Rejected assets in Al-Muwashah by Al-Khubaisi
Between ban and permit

Husam hassan ahmad alomari

Arabic Language Department - The Hashemite University
husam_omari.1985@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT:

This research analytically studies the unaccepted foundations in the book (Al Muashah Alaa Sharh Kafyat Ibn Alhajeb), Published by Alkhubaisy, by examining the syntactically unaccepted structures in the Arabic sentence. The unaccepted structures varied and were categorized into two sections: the first of which is entirely rejected by all grammarians, and the second one, which is only partially rejected. In each part of them the research made the rejected principles in the Muashah in two topics: advancement and delay, and Omission and increase.

The research consists of two sections: first, the theoretical side which comprises an introduction, an explanation, and a definition of unaccepted foundations. It also provides the reasons and justifications for the rejection among old grammarians and modernists. Second, the practical side, where the unaccepted foundations are divided into two types: the first one which is entirely rejected by all grammarians, and the research has provided the reasons of the rejection. The second type is the one which is partially rejected and accepted at the same time by some grammarians, and the research has justified the reasons of acceptance or non-acceptance. A table is provided in the conclusion of the research to explain that.

Keywords: Rejected assets , Al-Muwashah , ban , permit

INTRODUCTION

In their studies of Arabic grammar, the ancient grammarians sought to document the rules of the eloquent linguistic model, only; to make it a language model that can be taught and learned. Their studies provided fluent integer structure representations. On the other hand, they put wrong structures that cannot be uttered, which indicates that the movement of codification of rules is proceeding and the movement of linguistic correction, as the grammarians recorded the syntactic error to make it a reason for knowing the correctness, so their approach did not stop at the codification of the eloquent that must be adhered to, but rather to the recording of the error; Insight to the public about the shortcomings and weaknesses. In this method, the features of the normative approach, which is based on the principle of "say and do not say", are clear. The research considered that it should look at the wrong structures that were called the term of the rejected principles, and strive to explain the reason why the grammarians put such principles and assume them, and monitor the consensus of the grammarians to consider the composition to be rejected at all, or their lack of convergence on it permissibility, as the possibility that the composition is in accordance with one of the aspects Classical Arabic, and shows the opinion of modern grammarians on the rejected original, and provides an analytical description of it.

The research examines an important aspect of the linguistic thinking of the Arabs, which is the presence of some sentences or structures that it is not permissible to speak or use; for her departure on the rules set by Arab grammarians. The research sample was represented in the book of Al -Muwashah on the rhyme of Ibn al-Hajib by Al-Khubaisi; because in this book there are expressions that refer to the objectionable origins

or the prohibited combinations that al-Khubaisi legislated to issue rulings on refraining from uttering them. It is correct, and many of the combinations that preceded my negation, such as: "The implied one cannot be described," "the apparent from the implied one" and so on.

The research considered that the rejected principles mentioned in Al-Muwashah should be classified into two chapters: the first: which is rejected by the consensus of the grammarians, and the second: the rejection of its permissibility by some grammarians. In each chapter, the research section issues two topics: the first is the introduction and the delay, and the second is the addition and deletion.

Theoretical aspect: rejected assets

Grammar books are full of many hypothetical sentences and phrases that the authors of the books brought to indicate that it is not permissible to speak or use them, starting with Sibawayh who opened the door for those who came after him. It said.

The rejected origins were not rejected for their narration, for their narrators, for their geographical location, or for their time. Rather, they were rejected for reasons related to deviating from the rule that the grammarians estimated. Therefore, the grammarians put synthetic models that indicate that they are not uttered or compared to them (Safa, 2012). There were many reasons for preventing and rejecting installation, some of which were rejected due to the possibility of confusion (Morsi, 2013), or because they are assumed assets that no one has said about them, and they have not been used in real time in the history of Arabic (Al-Najjar, 2009), as evidenced by Ibn Jini's saying: These assets are rejected; Because it was not used once, it was not used at any time and then became neglected (Ibn Jinni, n.d).

Among the scholars of Arabic, who saw the opposite of that, and saw that it was used in the history of Arabic, or in some of its Semitic sisters, and called it linguistic accumulation, or linguistic accumulation (Abd al-Tawab, 1982). Thus, it is possible that these rejected origins represent a previous phase in the language, isolated in a certain linguistic environment after it developed into a new image that spread among the Arabs, or that it represents a new aspiration that was not able to spread among the Arabs, as in the grammar books a prohibited, rejected or abandoned origin (Al- Sayed, 2010).

Among the modernists are also those who saw structures as rejected for two reasons: the first is the lack of examples of the structure contrary to the original, and the second is the complete absence of examples of the structure (Al-Kindi, 2007). What was unsteady, the grammarians called it abnormal, necessity, little, rare, or wrong, and all of this, in the opinion of Tammam Hassan (Hassan, 2000) can be explained by the idea of licensing when there is no confusion, but if it is steady, it is subject to the following considerations:

- Benefit or security of wear (the benefit must be achieved despite the wrongdoing).

- Submission to certain rules, in the light of which this transgression takes place, and in the light of which he is expelled.

- The general framework of the grammar industry as it appears through the rules of guidance.

