

Agreements of Yahya bin Hamza Al-Alawi (d. 749 AH) with Al-Zamakhshari (d. 538 AH) in his book Al-Azhar Al- Safiya in explaining the Muqaddima Al-Kafiya

Sondos Ahmed Mohammed Al-Saadi¹, Dr. Abdullah Ahmed Hamza Al-
Nahari²

¹Researcher, Faculty of Education - Sana'a University – Yemen,
Sondos.alsasdi93@gmail.com

²Professor of Grammar and Morphology at Sana'a University, abdull.alnahari2@gmail.com

Abstract

The importance of this topic is manifested in its highlighting a facet of grammatical opinions in Arabic grammar that some grammarians uniquely held. It also showcases the critical personality that these grammarians possessed, which enabled them to present new views, even if they contradicted the grammatical school to which they belonged. An example of this is Al-Zamakhshari, whose grammatical opinions were recognized by Al-Alawi for their quality and precision, making them worthy of support. This led Al-Alawi to agree with Al-Zamakhshari, even if those opinions contradicted what many grammarians stated. Al-Alawi provided evidence that reinforced these opinions and opposed those who disagreed with them—by weakening or disapproving of them—and justified their incorrectness or deviation from the truth. Therefore, studying this topic in the context of Imam Al-Alawi highlights a part of the Yemeni grammatical heritage and the contribution of Yemeni grammarians to the maturation of Arabic grammar, as the opinions presented by Al-Alawi in agreement with Al-Zamakhshari and his rebuttals to other grammarians represent a rich intellectual resource and a scientific tributary for Arabic grammar.

The research on this topic began with an introduction, followed by a prelude, then issues of agreement between Al-Alawi and Al-Zamakhshari, concluding with a conclusion.

The introduction included a definition of the topic, its importance, how it is divided, and the methodology used in its study.

The prelude addressed the definitions of Imam Al-Alawi and Al-Zamakhshari, as well as the book "Al-Azhar Al-Safiya." Following that were the issues in which Al-Alawi agreed with Al-Zamakhshari, totaling sixteen issues.

The methodology used in studying all these issues was a descriptive approach based on tracing the phenomenon in its contexts, gathering, describing, arranging, discussing, and assigning a suitable title to each issue.

The conclusion included the most significant findings revealed by the research, among which

are:

1. Al-Alawi agreed with Al-Zamakhshari on sixteen points, and he expressed approval for his viewpoint on those points, characterizing it as the most probable, the best, the excellent, the correct, or the most in line with Arabic principles and grammatical parallels.
2. Al-Alawi often justifies the statement he chooses, explaining the reason for choosing it, strengthening it and gathering evidence for it from hearing and analogy, rejecting other statements that oppose it, and explaining their invalidity and the reason for their corruption.

Keywords: Al-Alawi - Al-Zamakhshari - agreement.

1. Introduction

Glory to God, the Almighty, and blessings and tranquility be upon the leader of the prophets and messengers, Muhammad ibn Abdullah, the honest and reliable, as well as his family, who are pure and moral, and his blessed and upright companions. May they all continue to follow him in righteousness until the Day of Judgment.

Now then:

It is clear that the multiplicity of grammatical positions on the same issue, whether in agreement and support or disagreement and objection, has been – and still is – one of the reasons for the maturation of this science, and a motivation to research its foundations and expand the perspective and contemplation on its evidence, issues, rulings, and analogies. At the level of a single grammatical school, we find that viewpoints vary on the same issue, and grammatical positions differ between agreement and support, and rejection, objection, and refutation. This phenomenon has continued to enrich Arabic grammar with intellectual wealth, providing it with a variety of grammatical viewpoints.

Among the grammarians who had varying stances, ranging from agreement to disagreement and objection, was Imam Yahya bin Hamza Al-Alawi in his book "Al-Azhar Al-Safiya." He had notable positions on the opinions of some grammarians who preceded him, such as Ibn Babshadh, Ibn Al-Sayyid Al-Batalyusi, Al-Zamakhshari, Ibn Al-Hajib, Al-Radhi, and others. However, Al-Zamakhshari was the most prominent among them in Al-Alawi's grammatical discussions in the mentioned book, as Al-Alawi took a supportive stance towards his opinion while objecting to those who disagreed with him, which draws the reader's attention and encourages them to explore the points of agreement between them. Hence, the choice was made to study the agreements of Imam Al-Alawi with Al-Zamakhshari in his book "Al-Azhar Al-Safiya" as a model that clarifies how Al-Alawi dealt with the opinions of those who preceded him and presented the evidence supporting the correctness of what he agreed with them on.

The importance of this topic is manifested in its highlighting of a facet of grammatical opinions in Arabic grammar that some grammarians uniquely contributed to. It also showcases the critical character that these grammarians possessed, through which they were able to present new

opinions, even if they contradicted the grammatical school to which they belonged. An example of this is Al-Zamakhshari, whose grammatical views were recognized by Al-Alawi for their quality and precision, making them worthy of support. This led Al-Alawi to agree with Al-Zamakhshari, even if those views contradicted what many grammarians said. Al-Alawi provided evidence to strengthen them, opposing differing opinions and justifying their incorrectness. Therefore, studying this topic in the context of Imam Al-Alawi highlights a facet of Yemeni grammatical heritage and the contribution of Yemeni grammarians to the maturation of Arabic grammar, as the opinions presented by Al-Alawi in his agreement with Al-Zamakhshari and his responses to other grammarians represent a rich intellectual resource and a scientific tributary for Arabic grammar.

The research on this topic begins with an introduction, followed by a preface, then the issues of agreement between Al-Alawi and Al-Zamakhshari, and concludes with a conclusion.

As for the introduction, it includes a definition of the topic, its importance, how it is divided, and the methodology followed in its study.

The preface discusses the definitions of Imam Al-Alawi, Al-Zamakhshari, and the book "Al-Azhar Al-Safiya," while the issues in which Al-Alawi agreed with Al-Zamakhshari follow, totaling sixteen issues.

The methodology used in studying all these issues is a descriptive approach based on tracking the phenomenon in its contexts, gathering, describing, organizing, discussing, and assigning a suitable title to each issue.

As for the conclusion, it included the most prominent results revealed by the research. We have exerted our utmost effort and ability in this research; if we have succeeded, it is a grace and favor from God, the Exalted. And if not, that is the nature of human effort—shortcomings, deficiencies, and errors. It suffices us that we have made the effort and exerted our ability.

2. Preface

Introduction to Al-Alawi, Al-Zamakhshari, and the book Al-Azhar Al-Safi.

First: Imam Al-Alawi:

The person in question is Imam Yahya bin Hamza bin Ali bin Ibrahim bin Yousef bin Ali bin Ibrahim bin Muhammad bin Idris Al-Hussaini Al-Alawi. In 669 AH, he was born in Sana'a and then relocated to Hawth. He has a penchant for justice, a clean tongue, and a sound heart. He is regarded as one of Yemen's best Zaidi intellectuals. One of the righteous and austere imams in this world, he took up the imamate and was well-known for responding to the summons. (al-Shawkani, 2006 AD, 1/885. al-Zarkali, 2002 AD, 8/143. Kahala, d/t, 13/195. Al-Saraji, 2019 AD, pp. 9-11)

Many sheiks in Sana'a and Hawth taught him the sciences and other knowledge. These sheiks included Imam Yahya bin Muhammad Al-Saraji, Imam Mutahhar bin Yahya and his son Muhammad bin Mutahhar, Sheikh Muhammad Khalifa, who studied with him in Hawth, Ali bin

Salman Al-Basir, Muhammad bin Al-Hussein Al-Isfahani, who also studied research with him, Amer bin Zaid Al-Samah, Ibn Atiyah, and the jurist Hamza bin Ali Al-Faqih, who is among those who authorized him. (Al-Saraji, 2019 AD, p27)

Several students studied under him and took from him, including the scholar Al-Mutahhar bin Tarik, who read his research, the jurist Ahmed bin Suleiman Al-Awzari, and the jurist Hassan bin Muhammad Al-Nahwi, who authorized him (Al-Intisar), as he authorized his two sons Abdullah and Idris, and many others. (Al-Saraji, 2019 AD, p28) As for his works, it was said that the notebooks of his works exceeded the number of days of his life, as he classified in many arts, so he classified in the principles of religion: Al-Shamel, Nihayat Al-Wusul ila Ilm Al-Usul, and Al-Tamhid li Ulum Al-Adl wa Al-Tawhid, and the principles of jurisprudence: Al-Hawi, and in grammar: Al-Iqtisad, and Al-Hasir li-Fawa'id Muqaddimah Tahir, and Al-Minhaj, and Al-Muhassal fi Kashf Asrar Al-Mufasssal, and in rhetoric: Al-Taraz containing the secrets of rhetoric and the sciences of the facts of the miracle, and Al-Ijaz li-Asrar Kitab Al-Taraz, and Al-Idah li-Maani Al-Miftah. He has other works on other topics, including The Ring of the Dove in the discussions of the Imamate, the Bright Dibaj in explaining Nahj al-Balagha by al-Radhi, and the Shining Answer in the Purification of the Creator, and others.(al-Shawkani, 2006 AD, 1/886,887. al-Zarkali, 2002 AD, 8/143, 144. Kahala, d/t, 13/195)

