclusion: active, and some said: by intermediary.

⁵ This particle is not a verb like ‘will not’; it negates the future.

⁶ This particle is not a verb like ‘did not’; it negates the past.

9. *Harf maṣdariyy* (infinitive particle); they are: [أَنْ], [إِنَّ], [مَا], [لَوْ] and [كَيْ]: some are active, some are not.
10. And others, like *harf khiṭaab* (particle of address) and *harf tambīh* (particle of alert; notice), in the chapters of pronouns and demonstrative nominals: inactive.

After mentioning the particle, the composer revisits the verb:

فَعْلٌ مُضَارِعٌ يَلِي لَمْ كَيْشَمُ ... 12

وماضِي الأفعال بالتَّاءِ مِزْ وسم بالنونِ فِعْلَ الأمرِ إِنْ أَمْرٌ فَهَمْ 13

12. ... A *mudaari^* verb follows [لَمْ], like: [يَشْمُ].

13. And the past verb, by the *taa'* distinguish (it); And mark ﴿تاء﴾ by the *nuwn* the imperative verb, if a command is understood.

The *mudaari^* herein, may also be called the *present/future verb*. Alone, it is *muhtamal*; not more apparently for the present or future. It is the verb that resembles a nominal, since:

1. it is subject to *i^raab*,
2. and the composer's son adds: and *the initiating laam*,
3. and its vowels match that of *ism faa'il* (the doer's name).

Here, the composer clarifies the signs that distinguish the *mudaari^* verb from its two counterparts, mentioning the famous example given by the scholars: [لَمْ], because of how it significantly changes the meaning; flipping the present/future verb to the past in meaning, not structure. Like [لَمْ] is a sign for the *mudaari^*, so are all of its other sisters; the *jazm* particles. Also are the *nawaasib* (accusative particles).

The past is distinct from the command and the *mudaari^* by the suffixed *taa'*, as already mentioned. The command has two signs, one of which has already been mentioned^(M): the *nuwn of stress*, which it shares with the *mudaari^*, and the other is imparting the meaning of a command.

والأمرُ إِنْ لَمْ يَكُ للنونِ مَحَلٌ فِيهِ هُوَ اسْمٌ نَحْوُ صَهْ وَحَيَّهْلُ 14

14. And the imperative, if there were not for the *nuwn* any spot ﴿تاء﴾ in it, then it is (actually) a nominal, like [صَهْ] and [حَيَّهْلُ].

The point of the imperative verb is for something that has not happened to happen, or for something that has happened to persist^(FQ). However, if an expression imparts the meaning of a command, but could not accept a suffixed *nuwn*, then it is truly a type of nominal called *ism fi'il* (verb-noun), like [صَهْ] (be silent), and [حَيَّهْلُ] (come forward; hurry). As-Suyutiyy and the composer's son add: Also, if a word has the meaning of a past act but cannot accept *the taa'*, or has the meaning of a present act but cannot

accept [لم], then it is a verb-noun, like [هيهات (he went far)] and [أفت (I am annoyed)], which can accept a *tanwin of indefiniteness*.

وبالله التوفيق

المعرب والمبني

The Mu^rab & The Mabniyy

The author mentioned this chapter second to clarifying the meaning of speech because intellectually, *kalaam* has precedence over ‘i^raab and *binah*’, like a body having precedence over the temporal characteristic that exists through the body^(KH). Al-Faakihiyy asserts that ‘i^raab and *binah*’ alternate on words^(FF) like the alternation of motion and stillness, or contact and separation. According to this way, there is no word ending excluded from either of these two types^(FF). The son says, “*The nominal is limited to two divisions.*”

Mu^rab means: being subject to ‘i^raab. In Al-Fawaakih, Al-Faakihiyy says that the most relevant linguistic meaning of ‘i^raab is *taghyir* (shifting; changing), but in Al-Kashf he says it is ‘*ibaaanah* (elaborating; clarifying), since its point is distinguishing meanings. It also means *tahsin* (improving; perfecting). Al-Khudariyy adds as a linguistic meaning ‘*izaalah* (removal).

