



The Morphological Term in Ibn 'Usfour al-Ishbili's Book "Almomti' Alkabeer Fi Altasreef" Between Tradition and Facilitation

Dr. Mustafa Taher Al-Haidrah, Yarmouk University-Jordan, Email: hydr12@yahoo.com

Terminology is the basic tool through which scientists and researchers access different sciences. If different sciences need the term, linguistic sciences are the mainstay of scientists in other sciences to address their terminology. Ibn 'Usfour al-Eshbili represents one of the most important scientists who contributed to the construction of the Andalusian linguistic lesson; for his inspiration from the language sciences in the Levant, he reformulated in a way that the Moroccans can communicate with them easily. This was represented in a series of books he wrote in various language sciences, including morphology. This paper seeks to identify the efforts made by Ibn 'Usfour al-Eshbili in dealing with the linguistic term in general and the morphological term in particular, to identify the places that he committed to what he found among the orientalist, and the areas of renewal at the level of pronunciation and definition in the provision of terms in a convenient way.

Key words: *Ibn 'Usfour al-Eshbili, Terminology, pronunciation, morphological term, Andalusian linguistic, orientalist*

Introduction

Upon the consideration of the morphological term. The formation of the linguistic term in general shall be taken into consideration. The reason behind that is attributed to the fact that the morphological term was not separated from the morphological or phonological term; instead the scientists were tackling various terms without differentiating between them. It is merely enough to look at the Sebawih book to find such a huge number of linguistic terms with various levels without separating them from one another.

The historians of this science have settled that the first independent book of morphology is Al-Māzini Inflection book. Nevertheless, the book has not been received independently, but rather along with the explanation provided by Ibn Jenni. Regardless the arguments are about the reality of morphology. The independence of morphology from grammar occurred recently. Moreover, its terms have taken advantage from the development occurred in grammar in general. It cannot be denied that there is a clear discrepancy between the reality of the term in the beginning of linguistic work and its reality upon its dependency on morphology.

The components of the basic term, namely pronunciation, conception, and definition shall be taken into account upon tackling the term. If the conception is outside the linguistic scope, then the appropriate pronunciation and definition shall be considered in the term. In fact, the conditions for choosing the appropriate term and the characteristics of the successful term are not included even if the definition field should be exhaustive. However, this study highlights the morphological Ibn 'Usfour terms in his book entitled "Al- Almomti' ". Furthermore, it seeks to reveal the stability and success factors. In this regard, it simplifies the previous explanations provided and their adopted compliance.

Ibn 'Usfour

He is one of Al-Andalus Scholars in the seventh century. Ibn 'Usfour was born in Sevilla and moved between Al-Andalus urbans. In respect of his knowledge, it was acquired from various scholars. One of which is Abu Ali Al-Shlobeen. Several prominent scholars were his disciples, such as Abu Hayyan al-Andualsi, The Little Shlobeen Al-Shugayr, and Tunisian Al-Rummāni. His significant contributions are embodied in deploying eastern linguistic lessons in Morocco. His considerable efforts enabled the students to be familiar with various works, such as Sibawayh, Al-Zajjaj, Al-Farisi, and so forth. He went to Morocco and moved between its cities starting from Marrakesh and ending with Tunisia until he died there in 770 Hijri.

It has been indicated that his book contains various compositions (more than twenty) that shed the light on providing Annotations and explanations (*Qabawah, 1981, pp.64-71*), most notably his explanation of his book entitled (Aljūmal). In fact, he explained it in three different times as follows: grand explanation, medium explanation, small explanation. All of which indicates his tendency to simplify sciences for learners as indicated in the "Al-Almomti' for Infelection" book.

With regard to his attitudes towards the opinions of orient scholars, he is more inclined to Al-Basrah school (Iraqi people) in general and Sibawayh in particular. To illustrate, he shares many of his views. To the extent that he Apologizes for him if he follows any opposing opinion of Sibawayh. Not only that, he regarded him as a reference for his citations. On the other hand, he is inconsistent with Al-Kufah school opposing and rejecting their views.