He died on the 29th of Ramadan, in the year 749 AH, in the fortress of Haran, west of Dhama. (al-Zarkali, 2002 AD, 8/143. Kahala, d/t, 13/195. Al-Saraji, 2019 AD, p218)

Second: Imam Al-Zamakhshari:

Born in Zamakhshar, one of Khwarazm's villages, in the year 497 AH, he is Jar Allah Abu Al-Qasim Mahmoud bin Omar bin Muhammad bin Ahmed Al-Khwarizmi Al-Zamakhshari. After hearing the hadith and studying law in Baghdad, he moved to Mecca and settled there, earning the moniker Jar Allah. He was an interpreter, hadith scholar, theologian, grammarian, linguist, rhetorician, poet, writer, and a participant in several sciences. He was also a vastly knowledgeable, extremely intelligent, and witty person who openly declared his belief in the Mu'tazilite school of thought. He is one of the well-known imams of knowledge who combined many sciences. (al-Anbari, 1998 AD, 1/ 338, 339. ibn Khalkan, 1978 AD, 5/ 168. al-Suyuti, 1979 AD, 2/ 27. al-Zarkali, 2002 AD, 7/ 178. Kahala, d/t, 12/187. Al-Afghani, d/t, 1/137. Al-Tantawi, d/t, 1/204, 205)

He took knowledge and literature from a group of scholars, such as Abu Al-Hasan Ali bin Al-Muzaffar Al-Naysaburi, and Abu Mudar Al-Isfahani, and he heard from Abu Saad Al-Shafani, and Sheikh Al-Islam Abu Mansour Al-Harithi, and others. (al-Suyuti, 1979 AD, 2/ 279) Several students of knowledge studied under him, took from him, and read to him, as people used to visit him while he was in Mecca, close to the Sacred House of God. Among those who studied under him and read to him were Ali bin Hamza bin Wahas, and Ali bin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Harun, who studied literature with him and became his greatest companion. Muhammad bin Abi Al-Qasim Baijok, Yaqoub bin Ali bin Muhammad bin Jaafar, and others also studied language and grammar from him. (al-Hamawi, 1993 AD, (4/1832), (5/1961), (6/2618), (6/2844))

He was a writer in several arts, sciences, and disciplines. Al-Kashshaf is found in interpretation, as well as in the peculiar hadith Al-Faiq, grammar Al-Mufasssal, Al-Anmouz, Samim Al-Arabiya, and Sharh Abiat Al-Kitab; proverbs Al-Maqamat and Al-Mustaqa; prosody Al-Qistas; language Asas Al-Balagha; literature and letters: Rabi' Al-Abraar, Atwaq Al-Dhahab, Al-Kalim Al-Nawabigh, and Muqaddimah Al-Adab; and Ajab Al-Ajab in Sharh Lamiyat Al-Arab, and Diwan Al-Rasa'il, among others. Commentators have taken notice of his writings, particularly the widely acclaimed novel Al-Mufasssal, which has led to a rise in the number of commentary on it. (ibn Khalkan, 1978 AD, 5/ 168. al-Zarkali, 2002 AD, 7/ 178. Al-Afghani, d/t, 1/ 137)

He died on the night of Arafah in the year 538 AH in Gorgan Khwarazm after his return from Mecca ..(ibn Khalkan, 1978 AD, 5/ 173)

Third: The Book of Pure Flowers:

Ibn Al-Hajib's (d. 646 AH) Kafiyya Introduction is explained in this book by Imam Al-Alawi. Up until recently, it was only available in manuscript form. However, God made it possible for someone to study it for two doctoral theses at Al-Azhar University: Dr. Abdul Hamid Mustafa Al-Sayyid, who studied the second part in 1979 AD, and Dr. Muhammad Ali Salem Al-Atawneh, who studied the first part in 1982 AD. (al-Zumar, 2008 AD. Pp. 441, 446.)

Drs. Sharif Abdul Karim Muhammad Al-Najjar and Ali Muhammad Ahmad Al-Shahri then looked into it and offered their comments. The first edition of their study was released in four volumes by Dar Al-Salem Press in Cairo in the year (1444 AH - 2023 AD). We base our analysis on this inquiry in its most recent version.

It appears from reading this book that Imam Yahya bin Hamza Al-Alawi tried to follow a disciplined methodology in presenting its topics, and this is not strange; because the classification in the eighth century in which Al-Alawi lived had risen and taken on a methodological character, and therefore the book Al-Azhar Al-Safiyya came according to a distinctive methodology based on chapters, topics and demands, and he - often - concluded each chapter or topic with issues specific to it, then explained them in a comprehensive explanation. He also explained his issues in general, mentioned the opinions of grammarians on them, commented on them either by agreement or objection, and provided justifications that would support the judgment he reached in them and the conviction on which his opinion settled.

The Holy Quran, Quranic readings, prophetic hadiths, poetry passages, well-known sayings, and several proverbs were among the evidence used in this work. He followed a particular methodology when citing this evidence, sometimes bringing them up after the issue and the comments made about it to bolster his position, and other times bringing them up in the body of the issue or citing them in opposition to being used as evidence for the issue if they are interpretive.

Even though the grammar of Ibn al-Hajib's Kafiya is explained in this book, Imam al-Alawi's encyclopedic nature forced itself during the explanation. As a result, he touched on additional morphological and doctrinal issues without deviating from his main point and instead mentioned a summary of them before referring to his other explanations in which he discussed these issues in-depth.

We will suffice with this summary of the book, as its purpose is to put the reader in a position of knowledge and awareness of what we are about to research and delve into its folds.

Issues in which Al-Alawi Al-Zamakhshari agreed

In his work Al-Azhar Al-Safiyya, Al-Alawi agreed with Al-Zamakhshari on several points. As will be evident from the presentation of the sixteen issues in this chapter, which we present as follows, Al-Alawi expressed this agreement in several ways. He did so by using specific phrases that indicate his choice of Al-Zamakhshari's opinion, or his approval and approval of it. For example, he described it as the most likely, the closest, the best, or the good, or praised it for its many subtleties and rhetorical aspects. He also dedicated himself to defending his opinion by outlining its aspects and arguments, thus negating the opinion of the one who objected to it.

1. A Methodology that divides the book into chapters:

It is known that the methodology in grammatical composition went through stages of growth, maturity, and development, and took many forms of division and arrangement, among which was the division according to the parts of the word: noun, verb, and particle. This is the methodology that appeared clearly in the book (Al-Mufasssal) by Al-Zamakhshari, who divided it into four parts. (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, p. 32)

The first is for nouns, the second for verbs, the third for letters, and the fourth for what is common between nouns and verbs. This methodology of the division had appeared before him in Ibn Babshadh in his book (Al-Muqaddimah Al-Muhsaba), but it was not as disciplined as it was in Al-Zamakhshari in terms of arranging the material under those chapters, as he divided it into ten chapters arranged as follows: (bin Babshadh, 1977 AD, p. 93)

The noun, the verb, the letter, the nominative, the accusative, the genitive, the jussive, the factor, the dependent, and the handwriting. Then he mentioned the issues under those chapters according to their type.

Al-Alawi also followed this methodology in his book (Al-Azhar Al-Safiyya), and praised it in his discussion of the methodology of grammatical composition among the ancients and moderns, and preferred it over other things for two reasons, so he said: "As for the first because if the chapters were limited and collected, they would be easier for the reader, easier for the student, more comprehensive for his mind, and easier for his memorization of them than if they were scattered and dispersed, not limited, and not disciplined.

As for the second, because if it is of this description in confinement, it is more appropriate for grammatical rules, and is conducted on the standard principles from all its divergences, and its scattered parts; for this reason, it was the best in presenting it, and it is the most amazing method in classification, and the best rule in composition, and hardly anyone engages in it except the wise among the people of ingenuity from the people of every science; because of what is in it of further revelation, and clarification of the intended meaning." (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 1/ 19, 20)

2. The grammatical position of the (singular word) within the definition of the word:

If the i'rab is a branch of meaning, then changing the i'rab vowel requires changing the meaning of the sentence or creating a variety of possible interpretations. This is what we find when we

look at the arab of the word (mufarid) from Ibn al-Hajib's definition, which states: "The word: a word that was placed for a single meaning, and it is: a noun, a verb, and a letter" (ibn al-Hajib, 1997 AD, 1/214), so the word (mufarid) here may be accusative as an attribute of (meaning), and nominative as an attribute of (word), and this results in a difference in meaning in each aspect, which is what al-Zamakhshari had taken precautions against before him by making it an attribute of (meaning), without any possibility in it, so he said: "The word is the word that indicates a single meaning by placement" (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, p. 32). Al-Alawi approved of this precaution from Al-Zamakhshari by making it an adjective for the word (meaning) without possibility, and he saw it as obligatory for two reasons, so he said: "As for the first, because the word has the right to be subordinate to the meaning, so if we describe the meaning with the singular, the word will be following it, and subordinate to it, so it is as if he said: The word is a singular word that was placed for a singular meaning, but he dispensed with one of them for the other. As for the second, because if we made it an adjective for his saying: (word), then there would be a separation between the adjective and its described without need, and it is not desirable; therefore, it must be in the genitive case, an adjective for the meaning." (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 1/ 29, 30)

Al-Alawi accepted what Al-Zamakhshari proposed in this way because he eliminated the other possibility and confirmed the genitive case alone. He also made the word (singular) an adjective (for meaning), rather than dividing it into the adjective and the described with a separator as Ibn Al-Hajib's definition does.

