

## On the Definitions of Particles that the Exegete must Know

By particles I refer to the letters and the like that are nouns, verbs and adverbs.

Know, that because of their differing occurrences, having knowledge of this material is an important necessity. It is because of such differing occurrences that speech takes on such variations. An example is the verse “wa innā au iyyākum la `alā hudan au fī d`alālin mubīn”<sup>1</sup> (34:24). The particle “`alā” is used for the truth and “fī” for misguidance, and it is as if the truthful person is highly placed, with vision that takes in various scenarios whereas the misguided person is submersed in darkness, is lowly placed, and not knowing where to turn.

Another is the verse “fa ib`athū aḥadakum bi wariqikum hāthihi ilā `l-madīnati fa lyanthur ayyuhā azkā ṭa`āman fa lya`tikum bi rizqin minhu wa lyatalaṭṭaf”<sup>2</sup> (18:19) is conjoined to the previous sentence by way of the participle “fā” and to the subsequent sentence by way of the participle “wāw”. And this is because the sequence has been disturbed. After all, watchfulness (*l-talaṭṭuf*) is not contingent on food being brought, as opposed to its coming which is anticipated. Also anticipating the food is linked to turning attention to it, and turning attention to it is linked to abandoning disputes about the time spent in the cave, and deferring to the knowledge of God in this regard.

And the verse “innamā `l-śadaqāt li `l-fuqarā`i wa `l-masākīn. . .”<sup>3</sup> (9:60) shifts from the particle “li” to “fī” in the case of the last four persons, to imply a greater right of the offerings than those before them who were preceded by the particle “li”. This is because “fī” alludes to ‘containing something’ and its usage suggests that they have greater right to being considered for the offerings, just as a thing is placed in its container to remain therein.

`l-Fārisī has said: “The verse uses ‘wa fī `l-riqāb’ and not ‘wa li `l-riqāb’ indicating that a slave lacks right of ownership.”

Ibn `Abbās is reported to have said: “Praise be to God who said: “`an śalātihim sāhūn”<sup>4</sup> (107:5) and did not say “fī salātihim”. Similar examples will be mentioned.

And in presenting this material he followed the sequence of the letters of the alphabet. A group of scholars dedicated separate works to this topic. This includes `l-Harawī from among the early scholars, who did so in the work *l-Uzhīyah*, and Ibn Umm Qāsim from among the later scholars who did so in the work *l-jana `l-dānī*.

### The Hamzah

This is of two kinds:

A- The interrogative particle (*hamzah` l-Istifhām*) which in reality seeks comprehension. and which is its original purpose. It is thus characterized by the following features:

---

<sup>1</sup> “And verily , (either) we or you are rightly guided or in plain error”

<sup>2</sup> “So send one of you with this silver coin of yours to the town, and let him find out which is the good lawful food and bring some of that to you and let him be careful”

<sup>3</sup> “Zakāt are only for the poor, needy, those employed to collect funds, ....”

<sup>4</sup> “Those who delay (absent-minded) their *salāt*”

1. To omit, as will be explained in section 56.
2. To establish form and to confirm, as opposed to the particle *hal* which is used strictly to confirm, and all other particles which are used strictly to form.
3. To affirm, as in the verse “a kāna li `l-nās `ajaban”<sup>5</sup> (10:2) and the verse “ā `l-thakarairani ĥarrama. . .”<sup>6</sup> (6:143) and deny, as in “A lam nashrah”<sup>7</sup> (94:1). It serves to provide two meanings: one, to remind and alert, as in the foregoing examples, and as in the verse “a lam tara ilā rabbika kayfa madda `l-zill”<sup>8</sup> (25:45). And two, to show amazement at some colossal event, as in the verse “a lam tara ilā allathīna kharajū min diyārihim wa hum ulūf ĥathara `l-maut”<sup>9</sup> (2:243). In both cases the purpose is to alert, as in the verse “a lam nuhliki `l-auwwalīn”<sup>10</sup> (77:16).

---

<sup>5</sup> “Is it a wonder for mankind that We sent.....”

<sup>6</sup> “Has he forbidden the two males”

<sup>7</sup> “Have We not opened your breast for you”

<sup>8</sup> “Have you not seen how your Lord spread the shadow”

<sup>9</sup> “Did you not think of those who went forth from their homes in thousands fearing death”

<sup>10</sup> “Did we not destroy the ancients?”