Mabniyy (built; structured) is what has *binah*’ (firm stacking^(FF)). As-Suyutiyy says like Ibn Hishaam and Ibn ^Aqil; that it is *khilaf* (different) from ‘i^raab, but like Al-Faakihiyy says, it is better to say that *binah*’ is the *didd* (opposite) of ‘i^raab^(FQ), because it is possible for two merely “different” things to come together at once, like standing and eating, as opposed to two opposites. However, Shaykh ^Ahmad has support for Ibn Hishaam’s expression, because he said^(AA) (with very slight alteration):

قبل دخول العوامل هو موقوف ليس معربا ولا مبني

Before the influence of the agents, the word is *mawquf* (suspended); neither *mu^rab* nor *mabniyy*.

An answer given by some who said they are opposites and not merely different, is that before the influence of agents, a word is *mabniyy*; it becomes like a particle that is neither influencing or influenced, and so it is static. They called this resemblance to a particle: ‘*ihmaaliyy* (dereliction). As-Suyutiyy agrees with the composer mentioning this type of resemblance in one of his other books, but Al-Khudariyy says about it, “*There is something about it.*”

There are two ways to technically define ‘i^raab:

The definition in Al-‘Aajurruwmiyyah taken by many^(FF), including Ibn Hishaam^(Q), is what Al-Faakihiyy said is the *Kufiyy* way^(FM), and he described it as obviously *ma^nawiyy* (abstract)^(FF):

الإعراب هو تغيير أواخر الكلم، لاختلاف العوامل الداخلة عليها لفظاً أو تقديرًا
'I'raab is the shifting of word endings, whether pronounced or approximated,
because of the varying agents that come upon the words.

- The changing of a word's ending is its becoming *marfuw*[^] (nominative; subjective) or *mansuwb* (accusative), or otherwise, depending on the effect of an agent (*^aamil*)^(FF).
- What is approximated is what is not pronounced, but instead intended and supposed, like the *dammah*, *fathah* and *kasrah* intended on the '*alif* in: [جاء] and [رأيت الفتى] and [مررت بالفتى]. The composer shall soon hint at this case with the example of [سما (sumaa)].

According to this way, you say that *raf*[^] and the rest have signs^(FF).

The *^aamil* (agent) is what has *^amal* (activity); it mandates a word ending being one way or another^(FF), whether before the *ma^mul* (governed) word or after^(FQ), or even if implied, like to say: [ضرب زيداً (He hit Zayd,)] and [زيداً ضرب (Zayd he hit,)] and [زيداً] (Zayd,) as an answer to the question, "Who did he hit?" [The agent may be a nominal, verb or particle^(FQ)]:

- The original agent is the verb^(FQ) because it has the strength to act even when implied. It can make a nominal *marfu*[^] (nominative; subjective) or *mansub* (accusative) like [ضرب زيدٌ عمرًا (Zayd hit ^Amr)], and it is that to which a prepositional particle seeks to link, like [بسم الله (in the Name of Allah)]. If there is no verb, it will link to anything that has *the whiff of a verb*.
- A particle can effect *raf*[^], *nasb*, *jarr* and *jazm* in nominals and verbs, and nothing can govern a particle.
- A nominal can make another nominal *marfu*[^] like [زيد قائمٌ] or *majrur* (genitive) like [غلام زيدٍ], and if it acts like a verb, it can make another nominal *mansub*, like God's Saying: < وَلَوْلَا دَفْعُ اللَّهِ النَّاسَ > < Had it not been for God's defending the people ... >.

It may also be pronounced, like these examples, or abstract, like what makes a *mubtada'* nominative. A *mudaari*[^] verb is *marfu*[^] by being devoid of what would make it otherwise. Some things weaken or hinder an agent from its activity, like *jumud* (frozenness) in a word, a sentence being out of its original sequence, and a word having *the right to precedence*.

