

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

### AL-ZANJANI GRAMMATICAL RESPONSES ON AL-FARRA

*Kareem Mezaal Mohammad*

Wasit University / College of Arts

**Kareem Mezaal Mohammad. Al-Zanjani Grammatical Responses On Al-Farra-- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(10), 582-593 ISSN 1567-214x.**

**Keywords: Al-Zanjani's Grammatical Responses To Al-Farra. The Regular Name With U After Except (ولا). Constructive Cause Of (الآن) Now. Elimination Of The Adverb Factor. The Origin Of The Lam (ل) In Distressing**

#### **ABSTRACT**

Al-Zanjani was considered one of the prominent Arab scholars of the seventh century AH in language and literature, as he has many works on language, literature, grammar, variation, morphology, performances and rhetoric, that they show us his scientific standing and his broad culture, he is interested in the opinions of his predecessors, following them with opposition and rejection, among those whose opinions he was care about is al-Farra ' died in (207 AH), the one that Al-Zanjani has pursued him in various matters. In this research, I tried to elucidate the responses of Al-Zanjani about Farra, relying on convincing arguments and evidence, to come out with a good opinion, following the method of description and evaluation, as a debate and an analyst.

#### **THE INTRODUCTION**

Praise be to God, Lord of the worlds, and prayers and peace be upon the Master of the Messengers, Abu Al-Qasim Muhammad, and upon his good and pure family and his chosen companions.

Then Al-Zanjani is Abo al-Maali Abid al-Wahab bin Ibrahim bin Abid al-Wahab bin Abi al-Maali al-Khazraji al-Zanjani. He was one among the scholars of the seventh century AH, the authors of the translations had not given him his right to mention his news and merit, however the works he succeeded in (language, grammar, morphology, performances, rhetoric, and arithmetic) show us his scientific standing and his broad culture, that he took from every science with one end, as the man wrote his most honest translator. Al-Zanjani was a student at the hands of Ibin al-Khabbaz (637 AH), he died in the year 655 AH, leaving a great linguistic legacy that came as:

1. Tasrif Al-Izzi.
2. Al-Kafi fi Sharh Al-Hadi.
3. Mieyar Al-Nazaar fi E'lum Al-'ash'ar.
4. Al-Maznun bihi alaa ghyr 'Ahlih

Al-Zanjani was famous for his book “Tasrif Al-Izzi”, but he has a book no less important than “Al-Tasrif Al-Izzi” book (Al-Kafi fi Sharh Al-Hadi), which it is one of the important linguistic books, that included the topics of phoneme, variation, morphology, syntax and connotation, so that I found it interested in the opinions of his predecessors, following them with objection and rejection, this is a scientific approach that was followed by those who preceded it among the scholars. As this is book by Sibawayh (180 AH) the oldest author that we have reached we find that his work may follow the opinions of his teachers with criticism and objection in response to them, just as the book itself was not free of rejection and response, As Al-Mubarak (285 AH) may follow him in many issues, that we find all scholars tracking the opinions of their predecessors, correcting what was crooked by it, Al- Zanjani followed the path of the predecessors of the linguists, responding and objecting to the opinions of those who progressed.

Therefore, through this research, I try to explain the grammatical responses of Al-Zanjani to Al-Farra (207 AH) in the book “Al-Kafi fi Sharh Al-Hadi”, relying on convincing arguments and evidence for this to come out with a propos opinion. In preparing this research, I followed a methodology based on description and evaluation, as I explain the grammatical opinion of Farra, then I stand on the response of Al-Zanjani, also the research included seven grammatical issues, in which Farra had an opinion that Al-Zanjani rejected, these issues are:

#### ***The regulator of the noun after if not (لولا)***

(لولا) is a non-specific letter, if it entered with the name, then it is a letter of abstinence for the existence such as your saying: If it were not for Zaid, I would honor you, the honor abstained because of the presence of Zaid, also if it enters with the verb then it is a provocative letter like your saying: If you did not deviate from hypocrisy (see: Ibin Yaish 2001, 1/243 and Al-Suyuti 1998, 2 / 575, and Al-Quwajwi 1995, 113-1-114).

