

# The Truth of the Grammatical Disagreement in 'Both'

Dr. Omar Thabit Yousuf Majeed Al-Jubouri

Anbar Educational Directorate

## Introduction:

Praise be to God, Lord of the worlds, and blessings and peace be upon our Prophet Muhammad and upon all his family and companions.

What is full of grammar books is the mention of the grammatical dispute, and this is one of the book's enrichment in terms of scientific material. And among those controversial issues was the issue of deification of both, and was it composed of a thousand feminization or a deuteronomy?

And we do not go beyond the truth if we say: This issue is one of the most famous issues of grammatical controversy mentioned in the books of grammarians, so there is hardly a grammatical book without mentioning it.

Most of the grammar books are attributed to all of the Kufians claiming that it is double-word and meaning, and that it was composed by a thousand Deuteronomy.

The truth of the matter is not so, and I will explain in this paper the truth of the Kufic saying: For researchers to determine the truth of their opinion in their books.

And our last prayer is praise be to God, Lord of the worlds, and may God's prayers and peace be upon our Prophet Muhammad and his family and companions.

## The fact of the disagreement in Deuteronomy both:

Grammarians agree that (no, and both) are dual in meaning, but they differed as to how they are twofold<sup>1)</sup>. Abu Al-Barakat Al-Anbari said: The Cuffs went to the fact that "no, and both" have verbal and moral deuteronomy, and the origin of both "each" so reduced the blame, and increased the thousand for deuteronomy, and increased the t's in "both" for femininity, and the aif in them is like the alif in "Zaidan", and al-Umran. Noon, Deuteronomy, eliminated them for the addition of Zomhma.

The Basrians were of the view that they have a verbal singularity and a moral perversion, and a thousand in them are like a thousand in a stick<sup>2)</sup>

Al-Suhaili said: As for the one who went to the fact that it is a singular noun and he composed it for the verb lam and not the thousand of deuteronomy, most of his argument is that in the three cases it is with the apparent one in one form, I mean the case of raising, accusative and lowering. Rather, it is reversed in the case of lowering and accusative with the implicit, especially as it turns what is not in the thousand of Deuteronomy, towards: they have, and upon them, and this is the meaning of the words of Al-Khalil and Sibuyah, and what is needed for this doctrine is the saying of the Arabs: They are both going, and he did not say: Are going<sup>3)</sup>

Al-Mroud said: Both names have the meaning of Deuteronomy, so you added one to two, do you not see that you say: the two are starting, and both are starting points, and we are both a guarantor on behalf of its owner, but his interpretation: each of us, as the poet said:

I dwell on it, and I know that we are both anxious<sup>5)</sup> <sup>4)</sup>

They cited the following:

One of them: that he does not utter one of them, so it is not said in the one: "all" other than the two?

The second: they are per thousand in the three cases if they are added to the apparent, and the two is not like that.

And the third: the fact that the Arabs tell them to tell the singular, God Almighty said: (Both paradises bore fruit)<sup>6)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> See: Al-Maqsul fi Sharh al-Fasul: 1 / 142-143, and Appendix and Complementation: 1 / 255-256.

<sup>2)</sup> Equity: 2/13.

<sup>3)</sup> Thought Outcomes: 281-282.

<sup>4)</sup> The House of the Great Sea is attributed to the book: 3 / 73-74, and the explanation of the verses of Sibawayh (for al-Nahas): 166 to Uday bin Zaid al-Abadi. I did not find it in his office. And attributed in Hamasa Al-Buhtri: 65 to Amr bin Jaber Al-Hanafi. There is no percentage in the summary: 3/241, and Amal Al Shajri: 1/291, and Al Insaf: 1/179.

<sup>5)</sup> Brief: 3/241.

<sup>6)</sup> Surah Al-Kahf 33.

He did not say: They came, and if they were two, he did not tell about them individually, do you not see that you do not say: The Hindus rose, and Zaidan rose? The poet said:

Both days in front of the day of repudiation, although we did not end it except occasionally)<sup>7)</sup>

Abu Al-Barakat Al-Anbari mentioned another evidence, so he said: What indicates that the thousand in them are not for deuteronomy is that it is permissible to tilt them. God Almighty said: Either they reach you with old age, one or both)<sup>8)</sup>

As for the Kufians, they argued that they said: The evidence is that they are double in terms and meaning, and that the thousand in them are for dual transmission and measurement:

As for the transmission, the poet said:

In all of her legs is a phalanx, one of which is attached to the appendix)<sup>9)</sup>

So he singled out his saying, "Kelt," indicating that both are deuteronomy.

