

## PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

### THE APPROACH OF AL-FARSI (377 AH) IN THE USE OF ANALOGY, (AL-MASAIL AL-BASARIAT) AS A MODEL

*Prof. Dr. Mahmud Fawzy Al Kubaisi<sup>1</sup>, Mustafa Rahim Farhan<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1,2</sup> Aliraqia University, College of Arts, Department of Arabic Language, Postgraduate Studies

Email <sup>1</sup>[Mahmood.alkubaisy@gmail.com](mailto:Mahmood.alkubaisy@gmail.com), <sup>2</sup>[Raheemmustafa89@gmail.com](mailto:Raheemmustafa89@gmail.com)

**Prof. Dr. Mahmud Fawzy Al Kubaisi, Mustafa Rahim Farhan. The Approach of Al-Farsi (377 Ah) In the Use of Analogy, (Al-Masail Al-Basariat) As A Model -- Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 18(9), 1655-1665. ISSN 1567-214x**

**Keywords: The Approach of Al-Farsi, Al-Masail Al-Basarat**

#### ABSTRACT

By memorizing His words, the Arabic tongue was preserved, and in this context, the Hungarian orientalist Abdel Karim Germanos mentions: "In Islam there is an important support for the Arabic language that has preserved its splendor and immortality. Therefore, the efforts of linguists, may God have mercy on them, came together, to preserve the language and preserve it from errors and mistakes, so their care became to study and analyze it, to consider its origins and branches, and to know its rulings and its ills. Other sciences that were related to Arabic, and about the importance of that, Abu Hayyan says: "The language with which came our Sharia. From discourses and sayings, "therefore, scholars have taken upon themselves the task of clarifying the right from the sick and showing the lean from the fat, and the science of Arabic has a wide field in which schools and circles have emerged, and grammarians compete with each other and put forward different opinions. After completing the research in the book (The Visual Issues), talking about grammatical issues, opinions on grammatical thought, the agreement between the Persian and the grammarians, and the conflict between the Persian and other Arabic language scholars, and the evidence that I presented Al-Farsi and the analysis of the grammatical rulings that resulted from it. The research reached important results, which are Through these issues, the personality of Al-Farsi clearly emerged, as Al-Farsi had an opinion and an argument in what he transmitted, and his mental ability and logical capabilities appeared in analyzing texts and incorporating evidence on them, as it was shown through which the breadth of his culture and his knowledge of the opinions of grammarians in the various sections of grammar.

## INTRODUCTION

Praise be to God, he taught by the pen, he taught man what he did not know, praise be to God, the revelation of the Qur'an in a clear Arabic tongue, a guidance and mercy to the worlds, a praise equal to his great grace and more bounty and benevolence. Follow them with charity until the day of the house and beyond.

By memorizing His words, the Arabic tongue was preserved, and in this context, the Hungarian orientalist Abdel Karim Germanos mentions: "In Islam there is an important support for the Arabic language that has preserved its splendor and immortality.

Therefore, the efforts of linguists, may God have mercy on them, came together, to preserve the language and preserve it from errors and mistakes, so their care became to study and analyze it, to consider its origins and branches, and to know its rulings and its ills. Other sciences that were related to Arabic, and about the importance of that, Abu Hayyan says: "The language with which came our Sharia. From discourses and sayings, "therefore, scholars have taken upon themselves the task of clarifying the right from the sick and showing the lean from the fat, and the science of Arabic has a wide field in which schools and circles have emerged, and grammarians compete with each other and put forward different opinions.

Among them, but among them and their elite, was Abu Ali al-Farsi, the imam of grammar in the fourth century, and a slip of time shone in the sky of Arabia, and his fame spread among the scientific circles. Died 392 AH).

### *Mensuration*

#### *First: Define It.*

Scholars define analogy "it is the carrying of the untransferable on the transmitted if it is in its meaning", which is the definition of the months, and it means that you measure the judgment on words that agree with it in meaning, and this speech is audible for the Arabs, or in other words, the clearest analogy for the unheard of the Arabs on the audible from the words of the Arabs, provided that the link between them is correct.