The grammarians differed regarding the regulator of the noun after if not (لولا), as the scholars from Basra went on to say that it is regular with u by the beginning, meaning that after (لولا) is primate (see: Anbari 2002, 1/60, and Al-Akbari 2011, 239). As for Kufians(scholars opinions of kufa), they have two sayings in this: One of them is the opinion of Farra that it is regular with u by (لولا), and the other is the opinion of Al-Kisaei (189 AH) that it is regulated with u by an omitted verb, meaning that what follows it is not primate (see: Farra “D. Dt”, 2/84 - 85, Al-Anbari 2002, 1/60, and Al-Akbari 2011, 239, and Ibin Yaish 2001, 5/90), Al-Zanjani mentioned al-Farra’s saying, rejecting it, as

he said: "Al-Farra said that it is regulated with u by it which it is false, because it follows the verb and the noun." Al-Jamouh said:

Imamah said, when I came to her as a visitor, "Could you throw some black arrows?"

Not let loose; I had thrown them, as had it not been determined, and no excuse for the determining (See: Al-Serafi 2008, 2/460, and Ibin Manzur 1994, 4/545) That the letter does not work unless it is specialized in one of the two types, also there is no letter in their speech that is regulated with u and not ending in open *a* (Al-Zanjani 2020, 2/168). By referring to the books of grammarians, we find that most of them claim that the name is after (لولا) regulated by the primate (see: Al-Anbari 2002, 1/60, Ibin Malik 1990, 1/283, Al-Muradi 1992, 599, Ibin Hisham 1985, 1/359, and Al-Azhari 2000, 1/224). As for the saying of Farra, they replied that it was not specialized in (لولا), as the letter does not work unless it was specialized (see: Al-Anbari 2002, 1/62, and Al-Akbari 2011, 241). The sayings of Al-Kisa'i also respond to him that you say: If it were not Zaid no Amr I would not have come to you, he will not sympathize with no (لا) after the negation (see: Al-Muradi 1992, 602, and Al-Muradi 2001, 1/173).

Ibin Malik (672 AH) had replied the two sayings together, when he said: "It was narrated on the authority of al-Farra that under the pretext of not being equal abstinence (لولا) is regulated with u the noun after it, other Kufians narrated that it is regulated with u by an implicit verb, as the two sayings are rejected; Because it entails with what is equalized, since there is no letter in speech that is regulated with u and not *ending in open a*, nor a letter that is obligated after it to be implicit to open ending, which it does not accept that which requires non-equal with a pronoun that has a counterpart" (Ibin Malik 1990, 1/283), and Al-Suyuti (911 AH ) Latif saying in (لولا): "If it was a worker, then reduced (ending in i) is more important than open ending by its specialization by the noun" (Al-Suyuti 1998, 1/394).

Ibin Malik referred to the primate which is the origin of the regular ending with u, as any place in which a regulated noun with u is found is likely to primating and otherwise, so primate is first (see: Ibin Malik 1990, 1/283-284).

### ***The regulator of the noun after the conditional if (إنّ)***

It is proven to the grammarians that the letter (إنّ) does not work unless it is specialized, and the conditional tools are competent to enter with verbs (see: Ibin Hisham "Dt", 2/79, and Al-Azhari 2000, 1/396), if after those tools, a noun comes, The Almighty says: (If one amongst the Pagans ask thee for asylum, grant it to him, so that he may hear the word of Allah; ) (Surat At-Tawbah: 6), as they exaggerated the interpretation and arbitrarily assessed until they received their origins that they had set, so the Basaris claimed that the one is an agent which was regulated (with u) by obligatory omitted verb, explained by the aforementioned verb, meaning that if someone hires you (see: Sibawayh 2006, 1/263, and al-Mubarrad "DT", 2/72, Al-Sarraaj 1996, 2/232,

Al-Anbari 2002, 2/504, Al-Akbari 1995, 2/57, Ibin Hisham "D. T", 2/79, Ibin Aqil 1964, 2/86, and Al-Azhari 2000, 1/396); as their argument in that is that it is not permissible to separate between the elision tool and the verb with a noun that is not applied to that verb, also for refraining from the presenting a noun after the conditional tools (Al-Anbari 2002, 2/504, see: Al-Akbari 1995, 2/57).