In a research by Sharif Al-Najjar, he saw that the rejected original also includes what was measured in permissible, even if it was not used, and its use is abnormal; Because he returned to an original that the Arabs did not use, he used something that was not used (Al-Najjar, 2011), and here is a reference from him to the fact that the composition that the Arabs did not use is rejected; For the structure to depart from what the Arabs uttered, the measure of acceptance or rejection is the use of the Arabs.

In a research by Hassan Al-Malakh, he saw that the rejected origin is what is not correct to use, or analogy with in the forms of speech formation in Arabic, without a specific poetic necessity (Al-Malkh, 2012), Hassan Al-Malakh linked the departure from the rejected original to poetic necessities.

Based on the foregoing, the object of the rejected principles is to direct the speaker to the linguistic correctness in pronunciation and writing (Al-Malkh, 2012); Being that they constitute prohibitions against the accepted eloquent cases, or stopping some linguistic phenomena that are contrary to what is common in the Arabic tongue (Al-Malkh, 2012), or making error a way to know what is right by recording and monitoring it;

Because the rejected assets have features of the normative approach that relies on the principle of "say and don't say." The goal of the rejected assets is to prevent confusion, and to preserve the exact meaning of the composition and not to go out to another meaning. The grammarians did not push the grammarians to assume rejected assets except the desire to reach fixed rules; So that the rules are steady and disciplined, following one Sunnah (Al-Omrini, 2009).

The rejected origins are linguistic structures assumed by the linguist or grammarian; He intended to avoid it in pronunciation, or he intended to represent what contradicts the features of Arabic grammar, as the Arab did not speak it at all, or to plot a future path by not allowing it to enter the linguistic system. The rejected origin was nothing but a criterion to which the word is returned and measured by (Hassan, 2000), and it was not arbitrary, but rather it goes to a target for the learner that lies in the accurate learning of what is said and what is not allowed to be said.

The practical side: the rejected assets in Al-Muwashah

The research divided the rejected principles mentioned in Al-Muwashah into two parts: a section rejected by the consensus of the grammarians, and it was rejected with the permissibility of some of them. In each section, the research arranged the issues in alphabetical order, which are two issues: introduction and delay, and omission and addition:

First: Rejected unanimously by the grammarians:

The grammarians agreed on a set of rules that cannot be deviated from in speech, and these rules carried with them the exemplary eloquent structure of the rule and the ramifications of the rule that have a representation in the speech of the Arabs, or an analogy to it. The Arabs use it, or it does not match Arabic in its system, and on that all the grammarians agreed. Among these compositions, what were mentioned in the research sample were the following issues:

A- Presentation and delay:

Presentation and delay are among the features of Arabic, and it is intended to transfer a word from its rank in the Arabic system, but the principle is not to advance and delay. The

grammarians rejected some of the structures in which the introduction and the delay occurred, and they explained the reasons for this. Among these compositions is what came in the research sample, which was rejected unanimously by the grammarians, represented in the following examples:

- (Verily, Zaid is standing)

The grammarians measured the news of An and its sisters according to the subject of the subject, so they made it carry its provisions in terms of being singular or a sentence, knowing or indefinite, one or multiple, and antecedent or late. "if: it is established; because they hate to make these letters behave like verbs, so don't say (Verily, Zaid is standing) (Al-Khubaisi, 2012), so the basic principle is that In and her sisters are letters, and the basic principle in every letter that is specific to nouns is that preposition works in them., it is not permissible for the grammarians to present her story to her name, knowing the reason for her failure to act like the behavior of verbs; This is so as not to deviate from the branch to which it originally departed to another branch, as the letters do not have the power of verbs to act.

- (Standing in the house, Zaid)

The adverb describes the form of the subject or the object of it, and its agent is only a verb or what is in the course of the verb from the nouns. Because of his weakness at work, it is not permissible: (Zaid standing in the house) (Al-Khubaisi, 2012). The rule in the case is that it lags behind its factor, but it can come forward if its agent is a dispositional act, or a derivative description that resembles a dispositional verb. Towards: Zaid standing in the house (Al-Ansari,), but they do not allow her to take precedence over her moral factor.

Accordingly, the grammarians did not allow the situation to take precedence over its moral factor due to its weakness, and its failure to act in the same way as the verbal factor. This rejected or assumed structure is one of the structures that you have never heard of the Arabs.

-(Zayd is better!)

The exclamation is a preserved syntax, which does not allow changing the order of its elements; because by changing it, it is a departure from the function that the wonder came with, and it became

news, and the wonder is not news, so the composition of the wonder is not acted upon by advance, delay, or separation. Nor: "Don't say It is not said: (Zaid is what is better), nor: (What is Zaid is better), nor: (Zeed is better), nor: (What is better in the house is Zaid), nor: (Honor today with Zaid).For their rigidity and action the course of proverbs, and their requirement is the beginning of the speech, because of the meaning of creation (Al-Khubaisi, 2012) so the formation of the exclamation is from the ranks preserved by the grammarians (Mazouz, 2011).

Ibn Ya'ish says: "The exclamation formula runs on one method that does not differ, so it is not permissible to present and delay it, due to the weakness of the act of exclamation" (Ibn Ya'ish,). And not to act on it by presenting or delaying it, as it is "evidence of that strong relationship between structure and significance" (Shawish, 2010). , 1988), it is a method that has a peculiarity in stagnation and inaction (Abu Jinnah, 1998), and this is what Tammam Hassan called for when he called them ambiguous expressions, referring to the declarative significance that they perform.

