

Grammatical Controversy According to Al-knowest Al-Shantmari in his Book (AL-Nokt in the Interpretation of Sibawayh Book) (Study in Argument Techniques)

Eman Abd Jasim^{1*}, Ahmed Abdullah Al-Mansouri²

^{1*}Department of the Arabic Language, Faculty of Education-Al-Qurna, Basra University, Iraq. Email: emanalfrhan58@gmail.com

²Department of the Arabic Language, Faculty of Education-Al-Qurna, Basra University, Iraq.

ABSTRACT

The book of (Al-Nokt) is rich in controversial issues, as Al-Knowest deposited a lot of scholars' opinions, whether it was between the two schools or between the Grammarians in the same school. Al-knowest did not limit himself to mentioning the controversy between grammarians only but rather presented the argument between linguists and grammarians so that he could balance these issues. He chooses correctness based on rational evidence and transfer, as we will see in practical matters. In this book, he confronted the criticism of Sibawayh from some of the grammarians in Basra, especially Al-Mazni, Al-Jarmi, Al-Mabrad, and Al-Zajjaj, as well as those who opposed him from the grammarians in Kufa. His book is rich in controversial issues. It raised many controversial issues that are revealed in his dialogues with a supposed interlocutor, inferring inferential reasoning, both responding and objecting. Al-knowest's attention to reasons affected the emergence of the grammatical controversy in his book. In his presentation of controversial issues, he was keen to raise objections in some grammatical matters to satisfy his desire for reasoning and argumentation.

Keywords

Controversy, Arguments, Grammatical Disagreement, Objection.

Introduction

Summarized the Grammatical Arguments in the Book of Al-Nokt

The grammatical controversy mentioned in Al-Nokt, the book was rich in these issues, as Al-Knowest deposited it with a lot of scholars' opinions, whether it was between the two schools or between the same schools. He was able to balance those issues. So he chooses the correctness based on rational evidence and recommendation, as we will see in practical matters.

In this book, he addressed the criticism of Sibawayh from some of the Basra grammarians, especially Al-Mazni, Al-Jarmi, Al-Mabrad, and Al-Zajjaj, as well as those who opposed him from the Kufa grammarians. Hence, the most knowest stood the position of his defender, refuting the objectors' arguments, following several methods [1]. His book is rich in controversial issues. It raised many controversial issues that are revealed in his dialogues with a supposed interlocutor, inferring reasoned reasoning, both responding and objecting. Al-knowest's attention to reasons affected the emergence of the grammatical controversy in his book. In his presentation of

controversial issues, he was keen to raise objections in some grammatical matters to satisfy his desire for reasoning and argumentation [2]. Ibn Mudha 'Al-Qurtubi said about him: ((Al-Knowest - May God have mercy on him - was on his sight in grammar, fond of these second causes, and he thought that when he deduced something from it, he won a futile) [3].

Dr Shawqi Dhaif said: ((Perhaps we would not be alienated if we told that Al-Knowest al-Shantiari is the first to approach Andalusia's grammarians in the strength of this trend, as the grammatical rulings he not satisfied with the first causes on which the verdict revolved. Such as that every initiate is raised; instead, he was asking for a second cause. Such a ruling explains why the initiate was presented and why it wasn't accusative.

He chooses for himself from the opinions of the Basrians, the Kofians, and the Baghdadiists)) [4]. The controversy requires linguistic tools to strengthen the arguments presented, as it is known that the object of the argument is to convince the opponent/recipient of his claim that he has inferred with evidence that he thinks is to prove the validity of what he argued, from this he adheres to presenting his text Based on solid

arguments, including linguistic elements that help him achieve his goal of persuasion. We see that these argumentative techniques and linguistic methods employed in the controversy increase the arguments presented in it. These techniques are numerous and varied according to the requirements of the matter in the dialectical discourse. From these tools, their function appears in the pilgrimage link between the arguments introductions on the one hand or between the case and its results on the other hand. These are called (The argumentative links). The argumentative links are interpersonal linguistic components, linking two (or more) sayings within a single argument strategy so that it allows the connection between arguments variables (that is, between an argument and an outcome, for example, or between a group of arguments) [5]. ((The links link between two sayings, or rather between two opinions (or more), assign each saying a specific role within the general argumentative strategy. The links can be represented by the following tools: Rather, but, even, especially, then, because, since, then.... etc.)) [6]. Links have many types, including:

- a. Listed links to arguments (up to, indeed, but because...) and listed links to findings. (So, for this, and therefore...).
- b. Links that contain strong arguments (even, indeed, but, especially...) and links that have strong arguments.
- c. Arguments oppositional links (indeed, but...) and argument symmetry links (even, especially...) [7].

As for the argumentative factors, they are “((They do not a link between arguments variables (that is, between an argument and an outcome or between a group of arguments), but they limit and restrict the arguments possibilities that have a saying. The category of factors includes tools such as: perhaps, roughly, almost, a lot, what... Accept, most of the minors' tools [8].

When looking at the scholarly polemical discourse, we find that it is a speech replete with those arguments techniques that he used to convince his claim's recipient. We will present these techniques by presenting the grammatical

controversy in the book of Al-Nokt in the applied investigations while studying the arguments that he relied on in refuting the opinions of the objectors. It is well known that syntactic reasoning is based on four pieces of evidence, namely: (hearing, analogy, desirability, and consensus). If this evidence contradicts, other evidence arises, known as polemical evidence: (induction, the original, the reasoning, the lack of proof of negation, and the lack of Analog and surviving proof).

The First Topic: The Grammatical Argument as to why the Verb is Raised in the Present Tense

One of the controversial issues mentioned by Al-Knowest in his book Al-Nokt is the issue of reason in raising a present tense verb; this issue was one issue that was the subject of controversy between the two school grammarians: the Basra and the Kufa, as the Basrians went to the fact that the reason for raising it corresponds to the names in many ways [9]. Whereas most of the Kufians went to the fact that the reason for introducing it is to expose it from the determining factors, Al-Kasaei raised excess in the beginning [9]. As for Al-Knowest, his role in this matter was the position corresponding to the protester and victorious to Sibawayh, following his usual method of interpreting his book's in winning to him, which is the method of argument dialogue, as he conducts the conversation between him and an objecting questioner that he assumes, by asking the objector a some of the questions he takes Al-Knowest should answer it, so he thinks the role of reasoning.

The controversial process began with the objector asking a question about the reason for raising the present tense verb ((If someone said: How do these present verbs raise?)) [1] This question has an argumentative purpose of presenting an implicit claim, which is to deny the reason for raising the present tense verb that the opponent said. In his question, he embraces his objection to their cause that they said. And he intends to push his opponent to explain to him why he begins his fallacy with questions, thus leading to dropping his case. Then Al-Knowest takes the role of (the

plaintiff / or the reasoning), then he answers the question of the objector by saying: ((He was told: By its occurrence, the position of the names, even if the syntax of the expressions differs)) [1]. In his answer, the approval of Sebawayh and the Basrien appears, as Sibawayh says about that: ((Rather, you contend with the names of the doers, that you say: Abdullah does, so your saying agrees: a doer, even as if you said: Zaid is a doer with whatever meaning you want. And this (LAM; L) is attached to him as she appended to the name, and the (LAM) is not appended verb, and she says he will do that and he will do so, so these two letters are appended to a meaning, just as the noun (ALIEF; A) and (LAM) are appended to knowledge [10].

And to that, Ibn Al-Sarraj went, when he said: ((Know that the verb only expresses what it expresses because of its similarity to names)) [1]. Then the objector gradually poses questions, so his question is attached to another question about the necessity of its location in the position of the names, and Al-Knowest answers about that: ((If someone says: Why is that required? In verbs, it is more like an initiation that is not a verbal factor)) [1]. Al-Knowest states that raising the present tense is to take the place of the noun, which is an intangible factor, so it is similar to beginning in that. He measured the present tense's performance in the name's position by starting with an analogy that is similar to an interchange between them, which is that each of them is a moral factor the denominator of the noun.