Whereas, Al-Farra went to the fact that it is regulated with u by what it returned to it from the verb without supposed the verb (see: al-Farra 1/422, and Anbari 2002, 2/504), that al-Zanjani refused that, saying: "Al-Farra claimed that someone is regulated with the return that he returned to it, which is the agent pronoun in (asylum) as he is corrupt, because at that time the word (asylum) becomes as a predicate to someone, that the speech will return as primate and predicate "(Al-Zanjani 2020, 2/193).

There is a third opinion of Al-Akhfesh (215 AH) that the name is regulated after the conditional if (إِذَا) may be expressed as a primate its predicate the sentence after it, in a condition that sentence must be a verbal one in the past tense (see: Al-Akhfesh 1990, 1/354, and Al-Akbari 1995, 57/2). This opinion was chosen by the Arabic Language Academy in Cairo for several reasons:

1. In it, it was taken in the outward appearance.
2. There is a dispensing with supposed with what the speech does not need to.
3. It is to facilitate the learners.
4. There is an analogy between the two conditionals (إِذَا) and (عِنْدَ) in such use (Al-Adaimi 2002, 98).

It seems to me that the saying of Al-Akhfesh, which was chosen by the Language Council in Cairo, is more correct, because it is to facilitate them to the learners, also to avoid us the supposed and interpretation which imposed on them by the rules that they set according to their incomplete extrapolation.

### ***The defective structure of now (الآن)***

"Now" an adverb of time for the present is based on open ending with a (al-Fateh) (see: Ibin Yaish 2001, 3/131, and Al-Zanjani 2020, 2/478), as the grammarians differed in the reason or defect for its construction, as the Basrians went that it was structured because it resembled the demonstrative noun, so if you say "you now" do you want You at this time do. As for the Kufians, they justified its construction by stating that the alf (أ) and the lam (ل) entered into a past tense from their saying: It is came at any time, as the verb remained on its open ending and this is the saying by al-Farra (see: al-Farra "D. T", 1/468, Al-Serafi 2008, 1/101, Al-Zajaji 1985, 56, and Al-Anbari 2002, 2/424, and Ibin Yaish 2001, 3/131); because the alf and the lam have the meaning of that. If I said: Now it was such-and-such. The meaning was: the time when it was such-and-such, and the alf and the lam were established as the place of which for frequent use in order to reduce, Al-Farazdaq said:

You are not with a judgment that satisfies his government, or the rhetoric, or the one with the opinion and controversy

He wanted what he is pleased with ... So is the same here now, and the verb remains on its opening. "(Al-Anbari 2002, 2 / 424-425, and see: Al-Farra" D. T, 1/468).

Al-Zanjani mentioned al-Farra's saying, rejecting it: "Al-Farra said its origin is that an action lasts from the time a thing will come when its time comes. It is said that it is time for you to do such-and-such, so when the alf and the lam came with it, he left what he had of the conquest, as it came in the hadith, forbade what was said and said, which it is corrupt because the action needs the agent, as the alf and the lam do not enter with it. "(Al-Zanjani 2020, 2/478). Al-Basrian also responded, "That the meaning of the sign is included in the status of the demonstrative noun, and it is not included by (Al-Suyuti 1998, 2/185).

When extrapolating the books of the grammarians, we find that scholars have other opinions about its construction, including an opinion of al-Mubarad (285 AH) quoted by Ibin al-Sarraj (d. 316 AH) in which he says: As for "now", Abu Al-Abbas, may God have mercy on him, said: It was structured because it occurred as definite, as it is from what was known before it was indefinite. Because if you say: Now, you mean by it the time in which you are from time, then it has nothing to associate with it, It is not time and now, so alf enters with it lam for being definite. Rather, it occurs as definite to the time you are in. "(Al-Sarraj 1996, 2/137, and see: Al-Zajari 1985, 56). That it to say, it occurred in the first conditions with tools of definite(alf with lam) so it infringes the names and semi letters, so it is built, which it is out saying, "the necessity for ritual and Laat and the like, which occurred in the first conditions of (alf and lam) and that if they were contrary to the noun of the other names obligatory for the semi-letter and maturity structure must form each name violates the names, weight or other, which it is null with all opinions. "(Al-Suyuti 1998, 2/185, and see: Al-Andalusi "d.t,"8/8)