Accordingly, the exclamatory synthesis can only be accomplished through a coin whose parts are inseparable and the order is not disturbed, otherwise the synthesis would have departed from the exclamatory purpose for which the sentence was created. It is not permissible for grammarians, by agreement, to dispose of the standard exclamation mark by presenting, delaying, changing, omitting, and so on. Because the structure in which the exclamation appeared is indisputable, it is not permissible to perform transformational operations on it.

-I liked Zaid beating

The infinitive indicates the absolute of the event without conjugating it with a time, and the infinitive does the action of its action if it is added to its subject or object, or if it is predicated, so it does not work until after it, so the infinitive does not precede its action, so it is not said: (I like Zaid beating); Since it is in the meaning of what is done the connection of the connected, and it is not preceded by it, in that it is destined by (that) and the verb, so it is not said: (Zayd is to strike a blow), just as the connection does not precede it; Because as part of the word (Al-Khubaisi, 2012). Sibawayh considered the course of the action and did not strengthen its power (Sibawayh, 1988).

Accordingly, the sources do not work except with what follows them, and is not preceded by what is done lest he be acting like actions, and Ibn Al-Siraj said in Al-Osoul: It is not permissible to give precedence to the one who does it; because from his connection, he became from him as a sign and a sign in Zaid (Ibn Al-Siraj, 1999). The grammarians assumed this origin in order to limit the power of the infinitive, so they do not make it behave like the action of verbs, since what is likened to a thing or measured does not strengthen the power of the measure. The rejected original was non-existent in the language of the Arabs, and it had no representation at all.

-I passed a man with a good face

The suspicious adjective does the action of the verb because it is similar to the noun of the subject, not the verb, but it does not act except with what follows it, so it is not preceded by its action, so it is not said: (I passed a man with a good face), and it is not sympathetic to the place of the deeds in it, so it is not said: (I passed by a man with a good face and hand) by erecting the hand or raising it at all (Al-Khubaisi, 2012), and refrained: (Baidid with a good face) by making it an attribute of knowledge (Al-Khubaisi, 2012) unless it comes to knowledge of the.

Sibawayh said about the suspicious characteristic: The addition in it is better and more; Because it did not strengthen the power of the verb, the grammarians agreed that the suspicious adjective should not be given precedence over what is done, because Ibn Al-Siraj said in it: "Whatever of the adjectives does not resemble the nouns of the participles, then it is farther from action and precedence. That he should precede what he worked on" (Ibn Al-Sarraj, 1999).

Accordingly, the grammarians did not allow the suspicious adjective to be presented. Because it is weak in action, as it is not able to do the action of the noun of the subject, and it is suspicious of the noun of the subject, not the verb, the power of action to act.

b- Addition and deletion:

The origin in speech is that it is understood, so any word that indicates a meaning in the structure, then the origin is mentioned, and any word is learned from the speech for a meaning remaining on it, so the original deletes it, if these two

principles conflict, the original mentions what needs to be mentioned, and deletes what needs to be deleted, and it came In the research sample, one example is represented in the phrase:

Not if Zaid is standing:

The (not) is not followed by (if), so it is not said: (Not that Zaid is standing) (Al-Khubaisi, 2012); Because "the" here cannot be taken lightly; Because it necessitates after it the distinguishing lam, as Sibawayh said: "And know that they say: Zaid is going... lest you be confused that what is in the same position as what is negated by it" (Al-Khubaisi, 2012, p. If the negation does not benefit, and the mitigated one is the affirmation, and it cannot be considered as a negation for the meeting of two negation tools; because the Arabs hated combining the similar in purpose (Sibawayh, 1988), so that two contradictory things do not meet in Arabic, nor two things for one meaning to make one of them need the other (Sibawayh, 1988, Touati, 2017), so "is" does not follow "if", just as "if" does not invalidate the action of "less", it has no value in action or meaning. The rejected original was something that the Arabic did not accept, and the grammarians rejected it by agreement for not using it at all in the sayings of the Arabs.

Zaid is better than Amr

It is not permissible for the Arabs to combine similarities, so it is not permissible: (Zaid is better than Amr) by combining the lam with the one; To dispense with one of them with the other, because each of them indicates the preferred over it intended (Al-Khubaisi, 2012), and it is not permissible to: (Zaid is better) without (from) unless the preferred over it is known by a presumption (Al-Khubaisi, 2012). But it must be deleted from the word (other), so it is not said: (A man and another man came to me from so-and-so) (Al-Khubaisi, 2012). The name of the preference does not work in appearance; Because it is far from the noun of the subject, in that it was in its origin neither plural, nor feminine, and because it does not have a verb with its meaning in addition to do his work, so it is not said: (I passed by a man better than his father) by lowering a better description of a man, but rather by raising it with the predicate, and the elevation of his father beginning (Al-Khubaisi, 2012).

Sibawayh said: "This nominative was better than before that it was not an adjective" (Sibawayh, 1988, p. 23), and therefore Sibawayh authorizes the report if the word is an adjective and strengthens it according to an estimate that I passed by a good man, but if the word is a noun, Sibawayh does not It is permissible only to raise in it because it does not occur an adjective, such as saying: I passed a sheet of clay its seal, and in this Ibn Al-Siraj said: "It is not permissible: I passed by a man who was better than his father on the epithet, but you raise it on the beginning and the report, and that is because of his distance from the semi-verb and the subject in order that "better than him" "It is neither feminine nor masculine, nor does it include(alif=أ) and (laam=ل), for every "doer than you" is in the same position as "better than you" and "evil than you," and everything that does not resemble the noun of the subject, it is not permissible to raise an apparent name with it at all" (Ibn Al-Siraj, 1999).