According to this, *binaa'* is a word ending adhering to one way, regardless of an agent. Ibn Hishaam^(HQ) demonstrated:

لَوْ كَانَ التَّغْيِيرُ فِي الْآخِرِ، وَلَكِنَّهُ لَيْسَ بِسَبَبِ الْعَوَامِلِ كَقَوْلِكَ جَلَسْتُ حَيْثُ جَلَسَ زَيْدٌ فَإِنَّهُ
يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ حَيْثُ بِالضَّمِّ وَحَيْثُ بِالْفَتْحِ وَحَيْثُ بِالْكَسْرِ إِلَّا أَنْ هَذِهِ الْأَوَّجُوهُ الثَّلَاثَةُ لَيْسَتْ
بِسَبَبِ الْعَوَامِلِ أَلَا تَرَى أَنَّ الْعَامِلَ وَاحِدٌ وَهُوَ جَلَسَ وَقَدْ وَجَدَ مَعَهُ التَّغْيِيرَ الْمَذْكُورَ

Had the shifting been at the end, but not caused by the agents, like your saying:
[جَلَسْتُ حَيْثُ جَلَسَ زَيْدٌ (I sat *hayth*{u/a/i} {where} Zayd sat)]; it is valid that you say
hayth{u} with a *damm*, *hayth*{a} with a *fat-h* or *hayth*{i} with a *kasr*. However,

these ways where not brought about by the agent. Do you not see that the agent is the same, which is [جلس (sat)], despite that there was found the mentioned change?

Al-Faakihiyy says^(FM) that its definition according to the *Bisris*, [and what Ibn Maalik not only prefers, but ascribes to the meticulous perfectionists^(FF)], and what appears from Al-Haririyy^(FM), is that 'i[^]raab is not an "alteration" or "adjustment"; it is a "pronunciation": [whatever vowel, letter, *sukun* or erasure^(Z)] uttered on what is judged as the word's end, demonstrating what is dictated by an **agent**. It is therefore the very utterance by which the end of a *mu[^]rab* word varies, and it is a trace (*athar*), whether apparent or estimated^(FM), as opposed to a change. According to this, it is not said that *raf[^]* has signs; instead, *raf[^]* is the 'i[^]raab. Al-Faakihiyy: Al-Muraadiyy: "This is more accurate." Shaykh Ahmad^(Z) mentioned it first, as did Al-Faakihiyy^(FM).

According to this, the *binnaa'* is something similar to 'i[^]raab, but is produced not to demonstrate what an agent dictates. It is not a citation, nor a way to prevent two *sukun*s meeting, nor a relocated vowel^(Z).

Two types of words are *mu[^]rab*:

1. An *ism mutamakkin* (situated nominal); a nominal that does not resemble a particle in one way, even if it resembles a verb in two ways. As-Suyutiyy cites Ibn Haajib's rationalization: resembling a particle even in one way is enough to distance the nominal from *ismiyyah* (nominal-ness), while resembling a verb in one way is not.
2. A *mudaari[^]* verb devoid of what renders it *mabniyy^(FF)*; unlike other verbs, it is subject to 'i[^]raab because it is subject to varying sentential meanings, like the difference between informing: [لا تفعل] ({You} do not do,) and forbidding: [لا تفعل] (Do not do {you})).

There is another technical usage for the word 'i[^]raab: parsing; breaking down the sentences in accordance with the rules of Arabic, like their saying: "Do the 'i[^]raab for the sentence [جاء زيد]." (KH)

15 والاسم، منه مُعَرَّبٌ ...

15. And the nominal, some of it is mu[^]rab ...

He means that the Arabic nominal, when involved in composition^(AA), is of two divisions: *mu[^]rab* (variable, articulating ending), and *mabniyy* (built; structured; static ending). Here, he mentioned the *mu[^]rab* first because that is the original case for nominals^(M); meaning their majority^(FQ), [and because of 'i[^]raab's privilege over *binnaa'*, and because the *mabniyy* fills the space of what would be *mu[^]rab^(FF)*]. This is its case because of the various sentential meanings to which a single word with its own meaning is subject, like doer or receiver, and is therefore needy of some convention that distinguishes those meanings^(F). A language without such conventions would be much more restricted in word order and less versatile. Because of 'i[^]raab, one can say:

| | | | |
|---------|---------|---------|---|
| عَمْرًا | زَيْدٌ | صَرَبَ | 1 |
| زَيْدٌ | صَرَبَ | عَمْرًا | 2 |
| زَيْدٌ | عَمْرًا | صَرَبَ | 3 |
| عَمْرًا | صَرَبَ | زَيْدٌ | 4 |
| صَرَبَ | عَمْرًا | زَيْدٌ | 5 |
| صَرَبَ | زَيْدٌ | عَمْرًا | 6 |

