

## The Grammatical Weighting Of The Arabized Names

<sup>1</sup>Nibras Dīaa Ali Al-Zubaidi, <sup>2</sup>Prof.Dr.Adel Saleh Alawi Al-Jubouri

1,2Tikrit University, College of Education for Human Sciences, Department of Arabic Language

Corresponding Author E-mail: [nibrasnnoo@gmail.com](mailto:nibrasnnoo@gmail.com)

---

### Abstract

*This study explores the grammatical integration and morphological adaptation of Arabized names within the structure of Modern Standard Arabic. Focusing on names borrowed from non-Arabic languages—particularly Greek, Latin, and Persian origins—it investigates how these names are assimilated into Arabic's syntactic, morphological, and phonological systems. The concept of "grammatical weighting" is employed to analyze the extent to which these names conform to Arabic grammatical rules, including gender assignment, case inflection, definiteness, and pluralization. Through both qualitative and corpus-based analysis, the study identifies patterns of nativization, highlighting differences between fully integrated and partially assimilated names. The findings reveal that Arabized names occupy a unique position in Arabic grammar, often balancing phonetic preservation with morphological conformity, and reflect broader linguistic strategies of cultural and linguistic adaptation in Arabic naming conventions.*

**Keywords:** Arabized names, Grammatical weighting, Morphological adaptation, Name assimilation

---

### MULTIPLE NEWS:

Grammarians differed in their opinions on the permissibility of multiple predicates of a subject without conjunction, with two opinions:

The first statement: It is permissible, and the majority agree with it.<sup>1</sup> By analogy to adjectives, because the predicate is a description in meaning of the subject, whether it is coupled with a conjunction or not, the first is your saying: Zayd is a jurist, a poet, and a writer . The second is...<sup>2</sup> And the poet said:<sup>3</sup>

Whoever has a home, this is my home, summer, winter

Meaning: This is a word that is suitable for summer, summer, and winter, and it is suitable for these seasons at the same time. The evidence for this is the multiplicity of the predicate muqīz, musayyif, mushti .

The second statement: prohibition, and it was chosen by Ibn Usfur d. 663 AH<sup>4</sup> And many Moroccans<sup>5</sup> Ibn Usfur said: "Know that the subject does not require more than one predicate except by conjunction, such as your saying: 'Zayd is riding and laughing', except that the predicate is their combination, not each one of them separately. So the meaning of your saying: 'Zayd is laughing and riding' includes laughing and riding at one time, so there is no need for conjunction because they are two predicates in wording, but with regard to meaning, they are one predicate."

---

<sup>1</sup> ()See: The Book 2/83, The Principles of Ibn al-Sarraj 2/63, Explanation of At-Tashil 1/309, and The Clearest Paths 1/228.

<sup>2</sup> ()Horoscope: 14-15.

<sup>3</sup> ()The verse is by Ru'bah ibn al-Hajjaj in Bughyat al-Wu'at 189, Jamharat al-Lughah 63, and Sharh Ibn Aqil 132.

<sup>4</sup> ()Explanation of the sentences of Al-Zajjaj 1/367, and Al-Mughni 1/161.

<sup>5</sup> ()Explanation of Ibn Aqil 1/257, and Huma' al-Hawami' 1/346.

And this is what the Arabs say: The pomegranate is sweet and sour , meaning: tangy, and Zayd is left-handed and easy-going , meaning: more accurate.<sup>1</sup> He works with both hands, and it was not made from the multiplicity of the news; because the benefit is not obtained except from the whole, and for this reason it is forbidden to connect the second to the first, and from that is the saying of the poet <sup>2</sup>:

He sleeps with one eye and protects himself from death with the other, so he is awake and asleep.

The multiple predicates in awake and asleep are as if he said: He is evil and cautious, meaning he combines sleep and wakefulness at the same time.

Ibn Malik d. 672 AH said:<sup>3</sup> The subject may have two or more predicates, with or without conjunction. None of these are multiple in wording but not in meaning, nor are their owners multiple in reality or ruling.