As for the analogy, they said: The evidence that it is a thousand deuteronomy is that it turns to the Z in the accusative and the ablution if it is added to the tacit. This is about your saying: I saw both men, and I passed both men, and I saw both women, and I passed by both women, even if the thousand at the end were like the thousand at the end of the stick. And it did not turn around, just as it did not turn its composition towards "I saw their rod and their movement, and I passed by their stick and their souls." So when the thousand turned in them, a thousand zaydans were upended, and Umrah indicated that they were verbally and morally dissuaded)<sup>10)</sup>

Al-Suhaili protested to them and said: It is an affirmation of the two)<sup>11)</sup>. He also said: One of the arguments for this other saying is that each of his pronouncements understands what he understands from the pronouncement of each, and he agrees with him in the fulfillment of the verb and its eye. As for the blame, it is omitted as it is omitted in many names. Evidence to support him, and no derivation to testify and support him)<sup>12)</sup>

It was not permissible for Abu Ali al-Farsi to be both in terms and meaning, so he said: What indicates the corruption of Deuteronomy is that it came as an addition to Deuteronomy, so if it was Deuteronomy, it is not permissible to add it to Deuteronomy. Because a thing is not added to itself, do you not see that they did not say: I passed by them two folds, and did not pass by one)<sup>13)</sup>

Abu Al-Barakat Al-Anbari responded to the doctrine of the Kufians, and weakened their protest, as he said: As for the answer to the words of the Kufists: As for their protest, according to the poet's saying:

There is one phalanx in her legs

There is no argument in it; Because the basic principle is to say both in the alpha, except that he omitted it as part of the fathah about the alef due to the necessity of poetry ... As for their saying: that the alef in them is reversed in the accusative and the ablative case if they are added to the tacit, we said: In the case of addition to the tacit, it is changed in two ways:

One of them: that when they had a verbal singularity and a moral idolatry, and sometimes they were added to the appearance, and sometimes they were added to the tacit, they made them a fortune from the singular case and a fortune from the state of deuteronomy.

They made them, together with the addition to the appearance, the singular in the form of the accusative and the accusative, and they made them, with the addition to the tacit, the position of Deuteronomy in the heart of a thousand in each of them J in the case of the accusative and the accusative Considering both likenesses, but rather making them singular with addition to appearance; Because the appearance is the original and the singular is the original, so the original was the first in the original, and they made them, with the addition to the tacit, the status of Deuteronomy. Because the sub-branch is a branch, and Deuteronomy is a branch, so the branch was the first branch...

The second aspect: which is the two-way facets, and it has the justification of most of the advanced ones, which is that the thousand in them did not change with the appearance, and they changed with the implicit Because they were required to add and post the name after them; So it is similar to me, to and to, and as I have and to and to and does not change its composition J with appearance towards: with

<sup>7)</sup> House of the Great Sea of Greer in his office 778.

<sup>8)</sup> Surah Al-Israa 33.

<sup>9)</sup> The house is attributed to Abi Al-Dhamma in Kitab Al-Jim (by Al-Shaibani): 3/150, without a percentage in the meanings of the Qur'an (for furs): 2/142, and the masculine and feminine (by Ibn Al-Anbari): 2/295.

<sup>10)</sup> Insaf: 2 / 13-14, and see: Asrar al-Arabiya: 256.

<sup>11)</sup> Thought Outcomes: 273.

<sup>12)</sup> Same source: 284.

<sup>13)</sup> The Book of Poetry: 1 / 128-129.

Zaid, and to Umaru, and on Bakr, and it fluctuated with the implicit towards you, and to you, and you have to do so both and both do not change their composition J with the appearance, and fluctuate with the implicit<sup>14)</sup>.

Ibn al-Hajib said: If I want its connotation, then it is correct, and if I want a word to be added at the end to denote al-Muthanna, then it is corrupt.

In both her legs, one phalanx, both attached to an appendix

It is rejected, and if it is given salutation, what is meant is both, and the meaning of what is required of it is for the one, and if he was blamed, he would have to be expressed in the letter absolutely<sup>15)</sup>.

When looking at the books of the applicants, we find that the disagreement between the applicants in the reality of both was not with this one that was depicted. Al-Fur'a said his words according to the words of God Almighty: (Both paradises paid off): He did not say: they came. And that is because both two do not separate and one of them, and the origin of each is as you say to the three: all the judgment was for the two to have what was for the combination, not to single out something for one, so its unification was permitted according to the doctrine of each.