Al-Siraafi (367 AH) has an opinion in which he says: "It was structured because when it was necessary to have one place, it resembled the semi letter, because the letters needed their places in which they were placed in their primacy, and the letters were formed; so is what is similar to them" (Al-Serafi 2008, 1/101, and see: Al-Anbari 2002 2/426, and Ibin Malik 1990, 2/219), that is, it was "structured to the semi letter in following with a single word because it does not being two or in plural, or being smaller, in contrast to "time, period and duration" (Ibin Malik 1990,2 / 219.); it was responded by saying: "A violation "now" in these things is not obligatory for semi-letter and merit structure" (Ibin Malik 1990, 2/219, see: Al-Andalusi "DT", 8/8), also it was said "now" is declined. Because it was mentioned to them (from now) in vowelized with e which it was also rejected; It is possible that the vowel e here is constructing the forming, then there are two languages in it: al-Fatih (open

ending with a) and (reducing with i ), but al-Fatih is more and more popular (Ibin Malik 1990, 2 / 219-220).

From the above, it seems to us that it is constructed rather than declined, because the advanced grammarians went to construct it, but there is no way that comes close to accepting a forming “now” with their many differences in it.

### *Deleting the status element*

The status or adverb: is “the description, the virtue, the upright, to denote the form, like: (an individual go), so (an individual) is an adverb, due to the presence of the restrictions mentioned in it” (Ibin Aqeel 1964, 2/243), as it must have a element, as if it was a verb, it is permissible to omit it if evidence indicates it, such as your saying to the purpose of the journey: travelling, which is opened ending to the travel, and your saying to the one coming from the Hajj: you were a rewarded opened end with a dip, you will return (()) See: Al-Azhari 2000, 1/614, and Al-Suyuti 1998, 2/334).

The omission of the status element came in the Almighty saying: {Does a person count because we gather his bones, but we are able to do so} (Surat Al-Qiyama: 4). Sibawayh said: “As for his words of Majesty:“ Yes we are capable, it is according to the verb that was shown, as if he said: Yes, we can gather them together ”(Sibawayh 2006, 1/346) as it is open ended for him on the status, that we gather for the indication of the verb that we agree upon, according to this statement most scholars (see: Al-Zamakhshari 1993, 93, Ibin Yaish 2008, 2/34, Andalusian "DT", 1/31, and Ibin Hisham "Dt. 2/293, Ibin Aqeel 1964, 2/283, Al-Azhari 2000, 1/614, and Al-Suyuti 1998, 2/334).

While Al-Farra went to that: its open ending with the conjunction of a verb indicated by the first verb counts, its weight: Let him count us capable, making it a second object to be counted (see: Furs "D. T", 1/171, Ibin Yaish 2001, 2/34, and Ibin Aqil 1980, 2/37). That Al-Zanjani mentioned the opinion of Al-Farra, rejecting it, so he said: “Al-Farra said: Let him know we capable, because it is indicated against him, as he is weak, because “yes” at that time it was not proven what it is denied” (Al-Zanjani 2020, 2/570), Ibin Hisham (761 AH) added another proof of the invalidity of the opinion of Al-Farra, so he said: The right thing in it is the saying of Sibawayh: “If they are able” anyway, that is, the verb of plural is closer than the verb of counting, also because (yes) is an affirmative action for the negative, which is in the verse is plural (Ibin Hisham 29/1985).

It was said: Yes, we appreciate, and they rejected it too, Ibin Yaish (d.643 AH) said: “Some of them went that their estimation is: Yes, we appreciate capable, it is also weak, because if the agent pronoun occurs as a status, it is not permissible for the verb from its pronunciation to act in it.”(Ibin Yaish 2001, 2/34).

From the aforementioned, it seems to us that the verb is capable is as status, then element in it we gather it in terms of the verb we gather, that it is not possible to estimate, so let us count for the nearest of the verb of gathering, also because (yes) is the answer to the negation, which is the verb of plural, it is not possible to estimate: because the status does not work in the verb of his pronouncement, thus it has been proven that Al-Zanjani response to Al-Farra is correct.

