

The Semantic Impact of the Responses of Sibawayh's Commentators and Their Morphological Objections in the 4th Century AH

Sahar Fadhil Abdulmutallab Al-Shammari^{1*}

¹ College of Islamic Sciences, Aliraqia University, Iraq. <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-2960-3783>

*Corresponding Author: sahar.f.abdulgotalib@aliraqia.edu.iq

Citation: Al-Shammari, S. F. A. (2025). The Semantic Impact of the Responses of Sibawayh's Commentators and Their Morphological Objections in the 4th Century AH, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(4) 2472-2481. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i4.3281>

Published: December 14, 2025

ABSTRACT

Sibawayh's book is considered a foundation in the art of morphology due to the rules and principles it included that completely encompassed the science related to morphology, as it fulfilled its laws and investigated its rules. Accordingly, this study aimed to trace the responses of the book's commentators to Sibawayh and their morphological objections in the fourth century AH, by examining the aspect of the commentators' responses and objections is on the aspect of the morphological study, which includes the structures of verbs. To achieve this, the researcher has adopted the inductive approach, which depends on collecting scientific material by examining the sources of the commentators on the book by Sibawayh, and then using the comparative analytical method to clarify and clarify Aspects of the commentators' responses and objections to the book. The study achieved many results, perhaps the most important of which is that the grammarians relied on their comments on Sibawayh in the book.

Keywords: Explainers' Responses, Morphological Objections, Sibawayh's Book

INTRODUCTION

Praise be to God, who made intentionality a price for His blessings, a refuge from His affliction, a means to His Paradise, and a reason for increasing His goodness. May blessings and peace be upon His Messenger, the Prophet of Mercy, and the Light of the Imams, and upon his family, the lamps of injustice, and his chosen, good companions.

As for what follows, one of the reasons for this research is the field of knowledge of Arabic science, especially the one that deals with an explanation of the first book compiled in Arabic, which is the Book of Sibawayh. After my review of the morphological material of the book and its collection and counting, the research was established, and I discussed the morphological commentators' commentaries on the book in the fourth century AH. He focused on several issues, the first of which was: the truth of the two chapters (reassured and reassured), the second: the reason for the deletion of the yā' in the verb (astahayt), the third: what was mentioned about the weight of (fa'al) from the verbs, the fourth: the specific verb from the word (haya), and the fifth: the reality of the verb (jubi, yujbay) and the sixth: the truth of the verb (kasb and ktasib), and the seventh: the truth of the verb that was a sample (ama, from the construction of (a verb to do)), and the eighth: the truth of the verb from the word (mahbub), and I would like to point out that I have addressed these issues. This included responses, objections, and comments to Sibawayh's book, and I present what it contained in terms of commentary, explanation, or clarification of Sibawayh's statements. The nature of the issues required that there be a discrepancy between each issue and another, and this is also one of the requirements of the nature of the study. I must point out that I tried to add something to this research. The science of modern morphology reached him, so I added to these issues

some of the opinions of the hadith scholars, and I only dealt with the issues that I thought differed from the ancients and required further research and discussion.

The Verbs

The first issue: The reality of the two verbs (taman and tam'ann)

Sibawayh said in (this is a chapter on degrading what had a heart in it): "...and likewise (mutamanat), but it is (tamanat), so they changed (the hamza)..." (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 3, p. 467) and he said in (this is a chapter What is the hamza in it in the place of (the lām) from the daughters of the yā' and the wāw: "...and the like of this in (the heart): taman and tma'ann." These things were only applied to the heart, since their meaning was the meaning of something that expels that in it, and the pronunciation in it was if you turned it around. That wording, so this became like the letter in which the extra letter is missing, then its meaning is derived from his wording in which the extra letter is missing..." (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 4, p. 381).

I said: The sum of what Sibawayh stated in these two chapters is that (taman) is the original, and (taman) is the inverted form of it, and that is in accordance with what both Al-Farsi and Al-Rummani decided upon Sibawayh, as Abu Ali Al-Farsi said: "... (taman) : So, he did... so if it was reversed, it became (tama'an): so perhaps..." (Abu Ali Al-Farsi, 1990, vol. 3, p. 320), and Al-Rummani said: "... but it must be the original, because verbs devoid of addition (are more deserving) In the original, "At-Tama'an" was not used except with an addition)" (Al-Rummani, 2021, vol. 5, p. 2514), and he also said: "...And the analogy of the Qalb is their saying: "At-Tama'an" and "At-Tama'an," for this is interpreted as "al-Qalb" because the second is inflected with an addition, and the infinitive F (without An increase) more deserving of the original..." (Al-Rummani, 2021, vol. 5, p. 3614).

Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi was the only one to disagree with Sibawayh on this issue, as he held that (tam'ann) was the original, not (taman), and he made excuses for that by saying: "...then (taman and tam'ann), the original in them is (tam'an), by introducing (the meem to the hamza)." (So he was fatam'ann) is inverted, and the evidence that the original is (tam'aan) is that we find (the meem) before the hamza in all its conjugations, like your saying: he taman, and he tam'ann, and he yatm'an, and (tam'an) is not inflected in these cases..." (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi), 2008, vol. 5, pp. 294-295), and some of them argued that the verb is "tamann, no one says in it: tamanan" (Al-Tuwajiri, 2003, vol. 2, p. 674), and Ibn Kharouf (Ibn Kharouf, 1995, vol. 2, p. 528).

Ibn Jinni said, explaining Sibawayh's doctrine: "And if the addition had some degree of justification for the original, it would be better for the heart to be with the addition" (Ibn Jinni, 1990, vol. 2, p. 75), and Al-Mubarrad followed him in that (Al-Mubarrad, 1997, vol. 2, p. 255) and Al-Suhaili (Al-Suhayli, 1914, vol. 2, p. 370).

Abu Omar Al-Jarmi said that "tam'an" is the basic principle. Because the infinitive running on (tam'an) indicates that it is the original, and that is their saying: (alatminan and altmanyn).