Feminizing it is permissible for feminization that appeared in both, and likewise, do both, and both, and all if you add them to knowledge and the verb comes after them<sup>16)</sup>. And from the plural (and everyone wandered inside)<sup>17)</sup>.

And he was like him. It is abundant in the Qur'an and all the words. The poet said:

Both of them were written for me in my newspaper, so that I do not want to live, nor do I go to death<sup>18)</sup>

The Arabs have singled out one of both of them while they alone go to two of them. Some of them sing to me:

Her legs are phalanx, one, both with an appendix He wants to bucklet<sup>19)</sup> And to that, Al-Tabari went<sup>20)</sup>

As for Abu Bakr Ibn al-Anbari, it seems that he has two schools of thought on this issue. He said about the masculine and the feminine: If someone said, why did not change both and both with the apparent, and changed it with the noun, so it made a Y in the accusative and the lowering?

He was told: There are two views on this:

One of them: The thousand in both the verb lam, and the weight of the k of the verb is a verb, for example: meaning and contentment, and a thousand both feminization as a thousand remembrance and poetry.

And the other saying: that the thousand is in both and both thousand deuteronomy, so it was made with the thousand with the apparent in every case. Because it is not unique to her in authenticity, so she was like a single name, and some poets have singled out to her one, which is something that does not pay attention to, so he said: Furs sang it:

In her legs, one phalanx, both of them attached to his appendix<sup>21)</sup>

This is his first doctrine.

And the other: What he said in an explanation to stop and start his speech on tilting in both: And I say: He who abolishes the inclination of both says: A thousand deuterations are written as a thousand boys, and one by one is both, and a thousand deuteronomy is not known to be inclined<sup>22)</sup>

In sum, the Kufis agree with the Basrians on this issue except for Abu Bakr Ibn al-Anbari in one of his words, and the evidence for that is what Abdul Qadir al-Baghdadi reported in his words, according to the poet's saying: In her legs, he said: Abu Hayyan said in his ticket this verse of the compulsion of the poets And it was not one of both, but it came to the meaning of no, except that he dropped the thousand depending on the opening before it and acted that it suffices from the one tilted to the z, and no one says that each of them is one of both, and he does not claim that both of them are one alone in the pronunciation using So, if he claims him against him, then he is slanderous and obscene from the opponents on the words of their opponents<sup>23)</sup>

And Abd al-Qadir said in support of Abu Hayyan's opinion: What I have seen in the meanings of the Qur'an for furs is supported by what I saw in the meanings of the Qur'an for furs when interpreting the Almighty's saying: (Both paradises paid off). Some of them sang me:

<sup>14)</sup> Equity: 2 / 21-22.

<sup>15)</sup> The explanation in the detailed explanation: 1/81.

<sup>16)</sup> Surah Maryam: 95.

<sup>17)</sup> Surah An-Naml: 87.

<sup>18)</sup> Al-Bayt from al-Bahr al-Tawil by Ibn Muqbel in his office: 39.

<sup>19)</sup> Meanings of the Qur'an: 2/142.

<sup>20)</sup> See: Jami al-Bayan in the interpretation of the verse of the Qur'an: 18/19

<sup>21)</sup> The masculine and feminine: 2 / 294-295.

<sup>22)</sup> Dahha endowment and commencement: 1 / 435-436.

<sup>23)</sup> Treasury of Literature: 1 / 132-133.

Each of her legs had one phalanx, both of which were attached to an appendix  
I mean, the dark, he wants all of you)<sup>24</sup>.

### Conclusion:

- 1 -That none of the Kufists claim that he composed both a thousand deuteronomy except Ibn al-Anbari in one of his two sayings.
- 2 -What the followers of al-Basrien argued is the impermissibility of singling out both of them is the saying of al-Fara.`
- 3 -That there is no disagreement between the applicants of the two schools of thought that it is not permissible to single out both and that they are composed of a thousand feminine.
- 4- That the later scholars agreed with the opinion that the Basrians went to, and they did not permit what Ibn al-Anbari said in the clarification.