Sheikh Khaled Al-Azhari d. 905 AH said: There is nothing like that which is multiple because its owner is actually multiple, such as: Banu Zaid, a jurist, a writer, and a poet.<sup>4</sup> And from it the poet said:<sup>5</sup>:

Your two hands: one hand that brings goodness and the other that is angry with its enemies

The evidence for this is his saying: “Your hands are one hand and the other,” where the predicate is multiple due to the subject being multiple in reality, so it is not considered a multiple predicate for one subject.

or a ruling The multiplicity of this is due to the multiplicity of the one being reported, and it is not used without conjunction.

Sheikh Khaled Al-Azhari preferred the opinion of the majority, saying: “The correct view is that it is permissible.”Whoever prevents it, he should assign a subject to every predicate other than the first, or make the second an attribute of the first.<sup>6</sup>.

## 2- The agent in the subject and predicate:

Grammarians differed on the factor of raising the subject and predicate in the following schools:

First: Sibawayh d. 180 AH and the majority of Basrans <sup>7</sup>:The factor in the subject is moral, which is the beginning, because it was built upon it, and the predicate raises the subject because it is built upon it, so it is raised by it just as it is raised by the beginning <sup>8</sup> Sibawayh said: “The subject is every noun that is used to begin a sentence. Know that the subject must be something that is itself, or it must be in a place or time. Each of these three is mentioned after what it begins with. As for that which is used to begin a sentence that is itself, the thing that is used is

---

<sup>1</sup>(1)He is the one who works with both his hands, he works with his left and his right, and so does every worker who works with both his hands., Lisan al-Arab: 7/340

<sup>2</sup>(2)The long verse is by Hamid bin Thawr bin Hazn al-Hilali al-Amiri, from a word describing the wolf. His collection: 123.

<sup>3</sup>()Explanation of At-Tashil: 1/309.

<sup>4</sup>()See: Mosul Al-Nabil 1/238.

<sup>5</sup>()The verse is of Mutakarib and has been attributed to Tarafa bin Al-Abd, but it has not been proven, and it is not in his collection of poems. Awda Al-Masalik: 1/230, and Al-Musaid: 1/243.

<sup>6</sup>() The Noble Connector: 1/239.

<sup>7</sup>()See: The Book: 1/81, Al-Insaf fi Masail al-Khilaf: 1/45, and Ibn Aqil’s Explanation: 1/200.

<sup>8</sup>()The book: 1/81, and the explanation of At-Tashil: 1/261.

raised by it just as it was raised by the beginning. This is your saying: ‘Abdullah is leaving.’ ‘Abdullah’ is raised because it was mentioned so that the thing that is leaving is built on it, and the thing that is leaving is raised because the thing that is used to begin a sentence is in the same position as it.”<sup>1</sup> And this is the choice of Ibn Malik.<sup>2</sup> This doctrine is attributed to Al-Mubarrad d. 285 AH.<sup>3</sup>

Second: Al-Akhfash d. 215 AH said:<sup>4</sup> Ibn al-Sarraj d. 316 AH<sup>5</sup> And Al-Jurjani d. 471 AH<sup>6</sup> The agent in the subject is the beginning. As for the predicate, the agent in it is the subject and the beginning.

The argument of these people is that the predicate does not occur except after the subject and the subject, so it is necessary that they be the two factors in it.<sup>7</sup>

This is invalid because it leads to preventing the predicate from being presented, because the object does not come before it unless the agent is a transitive word.<sup>8</sup>

Third: Some grammarians have said that the beginning is the factor in the predicate when the subject is present because it is inseparable from it.

This is what Ibn al-Anbari d. 577 AH said:<sup>9</sup> His argument is that the predicate is inseparable from the subject, and its order is that it does not occur except after it, so the subject works on the predicate when the subject is present, not by it, just as fire heats water by means of a pot and wood, so the heating only occurs when it is present, not by it. Ibn Ya’ish d. 643 AH followed him in this.<sup>10</sup>

Fourth: The subject and predicate are raised by the beginning, and this is the saying of: Al-Sirafi d. 368 AH<sup>11</sup> And Al-Zamakhshari d. 538 AH<sup>12</sup> And Al-Radhi d. 406 AH<sup>13</sup> And Ibn Asfour<sup>14</sup> They argued that the beginning required both of them, so it worked on them.<sup>15</sup>

It was replied that verbs are the strongest factors and there is nothing among them that works two nominative cases without following; so the moral factor is more deserving of not working two nominative cases.<sup>16</sup>

Fifth: The subject raises the predicate, and the predicate raises the subject, so they are both raised, and this is the doctrine of the Kufians.<sup>17</sup> Ibn Jinni chose it.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>()The book: 1/23-24.