Some grammarians pointed out that each of the words (taman and tam'ann) has a root with its head, as evidenced by hearing their two sources (alatminan and altaman). This is like the attraction and withdrawal of two self-contained origins due to the coming of the source from them (al-jadhb wa al-jabdh) (Ibn Jinni, 1990, vol. 2, p. 74)/(Ibn Adhimah, 1999, p. 45) meaning that "reassured" and "reassured" are two independent articles, and among them are those who believe that the root of the verb (reassured) is (reassured) in the form of (ahmar), which indicates the meaning of exaggeration, hamzat alifah; To meet the residents, and it became reassurance (Nahr, 2014, vol. 4, p. 421).

Ibn Asfour accepted Al-Jarmi's doctrine when he said: "It is correct in my view, because most of the inflexions of the word used it, so they said: atman, yatmyn and mutmyin, just as they said: taman yutamin mutamin, and they said: tmanyn, but they did not say tumyn" (Ibn Asfour, 1996, vol. 2, p. 617).

I think that Sibawayh and those who agreed with him did not succeed in getting this right, because both "taman and tam'ann" are two independent substances. And one of them is not inverted from the other, as two infinitives were mentioned for both verbs, which indicates that the two verbs are not the origin of the other, and the interpretation that prevails in my view is the interpretation that says that the root of the verb (atman) is in the form of (ahmar) with the hamzat of its alifah, to meet the two consonants and it becomes taman, as in (The evidence for this is that the article (tamman) exists in the Hebrew language with the same meaning and without the hamza (Al-Janabi, 1981, pp. 16-17).

What confirms that the hamza is redundant in the two verbs (atman and tam'an) and that they are not the origin of each other, but rather they are a branch of a root that is (taman). This is confirmed by many pieces of evidence, including the poet's saying:

And you are the son of Laila; the best of your people is a scene.

(Kathir bin Azza, 1971, p. 97). The other said: Even if the Tamim turned around and became isolated

Antichrist comes out seeking protection (Al-Tarmah 1994, p. 65).

And their saying: This is a young woman, and it is in the language of the Banu Kalb, in addition to many other pieces of evidence (Abdul Tawab, 1999, p. 194).

The second issue: The reason for deleting ya' in (astahayt).

Sibawayh's doctrine is that (astahayt) its root is (astahyayt); (The first Ya'ah) was deleted to prevent the two consonants from meeting, as he said in (This is the chapter on what was stated that (faealt) from it, such as: I sold, even if it was not used in speech): "...and likewise (astahayt), dwell on (the first Ya')." Among them, as it was made silent in (I sold), and (the second) was made silent because it is the verb's letter, so (the first) was deleted so that two people would not meet. Rather, they did this because it was widespread in their speech..." (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 4, p. 399).

Al-Rummani followed up on this with what he attributed to Abu Uthman al-Mazni (d. 249 AH), that the reason for deletion is (lightening), and not to prevent the two consonants from meeting. Al-Rummani considered the doctrine of Abu Uthman (the most apparent) from the doctrine of Sibawayh, even though everything follows the principles, as he said, Al-Rummani: "... As for their saying: (astahyt), the original is: (astahyayt). The vowel was transferred from (yaa), which is (ayn), to haa, and the yaa was deleted, due to the consonance of the two consonants, then the verb was inflected on the deletion that was necessitated by the vowel. It was said: He is ashamed, he is ashamed, and this is the doctrine of Sibawayh, and Al-Mazni disagreed with him in that, and he claimed that (the yā) was not deleted to join the two sakīn, but rather it was deleted (for lightening) in the two syllables.) ...No, the two statements are based on the principles, and Al-Mazni's statement is more apparent..." (Al-Rummani, 2021, vol. 8, pp. 3667-3668.)

I said: Al-Rummani was the only one with this preference, unlike any other commentator.

There is a note that should be taken into account in this issue, which is that (astahyayt) is not a real root for (astahyt); This is because they are two languages in the speech of the Arabs. Rather, the first was counted as the "original" for the second due to its being what it should be in (qiyas), as Al-Serafi said: "...Know that (astahyt) has two languages, one of them is: (astahyayt) and the other is: (astahyt), so as for (astahyayt) there are two ya's. It is the language of the people of Hijaz, and it is as it should be in (qiyas)... As for the other, which is (astahyt), it is the language of Bani Tamim, and the grammarians differed in it, and regarding the reason for which one of the two ya's was deleted..." (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi (2008, vol. 5, p. 318.)

Al-A'lam Al-Shantamari went to what Sibawayh did (Al-A'lam Al-Shantamari, 2005, vol. 2, p. 666), and as for Al-Qurtubi, he did not allow assimilation and considered it an error according to Sibawayh and his companions (Al-Majriti, 1984, 311).

Just as commentators differed in explaining this deletion, grammarians also differed in explaining it among themselves. Some of them mentioned that the reason for deleting the second yā' in (astahyt) was; Because it is connected to the subject' s ta' , the reason for its deletion in (aistahaa) that is not associated with the pronoun is not clear, and Al-Mazni denied this reasoning by saying: "It was not deleted to meet the two consonants, and if its deletion had been for him, he would have rejected it when he said: He is acting and he says: He is yastahy" (Ibn Jinni, 1954, Part 2, p. 204), and he demonstrated the validity of his statement with two pieces of evidence:

The first: If he deleted it, the two residents would meet; To return it if he said (yastahy); Because the lam is moved by the dhammah and its sukun is removed, and he mentioned an argument that refutes this necessity from Al-Khalil, when he said: "Some people said: They were deleted to meet the consonants, and they were not used in (ya'fal); because if they returned something, the like of it would not be raised in their speech, and that is because the verbs in the present tense if they are last.

It is not included in the nominative case in any speech" (Ibn Jinni, 1954, vol. 2, p. 204), and the other: What confirms that it is not the consonance of the two consonants is their saying in the two: (astaha), because the lam does not have a dhammah in it, but this is omitted due to frequent use, as they said. In many things, by deletion, such as: "I felt, I remained, and I touched," and they did not use the verb from (astahyayt) except with an addition" (Ibn Jinni, 1954, vol. 2, p. 204)/ (Abu Ali Al-Farsi, Al-Zamakhshari, and Al-Ayouni, 2021, vol. 4, p. 1873.)