Therefore, in the name of preference, there are several rejected origins, as the definition "the" does not meet with "from", because they serve the same purpose, and they deviate from the preferred over it, and it is not permissible to dispense with both of them unless a presumption indicates the omitted, and it can be estimated, and they can be dispensed with if The superlative noun was 'other', and the action of the subject noun does not work; Because it does not have a verb with its meaning, and its similarity is far from the noun of the subject, and it is originally an intransitive verb. It is a rejected asset; because it does not exist in the Arabic language completely.

Second: The objectionable with its permissibility according to some grammarians

The grammarians set the general rules of the Arabic language, and they found that there are uses in it that departed from these principles, so they started describing them as abnormal, rare, few, necessity and others. Refusal and permit are the following:

A- Presentation and delay:

Arabic permitted presenting and delaying in many places, and counted them as eloquence in many places, because Al-Jarjani said: "And you still see poetry that you like to hear, and whose position is pleasant to you, then you look and find that the one who appealed to you and was kind to

you presented something in it and transformed the pronunciation from one place to another" (Al-Jarjani, 1992), and from what was mentioned in the research sample on the permissibility of the issue of submission and delay:

-I have twenty dirhams

The principle of discrimination is that it is later than his worker, but it is permissible to give it precedence over his worker if he is actually his worker, and discrimination does not take precedence over his worker if it is a noun, so it is not said: (I have twenty dirhams), except for the necessity of poetry, as Al-Mazini, Al-Mubarrad and Al-Kisa'i permitted it, then they may present it It is, in comparison with the rest of the waste (Al-Khubaisi, 2012). The grammarians have agreed to prevent discrimination against his worker if the worker is not actually acting, or is a noun, and some grammarians have justified the lack of discrimination over his worker; Because the worker is a rigid name with weak action (Ibn Al-Hajeb, 1986), in which Ibn Al-Siraj said: "Know that the names that erect the erection of discrimination are not permissible to take precedence over what he did in them" (Ibn Al-Sarraj, 1999, p. 238).

From the foregoing, the grammarians unanimously agreed that it is not permissible to give discrimination to the worker, with the exception of Al-Mubarrad, Al-Mazini and Al-Kisa'i; Because they measured discrimination against other wastes of the sentence, the grammarians rejected it because it was odd in poetry, which prompted Al-Mazini, Al-Mubarrad, and Al-Kisa'i to allow it despite the lack of evidence against it.

Zaid beat his servant:

The early grammarians unanimously agreed to refrain from repeating the pronoun for a later in rank or pronunciation, so they refrained from saying "his servant Zaid was beaten"; To refer the pronoun to a later (Al-Khubaisi, 2012), Ibn Al-Siraj said in that that it is not permissible, "because you have given the pronoun over the apparent in the pronunciation and the rank." (The owner is in the house); as the pronoun belongs to the late (Al-Khubaisi, 2012), the pronoun refers to the latter in pronunciation and rank (Al-Khubaisi, 2012). Later grammarians agreed that the pronoun does not return to the latter in word and rank

except in the places identified by Ibn Hisham in Mughni al-Labib (Al-Ansari, 1991), stipulating the security of confusion (Al-Husami, 2010). When confusion is secured, Arabic resorts to the concession in grammatical laws, as Tammam Hassan said (Hassan, 1994).

Ibn al-Hajib mentioned the reason for the fact that the absent pronouns do not return to the aforementioned word, meaning or judgment by saying in Al-Amali: "The pronouns are ambiguous considering the realities of their meaning for the correctness of their application to the different ones, because if you say they did, and something similar to it, the Zaydeen, Al Oamareen, the Muslims and the polytheists, so they wanted to not repeat them except As mentioned above, to remove this confusion" (Ibn Al-Hajeb, 1989).

Thus, the grammarians who did not allow the pronoun to be restored to a later in rank and remembrance, were seeking security of confusion, while the grammarians who permitted it, stipulated that the composition should not be an illusion. Many grammarians forbade this rejected principle, and made it something that is used only as a necessity in poetry, while some grammarians permitted it for its inclusion in the poetic language of the Arabs.

b- Addition and deletion:

The issue of addition and deletion continued to occupy the Arabic grammar, so grammarians rejected the addition in a citizen, and the deletion in a citizen, and some of them permitted that, and from what came in the research sample, which the grammarians differed about:

- Beware of the lion

The method and warning against the predicates by the inclusion of a verb is obligatory (Al-Suyuti, 1998), which indicates the existence of a deleted verb that it may be shown in the absence of repetition of the one who warned against it, while it is obligatory to omit if the warning is "a" or repeated or sympathetic (Al-Suyuti, 1998 With the exception of these three images, it is permissible to show it. And do not say: (Beware of the lion) due to the abstention from the estimation of (from) (Al-Khubaisi, 2012), it is not permissible to include what must be mentioned in order to violate that meaning.