<sup>2</sup>()Explanation of At-Tashil by Ibn Malik: 1/261.

<sup>3</sup>() Explanation of At-Tashil: 1/261.

<sup>4</sup>() Meanings of the Qur’an by Al-Akhfash: 1/91.

<sup>5</sup>()Origins 1/58.

<sup>6</sup>()Al-Muqtasid in explaining Al-Idah 1/256.

<sup>7</sup>() Al-Insaf: 1/46, Ibn Ya’ish’s explanation 1/85, and Al-Radi’s explanation 1/299.

<sup>8</sup>()Explanation of Al-Zajjaj’s sentences 1/176.

<sup>9</sup>()Al-Insaf 1/46-47.

<sup>10</sup>()Detailed explanation: 3/1085.

<sup>11</sup>()Appendix and supplement: 3/261.

<sup>12</sup>()The joint: 1/85.

<sup>13</sup>()Explanation of Al-Radhi: 1/200.

<sup>14</sup>Explanation of the sentences by Ibn Asfour: 1/363-365.()

<sup>15</sup>Explanation of Ibn Aqil: 1/202, and Explanation of Al-Ashmouni 1/183.()

<sup>16</sup> Al-Insaf 1/44, Ibn Ya’ish’s Commentary 1/84, and Al-Ashmouni’s Commentary 1/183.()

<sup>17</sup> Equity 1/45.()

<sup>18</sup>The Shine in Arabic 1/200.()

Their argument is that the subject must have a predicate, and the predicate must have a subject, and one cannot be separated from the other; and the speech is not complete without them; therefore, one of them works on the other, and there is no objection to each of them being an agent and an object; and there are parallels to that in the likes of: *Whichever you hit, I hit* , so you put *Whichever* after *you hit* in the accusative case and you put *you hit* in the jussive case with *Whichever* , so each of them is an agent and an object.<sup>1</sup> .

It was weakened by the fact that it is necessary for each of them to have a precedence, because the origin of every agent is to precede its object, and that it is permissible for verbal agents to enter into the subject and predicate, such as: *Zayd was your brother*. So if each of them was an agent in the other, it would not be permissible for anything else to enter into it.<sup>2</sup> .

Sheikh Khaled Al-Azhari preferred the doctrine of Sibawayh and the majority of Basrans who say: The subject is raised by the beginning, and the predicate is raised by the subject, contrary to those who raised them by it, that is: raising the subject and the predicate by the beginning, and this is weak.<sup>3</sup> .

### 3- The parsing of the five nouns:

Grammarians differed in the parsing of the five nouns, and perhaps the origin of this disagreement was the lack of appearance of the original parsing movements, which are damma, fatha, and kasra. The grammarians' schools of thought varied as follows:

The first doctrine: It is the well-known one, and it was said by both Qatirib d. 206 AH<sup>4</sup> And Al-Ziyadi d. 249 AH<sup>5</sup> And Al-Zujaji d. 340 AH<sup>6</sup> From the Basrans, and Hisham d. 218 AH<sup>7</sup> From the Kufians, and it is the choice of Ibn Malik.<sup>8</sup> And Al-Zamakhshari<sup>9</sup> Ibn Ya'ish d. 643 AH<sup>10</sup> These letters are the i'rab and they replace the vowels. This statement was rejected, because the omission of i'rab does not affect the structure of the word. If we omitted these letters, the meaning of dual and plural would be invalidated and the meaning of the word would be disturbed. This indicates that they are not i'rab but rather they are i'rab letters.<sup>11</sup> .

The second doctrine: This is what Sibawayh said<sup>12</sup> And Al-Farsi d. 377 AH<sup>13</sup> And the majority of the Basrans and Abu Hayyan d. 469 AH<sup>14</sup> authenticated it.<sup>14</sup> Ibn Hisham d. 761 AH<sup>15</sup> And others of the latecomers<sup>16</sup> : It is declined with the implied vowels in the letters, and that what precedes the last is followed by the last. So if you say: *your father stood up* , its original form is *your father*, then the vowel of the ba' was followed by the vowel of the waw, so it was

---

<sup>1</sup>See: Al-Insaf 1/44-45.()

<sup>2</sup>Explanation of Ibn Ya'ish 1/84.()

<sup>3</sup>See: Mosul Al-Nabil 1/193-194.()

<sup>4</sup>()Secrets of Arabic 1/67, and Huma' al-Hawami' 1/125.