What is more likely to me is what Al-Rummani said. To be safe from the objections and reasons we mentioned.

Al-Akhfash, Ibn Duraid, and Ibn Hisham Al-Lakhmi went on to say, "The use of the verb (astaha) with one ya'a is the language of Tamim, and two ya'a is the language of the people of Hijaz, and it is the original, because if the place of the lam was defective, they did not raise the same as it, because they said: ahyayt and hawayt, and they say, I said, and I sold, so they say 'Tala'. Al-Ain, when the L did not become high, but they deleted the Ya' because of their frequent use of this word, as they said: I do not know who I do not know" (Ibn Hisham Al-Lakhmi, 2003, p. 459.)

What seems more likely to me is that he went to him; To be safe from the objections and reasons we mentioned.

The third issue: The verbs mentioned in the word “fa’al yaf’al.”

Sibawayh said in (This is the chapter on the knowledge of every verb that transcends you to something other than you): “... and the word (verb yafa’ul) came in the speech in (two letters) ... and that is: Fadl fadfadul, and die you will die...” (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 4), p. 40).

Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi followed him in this regard, when he said: “... I have mentioned in the past other than Sibawayh (Hadhar Yahadur), with evidence of it in poetry” (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, 2008, vol. 4, pp. 424-425).

I said: Abu Sa’id was the only one to do this, and no other commentators, and what is strange about what I came across in this issue is what the investigator of the Book of Sibawayh (Abdul Salam Muhammad Harun) claimed that he was the one who found this verb (hadur yadhur), when he said: “..I found (sixth) in (Al-Lisan and Standards), and he was present...” (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 4, p. 40)/ (Ibn Manzur, 1993, vol. 4, p. 196)/ (Ibn Faris, 2002, vol. 4, p. 508) / (Al-Zubaidi, 2005, vol. 33, p. 501).

Al-Haskouri went on to say that the verb (died) is not transformed into (a verb), but rather it is placed on it, and when he joined the present participle of ayin, it is anomalous, and its counterpart from the correct one, he preferred to be preferred, so he interpreted this, and he did not assume that it was transformed into (a verb) an anomaly, since our interpretation was ‘There is an anomaly in the present tense (Al-Tuwaijri, 2003, vol. 2, pp. 548-549).

Ibn Khalawayh mentioned in his book (Not in the Words of the Arabs): Fa’al - yafa’ul except for five letters, such as: (I lived forever), (I died, I will die), (Fadl is preferred), (Na’am is blessed), and (Qan’t yaqnat) (Ibn Khalawayh, 1979, p 95).

Ibn Al-Qutiyyah pointed out that what was in the form of (fa’l) was the future tense of (yafa’ul) except the (fadl) of the thing, because since the best form was (fadl), they dispensed with the future form of the future (fadl) (Ibn Al-Qutiyyah, 1993, p. 3), and Ibn Al-Qatta’ agreed with him in that. (Ibn al-Qatta’, 2003, vol. 1, pp. 11-12).

The truth is that Sibawayh deviated from the triple verb structures, and they are (fa’al - yafa’al) and (fa’al - yafa’al) and he considered them an anomaly, and Ibn al-Siraj mentioned that this anomaly and departure from analogy is what causes the problem when he said: “And among what is problematic is their saying: ‘You will die.’ The analogy was that whoever said: You died, you will die, like: You were afraid, you will be afraid, and whoever said: You will die, it is obligatory for him to say: You will die, as I said: You will rise, so this only came anomalous, as they said in the Sahih: Fadla, fadla” (Ibn al-Siraj, (d. T), vol. 3, p. 344).

Ibn al-Sakit mentioned the first weight and referred to what Sibawayh mentioned in terms of words and added to it when he said: “And likewise I continued for it and then you say it will last. Abu Yusuf said: Some grammarians claimed that some Arab people say, ‘So-and-so judge has attended’ and then they say, ‘he will attend’” (Ibn al-Sakit, 2002), p. 212/ (Ibn Qutaybah, 1963, pp. 278-279).

Al-Farra mentioned the second weight mentioned by Sibawayh, when he said: “As for those who included (we plotted), they wanted to differentiate between the malicious act of plotting in an act and the plotting act of proximity, so they said: We almost did that, and they said: (We plotted the people) from plotting, as he differentiated. Between them in Yafa’al, they said in the first “yakad” and in the second “yakkid”” (Ibn Qutaybah, 1963, pp. 278-279).

Ibn Jinni studied these problematic meters in the chapter (composition of languages), and the verbs previously mentioned among grammarians were among his examples of the combination of languages, and the combination of languages according to him is when “the owners of the two languages met, so this one hosted some of the language of this, and this part of the language of that, so a third language was combined” (Ibn Jinni Jenny, 1990, vol. 1, p. 381).

Hence, some of them attributed these two constructions to (the overlap of languages), so in Fadl - Fadl, he used (Fadl - Fadl) and (Fadl - Fadl).

Whoever combined (ayn) in the present tense in the broken past (ayn), used the present tense of the first construction with The past tense of the second construction, so you put together this new construction, which Sibawayh considered abnormal, and the same is said in (you die - you die), as he heard from it (you died - you die) and (you died - you died), so he used the present tense of the first with the past tense of the second, as well as (kaddat - takad). What is well known about it is (Kaddat - Taqadd), but he heard (Kudat - Takkud), so he took the present tense of the first with the past of the second, and thus this construction became” (Al-Hadithi, 1965, 255)/ (Ibn Jinni, 1990, vol. 1, p. 376).

Accordingly, the structures of abstract trilateral verbs according to Sibawayh are four, but: (fa’al - ya’fa’al) is specific to what (aynah) and (lamah) are one of the letters of the throat, and as for the other structures, they are irregular” (Al-Hadithi, 1965, 255).