Al-Knowest employed a set of arguments and techniques to convey his thesis; he strengthened his reasoning, as it helped him gain understanding and influence on the recipient. Then he began to explain and explain to the objector the reason for objecting by including the argument link employed for this, which is (by). The argument link (Al-Faa) used the argumentative. He came to it to connect two arguments linked by the link (as) (their occurrence, the position of the nouns, is not a verbal factor, since the nouns factors did not work in verbs) and a result (so it is similar to the debutant that is not by an oral factor), thus forming the argument scale represented in the following form:

More like a debutant that is not a verbal factor than a moral factor N

Noun operators do not work with verbs H2

Its occurrence, the location of the name, is not a verbal factor H1

He also employed the negation in two places: in the first place, he denied that their occurrence is the position of nouns by a verbal factor, thus achieving an accomplishment in which it is far from his inference the objection that can be invoked, which is that the characteristics of nouns do not work in verbs. In the second place, he denied that initiation is a verbal factor, proving that the initiation is a moral factor and that the present tense in the area of the noun is similar to it. Then the objector raises another question to sign the reasoning in his argument that he has inferred. His sense is reversed by raising the verb after (Seine), even though the noun does not fall after it.

Al-knowest says: ((If someone said: Why did you raise the verb after the (Seine) and the name do not fall after them? He was told: (Sain) and (alief) they entered the verb, they would become from its formulas like a (alief) and (lam), if they entered the name because if they entered they saved it for the future itself. They immigrated to collect the meaning for us and define it without the meaning being changed in itself, and the factors that enter the words after obtaining their meanings so that they change their meanings are known to them.)) [11]. the objections here objected to the necessity of an invalid order on their evidence, which invalidates it by entering the (Seine and I) will do the act and not enter it on the name. With that, the verb is lifted. So he differentiated between the verb and the noun by stating that among the present tense requirements is the entry of the sin and will have to, and the absence of this necessary in the nouns. How did they raise the present tense in such a combination? Al-knowest gave his answer to this objection relying on the analogy, as he showed through him that by entering these two letters in the verb, they became from its form, and not separated from it as if they had one

pronouncement, by measuring their entry into the verb by entering (alief) and (lam) on the noun by combining that each of them got rid of what joined Him to make sense. Just as entering the alief and lam saves the noun for the one itself, so does (sine), and you will conclude the verb for the future itself. And thus prevented the invalid order that the objector obligated him to infer his reasoning. In this way, he employs a group of argument techniques that have added an argumentative power to his answer, including the tool of reason and affirmation, the argument link (because). As he included this link to perform two functions in his argument, in addition to the assertion that (In) gave to the speech, he began to explain and justify to the objector its measure of the aleif and lam because of the similarity between it and the entry of seine and will on the act.

He employed the argument worker (but), which is one of the most important methods of minors, as he directs the discourse towards a specific and narrow result, by saying: ((They did not enter to change the meaning, but rather entered to collect the meaning for us and define it without changing the meaning in itself)). Joining these two letters (S and souf) is nothing but to acquire and explain the meaning...., this result is what Al-knowest intends to convey to the objector who assumed that by entering it the meaning would change, so he proved to him the opposite of his delusion as he determined and restricted the reason for its entry, and he supported him in that the use of negation in (they did not enter to change the meaning). From these two arguments argument ladder is formed, in which the argument is yet to be the most powerful because it includes an argumentative factor, and it can be represented as follows:

The verb is raised after (seine and will) N

Rather, they entered to acquire the meaning for us and define it for us H2

They did not change the meaning H1

He employed the argument link (waw) to link it between the argument (entering the Seen and will to redeem the verb for the future itself) and the

argument (not entering to change the meaning but rather to collect the meaning) to reach a conclusion that is the entry of the Sin and the verb will become from its form as the alief and the lam of the name.