3. An Object that does not have a specific subject:

Al-Zamakhshari was content to define the factor to encompass what it replaces rather than specifically mentioning the factor's deputy. As a result, he stated in his definition: "The factor is that to which the predicate of an action or something similar is always placed before it" (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, p. 44) While Ibn al-Hajib singled it out in the definition; to distinguish it from the factor, so he said about it: "The object of what its factor is not named: every object whose factor is omitted and is taken in its place". (ibn al-Hajib, 1997 AD, 1/348)

Al-Alawi agreed with al-Zamakhshari in that and described his opinion as being more correct, so he said: "As for al-Zamakhshari, he did not single it out in mention because it is included in his view under the essence of the factor, and what al-Zamakhshari said is more correct; because the name of what its factor is not named agrees with the factor in what its factor is named in all grammatical rules, so there is no need to single it out in mention". (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 1/ 214)

The person who considers this problem discovers that the noun whose factor is not named (the factor's deputy) does not differ significantly from the factor in any grammatical rule. Therefore, combining them in a single definition is beneficial for classification, as there is no reason to define them separately if they share the same rules.

4. The factor in the subject and predicate:

Scholars have approached the question of what constitutes the factor in the subject and predicate in a variety of ways. The most common view is that both the subject and the predicate are elevated, which is what Sibawayh, Al-Mubarrad, and most Basrans advocate. When Al-

Zamakhshari selected it, he said: “The subject and predicate are the two nouns that are stripped of the predicate, such as when you say: Zaid is leaving. What is meant by stripping is that they are devoid of the factors that are “kana,” “inna,” and “hasabat” and their sisters, because if they are not devoid of them, they will be manipulated and the decision will be forced upon them to be raised. The condition for stripping is that it be for the sake of the predicate because if they were stripped not for the predicate, they would be like the sounds that are right to be croaked with, not inflected because inflection is not deserved except after the contract and composition. And their being stripped for the predicate is their raiser, because it is a meaning that has taken them together in one approach, in that the predicate cannot be achieved without two parties, a predicate and a predicate to it”. (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, p.47- 48)

"What is chosen by us is what the majority of Basra grammarians relied on, and al-Zamakhshari, al-Maghribi, al-Mawsili, and others chose, and the author's words indicate that the factor in both of them is the beginning, and its reality is based on considering two matters: one of them is abstraction from verbal factors," said Al-Alawi, who in turn cited the opinions of al-Zamakhshari and other grammarians. The second is the attribution, wherein one is said to have originated from the other. The actuality of the beginning is called into question if one of these two issues is proven false. (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 1/ 227)

5. Deleting the predicate of “la” to negate the gender:

One of the rules of the predicate of la that negates the genus is its deletion. This deletion is permissible according to the Hijazis if there is evidence for it, and obligatory according to the Tamims. (al-Radhi, 1996 AD, 1/292) Ibn Aqil said: “If there is evidence for the predicate of la that negates the genus, it must be deleted according to the Tamims and Ta’is, and its deletion is common among the Hijazis. An example of this is when someone says: Is there a man standing? So you say: No man, and you delete the predicate, which is (standing), obligatorily according to the Tamims and Ta’is, and permissibly according to the Hijazis” (ibn Aqil, 1980 AD, 2/5)

It is known from the fact that Al-Zamakhshari and others did not take into consideration the condition of proof for it or its absence, that the predicate of (la) is not established in their language at all. They have declared this deletion in the language of Tamim. Says Al-Zamakhshari: “The Hijazis often delete it, and they say: No family, no money, no problems, no youth... and Banu Tamim do not establish it in their speech at all”. (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, p. 55) Al-Jazuli said: “The Banu Tamim do not utter its news unless it is Zarf” (al-Jazuli, d/t, pp. 220-221)

Ibn al-Hajib said: “The Banu Tamim do not confirm it”. (ibn al-Hajib, 1997 AD, 1/383) This is what prompted al-Andalusi to criticize them for what al-Radi narrated from him, as he said, criticizing al-Zamakhshari and others: “I do not know where he got it from, and perhaps he based it on analogy. He said: The truth is that the Banu Tamim delete it obligatorily if it is an answer or there is evidence in the question indicating it, and if it is not there, then it is not permissible to delete it at all, since there is no evidence for it. Rather, the Banu Tamim - then - are like the people of Hijaz in requiring it to be brought”. (Quoted from Al-Radhi, 1996, 1/292).

Al-Alawi refuted Al-Andalusi's denial, supporting Al-Zamakhshari and Al-Jazuli in the process. He said: "Al-Zamakhshari and others have stated this deletion in the language of Tamim, and

they have stated that the predicate of (la) is not established in their language at all, which is what is understood from their not considering the condition of evidence for it or its absence." Says Al-Zamakhshari: "This is a mistake on the part of the author of this article, and ignorance of their intentions, for they did not mention that it was deleted without any indication, but rather they said that it was not uttered in their speech at all, and they did not discuss the indication and lack of indication, so rushing to error when it is possible to carry them on safety is the error itself". (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 1/ 207)

6. The rule of deleting the factor of the infinitive that comes instead of its verb in the following examples: saqiya, ra'iya, and khaybah:

Al-Zamakhshari pointed out that the accusative sources in texts like "saqyan," "ra'yan," "khayban," "Hamdan," and "shukran" are accusative with implied verbs that are not shown because they replaced the word with these verbs. However, grammarians disagreed with the decision to delete these sources. Is it required that the verb never occur with it, or is it acceptable for the verb to appear with it in some situations?

Sibawayh believes that the verb that makes the accusative of these sources must be deleted. He mentioned this in two chapters: The first: The section (What makes the accusative of sources based on the implied verb that is not used to be shown), which is the chapter on supplication, because he mentioned in it something like سَيًّا (watering), رِيًّا (care), and خِيْبَنَ (disappointment), based on the estimation of سَكَكَ اللهُ (may God give you water), رِيًّا (care for you), and خِيْبَكَ (disappoint you). Then he explained that the verb in such sources does not appear in any case because the source has become a substitute for it, so he said: "This and what is similar to it are only accusative if a mentioned thing is mentioned and you supplicate for it or against it, based on the implied verb, as if you said: سَكَكَ أَفِيًّا (may God give you water), رِيًّا (may God give you care), and خِيْبَكَ (may God give you disappointment), so all of this and what is similar to it are accusative based on this. The verb was abbreviated here because they made it a substitute for the word with the verb, just as الحَذَرُ (caution) was made a substitute for حَذَرَ (beware). Likewise, this is as if it were a substitute for سَكَكَ اللهُ (may God give you water), رِيًّا (may God give you care), and نَخِيْبَكَ (whoever disappoints you)." God. (sibawayh, 1988 AD, 1/312).

The second chapter: The chapter on (what is erected on the omission of the verb that is not shown from the sources except in supplication), such as your saying: (Praise and thanks, not ingratitude and wonder, and I do that and honor...), etc. He said: "This is erected on the omission of the verb as if you said: I praise God with praise and I thank God with thanks, and as if you said: I am amazed with wonder, and I honor you with honor... and the verb was abbreviated here because they made this a substitute for the word with the verb, as they did in the chapter on supplication" (sibawayh, 1988 AD, 1/319)

Sibawayh's method was adopted by Al-Zamakhshari, who expanded on it by saying that "the sources that are accusative with inferred verbs are of three types: those that are used to show their action and to imply it, those that are not used to show their action, and those that have no action at all." Then he said: "And all three of them are supplications and other than supplications" (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, p57)

The second type is the one we are dealing with, which is those that are not used to show their action, and Al-Zamakhshari mentioned the same examples that Sibawayh mentioned in both chapters. But Ibn Ya'ish said in his explanation of Al-Zamakhshari's words - after stating that all of these sources are accusative with an implied verb that is not shown because it has become a substitute for the word with the action -: "And some of them show the action for emphasis, so they say 'May God give you a drink, and may God take care of you,' but that is not a lot" (bin Ya'ish, 2001 AD, 1/280).

Al-Alawi expounded upon this matter, referencing the beliefs of those who mandated erasure as well as those who approved of it. Then he stated his opinion on it, that what was reported by those who required deletion, such as Sibawayh and al-Zamakhshari, is the most correct. He strengthened this opinion with the auditory evidence from the speech of the Arabs in which there was no mention of combining these sources and their verbs because they are their representatives. (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 1/ 298)

As God Almighty says: "So away with the companions of the Blaze" (Al-Mulk: 11) and His saying: "Away with Madyan" (Hud).