In this, Sibawayh said: It is not permissible to say, "Beware of the lion" with the intent of "you from the lion," except in poetry (Sibawayh, 1988), so the warning must be mentioned in the position first, then the warning against it must be erected and turned (Al-Najjar, 2011), and therefore the warning structure is not mentioned unless it is bent, or added by the warning. Sibawayh explained the necessity of kindness; because it is a noun attached to another (Sibweh, 1988).

The word "beware" is set in an accusative verb that goes beyond a single object, and the determinant has sufficed with its position, so there is no way to deviate from the interpretation of the syntax of "the lion" except by inserting the letter of the conjunction on it (Sabra, 2004), Exiting this by mentioning the preposition "from" so that the verb becomes transitive with the preposition, as for deleting the preposition or the conjunction, it is not permissible except in the case of poetry.

- O Harith!

The origin of the call is to mention the instrument of the call, and it is permissible to omit it except in the ambiguous and the indefinite, but if the herald is defined by a separator, it must be separated from the herald with a comma; Because the grammarians forbade the combination of similar or opposites, or the substitute and the substitute for it. As for the issue of the follower, it is possible in the follower what is not possible in the follower, so it is permissible: O Zaid and Al-Harith, and it is not said: (O Al-Harith), and it is permissible: (My Lord, you created her) (Al-Khubaisi, 2010).

In your saying: "O Al-Harith," it is forbidden to grammarians, but it is permissible in the case of sympathy, such as your saying: "Oh Zaid and Al-Harith, you have combined the callers with one instrument of call, so it is permissible to keep the definition, and this is what Sibawayh said (Sibawayh, 1988). Intervention only on the indefinite, it is permissible in kindness to define its addition.

Accordingly, the grammarians do not allow the combination of the invocation and the definition, because Sibawayh said: "If Al-Harith carried O', it was not permissible at all." Because the appeal is no longer specific to the local noun with a, and because they allow in the subordinate what they do not allow in the subordinate, there is no

violation of the rule that does not allow the conjugation of the appeal letter and the definition, because if the letter of the appeal was returned, the definition would be deleted. However, the grammarians differed in the appeal of the local noun with the 'al', the Basri's went to forbid the combination of the letter the call and the 'al', because both of them benefit the definition, and it is not permissible to combine two definitions on one identifier, and the Kufics permitted it as a necessity in poetry.

- A man with an intention, man

It was previously stated that it is not permissible to combine the invocation and the definition directly, but to combine them with a comma, and it is not permissible to dispense with the tool if the caller is a denial, so it is not permissible to say: (man) on the intention (Oh man), because it leads to faces of omission, and their hatred That (Al-Khubaisi, 2010), and grammarians have seen that it omits the letter of the call to necessity according to the Basri, unlike the Kufis who permitted it in speech towards: it became night, knocked (Al-Taweel, 1984), and according to Sibawayh he sees that it is permissible to omit ya from the indefinite in Poetry (Sapphire, 1985), and according to Ibn Al-Sarraj, it is not permissible to omit the invocation of the ambiguous and the indefinite tool except in poetry (Ibn Al-Sarraj, 1999), one of the two elements of the sentence of the call cannot be dispensed with: the tool and the herald, it is a minted combination (Al-Najjar, 2011), Especially if the herald is in a state of denial, the tool cannot be dispensed with due to the violation of the deletion of the meaning and the lack of understanding of what is intended. The rejected principle was forbidden, except in the necessity of poetry according to the Basrians, and in speech and prose among the Kufics, if confusion is safe.

- O my man

The scar should be nothing but (baa=ب) or (waw=و), and in the scar a thousand, the last name is appended to the delegate; Because the scar is as if they were singing about it (Sibawayh, 1988), and nothing is mourned except what is good, so it is not said: (O my man); Not knowing what is meant by it by informing the mourners and making an excuse; Because he does not lament except what was known, and refrained, such as: (O zaid al-Tawlah), which appended the scar sign

as his character, as it can be dispensed with for the completeness of the meaning before it, unlike the genitive, as it is part of the genitive, unlike Yunus. Khubaisi, 2010), and Al-Khalil made a mistake and Sibawayh prohibited it and authorized Yunus (Sibawayh, 1988), and Ibn Al-Siraj does not allow the scar of the indefinite, nor the ambiguous, because the scar is only by the best of names, and it is also not permissible to attach the scar mark to the adjective; Because the adjective is not delegated (Ibn Al-Sarraj, 1999).

Accordingly, the grammarians do not allow the lamentation of the unknowing, because the lamentation is a supplication for a favor and grief for it. It is not possible for the lamentation to be for someone who does not know, and they do not allow the appendage of the scar sign to the attribute of the delegate, and they permitted it for the additive; Because they are like a single noun, while the adjective can be dispensed with to complete the meaning without it, and Yunus permitted it; Because it considers the adjective and the described as one part as the genitive and the genitive.

Conclusion

The rejected origins of Arabic grammarians were not arbitrary, but were represented by special motives and reasons that concern Arabs and Arabic. , or as evidence of the lack of it on the tongues of the Arabs, or the lack of it, or it is permissible in the language of poetry alone for necessity, or the dialect of a tribe in the era of protest. The rejected principles in this research were represented in two parts: a group of grammarians who agreed to reject it and promised to utter it; For his departure from the system of Arabic, and his never hearing from the Arabs, and a section in which the grammarians differed between refusal and permissibility; For his acceptance of analogy, for hearing from the Arabs, or for agreeing with one aspect of Arabic.