In all of these examples, Zayd is the striker, ^Amr is struck, and the word order only dictates the focus, not the doer - which is the subject of *balaaghah* (rhetoric), so here is a case where those two fields meet. However, technically, when the verb comes ahead of the doer, the doer is called *faa'il* (verbal subject), as in the first three examples. When the doer is ahead of the verb, it is called *mubtada'* (nominal subject). When the *i'raab* does not appear, which the composer shall address shortly, and there is no other context that frees the sentence from being limited in word order - like [أَرْضَعَتِ الصَّغْرَى الْكُبْرَى] - the original word order: first the doing, then the doer, then the done, becomes necessary, like: [ضَرَبَ مُوسَى عِيسَى]. Therefore, a benefit of *i'raab*, besides distinguishing meanings, is enhancing the language's customizability.

15 ... وَمَبْنِي لَشَبِّهِ مِنْ الْحُرُوفِ مُدْنِي

15. And [some is] mabniyy ☞ For some close resemblance to the particles.

A nominal's ending being static; not being reflective of its role in the sentence, is for some incidental reason, which is limited to^(^), as the composer exhibited, a nominal's resemblance to a particle. However, since "resemblance" could be close; strong or not, he noted that it would be a close, compelling resemblance, and he will list what makes it as such. If any resemblance to a particle is voided^(M), meaning something interfered with that resemblance, then it will remain *mu^rab* despite what resemblance to a particle it has. An example is [أَيَّ] (which); it resembles a particle by having a dependent meaning, like the abstract meanings of *asking* or *being conditional*, however it is bound to annexation, which is particular to nominals. That overrides its resemblance to a particle, so it remains *mu^rab*. You say: [أَيَّ ('ayy{u|i|n})] and [أَيَّا ('ayy{a|n})], but stopping on that with an *'alif*. Other examples are like [ذَان (these {two})] and [الَّذَان (those {two} who)]; they resemble particles in meaning or function, as will be addressed shortly, but the dual form interferes with that and renders them *mu^rab*, because duality is particular to nominals.

16 كَالشَّبِّهِ الْوَضْعِي فِي اسْمِي جِئْنَا وَالْمَعْنَوِي فِي مَتَى وَفِي هُنَا

17 وَكِنْيَابَةٍ عَنِ الْفَعْلِ بِلَا تَأَثُّرٍ وَكَافُتِقَارٍ أَصْلًا

16. Like the structural resemblance in the two nominals of [جئتنا] And the conceptual (resemblance) in [متى] and in [هنا].

17. And like being in the stead of a verb without Being governed, and like some fundamental lacking (in independent meaning).

[By these two lines^(^)], the composer divided the ways of resemblance to a particle into four according to Ibn ^Aqil and Al-Makkudiyy, or three according to Ibn Hishaam and the composer's son, by counting the third and fourth as one.

1. **Structural resemblance**; resembling the particle by being a word consisting of merely a letter or two. The son says: “Because the origin for nominals is to consist of three or more letters while the origin of particles is to consist of a letter or two.” The two nominals to which the composer refers in his example [جئتنا] (You approached us) are *taa' the pronoun* (you) which is a mere letter, and [نا] (us), which is two. [The first is a nominal because it is the subject, and the second is a nominal because it is a direct object^(^)]. The son says: “If you were to say, ‘But [يد] and [دم] consist of only two letters and we find them *mu^rab!*’ I say: That is because originally they were put forth upon three letters; their origins are [يدي] and [دمي], as proven by their saying [الأيدي] and [الدماء] and [اليديان] and [الدميان]. As long as a (nominal) was not put forth upon two letters, it does not closely resemble a particle, so it is not considered.” Ibn Hishaam^(HA) said similar about [أب] and [أخ].
2. **Conceptual resemblance**; [the expression's very meaning^(SON)] having a particle's meaning, whether there was already a particle for such a meaning or not. The first is like [متى (where)]; if it is interrogative, it resembles the interrogative hamzah [أ (?)], and if it is conditional, it resembles [إن (if)]. The second is like [هنا (here)]; ‘*ishaarah* (signaling) is a meaning that should be covered by a particle, [like how *khiṭaab* (addressing) and *tambih* (alerting) are meanings covered by particles^(M)], as well as such abstract meanings as *nafy* (negation), and *nahy* (prohibition)^(^). Al-Khudariyy documents *istighraqiyyah* (comprehensiveness) as one.
3. **Functional resemblance**; operating like a particle by being an ungoverned agent, like a verb-noun, like [دراك زيداً] (Catch Zayd); [دراك] replaces [أدرك] by making a veiled pronoun nominative and having a direct object as displayed in the example, but it cannot be governed by anything pronounced or implied. This is what he meant by being in the stead of a verb without being governed. He did not mean that the resemblance is merely replacing a verb, because there are *mu^rab* nominals that act as verbs, like the *maṣdar*. Ibn ^Aqil exemplifies that by: [ضرباً زيداً] (Hit Zayd); [ضرباً] replaces [اضرب] (hit; strike {you},) but it is governed by an agent, which is an *omitted verb*. That is why the composer added “without being governed”; to exclude what acts like a verb while also governable by another word.
4. **Dependency resemblance**; fundamentally needing [a sentence^(SON)] for its own clarity, like the relative nominals, like [جاء الذي يكتب] (He who writes came)]. By “fundamentally”, we exclude the likes of an indefinite word described by a sentence like [مررت برجل يكتب] (I passed by a man writing,)]