<sup>5</sup>()Ashmouni's explanation 1/54.

<sup>6</sup>()Sentences to glass 3-4.

<sup>7</sup>()Ashmouni's explanation 1/54.

<sup>8</sup>()Healing the Sick 1/122.

<sup>9</sup>()Explanation of the Detailed 1/53.

<sup>10</sup>()The whispers of the dawn 1/125.

<sup>11</sup>()See: Secrets of Arabic 1/68.

<sup>12</sup>()Sipping the Beat 2/826-837, and Huma' al-Hawami' 1/126.

<sup>13</sup>()Optics issues 2/852.

<sup>14</sup>()Sipping the beat 2/836.

<sup>15</sup>() The clearest paths 1/39.

<sup>16</sup>()The whispers of the dawn 1/39.

said: your father, then the damma on the waw was found too heavy, so it was deleted. And if you say: I saw your father, its original form is your father, then the waw is moved and what precedes it is opened, so it was changed to an alif. And if you say: I passed your father, its original form is your father, then the vowel of the ba' was followed by the vowel of the waw, so it became your father, then the kasra on the waw was found too heavy, so it was deleted, so it was sukun, and before it was a kasra, so it was changed to a ya'. This statement is supported by the fact that the origin of the declension is to be with apparent or implied vowels, so if it is possible to estimate it while there is a counterpart, then it is not deviated from.<sup>1</sup>.

The third doctrine: Al-Mazini d. 247 AH said:<sup>2</sup> And the glass d. 310 AH <sup>3</sup> It is expressed by the vowels that precede the letters, and the letters are saturation.

It was replied that the saturation is the root of poetry, and by keeping in you dhi mal on one letter.<sup>4</sup>.

The fourth doctrine: Al-Rubai'i d. 420 AH agreed with it.<sup>5</sup> It is inflected with the vowels before the letters, and it is transferred from the letters <sup>6</sup>.

It was responded that the condition of transfer is the pause, the validity of the one to whom it is transferred, its stillness, and the validity of the one from whom it is transferred, and that it is necessary to make the letter of inflection other than the last while the other remains.<sup>7</sup>.

The fifth school of thought: Al-Kisa'i and Al-Farra' hold that it is inflected from two places with both vowels and letters.<sup>8</sup> It was replied that it has no equal. <sup>9</sup>.

The sixth doctrine: Al-Jarmi d. 225 AH agreed with it.<sup>10</sup> ...that it is inflected by change and inversion in the accusative and genitive cases, and without that in the nominative case. It was responded that it has no equivalent, and that the factor of the nominative case does not have any effect, and that nothingness is not a sign <sup>11</sup>.

The seventh doctrine: Al-Akhfash is on it.<sup>12</sup> The letters are indicators of inflection.

There is a difference of opinion about its meaning:

Al-Zajaj and Al-Sirafi said: The meaning is that it is declined with movements estimated in the letters that come before the vowels, and it is prevented from appearing because the vowels require movements of their own kind.<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>()The whispers of the dawn 1/126.

<sup>2</sup>()Explanation of Ibn Ya'ish 1/52.

<sup>3</sup>()Appendix and supplement 1/177.

<sup>4</sup>()See: Huma' al-Hawami' 1/126, and Sharh al-Ashmouni 1/54.

<sup>5</sup>()He is: Ali bin Isa bin Al-Faraj bin Saleh Al-Rab'i Al-Shirazi, originally from Baghdad, residing in Abu Al-Hasan. A grammarian and linguist. He studied under Al-Sirafi and Al-Farsi. Among his works are Al-Badi' in grammar, Al-Farsi's commentary on Al-Idah, Al-Farsi's commentary on Al-Balagha, and others. He died in the year 420 AH. Bughyat Al-Wu'at 1/433.

<sup>6</sup>()See: Al-Tadheel and Al-Takmil 1/37.

<sup>7</sup>()Explanation of At-Tashil by Ibn Malik 1/255.

<sup>8</sup>()Sipping the beat 2/252.

<sup>9</sup>()The whispers of the dawn 1/129.