The objector was not satisfied with this number of questions, as he began to ask about the reason for making assertions for verbs, and they did not make them for nouns even though the verbs matched the noun and took their place. The scholar says: ((If someone said: Why did they make the syntax of strong verbs without nouns? For the name in its parsing, to complete its correspondence with it)) [1].

He answered with the statement of the cause, as he showed to the objector that the reason for the preposition of the verb to enter the verb is not the nouns, employing that reasoning by using (Lam the reasoning) to explain the impossibility of entering the prepositional movement on the verb Then it would be equivalent to the name in its syntax as if the Jazm movement came to replace the traction that was taken from it.

Thus Al-Knowest ends the argumentative process, and since both inferences have objections to them and the answers to those objections do not meet their responsibilities, the research goes to what Dr Al-Subayheen said, which is ((It is more correct than the lifting is an original syntax that comes before the coming of the factors, so it does not need a factor, whether moral or verbal)) [12].

The Second Topic: The Grammatical Controversy on the Issue of (In) in the Poet's Saying

The Storms Led it from Summer, and If from Autumn, they will not be Forbidden

(In) a conditionally or (ima) from (eima)?

We have also shown that the two ends of the argumentative process are not grammatical only, so that an argument may arise between grammar and poet, or grammatical and linguistic. In this issue, the most informed presents us an example of controversy between grammatical and linguistic, namely: Sibawayh and Asma'i who ((He was the owner of a language who was not the owner

Syntax)) [13]. Al-Knowest says: (And sing to Nimr bin Tulip, quoting to delete (ma) from (eima):

The storms led it and if from autumn, they
from summer will not be forbidden

Al-Asma'i denied this to Sibawayh and claimed that (In) is here for the reward, but he wanted. If I watered it from the autumn, the irrigation was not absent, and he omitted its watering so that he mentioned it at the beginning but instead describes a hoe and its start.

If he who dies It would have been the
is a survivor greatest rift

He describes that even if there is no livelihood on the mountain, he does not live with it, and the saying is the saying of Sibawayh in the house of the tiger, and that is that irrigation is not mentioned. Rather, the meaning was watered by the risers either in the summer or in the fall, and watering was not absent, or it was watered from summer and autumn, and (ma) was not removed from (eima) Either (except in poetry)) [1]. In his advanced polemical speech, Al-knowest presented an argument about (In) in the house of al-Nimr ibn Tulb, the advanced among Sibawayh who played the role of the claimant that (In) is from (eima) after deleting (ma) it, and Al-Asma'i, who played the role of the objector, responded to Sibawayh and saw that it is a penalty, As for the role of Al-knowest, it was the role of the weighted, as Sibawayh's opinion was favoured and supported by reasoning that he produced Sibawayh witness to a meaning consistent with his doctrine, as Sibawayh and in this particular verse saw that (In) it is (In) the rest of (eima) after deleting (ma), as the origin of Either): In what, when you omit (ma), the inverted for slurring returned to its original origin [13].

Sibawayh says: ((As for the words of the poet:

You have lied about If he is anxious, and
yourself, so do it that the sum of patience

This is based on either eima, not the penalty, such as your saying: if it is a truth even if it is a lie.

This is on ((eima)) portable. Do you not see that you are entering the fulfillment, even if it was on the penalty, and you received the words, you would need an answer? It is not his saying: If he is anxious, as his saying: It is a truth even if it is a lie, but it is according to the Almighty's saying: So either of us is afterwards or ransom. And if I said: If you say: If you are out of patience, because if you correct it, then it is not permissible. As for the necessity of poetry, al-Nimr ibn Tulb said:

The storms led it and if from autumn, they
from summer will not be forbidden

Instead, he wants: either from autumn. And whoever permits that in speaking, he enters into saying: I passed by a man if he is good and if he is insufficient, he wants either. And if he wants the reward, then it is permissible because it implicates the action.)) [14] And meditating on the words of Siboney, he finds that the basis on which he ruled, the type of (In) is intentionality, so he attaches its meaning to the will of the speaker/poet if he wants the purpose of (eima) as in the house in question. It is permissible, and if he wants (In) to be rewarded, that is also permissible. Al-Mabroud said in al-Kamil: ((Sibawayh claimed that it included ((ma)).