This study has adopted such scholar for several reasons, such as he is one of the prominent Al-Andalus scholars who has left Al-Andalus only to go to Morocco. Thus, he is Moroccan scholar, unlike other scholars such as Ibn Mālek and Abu Hayyān al-Andalusi. Also, he has a significant inclination towards facilitating the linguistic lesson in general, particularly the fact of his belonging to an era in which scholars demand for a morphology facilitation. In this regard, Ibn Maḍā' Al-Qurtubi and other Moroccans attempts have been demonstrated. In respect of Ibn 'Usfour, his tendency was obvious by his explanations and clarifications of Al Orientalists books as indicated in his works, which has led the publication house that published his entitled book 'Al-Almomti' Al-Kabeer in Conjugation to comment on the book cover by stating "a bright Andalusian aspect which clarifies in an interesting manner, simplified presentation, and simple addressing the abstraction, complication, and artificial smoothness it surpasses its historical age, considers as an introduction for clarification, indication, and facilitation." In this regard (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996*), Abu Hayyān Al-Andulsi has described Al-Almomti' book by stating "such type of work occupies the best rank, summary, and division and has the closest understandable" (*Al-Andulsi, Abu Hayyān, 1994*).

His book did not include the whole of infliction issues, but rather has confined itself to the study of abstraction, nouns, subjects, addressed the consonant Commutation and the merging, and rendered vowel issues in a constant Commutation chapter. However, other morphology subjects have not been indicated in his book. Accordingly, the mentioned terms in his book were only on certain aspects.

Text

The morphological term in accordance with Ibn 'Usfour is inclined towards Orientalists terms that settled in successive decades. Its efforts were concentrated on simplifying the scientific subject provided for readers. This is clearly obvious from the abundant number of examples indicated in each morphological rules tackled in his book.

Therefore, it has a significant role in addressing various terms in his book whether in the domain of selecting appropriate words for terms or in the domain of providing definitions for the used terms even if they agree or disagree with others.

Ibn 'Usfour dealt with Stable terminology as it is without any variation by providing a group of terms as saying: "the derivation origin refers to gerund while Simple verbs which is Consists of the triple origins that are closely related to the Complex verbs. On the other hand, all adjectives are suitable for subjects. However, nouns related to times and places and proper nouns are derived from the pronunciation of the verb that are also applicable. with regard to that might be either transferred or derived remain the same before transferring" (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, P. 44*). He merely provided the derivation and gerund terms, Simple verbs, Complex verbs, adjectives, time and place nouns, proper nouns, transferring without offering any explanation or modification.

The terms were rendered without commenting on their limits, denotative meanings, and their precision as indicated in his explanation of dynamic and static verbs by stating: "they wanted to differentiate between the omission of dynamic and static verb. For instance, their use of static verb has been demonstrated in their saying in (lastu- I don't) from (laysa-not) they added letters from the static verbs"(Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour,1996, P. 288).

Other scholars were adopting familiar ways in providing their terms by examples as created by Ibn Al- Sarrāj in presenting these terms by saying: "the first one is dynamic verbs such as (qāma –stand) and (dharaba- beat) that are conjugated into (yaqūmu-stands), (yaqūmu-standing), (taqūmu-stood), (yadhribu-beats),(’adhribu-I beat), and It is applicable for all verbs conjugations and the subject can be derived from it such as beater while the second one is static verbs that are not conjugated such as not, will, exclamation verb, and yes. In short, such kind of verbs are neither perform an action nor do the action and having only one structure” (*Ibn Al-Sarrāj, vol.1, P. 75-76*).