because mentioning the descriptive sentence⁷ is not binding. This fourth way is counted by some as *functional resemblance*.

The types of static nominals resembling particles in one of these three or four or five ways are listed in the Mutammimah:

ومبني وهو الفرع وهو ما لا يتغير آخره بسبب العوامل الداخلة عليه كالمضمرات وأسماء الشرط وأسماء الاستفهام وأسماء الإشارة وأسماء الموصولات.

Mabniyy is the derivative case (of nominals): what its ending does not change by agents influencing it, like the pronouns, conditional nominals, interrogatory nominals, demonstrative nominals and relative nominals.

18 وَمُعَرَّبُ الْأَسْمَاءِ مَا قَدْ سَلِمَا مِنْ شَبَهِ الْحَرْفِ ...

18. The mu^{rab} of nominals is what is clear ☞ Of resemblance to a particle, ...

Here, the composer finished discussing *binaa'* first, although '*i^{raab}*' deserves first mention, because '*i^{raab}*' is the lengthier subject, and the *mabniyy* is limited to what has been mentioned. He therefore finished the briefer subject first, although it is truly secondary, like how Ibn Hishaam presented the *nawaasib* in Qatr.

... كَأَرْضٍ وَسَمَا

18. ... like [أرض] and [سما].

A nominal that resembles a particle is unsituated (*ghayru-mutamakkin*). The composer means that the *mu^{rab}* is whatever is clear of resemblance to a particle. It is therefore situated (*mutamakkin*), even if unfirmly situated (*ghayru-^amkan*), meaning it resembles a verb^(^). But sometimes its '*i^{raab}*' does not appear, because there are two types of word endings: *sahih* (sound) and *mu^{tall}* (unsound)^(^). He therefore drew attention to that^(SON) and gave two examples: one for when the '*i^{raab}*' appears upon the sound ending, like: [أرض]; you say: [أَرْض] ('ard{u|i|n}) and [أَرْضًا] ('ard{a|n})), and another for when it does not because of unsound ending, like: [سما], and this was already addressed.

As for [سما], it is a variant of the word [اسم (name)]. Ibn ^Aqil said it has six variants – which is not an explicit denial of more. As-Suyutiyy gathered those six in a line of his that he shared:

إسم بضم الأول والكسر مع همزة وحذفها والقصر

“Ism”; with a damm on the front, or a kasr, ☞ With a hamzah or not, and with a short ‘alif.

⁷ ‘Writing’ in the example is a translation for an entire sentence in Arabic [يكتب ({He} writes)].

Those mentioned six are:

1. [إسم] (ism).
2. [أسم] (usm).
3. [سيم] (sim).
4. [سم] (sum).
5. [سىمى] (simaa).
6. [سمى] (sumaa).