### *The Origin of the lam (ل) in help*

Help is “the call of someone who is relieved of distress or helps in hardship” (Al-Muradi 2001, 3/1110), then it is said: Oh, Zaid, and the scholars differed as to the lam(ل) of the help, as the majority said that it lam of the reduction and opened to the difference between the one seeking help and those seeking help for it, then they differed about it, some said that it is an extra, and others said that it is not an extra, so it relates to the omitted verb, according to Sibawayh (180 AH), with the letter of the call, according to the opinion of Ibin Jinni (392 AH).

Whereas the Kufians went on to state that it is the rest of the family, the original of Oh, Zaid is Oh, family of Zaid:, and Zaid is reduced in addition, then the Hamza of (أل) for mitigation then it was removed meet two quiescence (see: Al-Muradi 1992, 104, Al-Muradi 2001, 3/1113, and Ibin Hisham 198, 2 / 289).

Al-Zanjani attributed the words of the Kufians to Al-Farra, who objected to it, so he said: Al-Farra claimed that there is an origin to O Zaid, O family of Zaid, so the Hamza and the Alef were omitted, so it became Oh, Zaid which it is false; By saying: Oh, if it was as he claimed, its origin would have been: Oh, The one who is added to the addressee may not be called upon "(Al-Zanjani 2020, 651/2).

He also rejected the saying of al-Farra, Ibin Ya'ish, as he said: “Al-Farra said: The origin of “ Oh, someone ”: “ Oh, family of someone, ”but it was reduced by deletion, which it is weak, because “ the family ”and “ relatives ”are one, if the origin was what he mentioned, it is permissible for the parents to fall into some use, which did not want that, so know it ”(Ibin Yaish 2001, 1/325).

The truth is that Al-Farra did not say that. Rather, this saying was quoted from some of them, when it was come: “Al-Farra narrated that some people claim that the lam is in (Oh, Zaid) and the likes of it are not reducing lam (ل) , rather it was the remains of (أل), so the apparent story of his story is that he is not the doctrine of the Kufians, that he does not say that, because he is one of the heads of the Kufians ”(Al-Andalusi 1998, 4 / 2213-2214).

### *The invariables (Yanbot) and (Yarbo'a)*

The prohibited from variation is what the modulation does not enter and is reducing to the a vowel, that there must be two causes of nine reasons or a cause that takes their place in order to prevent the name from being varied, among those reasons is that the noun if it was on the weight of the verb then it is prevented from variability like, Ahmed, thanks for the scientific and the weight of the verb (Ibin Aqeel 1964, 3/321).

As for (Yanbot and yerboa), the majority went to their variables (see: Sibawayh 2006, 3/199-200, and Al-Mubarad "DT", 4/18, and Al-Serafi 2008, 3/468, and Ibin Jini 1960, 1/128). Sibawayh said: "you must Know that every noun was in the beginning of an appendix and was not in the form of a verb, for it is a variable, that is towards: (Aslaitin, islubin, ta'dwad, yanbot, ) likewise this example if you derived it from the verb like in (yadrobin, Adreebin, tadreeb), because this is neither a verb nor a noun like a verb, it is not like Omar. Do you not see that you vary yarboa`, if it was yadroob in a similar manner of yadrib, you would not have varied it? "(Sibawayh 2006, 3/199-200), Al-Zajaj (311 AH) said: "if you are called a man with an increase in the beginning that similar an increase in the verb, it does not on the weight of the verb that was varied it, that is like, yasoob, ta'dwad, yarbo'a ... then this is an variables, because it is not based on the weight of the verb" (Al-Zajaj 1971, 19), as the reason for their variability is that they were not on the verb weights.