You have lied about If he is anxious, and that
yourself, so do it the sum of patience [14]

Al-Asma'i objected to Sibway's graduation to the house and made him (In) from (eima) and denied that to him, seeing that (In) is in the place of al-Nimr ibn Tulp for the penalty. The house's estimate is for him: If I watered it from the fall, irrigation would not be lost, and the act of the condition is omitted because of his mention of the first house. What follows is the answer, then (In) the verb may be omitted after that. If he was not mentioned in the speech, and if he noted, his omission would be stronger and clearer. Here is the reward. On the witness of Sibawayh al-Naqali from the tex side, he objected to his graduation, and the first of the verses other than that of Sibawayh, to agree with his doctrine that (In) she is here to be rewarded.

The role of Al-knowest in this matter was to favor Sibawayh's opinion and protest to him, by saying: ((The saying is the saying of Sibawayh in the tiger's house, and that is that irrigation is not mentioned, but the meaning was watered by the risers either in the summer or in the fall, and watering was not absent, or he was watered from summer and autumn, (ma) is not deleted from (either) except in poetry)). [14] Relying on a set of argument techniques employed in his protest, including:

The argumentative link is the name of the sign (that). It is one of the argumentative links listed for the argument, as he linked through it between the result from which he started, which is (Sibawayh's saying that whether from (eima) is the most correct saying). The argument for that is what he mentioned after the argumentative link (the name of the reference that It is: (Irrigation is not mentioned, but the meaning is that it was watered by the risers, either in summer or in autumn, and it was not irrigated, or it was flooded from summer and autumn), so he gave justifications for the result mentioned previously.

The argument worker (but), and the scholar employed this link to limit his argument and restrict it, by nullifying the possible faces and meanings at home and restricting them to two purposes, by saying: (Rather, the purpose was watered by the pedestrians either in the summer or in the fall, or he was watered from summer and autumn).

The argumentative factor (no... except) as it indicates that (ma) is not removed from (eima), then the argumentative factor (no... except) lead us to an implicit conclusion that deletion is restricted to the necessity of poetry and is not permissible in others, by saying: (And (ma) is not deleted from (eima) except in poetry).

The use of the linguistic act through negation with (no), and he intends to refute Al-Asma'i's opinion and argument, by saying: (And that is not mentioned for irrigation), and he's saying: (And do not delete (ma) from (eima) except in poetry).

We note from the above that these techniques have a great role in supporting the argumentative process and proving the scholarly argument and its consistency to bring it closer to the mind of the recipient, so that it becomes more convincing, and

these techniques affect the opponent and make him accept the case and be convinced of it.

Al-Mabrad - as it was quoted from him - supported the Al-Asma'i doctrine, according to what Ibn Walad quoted from him by saying: ((He said that it is wanted with it, and either from autumn, watering will not be absent. It must be repeated, but it came here once, and the words should not be carried to necessity, and you find a way to another. Still, the face in that is what Al-Asma'i said, it is (In) the reward, but he wanted if I watered it from a fall, he would not lack irrigation, and he did not need to He mentioned (it led him) because he said first: Al Rawda'a led it from Summer. He had indifferent what was not mentioned first in his saying: The servants are rewarded for their deeds, if good is good, and if evil is evil, so consecrate (it was) and not in speech. If it is annulled to be (In) meaning (eima); this is because first: (ma) it is not permissible to cancel it from (In) except when necessary.