Al-‘Ushmuniiyy documents ten in his own lines, and Shaykh ‘Ahmad said it has 18 famous variants. Then, after discussing nominals being *mu^rab* or not, he embarked on discussing what is [*mabniyy* or *mu^rab*^(M)] amongst verbs:

... **وَفِعْلُ أَمْرٍ وَمُضِيٌّ بُنْيَا** **19**

19. The verb of command and [of the^(M)] past are built ...

He started with what is *mabniyy*^(M) because that is the original case of verbs according to the *Bisris*, and that is correct^(^), since they are not subject to various sentential meanings that need distinction like nominals^(Z). Of the three types of verbs, two are always static: the past by consensus, and the imperative according to the *Bisris*, and that is weighty:

As for the past, according to Al-‘Aajurruwmiyyah, the past verb is always built with a *fat-h*:

فَالْمَاضِي: مَفْتُوحُ الْآخِرِ أَبَدًا
The past is forever built with a *fat-h*.

This is the way of Shaykh ‘Ahmad in both explanations, and Ibn Hishaam in ‘Awdah Al-Masaalik, and Al-Ghumaariyy. This is its judgement whether all of its letters are original or some are additives^(FF), and as Shaykh Bahraq and Al-Faakihiyy^(FM) said, whether it has:

1. Three letters, like: [فَعَلَ] and [فَعُلَ] and [فَعَلَّ].
2. Four letters, like: [فَاعَلَ] and [فَاعُلَ] and [فَاعَلَّ].
3. Five letters, like: [افْتَعَلَ] and [انْفَعَلَ] and [افْعَلَّ].
4. Six letters, like: [افْعَالًا] and [افْعُوْعَلًا] and [استَفْعَلًا].

The *fat-h* is estimated when the verb ends with an ‘*alif*, like [رمى] and [عفا]. However, some differed with Al-‘Aajurruwmiyyah’s absolute statement, which would mean that there is an estimated *fat-h* on that *baa*’ in [ضربوا] and [ضربت]. Concerning Al-Hariri’s general statement, which is not as absolute as that of As-Sinhaajiyy:

وَحُكْمُهُ فَتْحُ الْآخِرِ مِنْهُ
Its judgement is the *fat-h* of its ending.

Shaykh Bahraq said: “*It is not as absolute as posed.*” Rather, according to them, sometimes the past verb is built with a damm, and sometimes with a sukuwn. That is according to Shaykh Bahraq, Al-Faakihiyy and As-Suyutiyy. In Qatr-un-Nada, Ibn Hishaam said:

وبناؤه على الفتح كضرب إلا مع واو الجماعة فيضم كضربوا أو الضمير المرفوع المتحرك فيسكن كضربت
It is built with a *fat-h*, like [ضرب], except with the *waw* of plurality, for then it is with a damm, like [ضربوا], or the vowelled nominative pronoun, for then it is with a sukuwn, like [ضربت].

The synopsis is that they agreed that the past is built, but they differed about how: some said it is always built with a *fat-h*, even with *the waw of masculine plurality* and *the vowelled nominative pronoun*. Others said: excluding *the waw of masculine plurality* and *the vowelled nominative pronoun*. According to both ways, the damm is *the appropriate vowel*, and the sukuwn is due to the old Arabs’ *aversion to four consecutive vowels in what is like one word*, or, according to some, to differentiate between the doer and the receiver when you say: [ضربنا] or [ضربت].

As for the imperative, the best statement^(FM) about its structuring is what Shaykh ‘Ahmad^(Z), Al-Faakihiyy and Al-Ghumaariyy said:

هو مبني على ما يُجزم به المضارع
It is built like a *majzuwm mudaari^* verb.

That is more inclusive than the generalization of Al-Haririyy, Al-Makkuwdiyy and the son about it being built on a sukuwn, and more accurate than As-Sinhaaji’s simplification for the beginners:

والأمر: مجزوم أبدا
The imperative is forever *majzuwm*.