Al-Zanjani attributed a word to Al-Farra, in which he goes to vary them, rejecting it, so he said: "if it is called as a yanboot which is trees, yerboa and the like, it varied to contradict the weight of the verb, Al-Farra said: it does not as a variable and believes that the waw (و) was generated from the satisfaction of the vowel ... and it is weak; Because the verb pronouncement is vanish in any case, as for the poet's statement (Al-Razz without attribution: Al-Maari 2003, 114):

Bani yarbo`, the owners of the grill  
Some people fulfill the stems with semen  
He who drinks semen conceives a child  
There is no excuse for him in it because he wants yarbo' the tribe(Zanjani 2020, 1/147 - 148)

I did not recognize the words of Al-Farra in its meanings or in the books of scholars as I read, then if this statement about Farra was correct, then the Zanjani would have been right in his objection, as the word (yarboa') appeared in Arabic poetry. The poet said:

People who asked, knightes of yarboa, with our strength, people saw us at the bottom of the bottom that was duller  
(the verse by Zaid al-Khail, see: Zaid al-Khail, "Dt", 100).

Moreover, scholars are unanimously agreed on the variables of such nouns, because they are not based on the weight of the verb.



### *Saying (إن) after Maa (ما) is extra or negation tool*

It has been proven among the public that if (إن) is after what is added to confirm the negation, such as your saying: As soon as you saw Zaid, once Zaid is standing, then entering (إن) here confirms the meaning of negation (see: Al-Zamakhshari 1993, 423, and Ibin Yaish 2001, 5/64), and from it the saying Poet :

(ما إن رأيت ولا سمعت به كالיום هاني أيق جرب)

As soon as I saw and did not hear about it like today, Hanai Ainq, a disease (The verse by Duraid Bin Al-Samah, see: Duraid Bin Al-Samah 2009, 43)

The evidence for its increase is: "Its entry is like its exit, because there is no difference in the meaning between saying the saying (as soon as Zaid is standing) and (Zaid just standing), so when its exit was the same as its entry, it was given the status of (from) after negation, the Almighty also said: There is no god for you other than Him ((Al-A'raf: 59) that is, you have no god but him "(Al-Anbari 2002, 2/525).

Whereas we find that al-Farra went to the two negation letters that are interchangeably denied as a literal synonym for asserting that Zaid is standing (see: Al-Zamakhshari 1993, 423, and Ibin Yaish 2001, 5/64), al-Farra said: "So it was combined between what (ما) and if (إن), which are two denials. From the other "(Al-Farra" DT ", 3/85) so (if) that he means is as a negation tool.

Al-Zanjani refused the saying of Al-Farra, so he said in response to him: "Al-Farra went to the point that (if) is not extra, rather it is for negation, as synonyms of negation over negation, exaggeration and affirmation to it, that the lam also coincided with an affirmation of the affirmation in your saying: Zaid exists, as this is corrupt, because if (what, and if) tools of negative, the meaning will not be reflected in the positive, because if the negation enters into negation it becomes positive "(Al-Zanjani 2020, 1/832).

It was said that: " if (إن) associated with what (ما) is the negation tool, it was placed after (what) for confirming "(Al-Azhari 2000, 1/261) it was responded by saying: "The Arabs have used the extra (if) after: (what) is the nominative and literal conjunctive because it is similar in the pronunciation to what (ما) the tool of negation, so if the if (إن) that associated with what (ما) the extra tool of negation, then its increase after the two connected ones is not justified "(Al-Azhari 2000, 1/261), accordingly it appears the strength of the Al-Zanjani's response to Al-Farra, according to the rule of negation of negation is positive.

### **THE CONCLUSION**

At the end of each research, the findings of the researcher must be presented, the most important of these results are:

1. Al-Zanjani is from al-Basri doctrine, as he followed the Basrians in his responses to Al-Farra.
2. Al-Zanjani was successful in most of his responses to al-Farra, with his strong arguments and proofs and sound rules.
- 3-Al- Zanjani lineage an opinion of al-Farra, rejecting it, which it is not to vary (yanboot and yarbo'), as this has not been proven in its meanings or among other scholars.
4. The research proved that the lam (ل) in (Oh, Zaid) originally (Oh, family of Zaid) was not said by Al-Farra, but rather was transmitted by some of them.