And analogy is most of the evidence for grammar, and most of its questions are accepted according to it, as it was said: Grammar is only an analogy that is followed.

It is apparent from Al-Suyuti's statement that the Arabic grammar is mostly based on analogy, except that Ibn Jinni says: "God forbid that we claim that all language is covered by evidence by analogy, but if it was possible, we said it, and alerted us to it". This is despite his strong love for analogy and his preference for it in his books. Ibn Jinni was fond of analogy, influenced by his Persian sheikh, as he used to say: "Do not rush to give a hand by breaking its door and analogy by analogy", and Ibn Jinni mentioned a rule if it contradicts Hearing and analogy, so he said: "Hearing invalidates analogy" meaning that analogy is left if hearing is dominant over it, or something from hearing invalidates it; provided that the audible is not abnormal;

Because the measurement is based on what is frequently used:

“The most important thing is the analogy.”

Was it not for analogy, most of the language would have gone, since it is impossible for the entire language to be transmitted, but analogy is measured against analogy? Therefore, “denial of analogy in grammar is not achieved, and for this reason it was said in its limit: Grammar is the knowledge of criteria deduced from the induction of the speech of the Arabs, so whoever denies analogy has denied grammar”.

For example, “Taksir (Al-Rajz), which is torment, so you say (Arjaz) by analogy with (Loads), and if you do not hear (Al-Rajz)”, that is, it is the plural of (Rajaz) by analogy with the plural (Load), so it became (Rajz - Arjaz). ) as it was (pregnancy - loads). This example mentioned by Ibn Jinni is the analogy in the clearest and most concise form.

### ***Second: The Usefulness of Measurement.***

And analogy was found to make it easier for people, as no human being is able to memorize the entire language, because “to comprehend all the words of the Arabs is something that only God Almighty is capable of, or a prophet sent by the revelation of God Almighty and Exalted be He”.

Therefore, the greatest benefit achieved by analogy is to facilitate eloquence for people, Ibn Jinni says in the folds of his talk about the speech of the Arabs, “and from it what they find is compensated by analogy, and the cost is reduced in his knowledge of the people, so they are codified and separated”, so analogy is like a shortcut to understanding the language.

Abu Ali said regarding the usefulness of analogy: “These laws were only instituted so that those who are not among the people of the language follow its people, and those who are not eloquent and those who are eloquent are equal to those who are eloquent.” and preserve its assets.

And Dr. Ibrahim Anis believes that the analogy in the first and second centuries of the Hijri century was intended to establish general provisions, but to the fourth century this was intended with the creation of new meanings by deriving something new in the language that was not heard from the Arabs according to what the Arabs spoke This indicates that grammar was going through a stage of what is known as scientific luxury during the fourth century, in which Abu Ali presided over grammar.

Arab grammarians knew analogy at an early age and took it in the treatment of syntactic linguistic phenomena. Perhaps the oldest of Arab grammarians who knew analogy was Abdullah bin Abi Ishaq al-Hadrami, who died in 117 A.H. He was the first to branch into the grammar and its predicament, and that in his definition he relied on the extension of analogy and reasoning, so that it was very abstract for analogy, because analogy arose in the old days, and it can be said that it arose with the emergence of Arabic grammar or shortly after the emergence of grammar.

### ***Third: The Pillars of Measurement.***

And the process of measurement, which is the immovable load on the movable, is completed and has pillars for its completeness, and with these pillars the analogy is straightened and the inference is valid, and it is:

1. Origin: It is measured against.
2. Branch. It is measured.
3. Judgment: It is the result of the measurement, or what the grammarian concludes from the measurement process
4. The universal cause: It is the reason for the agreement of the measurer with the measurer.

And that is like “to make an analogy to indicate the nominative of what the doer is not named, so we say: a noun to which the verb is attributed in advance, so it must be a nominative by analogy with the original”.

The origin is the subject, and the branch is the subject’s deputy, and the judgment is the nominative, and the reason for combining them is the attribution to the verb.

This section contains a lot of talk about each of these pillars and the conditions for each of them, and when the analogy is correct and when it is weak, but I suffice with this amount to follow the topic of the research and do not leave it.