4. To show its connection to the previous verses it is placed in front of the conjunction. Examples include: “a wa kullamā `āhadū `ahdan”<sup>11</sup> (2:100); “a fa amina ahlu `l-Qurā”<sup>12</sup> (7:98), and the verse “a thumma ithā mā waqa`a”<sup>13</sup> (10:51). All by way of analogy with the parts of all conjoined sentences its related particles however. Examples include: “fa kaifa tattaqūn”<sup>14</sup> (73:17); “fa aina tathhabūn”<sup>15</sup> (81:26), “fa annā tu`fakūn”<sup>16</sup> (6:95); “fa hal yuhlaku”<sup>17</sup> (46:35), “fa ayyu `l-farīqaini”<sup>18</sup> (6:81), and the verse “fa mā lakum fī `l-munāfiqīn”<sup>19</sup> (4:88).
5. Abū Hayyān quotes some scholars as saying that it is not used as an interrogative particle until it is intuitively sensed that the response to the question would be in the affirmative. By contrast, *hal* conjures neither a positive nor a negative response.
6. As opposed to other particles it may also be part of a conditional statement. such as the verse: “a fa in mitta fahum khālidūn”<sup>20</sup> (21:34) and the verse “a fa in māta au qutila inqalabtum”<sup>21</sup> (3:144).
7. It does not serve literally to interrogate but to produce multiple meanings as will be clear in section fifty seven.

#### Note

When used in a sentence containing the verb *ra`ayta*, it precludes the literal meaning of seeing with the eye or the heart. Instead, it is then said to mean: “inform me” and when changed to the ???pronoun “hā”. Excluded from this is Qunbul’s recitation of the verse “hā antum hā’ulā”<sup>22</sup> (3:119) with a shortened *hā’*. It does however, appear in oaths, including the verse “wa

---

<sup>11</sup> “Is it not (the case)that every time they make a covenant”

<sup>12</sup> “Or, did the people of the towns then feel secure”

<sup>13</sup> “Is it then that when it has actually befallen, you will believe it?”

<sup>14</sup> “Then, how can you avoid the punishment”

<sup>15</sup> “Then, where are you going?”

<sup>16</sup> “Then, how are you deluded away from the truth?”

<sup>17</sup> “But shall any be destroyed except .....

<sup>18</sup> “So which of the two parties. . .”

<sup>19</sup> “Then what is the matter with you that you are divided into two parties about the hypocrites?”

<sup>20</sup> “Then if you die, would they live forever?”

<sup>21</sup> “If he dies or is killed , will you then turn back on your heels as (disbelievers)?”

<sup>22</sup> “Lo! You are the ones . . .”

lā taktum shahādatan”, which is read with *tanwīn*, followed by a lengthening of the *hamza* of the word “Allāh”.

B-The *hamzah* that is used as vocative particle for objects close by. To this category according to `l-Farā’ belongs the verse “a man huwa qānitun ānā’a `l-layl”<sup>23</sup> when recited without a doubled *mīm*. So read, it means O! You who possess these attributes!

Hishām has “This is far fetched because of the fact that the vocative forms of the Qur’ān appear only with the particle “yā”. Shielding it from assertions that it is metaphorical does however, make Farrā’s opinion plausible. After all, none of the interrogatives used by God are done so literally. It is similarly shielded from assertions that much has been elided. Those who argue in support of the interrogative particle reconfigure the verse to mean: “a man huwa qānit khair am hādha ‘l-kāfir”<sup>24</sup> referring that is, to the object of the following verse: “qul tamatta` bi kufrika qalīlan”<sup>25</sup> (39:8), Thus, two things have been deleted: the equivalent of the *hamzah* and the predicate.

### *Aḥād*

In the work *l-Zīnat* Abū Ḥātim said: “This is a designation more complete than the word “*l-wāḥid*”. Notice that the statement: *fulān lā yaqūm lahū wāḥid* (As for so and so: one person does not stand for him!) Holds out the possibility that two or more persons do indeed stand for him. This is different to saying: “*lā yaqūm lahū aḥād*” (No one stands for him)

The word “*l-aḥād*” encompasses characteristics not found in “*l-wāḥid*”. Thus the statement: “*laisa fī l-dār wāḥid*” does not preclude animals, birds, wild animals and human beings; it thus includes human beings and others, as opposed to the statement: “*laisa fī l-dār aḥād*” which is specific to human beings and excludes all others.

---

<sup>23</sup> “Is one who is obedient to God prostrating himself or standing (in prayer) during the hours of the night”

<sup>24</sup> “Is one who is obedient to God better or the disbeliever”

<sup>25</sup> “Say: “Exult in your disbelief for temporarily.”