Dr. Fakhr al-Din Qabawa stated, “The Arabs neglected these structures (fa’l) and (fa’l) due to the burden of moving from a dam to a kasra or from a kasra to a dam” (Qabawa, 1994, vol. 4, p. 64). In summary of the above, I say that deviating from analogy and changing the morphological structure is very possible, and that the Arab has

wisdom in basing most of his language on analogy, and this wisdom did not escape him in the event of deviating from analogy, but perhaps it is the reason for that, as Sibawayh indicates by saying: “And it is not Something they are forced to do unless they try to do it directly” (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 1, p. 32).

I see that the limited space of these buildings in use is very clear in their problems, and Sibawayh, Ibn al-Siraj and other scholars are sufficient witnesses to the problem of this issue, as mentioned above in their statements.

The fourth issue: The exact verb from the word (haya).

Sibawayh said in (this is the chapter on what is (muḥʾala) as a vowel that has a ha and a fatha): “...and they said: a foxed land... and a living one and a snake: in it there are snakes and snakes...” (Qabawa, 1994, vol. 4, p. 94).

Al-Serafi followed him in the word (life), when he said: “... Sibawayh’s doctrine is that the verbal noun of (haya) is a yā’, and for this reason they said: the land of life, and others said: it is (wāw), and the author of the book (Al-Ayn) said: the land of erased, and they said: Eve’s man (the owner of a serpent), and this is evidence that the noun of the verb is (waw)” (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, 2008, vol. 4, p. 496) / (Al-Farahidi, 2003, vol. 3, p. 317) / (Al-Jawhari, 1987, vol. 4, p. 2324) / (Ibn Manzur, 1993, vol. 14, p. 219).

I said: Al-Serafi was alone in disagreeing with this, unlike any other commentator.

Al-Haskouri went to what Al-Sirafi went to (Al-Tuwaijri, 2003, vol. 3, p. 712), and Ibn Jinni mentioned the recitation of Qatada and Ali bin Al-Hussein in (Mubasara) according to the meter of the mafa’ala, saying: “The mafa’ala has increased in the sense of commonness and abundance in all the jewels and events, and that is like their saying: A foggy land: a lot of mist, and a lot of foxes, and a muddy place, and a lot of snakes, and a place where it is full of snakes and serpents, so this is in jewels, and as for events, as you say... and eating fresh food is a resource, and a place where it is... and that is why the ma’fa’alah has increased in what we mentioned due to the desire to exaggerate” (Ibn Jinni, 1999, Part 2, p. 136).

There has been a difference of opinion regarding the origin of this word (haya), whether it is inverted from (waw) or (yaa). The doctrine of Al-Khalil, Sibawayh, and many scholars is that its origin is yaa (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 2, p. 394) / (Al-Mubarrad, 1994, vol. 1, p. 186) / (Ibn Jinni, 1990, vol. 1, p. 255) / (Al-Zamakhshari, 2006, vol. 1, p. 424) / (Ibn Ya’ish, 2001, vol. 2, p. 218).

Al-Mazni disagreed with Al-Khalil, Sibawayh, and the majority, and held that the waw has an origin and is not inverted from a yaa, and it is a word that is not pronounced with a verb, due to the many confusions it entails, because its essence is a yaa and its lam is a waw, so it was abandoned (Al-Mubarrad, 1994, vol. 1, p. 186) / (Abu Ali) Al-Farsi, 2003, p. 232) / (Al-Radi Al-Istarabadi, 1975, vol. 3, pp. 71-73).

It has been heard from its conjugations (animal), (haywa) the name of a man, (hayut) the mention of snakes, and (life).

The origin of life (hayya) is the ya’ that is moved and what precedes it is opened and is changed to an alpha (Al-Samin Al-Halabi, (d.d.), vol. 9, pp. 26-27), and it is also a source of hearing for the verb (hayya - yahya) and it has a preposition in the heart, and its origin is (haya) (Safi, 1995), vol. 1, p. 194).

Al-Mazni’s doctrine has been described as corrupt “because it has been proven that they replaced the yā’ with a waw as an anomaly, and it has not been proven in their speech that what is designated by the yā’ and its lamā is a waw... Also, (the animal) is from life, and they say in the Deuteronomy (hayyaan) with the yā’ and nothing else” (Ibn Asfour, 1996), vol. 2, p. 569) / (Abu Ali Al-Farsi, Al-Zamakhshari, and Al-Ayouni, 2021, vol. 4, p. 1870).

His citation of hearing (Haywah) and (Hayut) is that (Haywah) is the name of a man and its origin is (Hayya), except that since it was a proper name, and the proper names are often changed by it from the analogy of their words, they introduced a kind of change to it, so they replaced the second letter with a waw in contrast to the analogy, as They did this with many notable figures, such as: (Midian) and (Maryam).

(Hayut) is likely to be (Fa’ul) from (Al-Hout) and its origin is (Hayut), so its “ayn” was raised with a “ya” in its heart to escape the succession of proverbs, and it is possible that (F’alut) is from (Al-Hayat) and its origin is (Hayyut) and the “ayn” was silent, due to the combination of the two proverbs, and it was assimilated into the L. This is a support for changing the yā’ in (Al-Hayāwā) in order to escape the succession of proverbs (Abu Al-Barakat 2002, vol. 2, p. 246).

Perhaps what is more likely to me is what Al-Serafi said, because this fact was mentioned by most dictionaries, and I find that they differ in the origin of the words mentioned with a yā’, and I assume that there are those who confuse it and ask for evidence that its origin is a yā’ or a wāw; This is due to the fact that the rulings on these two letters are similar in terms of explanation and substitution, so their rulings are inferred from their counterparts.

This contemporary linguistic study has proven that the last part of the word is weak, and that it is subject to change and deletion, especially if it is soft or consonant sounds (Al-Rudaini, 2002, p. 259) / (Vendres, 1950, p. 88) / (Amin, 1965, p. 8).

The fifth issue (jabaa, yajbaa)

Sibawayh said in (This is the chapter What are these letters in which there are Fa'ats): "...and they said, 'Abi, Yabi,' so they likened it to (he reads) ... And they said: jabaa,yajbaa and qalaa,yaqlaa,' so they liked this to (he read, he reads) and the like... and we do not know. Except for this letter... As for jabbi yajbi, and qalaa yaqlaa, (they are not known), except from a weak and eminent person, so I refrain from using them as evidence..." (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 4, pp. 104-105.)