As for al-Farsi, a large part of his grammar can be summarized under the section on analogy. Because the Persian is very famous for analogy. Perhaps the reason for this is the unique logical mindset that the Persian possesses. He often supports his analogies with rational proofs. Al-Farsi was well-versed in his tools of analogy until Ibn Jinni quoted him as saying: “I am mistaken in fifty issues in the language, and I am not mistaken in one of the analogies.”.

Dr. Mahdi al-Makhzoumi mentioned it in the introduction to the standard grammarians, and he says in his talk about the development of grammar: “The grammar is progressing in its path, and he witnesses men who have gone a long way by analogy, until it has become as if it is the grammar, and the grammar as if it is the mastery in the application of analogy, and he was at the forefront of these standardists. Abu Ali Al-Farsi ”.

### ***Fourth: Persian Issues of Analogy:***

1- An issue in which it is mentioned that the initiation of sympathy is not preceded by anything. He said: “If someone says in what he says of (and bald) and the like, on the adverb of the neighbor and he is (Lord)”, and Al-Farisi’s answer to this explains it with the meaning of the saying of Ruba:

**Rather, it is a country that fills  
the gaps with darkness**

**Do not buy his flax and his  
pulp**

That is, weave Jahramah, because (Jahram) is a country.  
And Ruba also said:

**Rather, a country of hills and hills**

And the Persian in this matter agrees with al-Mubarrad, as it came in al-Muqtadat, “Do not be (Lord) at the beginning of speech”.

As for the waw, it is replaced by (rabb), and it is called waw rabb, and evidence of the correctness of what Abu al-Abbas said was the coming of waw first in his saying:

### *A Blind Slang Country*

The waw here is correct to come first even though it was not preceded by anything to be sympathetic to, and since what follows it is drawn up, it is proven that it is substitutable from (Lord) as I arrive at that file by analogy with the beginning with (Lord) in (Lord standing), and ( Lord of Balad) and the like, and in the summary on the authority of Waw (Lord) “As it was altered from (Lord) in his saying (and a town that does not have Anis), because when it was changed from Al-Ba’, it entered on (Lord)” .

The example that Al-Mubarrad mentioned is similar to the house of Ruba, so the analogy is correct according to the Persian; Because he preferred the saying of al-Mubarrad by analogy with the house of Ruba, and as for al-Mubarrad’s saying about the waw that it is replaced by the ba’, he wants the origin of the speech and it is (in a town that does not have anis), so she replaced the ba’, which is the preposition ba’a (Lord).

**2- An issue in which Yunus bin Habib’s opinion** is correct in relation to (sister), for he said (my sister), and the question posed to Abi Ali here is, is Yunus’ saying invalid because they omitted the plural in their saying (sisters)?

This is what Yunus said is not based on analogy, as Sibawayh said in the book, “As for Yunus, he says: My sister, not by analogy.”

Because analogy is the saying of the boyfriend: “And if you add to a sister, you say (brotherly), this is how the analogy should be, and this analogy is the saying of the boyfriend”.

And what indicates the validity of Hebron is that when you combined the feminine taa’, you deleted the feminine t’s and repeated it to the original (brother) without feminine, so the ratio is “brotherly”, but Yunus did not delete it and it was not made according to analogy.

Al-Farisi answers that by saying that Yunus’s opinion does not corrupt it. He said, “This does not indicate his corruption, because it is permissible for them to be

dispensed with collecting a brother over a sister, and if that is permissible, what I mentioned does not indicate his corruption.” that face; Because the hamza (sister) is joined, while the hamza (sisters) is open.

Al-Farsi goes far in detailing the analogy in this issue, as he relies on an analogy from Sibawayh’s analogies in another issue, where he said: “Do you not see that (Yah) has said in (the sheep of Jibbah Wajibat that they were dispensed with the plural of (Lijbah) rather than the plural of (Lijbah), as they dispensed with here? They also dispensed with the plural of sister, do you not see that its origin is an adjective, just as (libbah) is an adjective ”.