He also said: “The word *l-âhad* in the idiom of the Arabs refers to ‘the first ‘ as well as “the one”’, and serves to both affirm and negate. Thus in the verse: “qul huwa Allāh âhad”<sup>26</sup> (112:1) it means *wâhid*, whilst in the verse “fa ib`athū âhadakum bi wariqikum”<sup>27</sup> (18:19), it means *l-awwal*. When used in the converse however it serves to negate only. One thus says: “*mā jā’anī min âhad*” To this belongs the following verses: “a yaḥsabu an lan yaqdira `alaihi âhad”<sup>28</sup> (90:5); “an lam yarahū âhad”<sup>29</sup> (90:7); “fa mā minkum min âhadin”<sup>30</sup> (69:47); and the verse “wa lā tuṣalli `alā âhadin”<sup>31</sup> (9:84). The word “wâhid” however, is used without restrictions in both cases.

In using “*âhad*” both the masculine and feminine forms are equally appropriate. The Almighty has said: “lastunna ka âhadin min `l-nisā’i”<sup>32</sup> (33:32). This is in contrast to “*l-wâhid*”: one will not say: “ka wâhid min `l-nisā’i” but rather, “wâhidah”. Furthermore, “*âhad*” may be used for both singular as well as plural.

I would add that it is precisely for this reason that the verse “fa mā minkum min âhadin `anhu hājjizīn” does not use “*l-wâhid*”.

Also, “*l-âhad*” does have a plural form, “*l-âhadūn*” and “*l-âhād*”, as opposed to “*l-wâhid*” which has no plural. One does not say “wâhidūna” but “ithnān” and “thalātha” instead. And “*l-âhad*” may not be used in multiplication, numbers, division and in counting generally, as opposed to “*l-wâhid*”. This brief discussion now ends. But his discussion on these two things yields seven sub sections.

And in ‘l-Bārizī’s *Asrār l-Tanzīl* the following appears in a discussion of the chapter *l-ikhhlās*: It may well be asked that in the idiom of the Arabs ‘*l-âhad*’ commonly follows a negation whilst ‘*l-wâhid*’ follows an affirmation, whereas here *âhad* appears after an affirmation?

Abū `Ubayd is of the view that they both mean the same, in which case none will hold any advantage over the other, even though ‘*âhad*’ is used more frequently in the negative context. It may well be that this digression from the norm is in deference to the rhyme???

---

<sup>26</sup> “Say: “He is God, the One”

<sup>27</sup> “So send one of you with this silver coin of yours”

<sup>28</sup> “Does he think that none can overcome him?”

<sup>29</sup> “Does he think that none sees him?”

<sup>30</sup> “And none of you could have withheld Us from (punishing) him”

<sup>31</sup> “And never pray (funeral prayer) for any of them(hypocrites)”

<sup>32</sup> “You are not like any other women”

And in his *Mufradāt l-Qurʿān* l-Rāghib had this to say: “*aḥād* is used in two ways, to negate, and to affirm.” In the first case the object is to include the entire category of speakers, thus including many or a few. It is therefore quite correct to say : “*mā min aḥādin min fādʿilīn*”<sup>33</sup>. Or as the verse goes: “*fa mā minkum min aḥādin `anhu ḥājizīn*”. The second case takes three forms.

- I. That which is used in numbers with the tens e.g *aḥāda `ashara* (eleven) and *aḥādin wa `ishrīn* (twenty one).
- II. That which is part of an *idʿāfah* construction, and means the first. An example is the verse “*ammā aḥādu kumā fa yasqī rabbahu khamran*”<sup>34</sup> (12:41)
- III. That which is used as an adjective to describe God in particular, as is the case with the verse “*qul huwa Allāhu aḥad*”<sup>35</sup> (112:1). The origin of the word is “*waḥāda*” except that the word “*wahada*” is used for others.

### *Ith*

This assumes the following forms:

---

<sup>33</sup> “There is not any virtues people”

<sup>34</sup> “As for one of you, he (as a servant) will pour out wine”

<sup>35</sup> “Say: “He is God, the One”