Al-Serafi did not convey to him his position on (jabaa,yajbaa), in particular, as he followed it up by saying: "...and they said: jabaa, yajbaa," and qalaa,yaqlaa." (They were not as sound to him) as the soundness of (Abu Yaabi), and Abu Zaid narrated in (The Book of Sources): Jabut. I accept and I accept" (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, 2008, vol. 4, p. 482).

I said: Abu Sa'id was alone in tracing this, unlike any other commentator.

I did not come across this verb (jabi) among other commentators. Ibn al-Qatta' mentioned it in his book (Al-A'la') insinuatingly, not explicitly (Ibn al-Qatta', 2003, vol. 1, p. 189).

Accordingly, the structures of abstract triple verbs according to Sibawayh are four, and as for the form (fa'al - yaFal), it is specific to what is designated or lamed by one of the throat letters (hamza), (ha), (ha), (kha), (ayn) and (ghayn). As for the other constructions without these vowel letters, it is abnormal, such as the verb (abi-yabi), and (halak-yahalak), or from the overlap of languages, such as (rukn-yarkun) (Al-Hamalawi, 2007, pp. 25-26).

Sibawayh mentions what we call (functionality), by which we mean the effect of the specific sound within the structure on the other sound. If the verb's vowel is velar, it leads to the opening of the verb's eye, and if the verb's eye is velar, it opens itself (Nahr, 2014, vol. 4, 194-195); Therefore, "it must be opened by what is next to it, because the eye and the laam are involved in movement, and the fa of the verb and its eye are not the same, because the fa is stationary in the present tense and the eye is mobile, so they are different. If the eye were put in the place of the fa, it would be silent and would be different from its initial state of movement, and if the laam were placed in the place of the eye, it would not deviate from the movement that required it" (Abu Saeed Al-Serafi, 2008, vol. 4, p. 480).

The sixth issue: kasab,ktasab in terms of (meaning).

Sibawayh's doctrine is that there is a difference between them, as he said in (this is the chapter on the subject of Ifatala'): "...and as for (kasab), it says: he succeeded, and as for (ktasab), it means action, seeking, and diligence, in the position of confusion..." (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 4, p. 74).

Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi followed him in this regard, with what he attributed to others, and he did not weaken it in any way, as if he saw that he would not always be expelled, when he said: "... Sibawayh differentiated between (kasab, ktasab), and others said: There is no difference between them. God Almighty said:) for her. what she has earned, and upon her is what she has earned" ([Al-Baqarah: 286], and the meaning is the same) (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, 2008, vol. 4, pp. 452-453).

I said: I did not notice such a follow-up from any of the commentators other than Abu Sa'id.

Al-Zamakhshari said: "Why did he single out goodness as kasab, and evil as ktasab? I said: In ktasab there is dependability, so since evil is what the soul desires and is attracted to it and commands it to do, in achieving it I work and work diligently, so it is designated as acquired in it, and when it is not like that in goodness, it is described as what It does not indicate reliance" (Al-Zamakhshari, 1985, p. 107).

Al-Jarbardī said: "The meaning of kasab is the acquisition of something in whatever way it may be, and the meaning of earning is exaggeration and dependence on it." (Al-Jarbardī, (d.d.), vol. 1, p. 51), and from that is the Almighty's saying: "To her is what she has earned, and upon her is what she has earned" (Al-Baqarah: 286).

Ibn Al-Qutayyah believes that (earned and acquired) in one meaning, with no difference between them, as he said: "Al-Kāf means (faāl and 'afāl) in one meaning... I earned him money in earnest, and he earned it" (Ibn Al-Qutayyah, 1993, p. 64), and he cited as evidence the Almighty's saying:) Taste what You used to earn (Az-Zumar: 24) when He made earning in bad deeds just as He made it in good deeds.

Ibn Ya'ish said: "As for their saying: (kasab,ktasab), Sibawayh differentiated between them and said: (kasab in the sense of: he gained money, and ktasab in the meaning of: he sought and worked hard, in the same position as confusion)" (Ibn Ya'ish, 1393 AH, p. 82), and there are those who did not differentiate between them, and went on to say: Until their meaning is the same (Abu Al-Baqā Al-Akbari, 1979, vol. 1, p. 129).

What is most likely in my opinion is what those who differentiate between the two forms have argued, that multiplying the word means multiplying the meaning, and this is what the studies of hadith scholars have indicated: Their rule is that "every change from one form to another must be accompanied by a change from one meaning to another" (Al-Samarrai, 2017, p. 7).

Sibawayh said in the chapter: (Qualities that occur in things): And they said: poor as they said (small and weak) and they said: poverty as they said: weak and we did not name them. They said: (poverty) just as they did not say in severe (stressed) they abstained with (severe and poor). (He created) came in the abstract, triple meaning of (He

did), and Sibawayh represented this with (He lacked and read) and (He kidnapped and kidnapped). Sibawayh differentiated between (He earned, and He earned), and the morphologists disagreed about them. Are they in one sense or do they differ in meaning into two sayings:

The first saying: It is the saying of Sibawayh: "The meaning of (acquired) in it is an addition to the meaning of (kassab), to increase its structure by adding the alif and the ta', as the meaning of (kasab: is successful, and (acquired) strives to seek and act".

Al-Zamakhshari said: "Why did I single out good as earning, and evil as earning? I said: In earning there is dependence.

So since evil is what the soul desires, and it is attracted to it and commanded by it, it was hardworking and diligent in achieving it, so it was designated as earned in it, and since it was not like that in goodness, it was described as what There is no indication of reliance" (Al-Zamakhshari, 1985, p. 107).

Al-Jarbari said: "The meaning of earning is the acquisition of something in any way, and the meaning of earning is exaggeration and reliance on it." (Al-Jarbari, (d.d.), vol. 1, p. 51), and from that is the Almighty's saying: "To her is what she has earned, and upon her is what she has earned" (Al-Baqarah: 286).