According to Shaykh ‘Ahmad, he means that it has a *sukuwn* that resembles that sign of *jazm*^(AA); not that it is truly *majzuwm*, for that would mean that it is *mu^rab* and not *mabniyy*. Know that saying it is truly *mu^rab* is what the *Kufis* said, asserting that the imperative is *mu^rab* and not *mabniyy*, and in fact, not even a third type of verb. To them, the origin of [اضرب] is [لتضرب]; the command is clipped from the *mudaari^ majzuwm*, by removing *the laam of command* and the *taa’* for the addressee, to make it lighter when commanding the addressee, as opposed to a third person. Therefore, there are only two types of verbs: *madi* and *mudaari^*. According to Shaykh Ahmad, he did not contradict what he said right before that: “*The verbs are three*,” because he was only likening the command to the *majzuwm*. According to Al-Ghumaariyy, however, what he said secondly indeed nullified what he said before that, and therefore, this is the outweighed saying of the *Kufis*.

1. It is when it has a sound ending that it is built with a sukuwn^(FM); you say: [لم تضرب] like you say: [اضرب].
2. If it has an unsound ending, or is one of *the five models*, it has a *hadhf* (erasure; omission). You say:

- A. when omitting the unsound ending: [اخشن/ارم/اغز] like: [لم تخشن/لم ترم/لم تغز].
- B. when omitting the nuwn from the five models: [اضربوا] like you say: [لم تضربوا], and [اضربا] like you say: [لم تضربا] and [اضربي] like you say: [لم تضربي]. Al-Makkuwdiyy, Shaykh Bahraq and As-Suyutiyy do not mention the five models here, like Shaykh ^Ahmad^(AA), Al-Ghumaariyy and Al-Faakihiyy^(FM) did.

Then, the composer signaled to the *mu^rab* verbs:

وَأَعْرَبُوا مُضَارِعًا إِنْ عَرِيَا ... 19

مِنْ نُونٍ تَوْكِيدٍ مُبَاشِرٍ وَمِنْ نُونٍ إِنْثَاءٍ كَيَّرَعْنَ مَنْ فُتِنَ 20

19 ... ☞ And they gave 'i^raab to a mudaari^ verb when devoid;

20. Of a nuwn of stress in direct contact, and from ☞ the nuwn of females, like [يَرَعْنَ مَنْ فُتِنَ].

By “they”, the composer means the *Saligis*; the old Arabs whose speech is evidence for the language, not the grammarians. Their giving 'i^raab to the mudaari^ verb is their speaking in that way, and not that they decided any rules of the language. He means that their usage of the *present/future verb* was by giving it a variable articulating ending like a nominal; you say: [يفعل] and [لن يفعل] and [لم يفعل]. However, that is under the condition of lacking two nuwns; or else it will resort to the original case of verbs and be *mabniyy* like its two counterparts:

1. the nuwn of stress, whether doubled or not, like [يفعلن] (yaf^ala|n/yaf^ala|nn{a}), as long as it is in direct contact with the verb ending, makes the verb be built with a *fat-h*, because the verb with the nuwn became like the compound: [خمسَة عشر] (khamsat{a}-^ashr{a}). What blocks the nuwn from contacting the verb directly is an attached pronoun, like [تقومن], even if implied, like: [تقومن]. It is understood^(M) from stating this condition that if it is not in direct contact with the verb, then it will still be *mu^rab*, however, the sign of raf^ will be a nuwn omitted to avoid three successive nuwns.
2. the nuwn of females, like [يفعلن]. Since this nuwn would only be directly attached to the verb ending, there was no need for the composer to qualify it like the previous nuwn^(M).

After discussing what nominals and verbs deserve, the composer moved on to discuss what particles deserve^[a]:

وَكُلُّ حَرْفٍ مُسْتَحِقٌّ لِلْبِنَا ... 21

21. And every particle is worthy of being static ...

He means that every particle, even if it has five letters^[ff], [necessarily^[s]] has a static ending, by consensus^[fq], because it is [always frozen^[son/f]], and since it lacks independent meaning^[a], it is] never susceptible to various sentential meanings that require distinction. **Ibn ^Aqil**: If you say: [أخذت من الدراهم]; *I took min (from) the dirhams*, informing about “selecting some” exists without ‘i’raab.