The research concluded the following results:

Rejected assets	Rejected matter	The grammarians' agreement on it or their disagreement	Motives of the rejected asset
- (Verily, Zaid is standing)	The news of "In" is presented in the name of knowledge	Agreed to refuse	It does not exist in the Arabic language completely
-)Standing in the house, Zaid(	The situation takes precedence over the moral factor	Agreed to refuse	It does not exist in the Arabic language completely
)-Zayd is better(!	Implementation of transformation elements in composition	Agreed to refuse	It is minted and no transformation operations may be carried out on it
I liked Zaid beating	Discrimination takes precedence over his worker if it is a noun	The Mazni, the cooler and the Cassie nut	A necessity in poetry
I passed a man with a good face:	Submit the source on its own	Agreed to refuse	It does not exist in the Arabic language completely
Not if Zaid is standing:	Return the pronoun on a late in rank or pronunciation	Joza Al-Akhfash, Ibn Jinni and all the late grammarians, and the first grammarians prevented him	safe to wear
Zaid is better than Amr	Applicable is presented to the suspicious characteristi	Agreed to refuse	It does not exist in the Arabic language completely

	c			
I have twenty dirhams.	The local call for b ya	kufion nut	A necessity in poetry	
Zaid beat his servant :	Mention the warning without whom	Some of the opticians	A necessity in poetry	
- Beware of the lion	The call of the indefinite	The Basrians permitted it for necessity, and the Kufics permitted it if it was safe to wear	A necessity in poetry	
O Harith!	bulge scar	leave younes		
A man with an intention, man	follow not with if	Agreed to refuse	Hate to lengthen and demand abbreviation	

References:

1- Al-Ansari, Ibn Hisham, Explaining Paths to Alfiya Ibn Malik, achieved by: Muhammad Mohi Al-Din, Dar Al-Fikr, Beirut, d.

2- Al-Ansari, Ibn Hisham, Mughni Al-Labib on the books of Al-Arabiya, investigation: Muhammad Muhyi Al-Din Abdel Hamid, Sidon, the Egyptian Library, 1991.

3- Abu Jinnah, Hajib, Studies in Arabic Grammar Theory and Its Applications, Amman, Dar Al-Fikr, 1998 (first edition).

4- Ibn Jinni, Abu Al-Fath, Characteristics, investigated by Muhammad Al-Najjar, Scientific Library, d.T, d.T.

5- Ibn Al-Hajeb, Al-Amali, investigated by Fakhr Al-Din Qabawah, Amman, Dar Ammar, Beirut, Dar Al-Jeel, 1989 (first edition).

6- Ibn Al-Hajib, Al-Kafia fi Grammar, achieved by Tariq Najm Abdullah, Jeddah, Dar Al-Wafa Library, 1986 (first edition).

7- Ibn Al-Siraj, Origins in Grammar, Investigation: Abdul-Hussein Al-Fatli, Beirut, Al-Resala Foundation, 1999 (4th ed.).

8- Ibn Yaish, Sharh al-Mofasal, World of Books, Beirut, d.T., d.T.

9- Al-Jarjani, Abdul Qaher, Evidence of Miracles, read and commented on by: Mahmoud Muhammad Shaker, Jeddah, Al-Madani Press, 1992 (third edition).

10- Hassan, Tammam, Al-Osoul: an epistemological study of linguistic thought among the Arabs: Grammar - Philology - Rhetoric, Cairo, Alam Al-Kutub, 2000.

11- Hassan, Tammam, The Arabic language: its meaning and structure, Casablanca, House of Culture, 1994.

12- Al-Khubaisi, Shams Al-Din, Al-Muwashah on the Kafiya of Ibn Al-Hajeb in Grammar, investigated by Sharif Al-Najjar, Amman, Dar Ammar, 2012 (first edition).

13-

14- Al-Zajji, Abu Al-Qasim, The Clarification in the Reasons for Grammar, achieved by Mazen Al-Mubarak, Beirut, Dar Al-Nafais, 1973 (second edition).

15- Sibawayh, The Book, Investigated by Abdel Salam Haroun, Cairo, Al-Khanji Library, 1988 (third edition).

16- Al-Suyuti, Hama Al-Hawa'i fi explaining the collection of mosques, investigated by Ahmad Shams Al-Din, Beirut, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmia, 1998 (first edition).

17- Safa, Faisal, Evidence of poetic grammar: a study of exclusion and exclusion, Irbid, Modern Book World, 2012 (first edition).

18- Al-Taweel, Mr. Rizk, On the origins of grammar and its history: The dispute between grammarians: study, analysis and evaluation, Makkah Al-Mukarramah, Al-Faisaliah, 1984 (first edition).

19-

20- Abdel-Tawab, Ramadan, Research and Articles in Language, Cairo, Al-Khanji Library, 1982 (first edition).

21- Al-Karbasi, Muhammad, Al-Muktahab Min Kalam Al-Arab, Al-Najaf, Al-Adab Press, 1983.

22- Al-Kindi, Khaled, Grammatical explanation in the ancient and modern linguistic lesson, Amman, Dar Al-Masira, 2007 (first edition).

23- Mazuz, Dalila, Grammatical Rulings, Irbid, World of Books, first edition, 2011.