And the saying of Al-Nabigha Al-Dhubyani: (al-Dhubyani, d/t, p. 202. al-Qurashi, d/t, p. 186)

I was informed of the blessings of abandonment, reproaching,
watering (sakiah) and pasture (Ra'aia) for that reproachful visitor

As you can see, this data supports the conclusions reached by Sibawayh, Al-Zamakhshari, and Al-Alawi.

7. The meaning of the exception (Al Mostasna) in which the accusative and substitution are permissible:

One of the exception rules states that if the exception is entirely negative, it is acceptable to replace the accusative or nominative case for it. In contrast to the meaning that arises from both the accusative and the substitution, which is subject to debate among grammarians, particularly in the Qur'anic readings referenced in the Almighty's saying:

(Now travel with thy family while yet a part of the night remains, and let not any of you look back: but thy wife (will remain behind): To her will happen what happens to the people. Morning is their time appointed: Is not the morning nigh?") Houd, 81

There are two readings for His statement: "but thy wife." The first is in the accusative case as an exception to His statement: "Now travel with thy family." This is the reading of Nafi', Asim, Ibn 'Amir, and Hamza al-Kisa'i. The second is in the nominative case as a substitute for anyone "Ahad" in His statement: "And let not any of you look back:" This is the reading of Ibn Kathir and Abu 'Amr. (ibn Mujahid, 1400 AH, p. 338. al-Farsi, 1993 AD, 4/369).

The meaning of this verse in the commentaries is as follows: Leave your wife in the town, and if she goes outside, let her look back, because what happens to the people will also happen to her. Go out, you and your family, and let none of those who go outside look back. This is to prevent them from seeing what is coming down on the people of punishment. So the origin of

the accusative and nominative in the two readings - then - is the meaning, which is: Did you go out with him or did you not go out? And did she look back or did she not look back? So it was said that she went out and looked back and said: Oh my people! Then a stone hit her and killed her. Based on this, whoever reads in the accusative went to the conclusion that the woman was not taken by night, and whoever reads in the nominative went to the conclusion that she was taken by night and looked back. (al-Baghawi, 1420 AH, 2/460. al-Hilli and al-Suyuti, , d/t, p . 297. al-Jaza'iri, 2003 AD. 2/567. al-Fasi, 1419 AH, 2/546)

Al-Zamakhshari explained the meaning in both readings and mentioned two aspects of the accusative case as an exception, but he clarified the nominative case as a substitute in the second aspect, and said: "If you say: What is the reason for the reading of the one who read {except your wife} in the accusative case? I say: He excluded it from His statement: {So travel with your family} and the evidence for that is the reading of Abdullah: {So travel with your family during a part of the night except your wife}, and it is permissible for it to be in the accusative case for (do not turn) according to the principle of exception even if the eloquent one is the substitute, I mean the reading of the one who read in the nominative case, so he substituted it for someone." (al-Zamakhshari, - 1998 AD, 2/222).

Ibn al-Hajib denounced what al-Zamakhshari said about the accusative and nominative cases, as it leads to the impossible, and the story is the same, and he said: "And the statement of God Almighty: { and let not any of you look back: but thy wife} has been read in the nominative case The accusative case - and most of the reciters use the accusative case - so some of them interpreted it as an exception from the Almighty's statement { Now travel with thy family} and the nominative case as a substitute for the Almighty's statement { and let not any of you look back}; to avoid interpreting the majority's reading as something other than a substitute, and he thought that he had come with something that would free him from that. But this is a mistake because the story is one, so if he made an exception from the Almighty's statement {Now travel with thy family}, then he was not traveling by night with his wife, and if he substituted from the Almighty's statement {and let not any of you look back}, then he was traveling by her, which leads to him being traveling by her and not traveling by her, which is invalid.

Rather, someone who believes that the seven readings are individual and some of them may be wrong falls into something like this, so he does not care about interpreting the two readings as contradicting them. As for the one who believes that all of them are correct, he is far from such a thing." (ibn al-Hajib, 1997 AD, 2/ 545- 246)

It seems that Ibn al-Hajib was confused in understanding what al-Zamakhshari said, and this is supported by what al-Radi said in his response to Ibn al-Hajib after he mentioned his words, and that there is no contradiction between the readings because they are all Qur'anic, as he mentioned an interpretation that the meaning of the verse can be understood in both cases, whether in the accusative or the nominative, and he said: "The answer is that al-Isra', even if it appears to be absolute, is restricted in meaning by not paying attention, as what is meant is: Take your family on a journey in which there is no paying attention, except for your wife, for you will take her on a journey, so make an exception to this if you wish from (asra') or from (la yaltafi'), and there is no contradiction." (al-Radhi, 1996 AD, 2/ 99)

On this point, al-Alawi supported al-Zamakhshari and agreed with him; he also criticized Ibn al-Hajib for failing to perceive al-Zamakhshari's intentions in the two instances of specific meanings and nuanced directions, and he said: "And know that al-Zamakhshari has a precise meaning and subtle direction that Ibn al-Hajib neglected, and he states that we say: that this The interpretive meanings derived from the verses of the Qur'an are all true and correct, just as the legal rulings taken from the Book are all true and correct. So whoever is convinced that the woman was taken by the Night Journey, then this is God's ruling regarding him, and whoever is convinced that the woman was taken by the Night Journey, then this is God's ruling regarding him. So the difference between the two rulings is based on the exception from the first sentence, or from the second sentence." (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 2/ 19- 20)

8. Nouns that have a grammatical position by letters, if they are the noun of (la) which negates the gender:

The grammatical rule for the noun la, which negates the gender, is based on the fat-ha or on what replaces it. In what replaces it - if it is something that is parsed with letters, such as the six nouns, the dual, and the sound masculine plural, and after it comes a pronoun of the addressee, accusative with the lam - there are two uses: (sibawayh, 1988 AD,2/ 276- 278. al-Mubarrad, 1994 AD, 4/374-367. ibn Al-Sarraj, d/t, 1/389. al-Zajjaji, 1985 AD, p. 100. al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 2/74-75)

□ The first usage: deleting the alif from the six nouns and proving the nun in the dual and plural, so it is said: (La abb lak), (La ghulamayn lak), and (La muslimeen lak). The alif was deleted from the six nouns because the six nouns are not parsed with letters unless they are added, and here it has been cut off from the addition as a result of separating the added to (the kaf of address) with (the lam), and likewise, the nun was fixed in the dual and plural: (La ghulamayn lak), and (La muslimeen lak) for the same reason; which is that deleting the nun only occurs in the addition, and (the lam) here has separated the added from the added to; therefore, the addition is invalid, so deletion is prohibited.

□ The second usage: proving the alif in the six nouns, and deleting the nun from the dual and plural, so it is said: (La aba lak, nor ghulami lak, nor Muslim lak). There is a difference of opinion among grammarians on this aspect, is it based on the assumption of the addition to the pronoun, and the lam is an extra letter inserted between them to emphasize the addition, or based on the assumption of separation and lack of addition? There are two opinions:

The first: He believes that these names are ruled - in this usage - by the addition of an anomaly to the pronoun in the genitive case with the lam, and the lam is inserted between them to emphasize the addition, as evidenced by the presence of the alif in the six names and the deletion of the nun from the dual and plural, and that only occurs in the case of the addition. This is the opinion of Sibawayh and most grammarians. (sibawayh, 1988 AD,2/ 276- 278. al-Mubarrad, 1994 AD, 4/374-367. ibn Al-Sarraj, d/t, 1/389. al-Zajjaji, 1985 AD, p. 100. al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 2/74-75. al-Suyuti, d/t, 1/522)

Al-Zamakhshari agreed with it and said: "As for their saying: La aba lak, nor nasiry lak, it is similar in anomaly to the features, the memories, and ladun ghadwa. Their intention in it is the addition, the presence of the alif, and the deletion of the nun for that, and the added lam was

inserted to emphasize the addition. Do you not see that they do not say: *La aba fiha*, nor *raqibi alayha*, nor *mujiri minha*?”). (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, p94)

Ibn Ya'ish said, explaining Al-Zamakhshari's statement: (And they intend to add, and to prove the alif, and to delete the nun for that): "He means that the purpose of their saying: (No father for you), and (No slave for Zayd) is the addition and that the estimate is: No your father, nor your two slaves, even though the lam is a separator in the word. This is indicated by the proof of the alif in "the father" in your saying: (No father for you), and the deletion of the nun in the dual from your saying: (No slave for you). If "the father" were separate and not added, it would be incomplete and the lam was deleted, as you say: "This is a father", and "I saw a father" and "I passed by a father", and it is not used complete except in the case of an addition, like your saying: "This is your father", and "I saw your father", and "I passed by your father". Likewise, the nun in the dual does not fall in the case of the singular, but rather it falls for the addition, so its deletion here is evidence of the intention of the addition in wording.