The scholars preceding Ibn Al-Sarrāj were providing the term without defining its features as the case in Sibawayh "verbs that consist of two letters more than existed in the dynamic verbs because these are verbs are not conjugated" (*Sibawayh, 1988, vol.4. P.227*)

The handling of terms according to Ibn 'Usfour occurs by combining between binary opposition to detect their convergence and divergence aspects. To illustrate, his adoption of binary is manifested in his differentiation between constant Commutation and Upturning by stating that "the former means the change a consonant in a word according to its morphological or syntactic environment while the later means giving the opposite meaning of a term”. As such, terms like "said" and "bought" belong to the same category and their vowel letters are close to each other. Therefore, they could be Upturned. On the other hand, transitive verbs are considered as constant Commutation due to the variation between consonant letters from vowels (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour,1996*).

In this regard, he is the only scholar who defined and differentiated between the two terms. To clarify, both terms have been rendered by Sibawayh, Ibn Al- Sarrāj , Al-Khattābi, Ibn Jenni , Al-Harawi, Al-Zamakhshari, etc, but they did not define them. For instance, Sibawayh mentioned the section of constant Commutation in Persian without defining it(*Sibawayh,1988*).

Moreover, Ibn Al-Sarrāj rendered constant Commutation for no merging and he stated that they are eleven letters, eight of them affixes while three of the others (Ibn Al-Sarrāj,no date). instead he merely rendered the letters without defining them. However, Al-Khattābi indicated the rhyming words that have the same rhyme such as boat, moat, and float without either defining or differentiating between them(Al-Khattābi 1982). Ibn Jenni used constant Commutation and Upturning without determining them by substituted the word (’aynuq) by either mutating or Upturning them with the word (’anwuq) that are no longer used except in some exceptional cases. Also, he substituted the word (qīsī- bows) with (qu’ūs) because it is always Upturned (Ibn Jenni, no date).

Al-Harawi has differentiated between morphological Commutation and linguistic Commutation by indicating that: "Abu-Sahal has rendered in this book two types of constant Commutation, namely: morphological Commutation or "steady Commutation" and linguistic unsteady Commutation"(Al-Harawi,1420H,p180). However, Al- Zamakhshari who rendered the consonant Commutation without differentiating between the two terms(Al- Zamakhshari, 1993, p180).

Similarly, the Upturning process in morphology according to Sibawayh are represented by modifying the interface; ('ishāwah, shay 'ā ') they modified the interface before (sh) the letter and substituted the letter (yā with wāw) such as ('a'tituhu 'a'tūh, jibtuhu jibāwah, al'ulyā al'alyā). He related this with Upturning such as (Tam'ana and Etma'anna). If these words have been Upturned, they will be like other affix letters then another meaning will be derived. Subsequently, the superfluous letter will be removed.(*Sibawayh,1988,vol.4,p.381*)

Al-Mubarred in his book entitled "Al-Moktadab" pointed out that "first responders knew that(wāw) letter which stands for is modified to (yā) letter which stands before it, while the same thing is not applied on al'lif letter which means ('ā) they have the same rhyme and the Upturning might be a guidance if (wāw/and) letter was Consonant, then it has been Upturned.(*Al-Mubarred,no date, vol.2,p244*) Al-Mubarred has talked about it in other places in Al-nasib section by stating: "I know I must delete one from the double (y) letters because of the conjunction of both (y) letters and (kasrah) (A similar diagonal line *below* a letter) that is deleted by the motioned diacritic because if it is remained then it has to be either Upturned or changed the former is done because of (fathah) diacritic while the later is done because the conjunction of diacritics with vowel letters it could have Consonant letter such as saying ('asyad) to ('asayadī), (hayyin) to (hayyinī), and (mayyit) to (mayyitī) not else"(Al-Mubarred, no date, vol.3, p.135).He is inclined in justifying the situation and providing clear definition.