1-As a noun in most cases for the perfect tense. Most scholars maintain however, that it only appears as an adverb, as in the verse “fa qad naṣarahu Allāh ith akhrajahu allathīna kafarū”<sup>36</sup> (9:40). Or with the adverb as part of an idʿāfa construction, as in: “ith hadaitanā”<sup>37</sup> (3:8); “yauma’ithin tuḥaddithu”<sup>38</sup> (99:4), and “wa antum ḥīna’ithin tanzūrū”<sup>39</sup> (56:84). Other maintain that it appears as the direct object, as in the verse “wa uthkurū ith kuntum qalīlan”<sup>40</sup> (7:86)”, and as in the opening statements of all parables, where it means ‘recall’. Or as the substitution (*badl minhu*) as in the verse “wa uthkur fī ʿl-kitāb Maryam ith intabathat”<sup>41</sup> (19:16). Here “ith” is an exhaustive substitution (*badl ishtimāl*). Also belonging to this category is the verse “yas’alūnaka ʿan ʿl-shahr ʿl-ḥarām qitālin fihi”<sup>42</sup> (2:217) and uthkurū ni`mat Allāh ʿalaikum ith ja`ala fīkum anbiyā’a”<sup>43</sup> (5:20) which implies: remember those favors, that is, the cited installing of the prophets. So stated, the particle will be considered is the thing mentioned , therefore it is *badl kul min kul* (substituting the entire thing). Most scholars however, consider this an adverb for the direct object omitted in the first verse, that is: remember the favour of God when you were few. In the second verse they consider it an adverb of a word which is *mudʿāf* to a deleted direct object i.e. remember the story of Mary. This is supported by the verse “wa uthkurū ni`mata Allāh ʿalaikum ith kuntum a`dā’a”<sup>44</sup> (3:103). ʿl-Zamakhsharī asserts that it should be a *mubtadāʿ* (subject) and he cites the alternate reading of some of the verse “lamin manna Allāh ʿala ʿl-mu`minīn”<sup>45</sup> (3:164). He said: “Reconfigured, the verse implies: *mannuhū idh ba`atha* (His bounty appeared when He dispatched) In this case *idhā* is in the nominative case, just as it is in the statement: *akhtubu mā yakūn ʿl-amīr idhā kāna qāʿiman* (the leader is at his best when he delivers his address standing) i.e. when God sent him, then He favoured the believers”. Ibn Hishām said: “we do not know of anyone with this view”. Many scholars say that it serves to convert the perfect to the imperfect, as in the verse: “yauma’ithin tuḥaddithu akhbārahā”<sup>46</sup> (99:4),

<sup>36</sup> “For God did indeed help him when the disbelievers drove him out”

<sup>37</sup> “After you have guided us”

<sup>38</sup> “That day it will declare its information”

<sup>39</sup> “And you at the moment are looking on”

<sup>40</sup> “And remember when you were but few”

<sup>41</sup> “And mentioned in the Book (the Qur’ān), the story of Mary, when she withdrew in seclusion from her family”

<sup>42</sup> “They ask you about fighting in the sacred months”

<sup>43</sup> “Remember the favour of God unto you when He made appointed apostles from among you”

<sup>44</sup> “And remember God’s favour on you, for you were enemies”

<sup>45</sup> “God has indeed, conferred a great favour on the believers”

<sup>46</sup> “That day it will declare its information”

but the majority reject this view and designate this as belonging to those verses whose future events are so definitive as to be couched in past terms. To this category belongs the verse: “*wa nufikha fī `l-šūr*”<sup>47</sup> (18:99) as well. Those holding this view, Ibn Mālik among them, support their view by way of the verse “*fa saufa ya`lamūn; ith `l-aghāl fī a`nāqihim*”<sup>48</sup> (40: 70 - 71) This is because *ya`lamūn* due to it being prefixed by the particle *saufa* becomes imperfect in both word and meaning. due to the participle of *`l-tanfīs* (*soufa*) which enters upon it and influence the word “*ith*”, therefore it get the status of “*ithā*”. Others consider it a circumstantial phrase (*ḥāl*), as appears in the verse “*wa lā ta`malūn min `amalin illā kunnā `alaikum shuhūdan ith tufīdūna fīhi*”<sup>49</sup> (10:61)

### Note

Ibn Abū Ḥātim quotes Abū Mālik on the authority of `l-Suddī as saying: “wherever *in* appears in the Qur’ān nothing takes place, and wherever *ith* appears things do take place.

---

<sup>47</sup> “And the trumpet will be blown”

<sup>48</sup> “They will come to know when iron collars will be rounded over their necks”

<sup>49</sup> “Nor you do any deed but We are witness thereof when you are doing it”

2. As a causative explanation (*l-ta`līl*), as appears in the verse “wa lan yanfa`akum `l-yaum ith žalamtum annakum fī `l-`athāb mushtarikūn”<sup>50</sup> (43:39) to imply: that you share this day, the burden of punishment benefits you not, and this because of wrong doing in this world. Given that causative explanations stem from the intensity of the statement rather than the word as such, should this be considered a particle acting in place of the *lām* of causation, or an adverb of time? Two views exist in this regard, the first of which is attributed to Sībawaih. The second is critical of these explanations: for one, *ith* cannot be a substitute (*badl*) for *yaum* given the difference in time, and cannot be an adverb *yanfa`u* because it cannot affect both adverbs. Nor can it affect *mushtarikūn* because the governed word of the predicate of the “inna” rule cannot precede it, and because the governed word of a relative clause cannot precede the relative pronoun. Another reason is that they share in matters pertaining to the Hereafter, and not to the period of their wrongdoing.