And I must separate the saying in what Al-Farsi mentioned about Sibawayh, the first matter in the method of Al-Farsi that he adopts in measurement, he mentions the issue in its entirety and measures and after it has been exhausted, he mentioned Sibawayh’s text to infer the details of his measurement, but to say that Sibawayh used the same method of measurement in another issue, which is the question of collection ( A sheep), and the evidence for this is that the issue of al-Farsi in the ratio and the issue of Sibawayh in the plural, but they followed the same method in the method of analogy, and the Persian is as if he was answering an objector or a skeptic in its measurement. (Lijbbah), it is permissible for a Persian to dispense with the plural (brother) from the plural (sister).

The second matter is the Sibawayh issue, for it has a need for clarification and detail and its summary is how the Arabs assemble the “lijbah” which is the sheep , whose milk has decreased and collected it according to the analogy with “lujbat” in the silence of the gym. On analogy, but (Lijbat) came with the opening of Al-Jim, and this is contrary to analogy. That is why Sibawayh took it out as saying that they were rich in the plural (Lijbah), which is a noun and not an adjective for the plural of (Lijbah) with the sukoon of the gym, which is an adjective. Thus, the plural agrees with the analogy because (Jubbah) is plural by moving the Jab. ) Opening the gym is the analogy as it was said (a sheep for meals), and the detail of the issue is in the book.

As for the Persian, he does not leave a branch of the issue unreversed, and this is what makes his questions characterized by the length of the phrase and the extension of the analogy, and there is a lot of digression in it; Therefore, he mentions another argument that may contradict his opinion, so he mentions it and refutes it according to his usual style, saying: “If I said (girl and hent) as well, and only agreed on (girls and girls), if the matter was in (sister) as you mentioned, it would not be limited to it so that it does not come. Other than him, and he continued with other than (sister), meaning the plural of the same gender ” meaning that it must be an analogy followed in plural and lineage, and he wants the t in a girl, which is the sign of femininity, which is attached to the noun in the plural, and it is (girls) as well as in Hunt, and there is no omission in it. The plural and plural (Hanat).

The Persian responds that the plural does not necessarily have to be on the same singular word and its construction; Because in (girls) you say (daughter and girl), meaning that it comes on different buildings, and the plural did not come on any of them, but came on the original, the Persian says in that: “(Daughter) and (girl) comes

on different buildings, then it was said In it (daughters), he did not come to one of them, this indicates that he did not unanimously agree on one of them, and that he united according to the original.

Al-Farsi elaborates on this issue to mention what strengthens his opinion and his agreement with Yunus, and he says in protest: “The feminine sign if the feminine sign was attached to (both) was too obscene to be attached to the attribution mark” , and this is illustrated by the example he mentioned, which is the name of the plural gender towards ( Rum - Rumi) and (barley - barley), the ratio y meets with the feminine sign morally, both of which changed the name from the singular to the plural; Therefore, it is correct for him to combine lineage with the sign of femininity in (My sister), so the sign of femininity is (T) followed by the sign of lineage is (Ya). Their saying (brotherly) ; Hence, he says: “The combination of their two - meaning the feminine ta’a - with the lineage J in (my sister) and the like is more worthy.”

Al-Farsi continues to strengthen his opinion, and he responds to Al-Khalil and Sibawayh by saying: “As for what Al-Khalil and (Yah) have obligated him that if he says (my brother), he must say: (Hunti) in the lineage to (Hunt), this does not obligate him, don’t you see that (Hunt) is what is said in Al-Wasl, and when it stops, it is said (Hunt).

That is, the opinion of Al-Khalil and Sibawayh came because the construction of (Akht) is the same as the (Hunt) building, so they agree in the same building in terms of descent, and Al-Farsi believes that this analogy between (Akht and Hunt) is not correct and his argument is that the t in (Akht) is not the same as the t in (Akht). (Hunt) because the first is proven in speech, linking and endowing, as for the second in (Hunt), it is not fixed in the endowment, because if you stood, you said (here) and dropped the t, and thus the paradox of the t (sister) and with this the Persian dropped the measure of Hebron where he said “So since the t in (hunt) is not required in the connection and the endowment is necessary in (sister), it has no ruling , which means that the attribution to (hunt) is not (hunti) as in (my sister), but is by analogy. What Al-Khalil mentioned (Hanwi) by deleting the t.