## RESEARCH RESOURCES

### *The Holy Quran*

- Al-Adaimi, Khalid bin Saud bin Faris, The Grammatical and Morphological Decisions of the Arabic Language Academy in Cairo, Collection, Study and Evaluation, House of Palmyra, Saudi Arabia, Edition 1, 1423 AH - 2002 AD.
- Al-Akbari, Abu Al-stay (616 AH), explaining the doctrines of the Basri and Kufian grammarians, under: Abdul Rahman Suleiman Al-Uthaimin, The Lebanese House, Beirut - Lebanon, 1st Edition, 1433 AH - 2011 AD
- Al-Akbari, Abu Al-stay Abdullah bin Al-Hussein (616 A.H.), Al-Lubab in the ills of construction and parsing, under: Abdul Ilah Al-Nabhan, 1st Edition, Dar Al-Fikr, Damascus, 1416 A.H. 1995 A.D.
- Al-Akhfesh, Abu Al-Hasan (215 AH), The Meanings of the Qur'an, U: Dr. Hoda Mahmoud Qaraa, Al-Khanji Library, Cairo, 1st Edition, 1411 AH - 1990 AD.
- Al-Anbari, Abu Al-Barakat (577 AH), fairness in matters of disagreement between the Basrian and Kufian grammarians, under: Judah Mabrouk Muhammad Mabrouk, Al-Khanji Library in Cairo, 1st Edition, 2002 AD.
- Al-Andalusi, Abu Hayyan (745 A.H.), Appendix and Complementation in Explanation of the Book of Facilitation, Under: Hassan Hindawi, Dar Al-Qalam - Damascus, (d. T).
- Al-Andalusi, Abu Hayyan (745 AH), sucking beating from the tongue of the Arabs, under: Rajab Othman Muhammad, Al-Khanji Library, Cairo, 1st Edition, 1418 AH - 1998 AD.
- Al-Azhari, Khaled Abdullah (905 AH), Explanation of the statement on the clarification, under: Muhammad Basil Uyun Al-Soud, House of Scientific Books, Beirut - Lebanon, 1st ed., 1421 AH - 2000 AD.
- Al-Farra, Abu Zakaria Yahya Bin Ziyad (207 AH), The Meanings of the Qur'an, Under: Ahmed Youssef Najati, Muhammad Ali Al-Najjar, and Abdel-Fattah Ismail Shalabi, Dar Al-Masria for Authorship and Publishing, Egypt, 1 ed.
- Al-Maari, Abu Al-Alaa (d. 449 AH), The Message of the Angels, under: Abdul Aziz Al-Maymani, Dar Al-Kotob Al-Alami - Beirut / Lebanon, 1st Edition, 1424 AH - 2003 AD.