<sup>10</sup>()Secrets of Arabic 1/68, The Desire of the Aware 147.

<sup>11</sup>()See: Huma' al-Hawami' 1/127.

<sup>12</sup>()See: Explanation of Uyun al-I'rab, 57-58.

<sup>13</sup>()The whispers of the dawn 1/128.

Ibn Al-Sarraj said: Its meaning is that they are letters of inflection, and the inflection in them is neither apparent nor implied, so they are indicators of inflection in this estimation.<sup>1</sup>.

Sheikh Khaled Al-Azhari preferred the second school of thought, which is the school of thought of Sibawayh and the majority of Basrans, saying: "The waw replaces the damma, the alif replaces the fatha, and the ya replaces the kasra, so the waw is parsed as a nominative, the alif as an accusative, and the ya as a genitive, and that is in what is added to something other than the ya of the speaker, whether it is explicit or implicit."<sup>2</sup>.

The most likely opinion is that these nouns are inflected with letters as a substitute for vowels for the following reasons:

1- The saying "only by proxy" has equivalents in Arabic, such as the declension of the in-declinable, the sound feminine plural, and the dual.

2- The variable in these names is the letters a, w, y and the variable is a sign. Since the sign is an indication of a characteristic, adopting it as a criterion for sorting the established linguistic material is a sound scientific approach in research. This is because a careful examination of the word brother added to something other than the speaker's yaa in the following examples: your brother came - I saw your brother - I passed by your brother . It becomes clear to us that the word brother when added consists of two elements: a constant and a variable. If we consider it as a group of letters, its mathematical representation will be consistent with the set theory in mathematics as follows:

Your brother - A, K, W, K

Your brother - A, K, A, K

Your brother - that Kh, Y, K

The common elements between the three groups are the group A, Kh, K and the unshared elements are A, W, Y . The constants are the common elements and the variable is the unshared elements. This change encourages the construction of a hypothesis in analyzing signs, which is that the variable is a sign, and this is what Sibawayh stated in his saying at the beginning of the book: This is a chapter on the paths of the endings of words in Arabic .<sup>3</sup>.

It is the simplest and easiest of sayings for the language's children, especially the young ones, unlike the rest of the sayings, which are not without affectation and objections.<sup>4</sup>.

#### **4- The adjective comes before the noun it describes:**

The majority of grammarians went<sup>5</sup> The adjective does not precede the noun it describes, in analogy to the rest of the dependents, because the basic principle of the dependent is to come later.

Some grammarians said:<sup>6</sup> It is permissible to present the adjective other than singular , i.e. dual or plural, if one of its two antecedents comes before it. So it is said: Zayd the two wise men and Amr stood up , like the poet said:<sup>7</sup>:

<sup>1</sup>()See: Explanation of Uyun al-I'rab 58.

<sup>2</sup>()The Noble Connector 1/26-27.

<sup>3</sup>()Book 1/332.

<sup>4</sup>()See: The Grammatical Choices of Abu Hayyan 71-72.

<sup>5</sup>()Sipping the Beat 4/1936, and Huma' al-Hawami' 3/127.

<sup>6</sup>()The whispers of the dawn 3/127.

<sup>7</sup>()The verse is long and without attribution in Al-Durar 1/17, Sharh Al-Ashmouni 392, and Al-Mughni 2/617.

I will not admit to men the injustice of my father, that noble and generous uncle of mine.

He wants that is my uncle and my maternal uncle <sup>1</sup>.

The evidence for this is his saying: the two most generous ones, as it is an attribute of the paternal uncle and maternal uncle, so he presented them before one of the two described ones.

Sheikh Khaled Al-Azhari preferred the opinion of the majority, as he believes that the adjective should not be placed before its noun, contrary to some of them. <sup>2</sup>.

This is what I see as most likely, because the adjective and its noun are like one noun, so it is not permissible to place the last part of the noun before the first part in order to change the meaning. The same applies to the noun and its complement. And because the basic principle of the dependent is to come later, if there is something that appears to place the adjective first, it is parsed according to the factor, like the poet's saying: <sup>3</sup>:

And the believing bird that seeks refuge is touched by the riders of Mecca between Ghayl and As-Sand.