Second: (eima) it must be duplicated, but it came here once. Third: Speech should not be led to necessity while you find a way to another. Al-Farsi won for Sibawayh, citing the analogy of the conditional sounding, as he proved through it that (In) there is no penalty in the poet's verse:

You have lied about yourself, so do it	If he is anxious, and that the sum of patience
---	---

He mentioned to (In) two possibilities, one of which was nullified and the other confirmed, as it was not without the penalty or of (eima), and that which was nullified and therefore it was decided that it be the one from (eima), and on this he carried the house of al-Nimr ibn Tulp and proved the validity of the Sibawayh doctrine. By saying: ((This indicates that it is not free of ((In)) the penalty or the other that we have mentioned. If the one is for the penalty, and you appended the fulfillment in your saying: then you are appalled, then you must state the answer; do you not see that if you said ((You are more unjust) If you did)) fill in the preceding conditional blocking the answer, If you add a f, and say ((You are unjust if you do)), you must state an explanation for the condition, and what has been presented above is not sufficient for what the penalty requires. Just as

((In)) in his saying: ((then anxious)) in the meaning of ((eima)), this is also the case in the house of the tiger. This is a doctrine in which he will divulge it. (In) [14] And he mentioned a third doctrine in it, which is that (In) is excess, and it is the doctrine of Abu Ubaidah, the estimation of the house is: it was led by the pioneers from summer and autumn[13].

The research favors the Sibawayh doctrine because it relied on the will of the poet, so he said that it is from (eima); Because the indication of the house on the generalization of watering at all times, and Al-knowest relied on this meaning in its weighting of the opinion of Sebouih in his book *The collection of the eye of gold*, he said: ((And Sibawih's assessment is first due to the generalization of irrigation at all times of summer and autumn, and this meaning is not valid according to Al-Asma'i's estimation. And his companions, because they made irrigation for autumn watering especially for him)) [15].

Results of Research

1. The book of Al-Nokt is rich in controversial issues, as Al-knowest deposited it with a lot of scholars' opinions and differences between them, whether between the two schools or between the one school.
2. Al-knowest did not limit his mention of controversial issues to the debate between grammarians only. Still, instead, he mentioned what happened in the controversy between grammarians and linguists in the manner of the argument he had between Sibawayh and Al-Asma'i regarding the issue of (In) in the poet's saying:

The storms led it from summer, and if from autumn, they will not be forbidden, (In) a conditionally or (ima) from (eima)?

3. Al-knowest assumed the role of weight in some controversial issues and the plaintiff's role in some others, as in raising the present tense verb, as he took the role

of the plaintiff (reasoner) in answering the objections of the objectors.

4. Al-knowest was not limited to citing a controversy among grammarians. Still, he was keen on stirring up controversy, as he raised many controversial issues, as we found in his conversations with a supposed interlocutor in the debate on raising the present tense verb.
5. The knowest relied in his weighting on the reasoning, for he was justifying his preference for a specific doctrine based on rational arguments.
6. Al-knowest went in most issues of Subway's doctrine, favoring his doctrine as supporter and victorious.
7. The argumentative techniques employed in the scholarly polemical discourses gave an antagonistic power that supported the arguments made by him who supported his likely doctrine refuting his opponent's doctrine, as these techniques combined to draw a clear picture of the controversy and helped to pour in one result, which is the corruption and annulment of the opponent's doctrine, and the victory of the Sibawayh and the Basrien doctrine. And the acknowledgement of it to induce the recipient to submit and submit.

References

- [1] Abu Al-Hajjaj Yusef bin Suleiman bin Isa AL-knowest Al-Shantamri (d. 476 AH), Zuhair Abdul Mohsen. 1987. *Al-Nokt in the interpretation of Subway's book, Sultan's investigation, publications of the Arab Manuscripts Institute, Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Education, ed.1, 1407 AH / 1987AD: The Investigator Introduction*, 61-66.
- [2] Sami bin Umair bin Amer Al-Saadi. 1428 AH-1429 AD. *AL-Knowest Al-Shantamri's position in his book (Al-Nokt) from the Grammatical and Morphological Controversy - Presentation and Discussion (PhD Thesis), Islamic University of Madinah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*, 669.