Also, his saying: (And the adding lam was inserted to emphasize the addition), means that this lam was specifically inserted, and not the other adding letters, because of what it contains emphasizing the addition, since the addition here means the lam, even if it is not present. So if you say: "Abu Zayd," then its meaning is: "Father of Zayd," and if you bring it, it confirms that meaning, without changing it... That is why they did not say: "No father in it," and "No protector from it," and "No guardian over it," and they did not insert anything other than the lam, because it does not confirm the addition as the lam confirms it.”.(bin Ya'ish, 2001 AD, 2/ 103)

The second: Is what Ibn al-Hajib and others went to, that it is not an addition, but rather it is similar to the addition because it shares its original meaning, and that the addition here is not correct for two reasons: "The first: We are certain that their saying: (No father for you) means: No father for you, and there is no disagreement that: (No father for you) is not an addition, so it must be like it. The second reason: This (la) only enters on indefinite nouns, and if it was an addition, it would be definite, and then (la) is not allowed to enter it, and the correctness of its entry is evidence that it is not an addition. It has become clear that what we have presented is true, that he only gave this ruling because of its resemblance to the noun, not because it is a noun (ibn al-Hajib, 1997 AD, 2/ 580- 581. Ibn Malik agreed with him in his explanation of the Kafiyya Ash-Shafiyya 1982 AD, 1/529, saying: "The reason for this is that it is similar to an adjective, so it was treated in the same way in deleting the nun and adding the alif.”)

Al-Alawi agreed with Al-Zamakhshari and the majority that it is an addition, and he rejected what Ibn Al-Hajib said and described it as corrupt, saying: "As for what he said first - [that (*La Aba Lak*) means: You have no father, so it must be like it, not an addition] - it is corrupt; because one of the two forms differs from the other in terms of its wording and meaning; as for its meaning, because one of them is declined with the lam, and the other is built, and the lam is in it. As for its wording, because one of them is definite by addition without the other, they are separate, so what he said first is invalid. As for what he said second - [that this (*La*) only enters on indefinite nouns, and if it was an addition, it would be definite, and then (*La*) is not allowed to enter on it] - it is also invalid in terms of that, even if it is an addition in terms of its meaning, but because of what appears in it of the form of separation, it is permissible for (*La*) to enter on it.”.(al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 2/ 77- 78)

9. The factor in the dependencies:

Four schools of thinking emerged from the controversy among grammarians regarding the grammatical component of dependents. Al-Alawi highlighted these schools of thought in his technique, and Al-Azhar Al-Safiyya divided the responses to them. These schools of thought are as follows:

□ "The first: The school of thought of those who said: The factor in all of them is the first factor that must be repeated.

□ The second is the school of thought of those who claimed that the factor in them is themselves, so the factor in the attribute is it's being an attribute, and the factor in the emphasis is its being an emphasis, and so on for the rest of them.

□ The third: The school of thought of those who said there is a difference between the attribute, the emphasis, the substitute, and the conjunction, so you say about the conjunction and the substitute: It is necessary to repeat the factor in them without the rest of them because they are independent.

□ The fourth is the school of thought of those who said withdrawal, and this is what the people of investigation from Basra like Al-Zamakhshari, Al-Khwarizmi, and Ibn Al-Hajib said. Their purpose in withdrawal is: that the dependent is included under the work of the factor without the need to repeat it as some people claimed. And about this, they said: "The factor on the dependent and the followed is accusative One affiliation, and what they meant is what we mentioned. (al-Alawi, 2009 AD, 1/212, 213)

What he attributed to Al-Zamakhshari regarding the statement that the agent withdraws from the dependent and followed together is in agreement with what is in his detailed statement, where he said: "As for the dependents, they are in their nominative, accusative, and genitive cases included under the rules of the followed, the work of the agent is placed on the two tribes in one affiliation" (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, p44)

Al-Alawi agreed with him in this opinion and mentioned what supports its validity, which is that the dependent is included under the rule of the followed through its entry under the rule of the self, and thus the agent is not repeated in them, which is what is meant by withdrawal. In contrast, other statements were mentioned and described as corrupt; as for the opinion that says repetition, it is because it necessitates separation between the attribute and its describer, and each of them becomes an independent name from the other; because if we said: (Zayd the brave came) - according to the opinion of these people - the sentence would become: (Zayd came, the brave came), and this is what the speaker does not mean, so this statement is invalidated by repeating the agent.

As for the statement that they are the ones that work by themselves, it is corrupt; because it was not mentioned that the adjective - for example - is a verbal or semantic factor, and also if those dependents were working by themselves, their syntactic position would not have changed with the change of the factor that enters the antecedents in our saying, for example: (Zayd the generous came), and (I saw Zayd the generous), because the change in the syntactic position of the adjective is dependent on the change of the factor in the described, and thus it invalidates it's

being a factor by itself, and as for the opinion that says that there is a distinction between the dependents and the repetition of the factor in the substitute and the conjunction without others, it is invalid because it is not based on evidence. (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 2/ 179, 180)

Thus, it becomes clear that Al-Alawi denied all those statements about the factor in the dependents except for the statement of withdrawal that Al-Zamakhshari said, which is what Al-Alawi chose and agreed with him.

10. Interpretation of what is attributed to the Adjective if it is not derived:

The origin of the adjective is that it is derived, and if it is not derived, it is interpreted with a derivative. (sibawayh, 1988 AD, 1/434. al-Mubarrad, 1994 AD, 2/257, 259. ibn Al-Sarraj, d/t, 2/26, 28. al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, 118. bin Ya'ish, 2001 AD, 2/235, 236) In this regard, Al-Zamakhshari says: "And it - that is, the adjective - in the general matter is either an active participle or a passive participle or an adjective of comparison. And their saying: Tamimi and Basri, is based on the interpretation: attributed and attributed. And dhu mal and dhat sawar: are based on mutamawil and mutasawwirah, or the owner of wealth and the owner of a bracelet. And you say: I passed by a man, any man, and any man, on the meaning of complete manliness. And likewise: You are the man, all man, and this scholar is the grandfather of the scholar and the truth of the scholar, meaning the eloquent and complete in his affair. And I passed by a man, a man of truth, and by a man, a man of evil as if you said: righteous and corrupt, and truth here means righteousness and goodness, and evil means corruption and badness. And Sibawayh considered it weak to say: I passed by a man of a lion, on the interpretation: bold." (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, 118)

This issue is like others in which there is a contrary opinion, and this disagreement was adopted by Ibn al-Hajib, who did not consider derivation a condition, and what is important for him is the indication of the meaning in the described, whether the adjective is derived or not, so something like (Tamimi) is not interpreted according to him, but rather it is taken at face value. (ibn al-Hajib, 2010 AD, 42)

Al-Alawi agreed with al-Zamakhshari that the condition of the adjective is that it be derived, and he explained that by saying: "Because it is the right of the adjective to be capable of the pronoun referring to the described; because it is foreign to it, and it does not bear it except with it being derived" (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 2/ 192)

Al-Zamakhshari and al-Alawi's position is the one that is closest to reality since, in addition to being the majority view, it requires a pronoun to refer to the thing being described, which can only be done by a derivative or in the meaning of the derivative.

11. (Haat) between the verb and the verbal noun:

Some grammarians believe that (Haat) is an explicit imperative verb (Ibn yaish said: "this statement is attributed to Al- Khalil, and he provided evidence for that with his inflection" (ibn Ya'ish, 2001 AD, 3/ 9)

Among these also is Ibn Hisham, who said about (Come) and (Bring): "The correct view is that they are verbs" (Ibn Hisham, 1983 AD, 37). Likewise in the explanation of Qatr al-Nada, he

said: "The correct view is that they are verbs of command, as evidenced by the fact that they indicate a request and the feminine singular pronoun is added to them" (Ibn Hisham, 1990 AD, 32), Some of them believe that it is a noun of the verb (Ism al-Fi'l), and some sources have attributed this opinion to Al-Zamakhshari (Ibn Ya'ish, 2001 AD, 3/9. And Ibn Hisham, 1990 AD, 31). and some of them believe that it is a verbal noun, he is Al-Zamakhshari, as he included it among the verbal nouns, and said: "Haat the thing, meaning: give it to me, God Almighty said: (Say: Bring your proof) Al-Baqarah: "(al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, 145)

And those who said that it is a verb used as evidence of its inflection, Al-Akbari said: "As for (Haat), it is an explicit verb, it is said: Hata yahaati mahata" (Al-Akbari, 1995 AD, 2/91)

Al-Alawi agreed with Al-Zamakhshari that it is a verbal noun, and described his statement as being true about it, and he rejected the evidence of its inflection in the statement of those who said: It is a verb, and he said: "The truth is what Al-Zamakhshari said, that it is a verbal noun, because they are saying: (Haat), even if it is a verb, is only a derivation from the word (Haat), just as one says: (Hallelujah) if he says: There is no god but God, and what is derived from it is not It is an action.. (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 2/ 432)

12. The Format in (ma) if it is connected to (na'am and ba's):

If (ma) is connected to (na'am) or (ba'is) as in the Almighty's saying: Fan'i'ma hiya (Surat Al-Baqarah), then grammarians have two views on it:

The first: It is a complete definite noun, and it is the subject, and this is the opinion of Sibawayh, where he said: "And similar to their making (ma) a noun is the saying of the Arabs: (Inni mina an asna') meaning: It is from the matter that I do, so he made ma alone a noun, and similar to that (Ghasaltuhu ghaslan na'ma) meaning the best washing" (sibawayh, 1988 AD, 1/ 73). And he said in another place: "And you say: Inni mina an af'al that, as if he said: It is from the matter or the affair that I do that, so ma fell in this position, as the Arabs say: Bi'isma malhu, meaning Bi'is shay' malhu." (sibawayh, 1988 AD, 3/ 156)

The second: It is a completely indefinite noun, and it is parsed as a distinguishing noun, and the subject is implied because the distinguishing noun indicates it, and this is the opinion of Al-Zamakhshari, who said in the Almighty's saying: (Fan'i'ma (It is) Surah Al-Baqarah, and the noun in it is attributed to the implied agent, and its distinguishing feature is (what), and it is indefinite, neither described nor relative, and the meaning is: So what a good thing it is (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, 273, 274)

Al-Alawi approved of both opinions and explained each of them with what suits it, so he said: "Both schools are good, there is no fault with it, except that what Al-Zamakhshari said is more correct because it follows the grammatical rules, and the words of Sibawayh are more precise; because of the ambiguity in it that is appropriate to eloquence." (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 3/ 462, 463)

Al-Alawi, then, approved of both of these ideas since each had its own meaning and grammatical and rhetorical aspects, making it impossible to choose between them. As a result, he agreed with Al-Zamakhshari just as much as he did with Sibawayh.