Also considered causative are the particles in: “wa ith lam yahtadū bihi fa sa yaqūlūna hāthā ifkun qadīm”<sup>51</sup> (46:11) and “wa ith i`tažaltumūhum wamā ya`budūna illā Allāh fa`wū ilā `l-kahf”<sup>52</sup> (18:16). Most scholars reject this distinction, and say that it implies: *ba`da ith žalamtum*.

Ibn Jinnī has said: “I screened the verse “wa lan yanfa`akum `l-yaum. . .” repeatedly with Abū `Alī, probing the change of *ith* from *l-yaum*. We concluded therefrom that in the case of God this life and the after life are one, and so today is like the past.

3. Abu `Ubaidah, following by Ibn Qutaibah, cites the verse “wa ith qāla rabbuka li `l-malā`ikah”<sup>53</sup> (2:30) to support the view that it is an addition which serves to emphasize.

4. Like the particle *qad* it too is used to clarify. The verse in question is ascribed thereto. To this category Suhaylī adds the verse “ba`da ith antum muslimūn”<sup>54</sup> (3:80) Ibn Hishām however, said : “these two views are irrelevant”.

## Issue

---

<sup>50</sup> “It will profit you not this Day as you did wrong, (and) that you will be sharers in the punishment”

<sup>51</sup> “And when they have not let themselves be guided by it, they say : “this is an ancient lie”

<sup>52</sup> “And when you withdraw from them, and that which they worship, except God, then seek refuge in the cave”

<sup>53</sup> “And remember when your Lord said to the angels”

<sup>54</sup> “After you have submitted to God’s will”

The particle “ith” must be attached to sentence that is either nominal as in the verse “wa uthkurū ith antum qalīl”<sup>55</sup> (8:26), or verbal. In the latter case the verb in question must be perfect in tense and meaning. An example is the verse: “Wa ith qāla rabbuka li malā’ikah” and the verse “wa ithi ibtalā Ibrāhīm rabbahu”<sup>56</sup> (2:124). It may also be perfect in meaning alone, as in the verse: “wa ith taqūla li allathī an`ama Allāh `alaihi”<sup>57</sup> (33:37). All three scenarios are expressed in the verse “illā tanṣurūhu faqad naṣarahu Allāh ith akhrajahu allathīna kafarū thāniya ithnain ith humā fī `l-ghār ith yaqūlu li śāhibihi”<sup>58</sup> (9:40). Sometimes the sentence itself is omitted because of being well known, and in its stead a nunation is substituted, and because of the merger of two paused letter (*iltiqā’ al-sākinain*) the letter “thāl” is given a *kasra*. Examples are the verse “wa yauma’ithin yafraḥu `l-mu’minūn”<sup>59</sup> (30:4) and: “wa antum ḥīna’ithin tanzurūn”<sup>60</sup> (56:84).

`l-Akhfash opined that *ith* is declinable because it no longer needs the sentence, and that the *kasra* acts as end marker, in conjunction with the words “`l-yaum” and “`l-ḥīn” which are attached as *idāfa* to it. This is rejected because its indeclension is because it comprises of two letters, and that the need for the sentence remains remains in order to complete its meaning. This is similar to that demonstrative construction wherein the demonstrative particle has been omitted.

### Ithā

It is of two kinds:

1. One, which serves to surprise, especially in the case of nominal sentences, which need no reply, nor need appear in the beginning. The meaning is conveyed in the present tense, and not in the future. Examples include: “fa alqāhā fa ithā hiya ḥayyatun tas`ā”<sup>61</sup> (20:20); “fa lammā anjāhum ithā hum yabghūn”<sup>62</sup> (10:23); and “wa ithā athaqnā `l-nās raḥmatan min ba`di dharrā’a massathum ithā lahum makrun fī āyātina”<sup>63</sup> (10:21)

---

<sup>55</sup> “And remember when you were few”

<sup>56</sup> “And remember when the Lord of Abraham tried him with certain commands”

<sup>57</sup> “And remember when you said to him on whom God has bestowed grace”

<sup>58</sup> “If you help him not, for God did indeed help him when the disbelievers drove him out, the second of the two”

<sup>59</sup> “And on that day, the believers will rejoice”

<sup>60</sup> “And you at that moment are looking on”

<sup>61</sup> “He cast it down, and behold! It was a snake, moving quickly”

<sup>62</sup> “But when He delivers them, behold! They disobey God”

<sup>63</sup> “And when We let mankind taste mercy after some adversity has afflicted them, behold! they take to plotting against Our *āyahs*”