### ***3- A Question in The Form of The Oath (Laha Allah):***

Al-Farsi said: “If the hamza is reduced or achieved, and a use is made for that, then it is an aspect of analogy.”

And the detail of his saying (La Laha Allah), because this distraction is to alert and comes in place of the letter of the oath, so his saying (Halaah) i.e. (God) and it is said: If you use (ha) to warn instead, then it must come with the word (the) after the swearing by it, towards (La Laha Allah) The) ”.

As for the aspect of analogy with Abi Ali in this issue, it is its analogy with their saying (hello), meaning that if distraction is reduced or achieved, it is because it became with the oath as one thing, and it is indicated by (hello), it is likewise for warning, and it has become with this verb name as one thing. He says: “His point is that (ha) which is to warn when it joined it just as (ha) joined with (helm) and it

became instead of waw instead of waw as it became built with the verb or the noun with which the verb is named” , and he means by saying: (the named noun) It has the verb) the noun of the verb which is (hello).

And the Persian does not recommend cutting the hamza if it is (ha) instead of the waw-o-qom; Because it was not used on parts, so the measurement is not correct. And the view according to the Persian is that “Alif (God) is a thousand arrived, and a thousand (ha) is inhabited, and Laam (God) is still, so two residents meet, so he extends it, to become like (a beast) and he smashes it.” The permissibility of the face of the debtor who resides here is its separation, for the first stillness is in (ha) and the second is in the name of the majesty (Allah).

As for the second aspect, it is shortening, and he says: “No God, so the occupants will fall completely.”

And this issue according to Sibawayh “in the chapter on what is before the swear by it instead of the pronunciation, and that is by your saying: (i.e., God is this) you prove the thousand (ha), because the one after it is slurred and among the Arabs are those who say: (i.e. God is this) and he deletes the thousand after it. Distraction, and there is nothing in the divider here here except traction, because their saying “ha” became instead of the pronunciation with the word “waw,” so it was omitted to reduce it on the tongue “. Likewise, Sibawayh explained the ruling on swearing by it, where he said: (and there is nothing in the sworn here except traction), as Sibawayh referred to the reason for the omission, which is to reduce the burden on God, because if I said (ie, by God), it would have been heavy on the tongue, “Do you not see that the waw? It does not appear here as it appears in your saying (By God), so leaving them and waw here at all indicates that it went from here to ease the tongue and was compensated by it”.

Perhaps Al-Farsi did not come up with this detail in the matter because he focuses in the face of analogy between (Laha Allah) and the noun of the verb (hello), he left these details because they are not related to what he wants to protest against.

**- An issue regarding the refusal to add the herald to the pronoun of the addressee:**

Al-Farsi said: “It is not permissible, O your boy, to come.”

This saying is the saying of Al-Mubarrad, it came in Al-Muqtadat: “Know that adding the herald to the kaf that falls on the addressee is impossible, because if you say: O your servant, accept, then addressing the herald by addressing the kaf is invalidated”.

The reason for the prohibition of this speech is moral, so your saying (your servant, accept) is not correct in terms of meaning; (Because the herald must be a boy himself, and this is corrupt) , but if you want this kaf, which is the pronoun of the addressee, if you want by it other than the herald, then it is necessary to say (O boy, accept) and this is a distraction for the pronoun of the absent, and then the speech is correct, and this reasoning In both parts, he was mentioned by Al-Mubarrad, as he says: “If you add to the distraction, it will be correct for a trusted one, as the saying of the one who mentioned Zaid: O brother, accept, O father, and so on, as well as: O brother, O



father.”

He means by saying (peace be upon a trusted person), meaning that it is a distraction to the covenant, as in (the) the covenant, so your saying (Oh brother) is correct.

And the Persian also referred to this moral reasoning by saying: “If you mean by it other than the addressee who is calling, then it must be on the word backbiting, and if you mean by the addressee, it is not permissible.”