However, Al-A'idhat was originally an adjective for the bird, but when it came forward and was suitable for directly acting as the agent, it was parsed according to the agent and the described became a substitute for it. So Al-Tayr is a substitute for Al-A'idhat and it is accusative if Al-A'idhat is accusative with a kasra as the object of Al-Mu'min, and genitive if Al-A'idhat is genitive by adding Al-Mu'min to it. The original is according to the first and Al-Mu'min is Al-Tayr Al-A'idhat with the accusative of the first with a fatha and the second with a kasra. According to the second and Al-Mu'min is Al-Tayr Al-A'idhat with both of them being genitive with a kasra, so when the adjective came forward, it was parsed according to the agent and the described became a substitute for it. <sup>4</sup>.

#### 5- The meaning of all together after all :

All of them indicate emphasis, and so does all of them. If they come together, <sup>5</sup>

What is the meaning of all together here after all ?

Grammarians differed on the issue in statements:

First: That all together after all is an emphasis after an emphasis, and this is the doctrine of the majority. <sup>6</sup> Among them is Khalil <sup>7</sup> And Sibawayh <sup>8</sup> And Ibn al-Sarraj <sup>9</sup> And glass <sup>10</sup> And Al-Nahhas d. 338 AH <sup>11</sup> And Ibn Yaish <sup>12</sup> Ibn al-Hajib d. 646 AH <sup>13</sup> And satisfied <sup>14</sup> And Ibn

<sup>1</sup>() The whispers of the dawn 3/128.

<sup>2</sup>()See: Mosul Al-Nabil 2/1064.

<sup>3</sup>()The verse is by Al-Nabigha, from Al-Basit. Diwan Al-Nabigha 2/134, and Bughyat Al-Wu'at 1/9.

<sup>4</sup>()The Treasury of Literature 5/71.

<sup>5</sup>()Stone: 30.

<sup>6</sup>()See: The Book 1/151, The Principles 2/23, The Meanings of the Qur'an 3/179, and Ibn Ya'ish 3/41.

<sup>7</sup>()Book 1/151.

<sup>8</sup>()The same source 1/151.

<sup>9</sup>()Principles 2/23.

<sup>10</sup>()Meanings of the Qur'an 3/179.

<sup>11</sup>()Grammar of the Qur'an 2/380.

<sup>12</sup>()See: Ibn Ya'ish's explanation 3/41.

<sup>13</sup>()See: Sharh al-Radhi 2/395.

Asfour<sup>15</sup> And Ibn Malik<sup>2</sup> And Ibn Hisham<sup>3</sup> And Al-Ashmouni d. 929 AH<sup>4</sup> Among the commentators is Al-Razi d. 313 AH<sup>5</sup>.

Ibn Al-Sarraj said: As for what is emphasized by “all together” in your saying: “Your people came all together, all together,” then it is an exaggeration.<sup>6</sup>.

Al-Radi said: “Because if you say: ‘all of them’, its meaning is comprehensiveness and encompassment, by agreement between them, because they gathered at one time. So it is with the word ‘all of them’ being mentioned first, and it is as if they disliked - meaning Al-Mubarrad and Al-Zajaj - the use of two words synonymously for one meaning. What is the objection to that with the intention of exaggeration?”<sup>7</sup>.

Second: It indicates the union of time or meeting, in addition to the meaning of encompassing and comprehensiveness. Among those who said this is Al-Farra’<sup>8</sup> And the cooler<sup>9</sup> Among the commentators is a group of them, including Al-Zamakhshari.<sup>10</sup>

And Al-Baghawi<sup>11</sup> Al-Mubarrad said about the Almighty’s saying: I am not here<sup>12</sup> He said: So the angels prostrated. It was possible that they all prostrated, and it was possible that some of them prostrated. So when he said: all of them, he encompassed the parts and removed the doubt. If he had said: all of them only, it would have been possible that they all prostrated at different times. So he said: all of them so that it is known that the prostration was from them at one time.<sup>13</sup> This doctrine was rejected by:

- All together is not suitable to be used as a state, because it is a definite noun.<sup>14</sup>.
- Al-Mubarrad’s statement is wrong. If it were as he said, it would have been in the accusative case.<sup>15</sup>.

## 6- The exception with especially :

Grammarians differed on the meaning of especially as an exception, according to two schools of thought:

---

<sup>14</sup>()The same source 2/395.

<sup>1</sup>()Explanation of sentences 1/276.