Ibn Hājib has said : “By surprise is meant the simultaneous appearance of a thing together with you, in some activity”. In saying, for instance, *kharajtu fa idha l-asad bi l-bāb* (I stepped out, and Lo! There was the lion at the door!) the lion and your appearance at the place of emergence are simultaneous. Its emergence with you at the place of emergence establishes greater proximity than if it had been the time of emergence. This is because it is place and not time that singles you out. And the greater the proximity the greater the surprise. Conflicting views exist with regard to this particle “ithā”: that it is a participle, according to `l-Akhfash whose view Ibn Mālik gives preference to; that it is an adverb of place, according to `l-Mubarrad whose view Ibn `Uṣfūr give preference to; and that it is an adverb of time, according to `l-Zujāz, whose view Zamakhsharī give preference to. He also claimed that it is governed by an implied verb derived from the word `l-mufāja’ah. He said: “The implication is as follows: “then when he came to call you, behold! you went out at that time”. Ibn Hishām said: “this is not known from anyone else. Rather, it is the explicit or the implied predicate which is known to them as its accusative?? He said: “The predicate appearing with it in the Qur’an is always explicit.”

2. That it does not come for *`l-mufāja’ah*. In most cases it comes as an adverb for the future tense which include the meaning of *shart* (condition). It specially enters upon verbal sentences and is in need of a *jawāb* (reply to shart). It occurs in the beginning, unlike *`l-mufāja’ah* and the verb that follows it, is either visible e.g. the verse “ithā jā’a naṣr Allāh”<sup>64</sup> (110:1); or implied e.g. the verse “ithā `l-samā’u inshaqqat”<sup>65</sup> (84:1). Its *jawāb* is either a verb e.g. the verse “fa ithā jā’a amr Allāh qudhiya bi `l-ḥaqq”<sup>66</sup> (40:78) or a nominal sentence joined to the participle “fā” e.g. “Fa ithā nuqira fī `l-nāqūr fa thālika youma’ithin youmun `asīr”<sup>67</sup> (74: 8-9) and the verse “fa ithā nufikha fī `l-ṣūr fa lā ansāba”<sup>68</sup> (23:101); or likewise a verbal sentence of request e.g. the verse “fa sabbiḥ bi ḥamdi rabbika”<sup>69</sup>(110:3); or a nominal sentence joined to the participle “ithā- *`l-fujā’iyyah*” e.g the verse *ithā da`ākum da’watan min `l-`ardh ithā antum takhrujūn*<sup>70</sup> (30:25) and the verse “fa ithā aṣāba bihi man yashā’u min `ibādihi ithā hum yastabshirūn”<sup>71</sup> (30:48).

Sometimes it is implied due to an indication that precedes it, or an indication of *`l-maqām*

---

<sup>64</sup> “When there comes the help of God”

<sup>65</sup> “When the heaven is split asunder”

<sup>66</sup> “But, when comes the commandment of God, the matter will be decided with truth”

<sup>67</sup> “Then, when the trumpet is sounded, truly, that Day will be a Hard Day”

<sup>68</sup> “Then, when the trumpet is blown, there will be no kinship among them”

<sup>69</sup> “So glorify the praises of your Lord”

<sup>70</sup> “When He will call you by a single call, behold, you will come out from the earth”

<sup>71</sup> “Then when He has made them fall on whom of His slaves as He wills, lo, they rejoice”

(status). It will be explained in the categories of *ʿl-hathf*.

Sometimes the participle “ithā” is excluded from being an adverb. ʿl-Akhfash said regarding the verse “ḥattā ithā jā’ūhā”<sup>72</sup> (39:71) that the participle “ithā” is in the accusative case because of the word “ḥattā”. Ibn Jinnīy said regarding the verse “ithā waqa`at ʿl-wāqī`ah.....”<sup>73</sup> (56:1) concerning the accusative case of the verse “khāfidhatan rāfi`atan”<sup>74</sup> (56:3). The first “ithā” is a *mubtada`a* (subject) and the second one is a predicate and the two accusative words are *ḥāl* (condition). Likewise the sentence of *laysa* and its effect. The meaning is “when the Event befalls, bringing low a group and exalting others”. That is the time when the earth will be shaken. The majority of scholars reject that is excluded from being an adverb and they say regarding the first verse “ verily, the word “ḥattā” is a participle of initiation, entering completely on the sentence but do not effect it In the second verse the second “ithā” is a *badl* of the first and the first one is an adverb and its *jawāb* deleted due to the understanding of the meaning. The lengthy wording and its implied words after the second “ithā” i.e. “you are divided and you were in three groups , beautify it.