Ibn 'Usfour between bigger derivation and smaller derivation by stating that "bigger derivation is changing the whole word into a certain meaning as indicated by Ibn Jenni about six changing of the verb to the meaning of lightness." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour,1996, P. 39*)

On the other hand, he defines the smaller derivation by stating that "various morphologists defines it as creating a part of word from its roots such as the word ('ahmar-red) that is derived from (humrah-redness). In some cases, the word might be derived from other word without having an exact meaning i.e. if they have the same structure and approximate meaning." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour,1996, Pp. 40-41*)

He goes on to clarify the limit of the smaller derivation by saying:"the whole limit of this type of the derivation, I mean the smaller, is to Conjugate one of the constructions of the word on one meaning or two close meanings. And that is about your response to the one meaning of (وضاربا) and (ضاربا) and (وضروبا), and the like having the same meaning of

(الضرب- hit). However, most of the derivations are within what is defined by the grammarians of establishing a branch of the origin denoted to it." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, P. 42*)

In his presentation of the bigger derivation, he reconnoiter the definition provided by Ibn Jenni, the innovator of the idea of the bigger derivation, and reformulates it in a simplified manner without losing any of its elements; Ibn Jenni says: "as for the bigger derivation is to take one of the triple origins and hold a single meaning on its six compositions. The six compositions are combined in a single composition, however how far the meaning between them is Gently return to it, as the derivatives do so in a single structure " (*Ibn Jenni, (no date), vol.2, P. 136*).

As for the derivation, Ibn 'Usfour which called (the smaller), can be found in Ibn Jenni enunciation (the small) saying Ibn Jenni: the small which is in the hands of people and books, such can take one of its origins, then to read it, to combine meanings, although how different its formulas can be. So as the structure of "س ل م", of which you can have the meaning of safety (السلامة); and: (سلم) and (يسلم) and (سالم) and (سلمان) and (سلمى) and (السلامة) and (السلام): the Bitten, call it optimism of safety. And toward that the rest of the section can be taken" (*Ibn Jenni, no date, vol.2, P. 136*)

And Ibn 'Usfour takes the definition of the term that he found in his predecessors and reforms it in his own way to which he fulfills his satisfaction, so he resorts to change the image of the formation of the term as he chooses to change the pronunciation of the small instead of the smaller. It is known that some scholars use the big derivation term rather than bigger, but the first in this aspect committed to the term developed by the author of the idea and the term's constructor for the first time.

He makes a comparison from another point of view between derivation and Conjugation, saying: "As for (the derivative) is said to the branch that was formulated from the original because you require the meaning of the original in the branch, it is as if you derive the branch to get out of it the original, as if the original is buried in it, and its derivative is the original." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, P. 42*)

This corresponds to the conjugation as he said: "As for the conjugation, it changes the forms of the word to another one, as in (daraba- hit) like (Ja'far), and you say: (darbab), and like Qimatr, you say: (dirabb- hitting), and like (Dirham), and you say: (dirbab), and about changing the diminutive and broken plural and or whatever. It is almost a derivation, but the difference between them is that the derivation is related to what the Arabs did from that, and the conjugation is general for what the Arabs did and for what we do by analogy. Every derivation is a conjugation, not every conjugation is a derivation." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, pp. 46, 47*)

Here he goes beyond what the previous scholars said in defining the terms of the two concepts, as they provide us with an inaccurate idea about them, and they are satisfied with linking it to other sciences, as Ibn Jenni does in his saying: "However, the conjugation is an intermediate between grammar and language that attract it, and deriving is more distant in language than conjugation. As the conjugation is closer to the grammar than the derivation, this indicates that you can hardly find a book in grammar without finding the conjugation at

the end, and the derivation you know from grammar books, from which words have almost no chapter. The conjugation is for knowing the etymology of the words, and the grammar is to know its different conditions. "(Ibn Jenni, 1954,p. 4).

If we look at the definition of Ibn Jenni and Ibn 'Usfour, we will observe the simplicity, clarity and accuracy of the definition of Ibn 'Usfour in determining the meaning of the term, in contrast to the general meaning that came with Ibn Jenni. As if Ibn Jenni presupposes that the reader is knowledgeable and familiar with the significance of his term, but Ibn 'Usfour seeks to simplify his material as mentioned at the beginning of his book, and as described by others.