Al-Makkuwdiyy criticizes the composer’s use of worthiness; deservingness, because it is not binding that because something is worthy of something that it gets what it deserves. However, Shaykh Ahmad defends it, explaining the line to mean: *Every particle is static, as it deserves to be.*


والأصلُ في المَبْنِيِّ أن يُسَكَّنَا ... 21

21. And the origin of what is static is ending without a vowel

The origin of anything mabniyy, whether nominal, verb or particle, is being built with a sukuwn, because the origin of having a variable ending is to have a vowel, and because a sukuwn is lighter than a vowel^[^] while being mabniyy is itself heavy^[s]; had it been vowelised, it would have been doubly heavy^[a]. Also, the origin of a word ending is being devoid of a vowel. It would not be otherwise but for some reason that demands it, like the inability to take a sukuwn, or any of many reasons^[a]. **Ibn Hishaam**^[hm]: This is also called “*waqf*” (pause).

Al-Faakihiyy^[fq]: If anything is mabniyy as per its origin, there is no reason to inquire the reason for it being mabniyy, nor to inquire why it is built with a sukuwn if it is. However, if a word is built with a vowel, there are two questions: Why does it have a vowel, and why is it that vowel in particular? If it is a word that would originally have a variable ending, there is only one question if it is built with a sukuwn: why is it mabniyy? If such a word is built with a vowel, there are three questions: Why is it mabniyy, why is it with a vowel, and why is it that vowel in particular?

وَمِنْهُ ذُو فَتْحٍ وَذُو كَسْرٍ وَضَمٌّ 22 كَأَيْنَ أَمْسٍ حَيْثُ وَالسَّاكِنُ كَمْ

22. It includes what has a *fat-h*, and what has a *kasr*, or a *damm*  like [أَيْنَ], [أَمْسٍ], [حَيْثُ], and the example with sukuwn is [كَمْ].

Words that are mabniyy would have the endings mentioned above.

- The composer's first example is a nominal mabniyy due to its resemblance either to the interrogative particle [هل/?] or the conditional one: [إن/if]. The reason for its being built with a vowel is the inability of being built with a sukuwn, and that vowel is a *fat-h*, either because of its lightness, or to match the vowel of the hamzah. A verb of this category is [ضربَ], and some particles built with a *fat-h* include [أَنَّ] and [لَيْتَ] and [لَعَلَّ] and [رُبَّ].
- His second example is a nominal mabniyy because of incorporating the meaning of the definite particle [أل], and it was built with a vowel, not because it is impossible to build it with a sukuwn as some said, but because of its ability to mu[^]rab, like saying: [ذهب أمسنا] *Ams[u]naa (our yesterday) has passed; gone*. The reason for it being a kasrah is that being the original vowel for breaking two successive sukuwns. Examples of particles built with a *kasrah* are [جِيرَ] and the propositional [بَاءَ] and [لَامَ].
- His third example is [حَيْثُ], a nominal mabniyy for resembling a particle by being unavoidably dependent on a sentence. It is built with a vowel because it is not possible to build it with a sukuwn, and that vowel was a *damm* because it is similar to [قَبْلَ] and [بَعْدَ]. A particle built with a *damm* is [مَنْذُ] according to those who use it as a preposition.
- The forth is [كَمْ], a nominal built with a sukuwn as per the origin of being mabniyy. It resembles an interrogative particle if it is interrogative, and because of being put forth upon only two letters if it is declarative, or because it resembles [رُبَّ] in meaning plentitude. Examples of particles built with a *sukuwn* include [قَدْ] and [لَمْ] and [بَلْ] and [هَلْ], and an example of a verb is [اضربَ].

Shaykh Ahmad: His example of [كَمْ] “how many; very many” is nice, subtle wordplay by which he signals to the many of the three types of words built with a sukuwn, since it is the origin. Likewise is the case for what is built with a *fat-h*, since it is the lightest vowel and closest to a sukuwn. However, verbs are not built with a *damm* or a *kasr* because they are heavy, and the verb is already heavy.

23 وَالرَّفْعَ وَالنَّصْبَ اجْعَلْنِ إِعْرَابًا لَاسِمٍ وَفَعْلٍ نَحْوُ لَنْ أَهَابًا

23. Indubitably make *raf[^]* and *nasb* ‘i[^]raab for a nominal and verb, such as [لَنْ أَهَابًا].

In this section, the composer spoke about the designations for ‘i[^]raab in relation to nominals and verbs, after finishing discussing *binaa*. There are three categories; in this line is what is shared between nominals and verbs: *raf[^]* and *nasb*.