Sometimes it is exclude from the future tense , then it occurs as *ḥāl* e.g. the verse “wa ʿl-layl ithā yaghshā”<sup>75</sup> (92:1). Verily, darkness is attached to the night, and the verse “wa ʿl-nahār ithā tajallā”<sup>76</sup> , and the verse “wa ʿl-najm ithā hawā”<sup>77</sup> (53:1).

Sometimes it occurs as perfect tense e.g. the verse “wa ithā ra’ou tijāratān ouw lahwan .....”<sup>78</sup> (62:11), because the verse was revealed after seeing it and dispersing from it. Likewise the verse “wa lā `alā allathīna ithā mā atouka li taḥmilahum qultu lā ajidu mā aḥmiukum `alayhi”<sup>79</sup> (9:92); and the verse “ḥattā ithā balagha maṭla`a ʿl-shams”<sup>80</sup> (18:90) and the verse “ḥattā ithā sāwā bayna ʿl-śadafayn”<sup>81</sup> (18:96)

---

<sup>72</sup> “Till when they reached it”

<sup>73</sup> “When the Event befalls”

<sup>74</sup> “Bringing low (some) and exalting others”

<sup>75</sup> “By the night as it envelopes”

<sup>76</sup> “By the day as it appears in brightness”

<sup>77</sup> “By the star when it goes down”

<sup>78</sup> “And when they see some merchandise or some amusement .....

<sup>79</sup> “Nor (is there blame)on those who came to you to be provided with mounts, when you said: “I can find no mounts for you”

<sup>80</sup> “Until, when he came to the rising place of the sun”

<sup>81</sup> “Then, when he had filled up the gap between the two mountains”

Sometimes it is excluded from being a *sharṭ* (condition) e.g the verse “wa ithā mā ghadibū hum yaghfirūn”<sup>82</sup> (42:37) and the verse “wa allathīna ithā aśābahum `l-baghyu hum yantaşirūn”<sup>83</sup> (42:39). The particle “ithā” in the two verses is an adverb for the predicate of the subject, which follows it. If it was a *sharṭ* (condition) and the nominal sentence was its reply, it would have been connected to a letter *fā*. Others say : “it is assumed to be like that”. Therefore it is rejected because it cannot be deleted unnecessary. Another view is that the pronoun is for emphasising the *mubtada`a* (subject) and that which follows, is the reply. This is inaccurate. Another view is that its reply is deleted which is indicated by the sentence that follows it. This is difficult for no necessity at all.

### Notes

1. According to the experts, that which is in the accusative case of the particle “ithā”, is its *sharṭ*. The majority are of the view that it is the reply of a verb or something similar to it.
2. Sometimes the particle “ithā” has been used for continuity of the past, present and the future tenses like how the imperfect verb has been used for that e.g. the verse “wa ithā laqū allathīna āmanū qālū āmannā wa ithā khalou ilā shayāṭīnihim qālūinnā ma`akum innamā nahnu mustahzi`ūn”<sup>84</sup> (2:14) i.e. this is their condition at all times. Likewise the verse “wa ithā qāmū ilā `l-salāti qāmū kusālā”<sup>85</sup> (4:142)
3. Ibn Hishām mentioned in the work *`l-mughnī* the particle “ith mā” but not the particle “ithā mā”. Shaykh Bahā`u `l-Dīn mentioned it in the work *`urūs `l-afrāḥ* under the category of *adawāt `l-sharṭ* (particles of condition). As for the particle “ith mā”, it does not appear in the Qur`ān. The view of Saybawīh is that it is a particle. `l-Mubarrid and others said: “it is still an adverb. As for the particle “ithā mā”, it appears in the Qur`ān in the verse “wa ithā ghadhibū”<sup>86</sup> (42:37), the verse “ithā mā atouka li taḥmila hum”<sup>87</sup> (9:92). I did not see anyone who objected against it remaining to be an adverb or changed to a particle. It is possible that there are two view in regard to the particle “ith mā”. It is possible that it may be with a *sukūn* in spite of remaining to be an adverb because it is more improbable in *tarkīb* (construction) than the particle “ith mā”

---

<sup>82</sup> “And when they are angry, they forgive”

<sup>83</sup> “And those who, when an oppressive wrong is done to them, take revenge”

<sup>84</sup> “And when they meet those who believe, they say: “We believe,” but when they are alone with their *Shayāṭīn* (devils) they say: “truly, we are with you; verily, we were but mocking”

<sup>85</sup> “And when they stand up for prayer, they stand with laziness”

<sup>86</sup> “And when they are angry”

<sup>87</sup> “Nor (is there blame) on those who came to you to be provided with mounts”