24- Yaqout, Mahmoud Suleiman, Syntactically incorrect structures in the book by Sibawayh: a linguistic study, Dar al-Maarifa al-Jami'iyyah, 1985 (first edition).

Research and journals

1- Touati, Abdelkader, What do not meet in the Arabic language: a study of grammatical structures, Journal of Linguistic Practices, Mouloud Maamari University, Tizi Ouzou, Linguistic Practices Laboratory, Issue 40, 2017.

2- Al-Husami, Abdul-Malik, Grammatical provisions based on the security of confusion or fear of it: through the explanation of Al-Radhi on the sufficient, Journal of Social Studies, University of Science, Issue 31, 2010.

3- El-Sayed, Ibrahim, Uncommon Structures in Sentence Supplements, Journal of the Union of Arab Universities of Arts, Volume Seven, Issue One, 2010.

4- Sabra, Muhammad, What is suitable for the pronunciation and what is not for grammatical structures, Journal of the Faculty of Dar Al Uloom, Cairo University, Issue 32, 2004.

5- Morsi, Ihab, The Effectiveness of Syntactic Relationships in Security of Confusion, Modern Literature Association, Volume 78, 2013.

6- Al-Malkh, Hassan, Grammatical Prohibitions in the Arabic Language, Human and Social Sciences Studies, Volume Thirty-Ninth, Issue Two, 2012.

7- Al-Najjar, Tariq, The Rejected Origins of Arab Grammarians in the Light of the Musnad Inscriptions, Journal of the College of Education - Literary Department, Ain Shams University, College of Education, Volume XV, Issue Three, 2009.

8- Al-Najjar, Sharif, The Rejected Origins of Grammatical Structures, Collection and Analysis, The Jordanian Journal of Arabic Language and Literature, Mutah University, Volume VII, Issue One, 2011.

Undergraduate Theses

1-   Shaweesh, Mustafa, Fixed and Mutable in Arabic Grammar, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Islamic Sciences, Jordan, under the supervision of Duraid Al-Obaidi, 2010.

Footnotes:

- Safa, Faisal, (2012) Evidence of poetic grammar: a study of exclusion and exclusion, Irbid, Modern Book World, p. 7.

- Morsi, Ihab, (2013) The effectiveness of grammatical relations in the security of confusion, Modern Literature Association, Volume 78, p. 206.

- Al-Najjar, Tariq, (2009) The Rejected Origins of Arab Grammarians in the Light of the Musnad Inscriptions, Journal of the College of Education - Literary Department, Ain Shams University, College of Education, Vol. 15, No. 3, p. 204.

- Ibn Jinni, Abu al-Fath (392 AH 1002 AD), characteristics, achieved by Muhammad al-Najjar, Scientific Library, d.T., d.t., part 1, p. 260.

- Abdel-Tawab, Ramadan, (1982) Research and articles in language, Cairo, Al-Khanji Library, pg. 59.

- El-Sayed, Ibrahim, (2010) Uncommon Structures in Sentence Supplements, Journal of the Union of Arab Universities for Literature, Volume VII, Issue 1, p. 41.

- Al-Kindi, Khaled, (2007) Grammatical reasoning in the ancient and modern linguistic lesson, Amman, Dar Al-Masira, p.29.

- Hassan, Tammam, (2000) Origins: An Epistemological Study of Linguistic Thought among the Arabs: Grammar - Fiqh of Language - Rhetoric, Cairo, World of Books, pp. 130-131.

- Al-Najjar, Sharif, (2011) The Rejected Origins of Grammatical Structures, Collected and Analyzed, The Jordanian Journal of Arabic Language and Literature, Mutah University, Volume VII, Issue One, p. 69.

- Al-Malkh, Hassan, (2012) Grammatical Prohibitions in the Arabic Language, Studies of

the Humanities and Social Sciences, Volume Thirty-Ninth, Issue Two, p. 255.

- Al-Malkh, Grammatical Prohibitions in the Arabic Language, p. 252.

- Al-Malkh, Grammatical Prohibitions in the Arabic Language, p. 264.

- Al-Amirini, Muhammad, (2009) The phenomenon of the predominance of branches over origins: a fundamental grammatical study, King Saud University Journal - Educational Sciences and Islamic Studies, Volume Twenty-first, Issue Two, pg. 439, and p. 451.

- Hassan, Tammam (2000), p. 127.

- Al-Khubaisi, Shams Al-Din, (2012) Al-Muwashah on Ibn Al-Hajeb's sufficiency in grammar, investigated by Sharif Al-Najjar, Amman, Dar Ammar, p. 205.

- Ibn Yaish (643 AH 1246 AD), Sharh al-Mofasal, World of Books, Beirut, Dr. T. T. T., Part 1, p. 102.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, pg. 205.

- Al-Ansari, Ibn Hisham (761 AH 1360 AD), explained the paths to the Alfiya of Ibn Malik, investigation: Muhammad Muhyi al-Din, Beirut, Dar al-Fikr, d. T, part 2, p. 332.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, pp. 668-669.

- Mazuz, Dalila, (2011) Grammatical Rulings, Irbid, World of Books, first edition, p. 1.

- Ibn Yaish, Sharh al-Mofasal, Part 4, pg. 422.

- Shawish, Mustafa, (2010) Fixed and Mutable in Arabic Grammar, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Islamic Sciences, Jordan, under the supervision of Duraid Al-Obaidi, p. 38.