The second statement: That (he earned and earned) has one meaning and there is no difference between them, as Al-Quthiyah said: "Al-Kaf is based on (fa'al and 'af'al), with one meaning... We earned him the money in a way, and I earned it" (Ibn Al-Quthiyah, 1993, p. 64).

Those who say this say infer the validity of their doctrine by the Almighty's saying: "Taste what you used to earn" [Al-Zumar: 24], when He made earning in bad deeds just as He made it in good deeds.

Ibn Ya'ish said: "As for their saying: (He earned and earned), Sibawayh differentiated between them and said: He earned meaning: he gained money, and he earned meaning: he sought and worked hard, in the same position as confusion" (Ibn Ya'ish, 1393 AH, p. 82).

What seems to me in this matter is that what Sibawayh and those who followed him from among the morphologists held was that the meaning of (gain): he achieved success, and (acquired): he worked hard to achieve success is more acceptable; Because the increase in its structure is evidence of an increase in its meaning, just as the verbs that are formulated with "ifta'al" come with different meanings, such as compliance, taking, interaction, and others, and the structure is the same.

As for the verbs that appear on (ifta'al), which is in the sense of (verb) in the example of (recite and recite), they are few and cannot be based on a rule, and they can be interpreted in their coming as more in the abstract sense, pointing out the origin of their description.

The seventh issue: What was the (ghāyn) in it (lam) in the construction of (faāl yāfa'ūl).

Sibawayh said in "This is the chapter on what (fa'ul) is from (fa'al) in it is open: "That is if the hamza, or the ha, or the ayn, or the ha, or the ghayen, or the kha is (lam or ayna), and that is your saying: He recites, he recites. He forced him to do it, and he took off to take off... and (emptied to be done) ... and slaughtered to be slaughtered... and played to be played... This is what these letters (lamat) were in..." (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 4, p. 101).

He was followed in his example by Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, who said: "... Sibawayh did not mention (Al-Ghain Lama), and it came from it: dhamu yadhamu, and his head is thick with him, so these letters in these verbs are (lamat)..." (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, 2008, vol. 4, p. 476).

I said: This continuation is incorrect, and it is a pure illusion on the part of Abu Saeed, and that is because Sibawayh exemplified his example in what was mentioned above with (Faragh Yafarghu), and therefore there is no basis for what he mentioned. Yes, Abu Saeed apologizes for the fact that his copy of Sibawayh's book is devoid of this example. This is indeed what I noticed in Sibawayh's underlined words in his explanation (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, 2008, vol. 4, p. 476). This same example was also mentioned in the explanation of Abi Al-Hasan Al-Rummani (Al-Rummani, 2021, vol. 6, p. 3086), and this is evidence that Sibawayh did not neglect the representation because his mother was weak in the construction (fa'al - ya'fa'l), and that the problem is only in Abi Sa'id's version.

The eighth issue: The reality of the verb (mahbub)

Sibawayh's doctrine is that its analogy is for it to be formulated from (his love), for he is loved, and not from (he loved him), and the hearing was mentioned in the first as well, but he again denied the hearing in another chapter, and he recorded what was reported by him, when he said: In (this is the chapter of what came) (Fa'l) from it other than its verb): "...And also: I made him sad and I loved him. So, if you say: He is sad and loved, it comes in a way other than (I loved), and some of them said: (I loved), so he brought it by analogy" (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 4, p. 67). He said: In (this is the chapter on the six letters, if each one of them is an 'ayn...): "...they said in an irregular letter: I love, we love, and I love. They likened it to their saying: (stinking), but it came on (verb), even if it did not, they say: (I loved) ..." (Sibawayh, 1988, vol. 4, p. 109).

I said: And his saying: "... even if they do not say: (I loved) ..." is a contradiction of what was mentioned above, including his saying: "... and some of them said: (I loved) (Then Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi followed him by saying: "... It has been said previously that (love) was used, and I mentioned in it what was narrated on the authority of Abu Raja' Al-Ataridi: (Say, 'If you love God, then follow me, and God will love you') [Al Imran: 31] And poetry I recited In it, and other than that, some of Banu Mazen from Tamim said:

*By your age, I am the stronghold of Egypt
"You will have a distance from what you love".
(Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, 2008, vol. 4, p. 485)
The Seraph had also cited a third witness, which is what the poet said:
By God, had I not passed by him, I would not have loved him*

Nor was he inferior to Ubaid and Mashreq
(Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, 2008, vol. 4, p. 447) / (Ibn Manzur, 1993, vol. 1, p. 289)

Al-Sirafi was the only one to follow this, unlike any other commentator, and it is a truly valid criticism of Sibawayh.

He went to what Al-Sirafi went in his explanation of Al-Haskouri (Al-Tuwaijri, 2003, vol. 1, p. 45), and the word (beloved) is an active participle of the verb (love), which is a verb that deviates from analogy due to the kasrah of the present tense in it (Al-Jawhari, 1987, vol. 1, p. 136). / (Al-Farabi, 2003, vol. 3, p. 136).

Grammarians differed among themselves regarding the verb (hib), it is said: He loves him, so he is beloved, and the Basranians denied the occurrence of the triple (hib) (Ibn al-Anbari, 1992, vol. 1, p. 435).

The Kufans mentioned that the verb (to love to love) in the present tense is language in (he loved to be loved), and this includes their saying in the proverb: The workmanship of someone who is a medicine for someone who loves (Ibn Al-Anbari, 1992, vol. 1, p. 435) / (Al-Maydani, 1987, p. 397), and from This is what the poet said:

*I even loved Sudan for its love
I loved black dogs for their love*

Al-Farra, D.T., vol. 1, p. 135).

Whoever says: (beloved) based it on the language of those who say: I loved a man, I will love him (Al-Farra, D.T., vol. 1, p. 135).

Abu Raja al-Atardi (Abu Hayyan, 1420 AH, vol. 2, p. 448) read the Almighty's saying: "Say, 'If you love God, then follow me, and God will love you.'" [Al Imran: 31] in the language of those who say: I loved the man.