- [3] Ibn Mada'a Al-Qurtubi. 1366 AH / 1947 AD. *The response to the grammarians, published and verified by Dr Shawqi Dhaif, Arab Thought House, 1st Edition:* 160.
- [4] Shawqi Dhaif. *Grammar schools, D., Dar Al Maarif, 7th Edition, DT:* 292-293.
- [5] Abdel-Latif Adel. 1434 AH / 2013 AD. *The rhetoric of persuasion in the debate. Defaf publications, Beirut-Lebanon, 1:* 100.
- [6] Abu Bakr Al-Azzawi. 1426 AH / 2006 AD. *Language and arguments, Al-Umda for Printing, 1st Edition:* 27.
- [7] Hamo Al-Naqari, Al-Najah. 1427 AH / 2006 AD. *Argumentation, its nature, fields, and functions, Coordination by Al-Jadida Press - White House, 1st Edition:* 65-66.
- [8] Abu Bakr Al-Azzawi. 1426 AH / 2006 AD. *Language and pilgrims, Al-Umda for Printing, 1st Edition:* 27.
- [9] Basrians, and Kufis, Kamal al-Din Abi al-Barakat Abd al-Rahman bin Muhammad bin Abi Saeed al-Anbari. 1428 AH / 2007 AD: 2/551 AD. Equity in matters of disagreement between grammarians: al-Grammar (d. 577 AH), and with him the book fairness from fairness, Muhammad Muhyiddin Abd al-Hamid, Modern Library, Saida - Beirut, Lebanon, Dat, and the Economist in Explaining Al-clarification, Abdul-Qaher Al-Jarjani, Kadhim Bahr Al-Murjan's investigation, Publications of the Ministry of Culture and Information, Dar Al-Rasheed, Iraqi Republic, D.
- [10] Abu Bishr Amr bin Othman bin Qanbar. 1402 AH / 1982 AD. The book: (d.180 AH), investigation and explanation: Abd al-Salam Muhammad Harun, Dar Al-Jeel for Printing, Publishing Al-Khanji Library in Cairo, 2nd Edition, 1/14, and see: Sharh Al-Mufassal, Mowafak Al-Din you live Ibn Ali Ibn Yaish Grammar (d. 643 AH), Department of the Enlightenment Edition, ed. 1, dt, d.: 7/6.
- [11] Abu Bakr Ibn Al-Sarraj (d. 316 AH). 1393 AH / 1973AD. *Origins in grammar, edited by Dr Abdul-Hussein Al-Fattli, Al-Numan Press, Najaf Al-Ashraf, 2/146.*
- [12] Muheb al-Din Abdullah bin al-Hussein al-Baghdadi (d.616 AH). 1399 AH / 1979 AD. Al-Muqtasid: 1/118, and al-Bab on the ills of construction and parsing, edited by Muhammad Othman, publisher: Religious Culture Library, ed. Detailed: 7/6, Jalal Al-Din Al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH), and Al-Hawa'yah in explaining mosques' collection. Abd Al-Aal Salem Makram, Scientific Research House - Kuwait, Dat, 1/54.
- [13] Abdul Qadir bin Omar Al-Baghdadi (d. 1093 AH). The Treasury of Literature and the Pulp to Bab Lisan Al Arab investigate and explain Abd al-Salam Muhammad Haroun, Al-Khanji Library, Cairo, DT, d: 11/93.
- [14] Abu Ali Al-Farsi (d. 377 AH). 1429 AH / 2008 AD. Explanation of the problematic verses the parsing called ((Explanation of Poetry)), achieved by Dr Hassan Hindawi, Dar Al-Qalam, Damascus, Dar Al-Uloom and Culture, Beirut, 1st Edition, 1407 AH / 1987 AD: 101, and the explanation of the book of Sibawayh, Al-Hassan bin Abdullah bin Al-Marzaban Abu Saeed Al-Serafi (d. Scientific Books, Beirut-Lebanon, Edition 1: 2/165.
- [15] Abu Al-Hajjaj Yusuf Bin Sulaiman Bin Isa Al-Alam Al-Shantiemari 1415 AH / 1994 AD. Collecting the Ain of Gold from the mineral of the essence of literature in the science of Arab metaphors, investigated and commented on, Dr Zuhair Abdul Mohsen Sultan, The Resala Foundation, 2nd Edition, 186.