Sibawayh (180 A.H. 796 A.D.), (1988) the book, investigated by Abdel Salam Haroun, Cairo, Al-Khanji Library, (third edition), vol. 1, p. 73.

- Abu Jinnah, Hajib, (1998) Studies in the Theory of Arabic Grammar and its Applications, Amman, Dar Al-Fikr, p. 81.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, p. 527.

Sibawayh, The Book, Part 1, p. 33.

- Ibn Al-Sarraj (316 AH 929 AD), (1999) The Origins of Grammar, investigation: Abdul-Hussein Al-Fatli, Beirut, Al-Risala Foundation, (fourth edition), see: Part 1, p. 209.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, p. 542.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, pg. 275.

Sibawayh, The Book, Part 1, p. 194.

- Ibn Al-Siraj, Al-Osoul, vol. 2, p. 238.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, p. 265.

Sibawayh, The Book, Volume 2, pg. 139.

Sibawayh, Al-Kitab, Part 3, p. 124.

- Touati, Abdelkader, (2017) What do not meet in the Arabic language: a study of grammatical structures, Journal of Linguistic Practices, Mouloud Maamari University, Tizi Ouzou, Linguistic Practices Laboratory, Issue 40, p. 118.

- Al-Khubaisi, Muwashah, p. 557

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, p. 558.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, p. 559.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, pp. 559-560.

Sibawayh, The Book, Part 2, p. 23.

- Ibn Al-Siraj, Al-Osoul, Part 1, p. 154.

- Al-Jarjani, Abd al-Qaher (471 AH 1078 AD), (1992) Evidence of Miracles, read and commented on by: Mahmoud Muhammad Shaker, Jeddah, Al-Madani Press, (third edition), p. 33.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, pp. 221-222.

- Al-Anbari, Fairness in matters of disagreement, vol. 2, p. 830.

- Ibn Al-Hajeb, (1986) Al-Kafi, investigated by Tariq Najm Abdullah, Jeddah, Dar Al-Wafa Library, (first edition), see: p. 108.

- Ibn Al-Sarraj, Al-Osoul, vol. 2, p. 238.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, pg. 58.

- Al-Suyuti, The Proposal, p. 44.

- Al-Khubaisi, Muwashah, p. 96.

- Ibn Al-Hajib, Al-Kafia fi Grammar, p. 68.

- Al-Ansari, Ibn Hisham (761 AH 1360 AD), (1991) Mughni al-Labib on the books of Al-Arabs, investigative by: Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abd al-Hamid, Sidon, Egyptian Library, pp. 562-564.

- Al-Husami, Abdul-Malik, (2010) Grammatical rulings based on the security of confusion or fear of it: through the explanation of Al-Radhi on the

sufficient, Journal of Social Studies, University of Science, Issue 31, p. 109.

- Hassan, Tammam, (1994) The Arabic language: its meaning and structure, Casablanca, House of Culture, p. 233.

- Ibn Al-Hajib, (1989) Al-Amali, achieved by Fakhr Al-Din Qabawah, Amman, Dar Ammar, Beirut, Dar Al-Jeel, Volume 2, pp. 771-772.

- Al-Suyuti (911 AH 1505 AD), Ham' al-Hawa'i fi Sharh Jam' al-Jaami', Investigated by Ahmad Shams al-Din, Beirut, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 1998 (first edition), vol. 2, p. 26.

- Al-Suyuti, Homa Al-Hawa'i, Volume 2, p. 17.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, pg. 188.

Sibawayh, The Book, Part 1, p. 279.

- Al-Najjar, Rejected Assets in Grammatical Structures, Collection and Analysis, p. 103.

Sibawayh, The Book, Part 1, p. 274.

- Sabra, Muhammad, (2004) What works and what does not fit the pronunciation in grammatical structures, Journal of the Faculty of Dar Al Uloom, Cairo University, Thirty-Second Issue, ,, p. 647.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, p. 277.

Sibawayh, The Book, Volume 2, pg. 187.

Sibawayh, The Book, Volume 2, pg. 187.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, pg. 173.

- Al-Taweel, Al-Sayyid Rizk, (1984) On the Origins of Grammar and its History: The Dispute between Grammarians: Study, Analysis and Evaluation, Makkah Al-Mukarramah, Al-Faisaliah, p. 354.

- Yaqout, Mahmoud Suleiman, (1985) grammatically incorrect structures in the book by Sibawayh: a linguistic study, Dar al-Marefa al-Jami'iyya, p. 298. Citing a verse of poetry: My neighbor, do not condemn my virginity, which is one of the evidences of the book, Volume 2/231. The coolant directs the witness to leave out that it is not permissible. The coolant used the reference from the poet, which made the indefinite the status of knowledge; As the poet made the slave-girl a nobody while referring to a specific slave-girl, and she became known by reference, and for more information, look at the book: Syntactically Incorrect Structures in the Book by Sibawayh, p. 299.

- Ibn Al-Siraj, Al-Osoul, Part 1, pg. 401.

- Al-Najjar, Rejected Assets in Grammatical Structures, Collection and Analysis, p. 99.

Sibawayh, The Book, Volume 2, p. 220.

- Al-Khubaisi, Al-Muwashah, pg. 172.

Sibawayh, The Book, Volume 2, p. 225.

- Ibn Al-Siraj, Al-Osoul, Volume 1, 435-436.