The Basrans said: No, I loved the man, and they said in their saying: A beloved man, based on what I loved, and I loved, not spoken of, just as they said: A crazy man, based on the paradise of God Almighty, and his paradise not spoken of, but it is said: God made him mad, Glory be to Him (Ibn al-Anbari, 1992, vol. 1, p. 435).

It was narrated on the authority of Abu Raja': "You love" (Al-Zamakhshari, 2006, vol. 1, p. 424) / (Abu Hayyan, 1420 AH, vol. 2, p. 431) / (Al-Alusi, 1415 AH, vol. 3, p. 129), by opening the ta and breaking the ha from love, as it was narrated from him. May God love you" (Ibn Khalawayh, 1934, p. 20) / (Al-Zamakhshari, 2006, vol. 1, p. 424) / (Al-Alusi, 1415 AH, vol. 3, p. 129) / (Abu Hayyan, 1420 AH, vol. 2, p. 431), by opening the yā, kasra for the ha, and assimilation of the ba. Although it is juzm; This is in the language of Tamim, Qais, Asad, and a group of Arabs (Al-Mubarrad, 1997, vol. 1, p. 339) / (Al-Nahhas, 1988, vol. 1, p. 321).

Al-Mubarrad mentioned (His love is loved by him) two verses from poetry, then he said: Abu Raja' Al-Atardi recited the Almighty's saying: "Say, 'If you love God, then follow me, and God will love you.'" [Al-Imran: 31], so he did two things in this: one of them was that he brought it to whom I loved, and the other It is an assimilation in the place of juzm, and this is the doctrine of Tamim, Qais and Asad (Al-Mubarrad, 1997, vol. 1, p. 339).

Al-Zajaj went on to say that "it is permissible in the language (you love), but most often (you love), because 'I love' is few in the language, and he claimed that it is a language that has died according to what is thought" (Al-Zajaj, 1988, vol. 1, p. 440). What Abu Bakr attributed to the Basrans, al-Zajaj attributed to Al-Kisa'i, one of the imams of the Kufans.

Al-Nahhas said: "Al-Kasa'i said: He is loved by whom I loved, as if it were a dead language" (Al-Nahhas, 1988, vol. 1, p. 321), and it was reported on the authority of Abu Zaid that it was said: I loved, he loves, and he loves, and he loves, and he loves, and on the authority of Al-Asma'i that he heard it in the present tense beginning with the letter ta, but he did not know it. In others.

He also said, after he reported Abu Raja' al-Atardi's recitation: "Al-Kisa'i said: It is said: 'He loves' and 'He loves' and 'I love' and 'He loves' with a kasra on the ya' and 'He loves' and 'I love' and 'I love', and he said: This is the language of some Qais meaning a kasra. He said: 'Al-Fath' is the language of Tamim, Asad and Qais, and it is the language of the one who said: 'Love'. It is a dead language, and Al-Akhfash said: "You did not listen, I loved it" (Al-Nahhas, 1988, vol. 1, p. 321).

Abu Jaafar stated that “It is not permissible for the Basrans to break the yā’ if one loves, due to the heavy kasra in the yā’, and as for opening it, it is known and indicated by a loved one” (Ibn Al-Anbari, 1992, vol. 1, p. 435). These texts deny what Abu Bakr attributed to the Basrans, and what Al-Nahhas reported indicates that the Basrans reported the authenticity of their saying: “I loved the man,” except that Al-Akhfash alone did not hear it, but he did not prevent him. What the Basrans do not allow is breaking the yā’ in the form: he loves, and that is due to a well-known morphological problem, which is escaping heaviness, and what Abu Bakr attributed to the Basrans that the past is not spoken (Ibn al-Anbari, 1992, vol. 1, p. 354) and is not supported by the previous texts.

In conclusion, it seems to me that Al-Serafi’s guidance on this issue is correct. Because the verb (hab) even if it is irregular, it has been heard “with fatha and kasra. As for fatha, it is the language of Najd, and as for the Banu Asad, they break the verb as well as the Banu Ka’b” (Al-Khatib, 2003, vol. 2, p. 242), and it would have been better to say that they “chosen The irregular is different from the heavier” (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, 2008, vol. 4, p. 485).

CONCLUSION AND RESULTS

It is necessary to finish delving into the morphological issues related to verbs. The research produced results, the most important of which are:

1. The commentators of the fourth century AH, led by Al-Serafi, who was one of the prominent scholars of his time, excelled his contemporaries such as Al-Farsi and Al-Rumani in these issues.
2. I believe that the commentators of the fourth century AH were based on linguists from the two countries (Kufa and Basra).
3. The commentator looked at the many versions of the book that one scholar read over another, choosing the most correct and accurate one.
4. The commentators cited many verses of the Holy Qur’an to prove the morphological rulings in these issues, even the irregular ones. The research proved that the analogy among the commentators emerged in two matters: one of them: they made it a supplement to what is heard, and the other: they used it in rejecting rare and irregular words of the Arabs.