13. The circumstantial “Al Zarfia” (fi) replaces the letter of superiority (ala):

Some grammarians believe that prepositions replace each other in a consistent manner (the statement that they are permissible to replace them is attributed to the Kufians, and the prohibition to the Basrans. Ibn Hisham said: “The Basrans’ doctrine is that prepositions do not replace each other by analogy, just as the letters of the jussive and the letters of the nasb are likewise. And whatever suggests that is, according to them, either interpreted in a way that the wording accepts, as was said in {And I will crucify you on the trunks of palm trees}, that in does not mean on, but rather the crucified is likened to the trunk because it is capable of being in the state of the thing, or on the implication of the verb with the meaning of a verb that is transitive with that letter... or on the anomaly of one word replacing another, and this last is the generality of the entire chapter according to most of the Kufians and some of the later ones, and they do not consider that anomaly and their doctrine is less arbitrary.” Ibn Hisham, 2000 AD, 2/515). As in the Almighty’s statement, “And I will surely crucify you on the trunks of palm trees” (Surat Taha:), some grammarians hold that prepositions always replace one another. In this case, the circumstantial (fi) replaces the letter of superiority (ala). This is the saying of Al-Farra’, Al-Mubarrad, and others. Al-Farra’ said: “And His saying: (And I will surely crucify you on the trunks of palm trees) (ala) is suitable in the place of (fi), and (fi) is suitable because it is raised in the wood in its length, so (fi) is suitable, and (ala) is suitable because it is raised in it and becomes on it, and God Almighty said: (And they followed what the devils recited during the kingdom of Solomon) Surat Al-Baqarah: and its meaning is in the kingdom of Solomon. (al-Farra, d/t, 2/186)

Al-Mubarrad said: “The addition enters one upon the other, and from that is the saying of the Almighty: ...)And I will surely crucify you on the trunks of palm trees (i.e. on), and He said:)Or do they have a ladder on which they listen (Surat At-Tur, i.e. they listen on it” (al-Mubarrad, 1994 AD, 2/ 319)

A group of later scholars have said this opinion, such as Ibn Hisham, who made it in that verse mean the letter of superiority) . Ibn Hisham, 2000 AD, 2/ 515)

This was rejected by the doubters, who saw it as a metaphor in which he compared the crucified person to his capacity to the trunk with the condition of the item. As a result, the word "in" retains its original, situational meaning and does not imply "on." At the head of these deterrents is Al-Zamakhshari, who said in his interpretation: “He likened the crucified person’s ability to be in the trunk to the ability of the thing contained in its container; therefore it was said: (in the trunks of palm trees) Surah Taha: “ (al-Zamakhshari, - 1998 AD, 3/ 97)

Al-Zamakhshari agreed with Al-Radhi in this opinion; he went to the view that it is better for (in) to have its original meaning; because then it indicates the ability of the crucified person to be in the trunk, just as (Al Mazroof) is in (Al Zarf). (al-Radhi, 1996 AD, 4/ 279)

Al-Alawi also approved of it after he attributed it to Al-Zamakhshari, on the basis that keeping it in its meaning of the circumstance is better; because it indicates their ability to be in the trunk like the ability of the contained thing in its container, then he said: “And it is the view of the scholar Al-Zamakhshari that he mentioned in his interpretation, and it is good.” (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 3/ 491)

14- (Lam) of the preposition between the reason and the meaning of (A'n):

There is a difference of opinion regarding the reality of the prepositional lam for the relative pronoun after the statement in the Almighty's saying: "And those who disbelieved said to those who believed, 'If it had been better, they would not have preceded us to it.'" (Surat Al-Ahqaf): Because carrying it on its original meaning of conveying the meaning of notification, is rejected by the fact that the disbelievers did not address the believers with that in their presence so that they would be the ones to whom that statement was said? So Al-Zamakhshari went to the fact that it is on its original meaning, but on the meaning of explanation, not notification, so he said: "(For those who believed): for their sake, and it is the speech of the disbelievers of Mecca" (al-Zamakhshari, - 1998 AD, 5/ 497) Ibn Malik agreed with him, as he cited this verse in a group of what he cited as evidence for the meaning of explanation with the lam, which is one of its original meanings. (Ibn Malik, 1990 AD, 3/145)

Ibn Al-Hajib went to the fact that it is Meaning about for the reason mentioned above that the disbelievers did not address the believers with that, and this meaning was restricted in it by its occurrence with the saying, so he said: "And in the meaning of (about) with the saying, meaning in the like of the saying of the Highest: (And those who disbelieved said to those who believed, 'If it had been better, they would not have preceded us to it.')

Surah Al-Ahqaf: And it was not intended that they addressed those who believed with that; because it should have been said: If it had been better, you would not have preceded us to it, but rather the meaning is: And those who disbelieved said about those who believed." (ibn al-Hajib, 1997 AD, 3/ 947)

Al-Alawi agreed with Al-Zamakhshari's opinion regarding it and described it as good, then he added clarification to it, saying: "This statement was not issued by the disbelievers except for the sake of addressing the believers. He did not say: "You preceded us to it" because the majority of the believers were absent, or because the apparent name is like the absent one, so when he came forward the absent pronoun returned to him." (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 3/ 493)

15. The position of "an'na" and its dependents after the conditional "law":

The heavy "an" in the Almighty's statement, "And if only they had been patient," is followed immediately by the conditional (law), making it unique (Surat Al-Hujurat). There was disagreement among the grammarians on where "an" should come after "law" in two cases:

The first: Sibawayh and a group of Basrans went to the position of raising as a subject, and the predicate is deleted and cannot be shown as it is deleted after "lawla". (sibawayh, 1988 AD, 3/ 11, 121, 139- 140. ibn Al-Sarraj, d/t, 1/ 268. al-Sirafi, 2008 AD, 3/340. ibn Malik, 1990 AD, 4/98. al-Suyuti, , d/t, p 1/ 502)

The second: The Kufians, Al-Mubarrad, Al-Sirafi, and Al-Zamakhshari went to the position of raising as an agent with an implied verb after "law", which is "established", and that is to keep "law" in its state of being specific to the verb. (al-Mubarrad, 1994 AD, 3/ 77. ibn Al-Sarraj, d/t, 1/ 268. al-Sirafi, 2008 AD, 3/ 340. al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, pp 328, 329. ibn Malik, - 1990 AD, 4/ 98. al-Suyuti, d/t, 1/ 502)

Therefore, Al-Zamakhshari said about the specificity of the conditional (in and "law") to the verb: "The verb must follow them" (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, pp 328, 329), and if it is not

apparent, then it is implied, and that is like the Almighty's saying: (Say: If only you possess) (Surat Al-Hujurat). Al-Isra', and his saying: (If a man perishes) Surah An-Nisa', is "on the implication of a verb that is explained by this apparent meaning. Therefore, it is not permissible to say: (If Zaid were to go), nor: (If Amr were to go). And because they require the verb, it is necessary for (that) that occurs after (if) that its predicate be a verb, like your saying: If Zaid came to me, I would honor him." (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, pp 328, 329)

Al-Alawi agreed with him on that and described his statement as the best and closest to agreeing with the grammatical metrics and principles, and he said: "The truth is that what Al-Zamakhshari said is better and closer to agreeing with the grammatical metrics, and more following the Arabic principles." (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 4/ 128) Then Al-Alawi cited some evidence that supports this, such as the Almighty's saying: (Say: If you possessed the treasures of the mercy of my Lord) Surah Al-Isra', although he said: "(possessed)" and did not say: (possessed); because of what we mentioned of its indication of the implied verb after (if) and the implied was: Say: If you possessed, so when the verb was deleted the pronoun was separated due to the lack of connection to the verb. (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 4/ 128)