- Al-Mouradi, Al-Hassan bin Qasim (d.749 AH), Clarification of the Purposes and Paths with the Explanation of the Millennium Ibin Malik, under: Abd al-Rahman Ali Suleiman, House of Arab Thought, Cairo, 1st Edition, 1422 AH - 2001 AD.
- Al-Mubarak, Abu Al-Abbas Muhammad Bin Yazid (285 AH), Al-Muqtaseb, Under: Muhammad Abdul-Khaleq Adima, The World of Books, Beirut, (D.T).
- Al-Muradi, Abu Muhammad Badr al-Din al-Hasan Ibin al-Qasim (d.749 AH), the proximal jana in the letters of the meanings, under: Fakhr al-Din Qabawa, and Muhammad Nadim Fadel, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut - Lebanon, 1st ed., 1413 AH - 1992 AD.
- Al-Quwajwi, Muhammad bin Mustafa (950 AH), Explanation of the Grammar of Parsing by Ibin Hisham, Under: Ismail Marwa, House of Contemporary Thought (Beirut - Lebanon), Edition 1, 1416 AH - 1995 AD.
- Al-Sarraj, Abu Bakr Muhammad Bin Sahl (316 AH), Al-Usul in grammar, under: Abdul-Hussein Al-Fattli, Al-Risala Foundation, Lebanon - Beirut, 3rd Edition, 1417 AH - 1996 AD.
- Al-Serafi, Abu Saeed Al-Hassan bin Abdullah bin Al-Marzban (368 AH), Explanation of the Book of Sibawayh, Under: Ahmad Hassan Mahdali and Ali Syed Ali, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut - Lebanon, 1st ed.
- Al-Suyuti, Jalal al-Din Abd al-Rahman bin Abi Bakr (911 AH), Hama al-Hawamah in explaining the collection of mosques), under: Ahmad Shams al-Din, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut - Lebanon, 1st ed.
- Al-Zaji, Abu Al-Qasim Abdul-Rahman bin Ishaq, (337 AH), Al-Llalat, under: Mazen Al-Mubarak, Dar Al-Fikr - Damascus, 2nd ed., 1405 AH, 1985 AD.
- Al-Zajaj, Abu Ishaq (311 AH), What goes and does not go, Under: Hoda Mahmoud Qaraa, Cairo, 1391 AH - 1971 CE.
- Al-Zamakhshari, Jarallah Abu Al-Qasim Mahmoud bin Omar (538 AH), the detailed work of the parsing, under: Ali Abu Melhem, Al-Hilal Library - Beirut, 1st Edition, 1993.
- Al-Zanjani, Abu al-Maali Izz al-Din Abd al-Wahhab bin Ibrahim (655 AH), al-Kafi in Sharh al-Hadi, U: Mahmoud Fajal and Anas Mahmoud Fajal, Dar al-Nur al-Mubin, Amman - Jordan, 2020 AD.
- Farea, Muti` Ghanem, Ibin Malik's Responses to the Grammarians, Al-Yazouri Science House, 1st Edition, 2014 AD.
- Ibin Aqil, Bahaa Al-Din Abdullah (769 AH), assistant in explaining the facilitation, under: Muhammad Kamel Barakat, Dar Al-Fikr, Damascus, 1400 AH - 1980 AD.
- Ibin Aqil, Bahaa Al-Din Abdullah (769 AH), Ibin Aqil's explanation of Alfiyeh Ibin Malik, Dar Al Turath Library, Cairo, 14 ed., 1384 AH - 1964 AD.
- Ibin Hisham, Jamal al-Din Abdullah (761 AH), Mughni al-Labib, on the books of Al-A'rib, under: Mazen Al-Mubarak, and Muhammad Ali Hamdallah, Dar Al-Fikr - Damascus, 6th Edition, 1985.

- Ibn Hisham, Jamal al-Din Abdullah bin Yusuf (761 AH), explained the paths to the millennium Ibn Malik, under: Yusuf al-Sheikh Muhammad al-Buqai, Dar al-Fikr for Printing and Publishing, Beirut,
- Ibn Jini, Abu Al-Fath Othman (392 AH), Al-Munsif, U: Ibrahim Mustafa and Abdullah Amin, House of Revival of the Old Heritage, 1st Edition, 1379 AH - 1960 AD.
- Ibn Malik, Jamal al-Din Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Abdullah al-Ta'i al-Andalusi (672 AH), Sharh al-Tasheel, under: Abd al-Rahman al-Sayid and Muhammad Badawi al-Mukhtoon, Hajar for printing and publishing, Egypt, ed.
- Ibn Manzur, Abu al-Fadl Jamal al-Din Muhammad bin Makram (711 AH), Lisan al-Arab, Dar Sader - Beirut, 3rd Edition, 1414 AH - 1994 AD.
- Ibn Yaish, Muwafak al-Din Abu al-Baqi', Ya'ish bin Ali bin Ya'ish al-Mawsili (643 AH), detailed explanation by al-Zamakhshari, under: Emil Badi Ya'qub, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut - Lebanon, 1st ed., 1422 AH - 2001 AD.
- Sibawayh, Abu Bishr Amr bin Othman bin Qanbar (180 AH), Book of Sibawayh, under: Abd al-Salam Harun, Al-Khanji Library - Cairo, 3rd Edition, 1427 AH - 2006 AD.
- Zaid Al-Khail, The Court of Zaid Al-Khail, Under: Nuri Hammoudi Al-Qaisi, Al-Nu'man Press, Al-Najaf Al-Ashraf, (Dr. T).
- Duraïd Ibn Al-Sama, Diwan of Duraïd Ibn Al-Samah, Under: Omar Abdel-Rasoul, Dar Al-Ma'arif - Cairo, 2009 AD.
- The Holy Quran.
- [Kallami@uowasit.edu.iq](mailto:Kallami@uowasit.edu.iq)