REFERENCES

The Holy Quran

- Ibn Al-Anbari, Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Al-Qasim bin Muhammad bin Bashar. (1992). *Al-Zahir fi the Meanings of People’s Words* (Hatem Saleh Al-Dhamen, Ed.; 1st ed.). Al-Resala Foundation.
- Ibn al-Siraj, Abu Bakr Muhammad bin al-Sari bin Sahl al-Nahwi. (n.d.). *Fundamentals of Grammar* (Abdul Hussein al-Fatli, Ed.). Al-Resala Foundation.
- Ibn al-Sakit, Abu Yusuf Yaqoub bin Ishaq. (2002). *Islah al-Loqiq* (Muhammad Merheb, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dar Ihya al-Tarath al-Arabi.
- Ibn Al-Qatta’, Abu Al-Qasim Ali bin Jaafar bin Ali Al-Saadi Al-Saqili. (2003). *Kitab Al-A’fal*. Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya.
- Ibn Al-Qutayyah, Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Omar bin Abdul Aziz. (1993). *Kitab Al-A’fal* (Ali Fouda, Ed.; 2nd ed.). Al-Khanji Library.
- Ibn Jinni, Abu Al-Fath Uthman Al-Mawsili. (1954). *Al-Munsif Ibn Jinni* (Explanation of the Book of Attribution by Abu Uthman Al-Mazni) (1st ed.). Old Heritage Revival House.
- Ibn Jinni, Abu Al-Fath Othman Al-Mawsili. (1999). *Al-Muhtasib in clarifying the aspects of abnormal readings and clarifying them*. Ministry of Endowments, Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs.
- Ibn Jinni, Abu al-Fath Othman al-Mawsili. (1990). *Characteristics* (Muhammad Ali al-Najjar, Ed.). House of Cultural Affairs.
- Ibn Khalawayh, Abu Abdullah Al-Hussein bin Ahmed Al-Hamdhani, Al-Nahwi Al-Shafi’i. (1979). *Not in the Kalam of the Arabs* (Ahmed Abdul Ghafour Attar, Ed.; 2nd ed.).
- Ibn Khalawayh, Abu Abdullah Al-Hussein bin Ahmed Al-Hamdhani, Al-Nahwi Al-Shafi’i. (1934). *A summary of the distortions of the Qur’an from the book Al-Badi’* (C. Bergstrasser, Ed.; 1st ed.). Al-Rahmaniyah Press.
- Ibn Asfour, Abi Al-Hasan Ali bin Mu’min bin Muhammad bin Ali Al-Ashbaili. (1996). *Al-Mumti’ Al-Kabir fi Al-Tasrif* (Fakhr Al-Din Qabawa, Ed.; 1st ed.). Liban Publishers Library.
- Ibn Adima, Muhammad Abdel Khaleq bin Ali. (1999). *Al-Mughni fi Conjugation of Verbs* (2nd ed.). Dar Al-Hadith.
- Ibn Faris, Abu Al-Hussein Ahmad. (2002). *Dictionary of Language Standards* (Abdul Salam Muhammad Haroun, Ed.; 1st ed.). Arab Writers Union.

- Ibn Qutaybah, Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim al-Dinouri. (1963). *Adab al-Kitab* (The Literature of Writers) (Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abd al-Hamid, Ed.; 4th ed.). Commercial Library.
- Ibn Manzur, Abu al-Fadl Jamal al-Din Muhammad bin Makram bin Ali al-Ansari al-Ruwaifi'i al-Ifriqi. (1993). *Lisan al-Arab* (3rd ed.). Dar Sader.
- Ibn Hisham Al-Lakhmi, Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Ahmed bin Khalaf Andalusi. (2003). *Introduction to the Evaluation of the Tongue* (Hatem Saleh Al-Dhamen, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dar Al-Bashaer Al-Islamiyyah.
- Ibn Ya'ish, Abu al-Baq' Muwaffaq al-Din ibn Ali ibn Ya'ish Ibn Abi al-Saraya Muhammad ibn Ali al-Asadi al-Mawsili. (2001). *Sharh al-Mufasal by al-Zamakhshari* (Emil Badi' Yaqoub, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn Ya'ish, Abu al-Baq' Muwaffaq al-Din ibn Ali. (1973). *Sharh al-Maluki fi al-Tasrif* (Fakhr al-Din Qabawa, Ed.). Arabic Library.
- Abu Al-Barakat, Kamal Al-Din Abdul Rahman bin Muhammad bin Ubaidullah Al-Ansari. (2002). *Al-Bayan fi Strange Parsing of the Qur'an* (Barakat Yusuf Haboud, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dar Al-Arqam.
- Abu Al-Baq' Al-Akbari, Muhib Al-Din Abdullah bin Al-Hussein bin Abdullah. (1979). *Dictating what the Most Merciful has revealed in terms of parsing and readings in all of the Qur'an* (1st ed.). Scientific Books.
- Abu Hayyan, Muhammad bin Yusuf bin Ali bin Yusuf bin Hayyan Atheer Al-Din Al-Andalusi. (1420 AH). *Al-Bahr Al-Muhit fi Al-Tafsir* (Sidqi Muhammad Jamil, Ed.). Dar Al-Fikr.
- Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi, Al-Hasan bin Abdullah bin Al-Marzban. (2008). *Explanation of the Book of Sibawayh* (Ahmed Hassan Mahdali & Ali Sayyid Ali, Eds.; 1st ed.). Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah.
- Abu Ali Al-Farsi, Abu Al-Hasan bin Ahmed bin Abdul Ghaffar bin Muhammad bin Suleiman. (1990). *Commentary on the Book of Sibawayh* (Awad bin Hamad Al-Quzi, Ed.; 1st ed.).
- Abu Ali Al-Farsi, Abu Al-Hasan bin Ahmed bin Abdul Ghaffar bin Muhammad bin Suleiman. (2003). *Al-Baghdadiyyat* (Yahya Murad, Ed.). Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Alusi, Shihab al-Din Mahmoud bin Abdullah al-Husseini. (1415 AH). *The Spirit of Meanings in the Interpretation of the Great Qur'an and the Seven Mathanis* (Ali Abd al-Bari Attiya, Ed.; 1st ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Zamakhshari, Jarallah Abu Al-Qasim Mahmoud bin Amr bin Ahmed. (1985). *Parsing Jokes in Strange Parsing in the Holy Qur'an* (Muhammad Abu Al-Futuh Sharif, Ed.). Dar Al-Ma'arif.
- Al-Zamakhshari, Jarallah Abu Al-Qasim Mahmoud bin Amr bin Ahmed. (2006). *Al-Kashfah fi Facts of Revelation and the Eyes of Sayings in the Faces of Interpretation* (Al-Dani bin Munir Al-Zahwi, Ed.). Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi.
- Al-Samarrai, Fadel Saleh. (2017). *Meanings of Buildings in Arabic*. Dar Ibn Kathir.
- Sibawayh, Abu Bishr Amr bin Othman bin Qanbar Al-Harithi. (1988). *Al-Kitab* (Abdul Salam Muhammad Haroun, Ed.; 3rd ed.). Al-Khanji Library.