And your saying (Oh your boy, accept) this speech is in accordance with the rules of Arabic grammar in terms of its composition; It does not violate a grammatical rule, nor does it violate any of the rules of the language, yet it is corrupt in their view. Because its meaning is incorrect, and this is a presentation of the meaning at the expense of the pronunciation. If the pronunciation is correct and the meaning is corrupted, it is not permissible to speak. Abu Ali added to al-Mubarrad, as he does not leave an issue in which analogy is not valid without analogy. He measured the refusal of this issue on their saying (Do you see), so the t here is in the same condition, whether for the masculine and the feminine, and for both and all, so what changes in it is its movement only, Al-Farsi says: “It strengthens me.” This what he took left them for the t in (I saw) on one case for the masculine and the feminine and for the two and everyone, as if when the speech sign became after the t, it came out of being a speech sign, don't you see it on one condition in all cases just as two signs did not meet here for the speech also did not meet in (O your boy) ”.

But if this issue is carried on the scar, then it is permissible according to analogy, and it is permissible in the case of the narrator and the Persian. Al-Mubarrad said: “As for the scar, it is permissible: O your boy or our brother, because the delegate is not addressed, but rather mourns for him.” The scar, for he permits it as well, as he says: “If you mourn and say (Oh, your servant), it is permissible, because the delegate is not addressed.” Perhaps he wants that the delegate is mostly absent, so he said (because the delegate is not addressed), but the construction still indicates In its form on the addressee in your saying (Oh, your servant), how is this correct? For if he wanted to scar, he had to say (Wa his servants).

##### ***5- An Issue in Which He Explains a House for Al-Farazdaq:***

In the sixty-first issue, Al-Farazdaq said:

And if a narrator and a group of her men were asked about me, then someone would not be uttered by the lips And he explained it to estimate a deleted circumstance that is related to the news and appreciation to him (the lips did not utter from it), and the reason for this is so that the news is not without a link that goes back to the subject, because the meaning of the speech according to the Persian is (one from whom the lips did not utter), and the distraction that he estimated in the circumstance (from him) ) go back to the beginning; And in this he follows the analogy, because the original in the predicate and the ascribed to it is that there is a connection between them either with something that goes back to the subject, or something that is related to it in meaning towards your saying (the truth is victorious), so the Persian relied on the assessment of speech, which is better than the interpretation of the audience, and the

grammarians have estimated That (Al) renounced the existence of the pronoun, so his saying (the lips) was as if he had said (his lips), but the Persian did not accept this.

Al-Farisi mentioned this opinion and said in contrast to it, saying: "Some of them said: He wants (his lips did not utter), and this we have on (the lips did not utter from him), it is necessary to estimate the omitted return, because the news is not free of those who refer to the informant, or something that it is. In the sense ".

Al-Farsi makes a difference between Al-Farazdaq's statement here and the other saying:

And the neighbors knew that our pots are guarantors of livelihood, and the wind blew Rather, it was mentioned by al-Farisi in this issue because some grammarians interpret it as they interpreted the first house of al-Farazdaq, and they said that (al) in the semi-sentence (al-rizaq) also departed from the presence of the pronoun that connects it to the subject; Because it came at home without a conscience (sustenance), and appreciation for them (guarantors of their livelihood).

But Aba Ali sees something other than this opinion, as he says: The sentence here does not need the pronoun at all, rather leaving it here is better in meaning and more eloquent. Because his saying (guarantees of livelihood) has this moral link in terms of not needing a link in its composition, and in terms of its eloquence and good formulation, if he says: (Guarantees of livelihood) on its release without restriction, it includes his neighbors and non-neighbors; Because the meaning is based on the estimation of the one who said on behalf of (Al) about the pronoun that he will be guarantors of their livelihood, i.e. for the sustenance of the neighbors, so it is specified, but the meaning is according to the assessment of the Persian, it is (guarantors of livelihood) so it is based on its release, and in that the Persian says: "Do you not see that if this estimate is estimated, it was limited? On the neighbours, and if it is on its surface, it was for them and for others, so the meaning - in his saying (livelihood) in absolute and not added - is their livelihood by feeding them and the livelihood of those other than them by watching them".