16. Definition of the follower and the followed in the conjunction of statement:

The conjunction of the statement is a continuous subjunctive that explains and clarifies its follower and agrees with it in all the rulings in which the real participle agrees with its participle. Except for the rule of definiteness and indefiniteness, there is a disagreement among grammarians about it; as some of them stipulated for the validity of the explanatory apposition that both the dependent and the antecedent be definite, and they forbade them from being indefinite. (ibn Al-Sarraj, d/t, 2/ 45. ibn Ya'ish, 2001 AD, 2/ 273. ibn Malik, 1982 AD, 3/ 1193. ibn Malik, 1990 AD,3/ 325, 326. ibn Hisham, d/t, 3/310-311. ibn Aqil, 1980 AD, 3/220)

It appears that Al-Zamakhshari does not say this condition in it, based on two proofs:

□ First: He defined it in Al-Mufasssal, and did not make the definition a condition in it. Rather, he stipulated in the second of them that it be more famous than the first; because it is similar to the word used in translation and explanation. He said: "The explanatory apposition: is a noun other than an adjective, it reveals what is meant by revealing it, and it is lowered from the antecedent to the status of the word used from the strange if it is translated with it. This is like his saying: (I swear by God Abu Hafs Omar...) he meant Omar bin Al-Khattab - may God be pleased with him - so as you see it is in the course of translation where he revealed the nickname because he was famous without it." (al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, 124)

□ The second: - and it is more evident than the first - is that he permitted in Al-Kashshaf the coming of the explanatory apposition from indefinite nouns, and this is in the saying of God Almighty:)And he is given to drink from a water of festering festering 16(Surah Ibrahim, he mentioned that (festering festering) is an explanatory apposition for (water) even though it is an indefinite and ambiguous noun. He said: "If you say: What is the meaning of God Almighty's saying (from a water of festering festering)? I say: Festering festering is an explanatory apposition for water, he said: (And he is given to drink from a water of festering festering), so he made it ambiguous (al-Zamakhshari, 1998 AD,3/ 370)

Yes, Al-Zamakhshari's words in Al-Mufasssal may give the impression that he stipulated the definition of the explanatory apposition, because he limited his example to what is definite, which is his saying: (I swear by God, Abu Hafs Omar...), but his words in Al-Kashshaf refute this illusion, as Ibn Malik says: "He made in Al-Kashshaf 'pus' from: (And he is given to drink from a water of pus 16) an explanatory apposition, so he knew that the definition is not required in it. And this is correct". (ibn Malik, 1982 AD, 3/ 1194)

Al-Alawi concurred with him in this regard, so he did not specify the meaning of the dependent and the followed in the explanatory apposition. Instead, he declared that both the definite and the indefinite could use it, even though he acknowledged that the definite can use it more frequently than the indefinite. This is not a requirement, though, as the clarification and explanation it provides is what it is intended to do, and the indefinite is more in need of it than the definite in this regard. Therefore, he said: "Yes, its use in definite nouns is greater than its use in indefinite nouns, and its frequent use in definite nouns does not require the definition of it..." (al-Alawi, 2023 AD, 2/ 258)

**** *

From the issues listed above in this section, it is evident that Al-Alawi agreed with Al-Zamakhshari on every one of them. He also expressed approval of Al-Zamakhshari's opinion in them, thought it appropriate, and characterized it as the most accurate, best, good, or right, or that it is the most consistent with Arabic principles and grammatical analogies, or he praised it for its precise meanings, many subtleties, and rhetorical elements. He therefore committed himself to proving his point by outlining its logic and face while disputing the viewpoint of the person who objected. Also, Al-Alawi agreed on some issues with all the statements mentioned in them and approved of them; because each of them has its meaning and grammatical or rhetorical aspect, which makes it impossible to prefer between them.

Throughout, Alawi provides support for the statement he selects, elucidates the rationale behind it, bolsters it, and gathers proof through analogy and listening. He refutes more claims that go counter to this one, demonstrating their fallibility and the source of their corruption. He employs the technique of going into depth about them in his conversations, denials, and presentation of the relevant elements with "Emma."

3. Conclusion

The most important results concluded by the study:

1- Al-Alawi agreed with Al-Zamakhshari in sixteen issues, and he approved of his opinion in them and approved of it and described it as the most likely, or the best, or the good, or the right, or the closest to agreeing with grammatical analogies, and the most consistent with the Arabic origins, and he devoted himself to defending his opinion by explaining its face and argument and invalidating the opinion of the objector.

2- Al-Alawi agreed with all the statements mentioned in some of the studied grammatical issues and approved of them; because each of them has its meaning and grammatical or rhetorical face that makes it impossible to prefer between them.

3- Al-Alawi often justifies the statement he chooses, so he explains the reason for choosing it, strengthens it and marshals evidence for it from hearing and analogy, rejects other statements that oppose it, and shows their invalidity and the face of their corruption, and in that he often uses the path of detail with (Emma).

WORKS CITED

The Holy Quran

- Al-Anbari, 1998 AD, Abu al-Barakat Kamal al-Din Abd al-Rahman bin Muhammad al-Anbari (d. 577 AH), *Nuzhat al-Albaa fi Tabaqat al-Udabaa: Investigation*: Dr. Muhammad Abu al-Fadl, Dar al-Fikr al-Arabi, Cairo.
- Al-Afghani, n.d, Saeed, *From the History of Grammar*, Dar Al-Fikr.
- Ibn Babshad, 1777 AD, Tahir bin Ahmed, (d. 469 AH), *Explanation of the Calculated Introduction: investigation*: Khaled Abdul-Karim, Al-Asriya Press, Kuwait, 1st edition.
- Al-Baghawi, 1420 AH, Abu Muhammad al-Husayn ibn Mas'ud ibn Muhammad ibn al-Farra' al-Shafi'i (d. 510 AH), edited by: Dr. Abd al-Razzaq al-Mahdi, *Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-Arabi*, Beirut, 1st ed.
- Al-Jaza'iri, - 2003 AD, Abu Bakr Jabir bin Musa bin Abdul Qadir bin Jabir, *The Easiest Interpretations of the Words of the Most High, the Great*, Library of Sciences and Wisdom - Medina, 5th edition.
- Al-Jazuli, n.d., Abu Musa Issa bin Abdul Aziz bin Yallabakht Al-Barbari Al-Marrakushi (d. 607 AH), *Al-Jazuliyyah Introduction to Grammar: Investigation*: Dr. Shaaban Abdul Wahhab Muhammad, Review: Dr. Hamed Ahmed Nabil, and Dr. Fathi Muhammad Ahmed Juma, Umm Al-Qura Press.
- Ibn al-Hajib, 1997 AD, Jamal al-Din Abu Amr Uthman (d. 646 AH), *Explanation of the Sufficient Introduction to the Science of Grammar, study and investigation*: Jamal Abdul-Ati Mukhaimer Ahmed, Nizar Mustafa al-Baz Library, Mecca - Riyadh, 1st edition.
- Ibn al-Hajib, 2010 AD, Jamal al-Din Uthman bin Omar, *Al-Kafiya in the Science of Grammar and Al-Shafiyya in the Science of Morphology and Calligraphy*, investigation: Dr. Saleh Abdul-Azim al-Shaer, Maktabat al-Adab, Cairo, 1st edition.
- Al-Hilli, Jalal al-Din Muhammad ibn Ahmad (d. 864 AH)ᵀ Al-Suyuti, Jalal al-Din Abd al-Rahman ibn Abi Bakr (d. 911 AH), n.d., *Tafsir al-Jalalain*,), Dar al-Hadith, Cairo, 1st ed.
- Al-Hamawi Al-Rumi, 1993 AD, Yaqut Al-Rumi (d. 626 AH), *Dictionary of Writers Guidance for the Intelligent to Knowing the Writer*, investigation: Dr. Ihsan Abbas, Dar Al-Gharib Al-Islami, Beirut, 1st ed.
- Ibn Khallikan, 1978 AD, Abu al-Abbas Shams al-Din Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Abi Bakr (d. 681 AH), *Wafiyat al-A'yan wa Anba' Abna' al-Zaman*, Investigation: Dr. Ihsan Abbas, Dar Sadir, Beirut.
- Al-Dhubyani, n.d., Diwan Al-Nabigha Al-Dhubyani, Investigation: Dr. Muhammad Abi Al-Fadl Ibrahim, Dar Al-Maaref – Cairo.
- Al-Radhi, 1996 AD, Al-Radhi's *Explanation of Al-Kafiya*: by Youssef Hassan Omar, Publications of Garyounis University, Benghazi, 2nd ed.
- Al-Zajaji, 1985 AD, Abu Al-Qasim Abdul-Rahman bin Ishaq Al-Baghdadi Al-Nahwandi, (d. 337 AH), *Al-Lamaat*, Verified by: Dr. Mazen Al-Mubarak, Dar Al-Fikr, Damascus, 2nd ed.
- Al-Zarkali, 2002 AD, Khair Al-Din, *Al-A'lam Dictionary of Biographies of the Most Famous Men and Women from the Arabs, Arabists and Orientalists*, Dar Al-Ilm Lil-Malayin, 15th ed.
- Al-Zamakhshari, 1998 AD, Jar Allah Abu Al-Qasim Mahmoud bin Amr (d. 538 AH), *Al-Kashaf 'an Haqa'iq Ghawamid Al-Tanzil wa-Uyun Al-Aqawil fi Wajooḥ Al-Ta'wil*, Verified by: Dr. Adel Ahmed Abdul-Mawjoud and Dr. Ali Muhammad Mu'awwad, co-verified by: Dr. Fathi Abdul-Rahman Ahmed Hijazi, Al-Kubai'an Library - Riyadh, 1st ed.
- Al-Zamakhshari, 2004 AD, Abu Al-Qasim Mahmoud bin Omar (d. 538 AH), *Al-Mufasssal in the Science of Arabic*, study and edited by: Fakhr Saleh Qadara, Dar Ammar, 1st ed.