<sup>2</sup>()Explanation of At-Tashil 3/301, and Shifa’ Al-Aleel 2/741.

<sup>3</sup>()The Singer 481.

<sup>4</sup>()Ashmouni’s explanation 3/328.

<sup>5</sup>()The Great Interpretation 19/191.

<sup>6</sup>()See: Al-Usul 2/23.

<sup>7</sup>()Explanation of At-Tashil 3/295, and Explanation of Al-Ashmouni 3/110.

<sup>8</sup>()Explanation of At-Tashil 3/295.

<sup>9</sup>()Explanation of Al-Radhi 2/396, and Memorandum of Grammarians 525.

<sup>10</sup>Al-Kashaf 3/334

<sup>11</sup>()Landmarks of the Revelation in Interpretation and Explanation 3/402.

<sup>12</sup>() Surah Sad: 73.

<sup>13</sup>()Al-Muqtaṣab 1/54, Tadhkirat al-Nahāt 525, and Fath al-Qadir 3/132.

<sup>14</sup>()Ibn Ya’ish 3/41.

<sup>15</sup>()The meanings and grammar of the Qur’an by Al-Zajaj 3/79.



First: Khalil went <sup>1</sup> And Sibawayh <sup>2</sup> The majority of grammarians <sup>3</sup> Until *la-siyama* does not indicate exception, rather its meaning is preference and priority. Sibawayh said: I asked Al-Khalil about the Arabs' saying: *wa-siyama Zayd*, so he claimed that it is like your saying: *wal-mithil Zayd*, and it is not meaningless <sup>4</sup>.

Second: The Kufians went <sup>5</sup> And a group of grammarians, such as Al-Akhfash <sup>6</sup> And Abu Hatim d. 277 AH <sup>7</sup> And Persian <sup>8</sup> And copper <sup>9</sup>: That especially is one of the tools of exception, and its reason is that if you say: The people stood up, especially Zayd, then Zayd differed from them in that he was more deserving of standing, so he differed in the ruling that was established for them by way of priority, and since after it is some of what came before it, and outside of it in the meaning of increase, it was an exception from the first, because it departed from it in a way that it did not have. This doctrine was refuted as follows:

- When we say: "The people stood up in particular," Zayd is a participant in the people's standing up and is not an exception from the people. The emphasis on standing up in his case does not exclude him from being a person standing up.

- Their claim that "*la siyama*" is for exception is invalidated by the addition of the letter "waw" to it and the inappropriateness of "*illa*" in its place, unlike the other tools, as what is mentioned after it is not an exception.

It appears from the grammarians' statement that *la-sayyama* is a sentence composed of *la* and its predicate is omitted, meaning: existing. However, it is not independent in usage, so it is not said: *la-sayyama Khalid* because it is used to indicate the priority of what comes after it over what comes before it, and therefore it is not independent in speech.<sup>10</sup>

Sheikh Khaled Al-Azhari preferred the view of Sibawayh, as he believes that it is not considered one of the tools of exception, because he shares with them in standing, and the confirmation of standing in his case does not remove him from being standing, and this is correct.<sup>11</sup>

What Al-Azhari preferred is what appeared to me, because it does not indicate the exclusion of something from something as they claimed, but rather it indicates the priority of the noun after it, and it is included in the ruling and not outside of it. So our saying: The students stood up, especially Muhammad means that Muhammad is more deserving of standing up than them despite his standing up with them.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>()Book 2/286.

<sup>2</sup>()The same source 2/286.

<sup>3</sup>()See: Explanation of Al-Jumal by Ibn Asfour, Vol. 2/252, Explanation of At-Tashil, 2/318, Shifa' Al-Aleel, 2/518, and Irtishaaf Al-Darb, 3/1549.

<sup>4</sup>()Book 2/286.

<sup>5</sup>()Sipping the Beat 3/1549, and Healing the Sick 2/518.

<sup>6</sup>()Sipping the beat 3/1549.

<sup>7</sup>()Sipping the Beat 3/1549, and Huma' al-Hawami' 2/216.

<sup>8</sup>()The whispers of the dawn 2/216.

<sup>9</sup>()The same source 2/216.

<sup>10</sup>()Meanings of grammar 1/417.

<sup>11</sup>()See: Mosul Al-Nabil 1/653.

<sup>12</sup>()See: Tadhkirat al-Nahhat 576.