### Sources and references:

- \*Asrar Al-Arabia, Abu Al-Barakat Al-Anbari (d. 577 AH), under: Fakhr Saleh Qadara, Dar Al-Jeel, Beirut, 1st Edition, 1415 AH - 1995 AD.
- \*Amali Ibn Al-Shajri, Hebat Allah bin Ali bin Muhammad bin Hamza Al-Hasani Al-Alawi (d.542 AH), edited by: Muhammad Mahmoud Al-Tanahi, Al-Khanji Library, Cairo, 1st Edition, 1413 AH - 1992 AD
- \*Equity in matters of disagreement between the Basriene and Kufian grammarians, Abu Al-Barakat Al-Anbari (d. 577 AH), under: Muhammad Muhi al-Din Abd al-Hamid, Dar al-Talaa ', Cairo, Lat, Latt.
- \*The clarification in Sharh al-Mufassal, Ibn al-Hajeb Abu Amr Othman bin Abi Bakr Yunus al-Doni (d.646 AH), under: Ibrahim Muhammad Abdullah, Dar Saad al-Din, 1st Edition, 1425 AH - 2005 AD.
- \*Clarifying the Endowment and Beginning in the Book of God Almighty, Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Al-Qasim Al-Anbari (d.328 AH), Live: The Faithful Ramadan, Publications of the Arabic Language Academy - Damascus, Latt, Lat.
- \*Appendix and supplement to explaining Al-Tasheel, Abu Hayyan Al-Andalusi (d. 745 AH), edited by: Dr. Hasan Hindawi, twelve volumes of which were printed, some of which were printed in Dar Al-Qalam, Damascus, and some in the House of Treasures of Seville, Saudi Arabia.
- \* Jami al-Bayan on the interpretation of the verse of the Qur'an, Abu Jaafar Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Tabari (d. 310 AH), edited by: Dr. Bashar Awad Maarouf and Issam Fares Al-Haristani, The Resala Foundation, 1st Edition, 1415 AH -1994 AD.
- \*The enthusiasm, Abu Ubadah Al-Walid Bin Al-Bahtari (d. 248 AH), Dr. Ahmed Ibrahim and Ahmed Muhammad, Abu Dhabi Authority for Culture and Heritage, 2007 CE.
- \*The Treasury of Literature and the Heart of the Bab Lisan Al-Arab, Abdul Qadir bin Omar Al-Baghdadi (d. 1093 AH), Explanation and Worship: Abdul Salam Muhammad Haroun, Al-Khanji Library, Cairo, 3rd Edition, 1416 AH - 1996 AD.
- \*Diwan Jarir, Explained by Muhammad Ismail Abdullah Al-Sawy, Publications of the Library of Life House, Beirut, Lat.
- \*Explanation of the verses of Sibawayh, Abu Jaafar Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Nahhas (d. 338 AH), U: Dr. Zuhair Ghazi Zahid, The World of Books, Beirut, 1st Edition, 1406 AH - 1986 AD.
- \*The book, Abu Bishr Amr bin Othman bin Qanbar, nicknamed Sebawayh (d.180 AH), under: Abd al-Salam Muhammad Harun, Al-Khanji Library, 4th Edition, 1425 AH-2004 AD.
- \*The Book of the Gym, Abu Amr Al-Shaibani, edited by: Ibb Al-Karim Al-Gharabawi, revised by: Abd Al-Hamid Hassan, General Authority for the Affairs of the Emiri Press, 1395 AH - 1974 AD.
- \*The Book of Poetry, or Explanation of Formed Verses Al-Arrab, Abu Ali Al-Farsi Al-Hassan Bin Ahmed Bin Abd Al-Ghaffar (d. 377 AH), U: Dr. Mahmoud Muhammad Al-Tanahi, Al-Khanji Library, Cairo, 1st floor, 1408 AH - 1988 AD.
- \*The Results in Al-Fusul (Explanation of Fosul Ibn Mu`at in Grammar), Ibn Iyaz Al-Baghdadi Jamal Al-Din Al-Hussein Bin Badr Al-Din Bin Iyaz Bin Abdullah (d.681 AH), U: Dr. Sherif Abdul Karim Al-Najjar, Dar Ammar, 1st floor, 1431 AH-2010 AD.
- \* The masculine and feminine, Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Al-Qasim Al-Anbari (d.328 AH), U: Dr. Tariq Al-Janabi, Dar Al-Raed Al-Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon, 2nd ed. 1406 AH-1986 AD.

<sup>24)</sup> The same source: 1/133.

\*The meanings of the Qur'an, Yahya bin Ziyad al-Farra (d. 207 AH), U: Ahmed Yusef Najati, and Muhammad Ali al-Najjar, Dar Al-Surur, 2nd ed.

\*Al-Muqtaseb, Abu al-Abbas Muhammad ibn Yazid al-Mabrad (d. 285 AH), U: Muhammad Abd al-Khaliq Atimah, The World of Books, Beirut, Latt, 1431 AH-2010AD.

\* Results of thought in grammar, Abu al-Qasim Abd al-Rahman bin Abdullah al-Suhaili (d.581 AH), edited by: Muhammad Ibrahim al-Banna, Dar Al-Riyadh, for publication and distribution, Latt, Lata.