4. The particle “ithā” is specially used on something that is confirmed, assumed and that occurs a lot unlike the particle “in” which is used for doubtful things and imaginary rare things. Therefore God says in the verse “ithā qumtum ilā `l-solāt fa ighsilū” then He said “wa in kuntum junuban fa iṭṭaharū”<sup>88</sup> (5:6). The particle “ithā” is brought in ablution for its frequent occurrence and its multiple causes but the particle “in” is used in *janābah* for its rare occurrence in relation to the impure state. God says in the verse “fa ithā jā`athum `l-ḥasanah qālū lanā hāthihi wa in tuṣibhum sayyi`atun yaṭṭayarū”<sup>89</sup> (7:131) and the verse “wa ithā athaqnā `l-nās raḥmatan fariḥū bihā wa in tuṣibhum sayyi`atun bimā qaddamat aydīhimithā hum yaqnaṭūn”<sup>90</sup> (30:36). The particle “ithā” was brought for something good because the bounties of God which he bestows on his slaves, are many and a decreed matter. The particle “in” was brought for evil because it seldom occurs and is doubtful.

Two verses contradict this rule viz. the first, the verse “wa la in mittum”<sup>91</sup> (3:158) and the verse “a fa in māta”<sup>92</sup> (3:144). The particle “in” is brought in spite of death being a certainty. The other is the verse “ wa ithā massa `l-nās dhurrun da`ou rabbahum munībīna ilayhi thumma ithā athāqahum raḥmatan ithā farīqun minhum bi rabbihim yushriūn”<sup>93</sup> (30:33). So the particle “ithā” is brought at both sides. `l-Zamakhsharīy replied to the first by saying that because the time of death is unknown, it is considered to be something that is undecided. `l-Sakkākīy replied to the second by saying that it intends reprimand and scolding. So it brought the particle “ithā” as a means of instilling fear in them and informing them that they certainly taste some punishment. The meaning of some is derived from the word “l-mass” and the indefiniteness of the word “dhurr”.

---

<sup>88</sup> “When you intend to offer prayers then wash your faces and hands..... and if you are in a state of *janābah* (after sexual discharge), purify yourselves”

<sup>89</sup> “But whenever good came to them, they said: “ours is this”. And if evil afflicted them, they ascribed it to the evil omens”

<sup>90</sup> “And when We cause mankind to taste of mercy, they rejoice therein; but when some evil afflicts them because of (evil deeds and sins) that their own hands have sent forth, behold , they are in despair”

<sup>91</sup> “And whether you die”

<sup>92</sup> “If he dies”

<sup>93</sup> “And when harm touches men, they cry sincerely only to their Lord, turning to him in repentance; but when He gave them a taste of His Mercy, behold , a party of them associates partners in worship with their Lord”

As for the verse “wa ithā an`amnā `alā `l-insān a`radha wa na`ā bi jānibihi wa ithā massahu `l-sharr fathū du`ā`in `arīdh”<sup>94</sup> (41:51). It was replied to it that the pronoun in the word “massahu” refers to a person who turns away and who is filled with pride, not to any person. The particle “ithā” is brought as a warning that for this person who turns away, is an evil punishment which will certainly afflict him.

`l-Khuwayyī said: “according to me, it is permissible that the particle “ithā” enters upon certainty as well as doubtful things because it is an adverb and a *sharṭ* (condition). As for being an adverb, it enters upon certainty like all other adverbs.

5. The particle “ithā” differs with the particle “in” also in giving the meaning of *`l-`umūm* (generality). Ibn `Uṣfūr said: “if you say ‘when Zayd is standing, `Amr is standing’, it conveys the meaning of whenever Zayd stands, `Amr stands”. He said that this is correct. In the particle “anna” which is *mashrūṭ* (conditioned) by it, if it is non-existent the reply follows immediately. In the particle “in”, it does not occur unless despair in its existence materialised. In the particle “an”, its reply follows its *sharṭ* when it is joined. It is not advanced nor delayed unlike the particle “in”. In the particle “anna”, whatever it enters upon cannot get a *sukūn* because it cannot bring a *sharṭ*.

#### *Khātimah*

It has been said: “sometime the particle “ithā” is just an extra word”. He elucidated the verse “ithā `l-samā`u inshaqqat”<sup>95</sup> (84:1) i.e. the heaven split asunder like the verse “iqtarabat `l-sā`ah”<sup>96</sup> (54:1).

---

<sup>94</sup> “And when We show favour to man, he withdraws and turns away; but when evil touches him, then he has recourse to long supplications”

<sup>95</sup> “When the heaven is split asunder”

<sup>96</sup> “The Hour has drawn near”