- Al-Zumar, 2008 AD, Abdul Rahman Ahmed Muhammad Ghaleb, The Grammatical Efforts of the Ancient Yemeni Grammarians According to Modern Scholars (A Descriptive Critical Study) for a PhD in Arabic Language and Literature, Supervised by: Professor Mustafa Muhammad Al-Faki, University of Omdurman Islamic University – Sudan.
- (Sibawayh, 1988 AD, Abu Bishr Amr bin Uthman bin Qanbar (d. 180 AH), The Book, investigation: Abdul Salam Muhammad Harun, Maktabat al-Nakhaji - Cairo, 3rd edition.
- Ibn Al-Sarraj, n.d., Abu Bakr, (d. 316 AH), Al-Usul in Grammar, Investigation: Dr. Abdul Hussein Al-Fatli, Al-Risala Foundation, Beirut.
- Al-Saraji, 2019 AD, Al-Qasim bin Al-Hussein bin Al-Qasim, The Fragrant Smells with a Brief Biography of the Commander of the Faithful, Supported by the Lord of Glory, Imam Yahya bin Hamza, peace be upon him, Al-Tabsirah Foundation for Printing and Publishing, 1st ed.
- Al-Sirafi, 2008 AD, Abu Saeed (d. 368 AH), Explanation of the Book of Sibawayh, edited by: Dr. Ahmed Hassan Mahdali, and Dr. Ali Sayed Ali, Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyyah - Beirut, 1st ed.
- Al-Suyuti, 1979 AD, Jalal al-Din Abd al-Rahman (d. 911 AH), Bughyat al-Wu'at fi Tabaqat al-Lughawiyyin wa al-Nahhat, edited by: Dr. Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, Dar al-Fikr, 2nd ed.
- Al-Suyuti, n.d., Jalal al-Din Abd al-Rahman bin Abi Bakr (d. 911 AH), Huma al-Hawami' fi Sharh Jami' al-Jawami', Investigation: Dr. Abdul Hamid Handawi, al-Tawfiqiya Library, Egypt.
- Al-Shawkani, 2006 AD, Muhammad bin Ali (d. 1250 AH), Al-Badr Al-Tali' Bi-Mahasin Min Ba'd Al-Qarn Al-Sabe', Investigated, commented on, corrected its deficiencies and made its indexes: Dr. Muhammad Hassan Hallaq, Dar Ibn Kathir, Damascus - Beirut, 1st edition.
- Al-Tantawi, n.d, Muhammad, The Origin of Grammar and the History of the Most Famous Grammarians, Dar Al-Maaref, 2nd ed.
- Ibn Aqil, 1980 AD, Baha' al-Din Abdullah al-Aqili al-Hamadani al-Masri (d. 672 AH), Ibn Aqil's Explanation of Ibn Malik's Alfiyya, edited by: Dr. Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abdul Hamid, Dar al-Turath - Cairo, 20th ed.
- Al-Baghdadi, 1995 AD, Abu Al-Baq'a' Abdullah bin Al-Hussein bin Abdullah Al-Akbari (d. 616 AH), Al-Lubab fi 'Illal Al-Bina' wa Al-l'rab, Verified by: Dr. Abdul-Ilah Al-Nabhan, Dar Al-Fikr - Damascus, 1st ed.
- Al-Alawi, 2009 AD, Yahya bin Hamza, (d. 749 AH), Al-Minhaj in Explaining the Explanation of Jum' Al-Zajaji, Investigation: Dr. Hadi Abdullah Naji, Al-Rushd Library - Riyadh, 1st ed.
- Al-Alawi, - 2023 AD, Yahya bin Hamza Al-Yemeni (d. 749 AH), Al-Azhar Al-Safiyyah in Explaining the Sufficient Introduction "Explanation of the Sufficient Introduction of Ibn Al-Hajib in Grammar", Investigation: Prof. Dr. Sharif Abdul Karim Muhammad Al-Najjar. And Prof. Dr. Ali Muhammad Ahmad Al-Shahri, Dar Al-Salam, and Dar Ammar for Publishing and Distribution, Egypt - Cairo, 1st ed.
- Al-Farsi, 1993 AD, Abu Ali Al-Hasan bin Ahmed bin Abdul Ghaffar (d. 377 AH), Al-Hujjah for the Seven Readers, edited by: Dr. Badr Al-Din Qahwaji, no date. Bashir Jujabi, Review and Proofreading: Dr. Abdul Aziz Rabah, and Dr. Ahmed Youssef Al-Daqqaq, Dar Al-Mamoun for Heritage - Damascus/Beirut, 2nd ed.
- Al-Fasi, 1419 AH, Abu Al-Abbas Ahmad bin Al-Mahdi bin Ajiba Al-Hasani Al-Anjari Al-Sufi (d. 1224 AH), Al-Bahr Al-Madeed in the Interpretation of the Glorious Qur'an,) Investigation: Dr. Ahmad Abdullah Al-Qurashi Raslan, Publisher: Dr. Hassan Abbas Zaki, Cairo.
- Al-Farra, n.d., Abu Zakariya Yahya bin Ziyad (d. 207 AH), The Meanings of the Qur'an, investigation and review: Dr. Muhammad Ali Al-Najjar, Egyptian House for Authorship and Translation.
- Al-Qurashi, n.d., Abu Zayd Muhammad ibn Abi al-Khattab, (d. 170 AH), Jamharat Ash'ar al-Arab, edited by: Dr. Ali Muhammad Al-Bajjadi, Nahdet Misr for Printing, Publishing and Distribution.
- Kahala, n.d., Omar Reda, Dictionary of Authors, Biographies of Authors of Arabic Books, Al-Muthanna Library, Beirut, Dar Ihya Al-Turath Al-Arabi, Beirut>
- Ibn Malik, 1982 AD, Jamal al-Din Abu Abdullah Muhammad LM Abdullah al-Ta'i al-Jayyani (d. 672 AH), Explanation of Al-Kafiya al-Shafiyya, edited by: Dr. Abdul-Moneim Ahmed Haridi, Umm Al-Qura University, Center for Scientific Research and Revival of Islamic Heritage - Makkah Al-Mukarramah, 1st ed.
- Ibn Malik, 1990 AD, Jamal Al-Din Muhammad bin Abdullah Al-Ta'i Al-Jayyani Al-Andalusi (d. 672 AH), Explanation of Al-Tashil, Investigation: Dr. Abdul Rahman Al-Sayyid, and Dr. Muhammad Badawi Al-Mukhtoun, Hijr for Printing and Publishing, 1st ed.
- Al-Mubarrad, 1994 AD, Abu Al-Abbas Muhammad bin Yazid(d. 285 AH), Al-Muqtabas, edited by: Dr. Muhammad Abdul Khaliq Udayma, Cairo.

- Ibn Mujahid, 1400 AH, (d. 324 AH), The Book of the Seven in Readings, edited by: Dr. Shawqi Dayf, Dar Al-Maaref, Egypt, 2nd ed.
- Ibn Hisham, 1983 AD, Al-Masa'il Al-Safariyah, investigation: Hatem Saleh Al-Dhamin, Al-Risalah Foundation - Beirut, 1st edition.
- Ibn Hisham, 1990 AD, Abu Muhammad Jamal al-Din Abdullah bin Yusuf bin Ahmad bin Abdullah bin Yusuf, (d. 761 AH), Explanation of Qatar al-Nada wa Bal al-Sada, edited by: Dr. Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abdul Hamid, publisher Cairo, 11th ed.
- Ibn Hisham, 2000 AD, Al-Ansari (d. 761 AH), Mughni Al-Labib, edited and explained by: Dr. Abdul Latif Muhammad Al-Khatib, Heritage Series - Kuwait, 1st ed.
- Ibn Hisham, n.d., Imam Abu Muhammad Abdullah Jamal Al-Din bin Yusuf bin Ahmed bin Abdullah Al-Ansari Al-Masri (d. 761 AH), The Clearest Paths to Ibn Malik's Alfiyyah, Investigation: Dr. Youssef Al-Sheikh Muhammad Al-Baqaei, Dar Al-Fikr for Printing, Publishing and Distribution.
- Ibn Yaish, 2001 AD, Muwaffaq Al-Din Yaish bin Ali Yaish Al-Nahwi (d. 643 AH), Explanation of Al-Mufasssal, introduced by: Emile Badi' Yaqoub, Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyyah - Beirut, 1st ed.