## CONCLUSION

After completing the research in the book (The Visual Issues), talking about grammatical issues, opinions on grammatical thought, the agreement between the Persian and the grammarians, and the conflict between the Persian and other Arabic language scholars, and the evidence that I presented Al-Farsi and the analysis of the grammatical rulings that resulted from it. The research reached important results, which are:

- 1- Through these issues, the personality of Al-Farsi clearly emerged, as Al-Farsi had an opinion and an argument in what he transmitted, and his mental ability and logical capabilities appeared in analyzing texts and incorporating evidence on them, as it was shown through which the breadth of his culture and his knowledge of the opinions of grammarians in the various sections of grammar.
- 2- It seemed through the research that Al-Farsi was very reliant on analogy and he is one of the two analogy scholars, and his style is almost entirely based on the origin of analogy, although he used listening and other grammatical principles, but he paid

great attention to analogy.

3- The research shows the extent of Al-Farsi's interest in the grammatical witness, as he puts the witness in the first place, and accordingly it is necessary to build the validity of the issue from its corruption, as evidenced by the evidence included in the optics, the vastness of Persian memorization of the words of the Arabs, its system and its prose.

## REFERENCES

- The Origins of Grammatical Thinking, Ali Abu al-Makarem, i / Dar Gharib for printing - Cairo 2007
- Strangeness in the Controversy of Syntax, Abu Al-Barakat Al-Anbari, T/ Saeed Al-Afghani, I/ The Syrian University, 1957
- Disclosure in explaining the verses of the problem of syntax for Al-Fariqi, i / Al-Resala Foundation, Damascus
- The Suggestion in the Origins of Grammar, Abd al-Rahman Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti, t / Abd al-Hakim Attia, ed. al-Bayroti II, 1427 A.H. - 2006 A.D.
- The Argument in the Seven Reciters, Al-Hasan bin Ahmed Abu Ali Al-Farsi, T. / Badr Al-Din Kahwaji, T. Al-Mamoun Heritage House, Damascus - Beirut 1993
- Characteristics of Abu Al-Fath Othman bin Jinni i / General Egyptian Book Authority, fourth edition
- Diwan Al-Farazdaq i / the second Beirut
- Diwan Ruba bin Al-Ajaj, i / Al-Afaq Al-Jadeeda
- Explanation of Radhi al-Din al-Istrabadi on Kafiya by Ibn al-Hajib Ali al-Kafi, i / Beirut
- Layers of Poets Stallions Muhammad bin Salam Al-Jamahi T/ Mahmoud Muhammad Shaker T/ Dar Al-Madani Jeddah
- Methods of developing words d. Ibrahim Anis
- In Arabic grammar, criticism and guidance by Dr. Mahdi Al-Makhzoumi, i / Dar Al-Raed Al-Arabi - Beirut II 1986
- The book by Sibawayh T. / Abd al-Salam Harun i. al-Khanji, third edition
- Lisan al-Arab Muhammad ibn Makram Jamal al-Din ibn Manzur i / Dar Sader Beirut 1414 AH
- Luma'a Evidence fi Usul Grammar by Abu Al-Barakat Al-Anbari, T/ Saeed Al-Afghani, I/ The Syrian University 1957
- The Ranks of Grammarians, Abu al-Tayyib, the Linguist, T. Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, i. al-Maqtaba al-Asriyah, 2002
- Language Standards for Ahmed bin Faris, i / Dar Al-Hadith, Cairo 2008
- Al-Muqtab by Abu Al-Abbas Al-Mubarrad T/ Muhammad Abdul-Khaleq Azimah I/ Alam Al-Kutub Beirut
- Al-Monsef Explanation of the Book of Al-Tasrif by Abu Othman Al-Mazini by Abu Al-Fath Othman bin Jinni, i / House of Revival of the Old Heritage 1954 A.D.
- The optics of Abi Ali Al-Farsi, T. / Muhammad Al-Shater, first edition, 1405 A.H. - 1985 A.D.