And he connects between some of the sub-terms to differentiate between the state of each of them, as is the case between those with (wāw و) and those with yās (ي), so he says: "If the (wāw و) and yā (ي) are the second letters; then they can be two letters in the second rank in a word on three letters, or on more than one, so if the word is a verb it can be an active verb or a passive verb. If it is an active verb, the verb of the ones with (wāws) will be (fa'ala) ,(fa'ila) and (fa'ula) (فَعَلَ) و(فَعِلَ) و(فَعُلَ) according to the diacritical mark for the second letter ,as in (fu'ila):qam (قَام) , (fa'ula-tāl-طَالَ) (فَعُلَ), (fa'ila- khāfa-خَفَ).those for (wāw) (و). While those for (ي)As in (fa'ala) ,(fa'ila) by using al-(fatha) (َ) on the second letter ,we cannot use dhammah (ُ) because it will be stressed and difficult as in:(fa'ila bā'a (بَاعَ) , (fa'ala: kād (كَادَ)) (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 287)

Also, it is between those with (wāws) and those with (yā) to differentiate between them by saying: "And the diacritical marks' (harakat) of the second radical in those with (wāws) has been transferred to al-dhammah (ُ), and in those with yaws to the (kasrah)(.), so that the difference between those with wāws and yaws is obtained, because the al-dhammah (ُ) is suitable for wāw(و), and the (kasrah)(.) denotes the yā (ي) because it is also suitable for yā (ي)." (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 289)

He combines them again to emphasize the difference between them in use, and he says: "they wanted to differentiate between wāws(و) and yās(ي), so they adhered to those with wāws (yuf'ilu) by using dhammah (ُ) on the second letter because the dhamma's suitable for wāws (و), and in the verb" of the yā (yf'ilu)) by using (kasrah) (.), because the (kasrah) (.) is suited to yā (ي)." (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 292)

He used this in the context of various subjects with various terminologies by considering them as the terms have been settled. In this regard, if (tuih) was vowelised it will become tuwih by considering it from (y) affixes and (tuwiha) by considering it from (w) affixes. The merging was unacceptable since (sūyīr) was not merged because the (w) letter is considered as (maddah). (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 291)

When we look at the previous literature, we find that these two terms are almost absent, except in a few cases, such as what we find with Ibn al-Sekkīt in his treatment for the chapter of maf'il and muf'il (مَفْعُولٌ وَمَفْعُولٌ), by saying: " what was from the (wāw and yā), such as:(da'awtu & qadhaytu- I called and judged), the verb will take the diacritical marks' (harakāt) al(fatha) (َ), whether it is a name or a derivation , except the (ma'āqi al'ayn- The tips of the eye) , because the Arabs use al-(kasrah) (.) for these letters." (Ibn al-Sekkīt, Ya`qoub, 2002, p. 95)

What we find with Al-Nahhās in its treatment of (طين, tīna) word by saying: “As for the dying the book (tintu alkitāba, طنت الكتاب), then its verb: tintu alkitāb 'atīnuhu taynan so lam tā'inun (طنت الكتاب أطينه طيناً، فأنا طائنتن)... It is permissible to be (matyūn and mabyū - مطيون ومبيوع), this is not suitable for wāw and its derivatives, a ring formulated khatim maswūg- (و) for the difficult of wāw (و), this is the view of the Basrah school, but as for the kuffah school, they permitted that." . (Al-Nahhās, Abu Ja'far, 2004, p. 138)

We note that these two terms were used once to denote the Hollow weak verb (فعل أجوف) and once to the Deficient weak verb (فعل معتل ناقص), but Ibn 'Usfour took the minimum level of the learners knowledge of them and chose to present them in simplest form. This is what was absent from many of the previous scholars. What we found with Ibn al-Sekkīt and al-Nahhās doesn't represent a treatment or definition of them, but rather an accidental use when treating a specific term.

It may combine a number of idiomatic binaries when it comes out of the field of definition, but these binaries help in understanding the required significance, as it uses binaries (active participle, direct object), (pronouns), in addition to the derivative wāw (و) and derivative of yā (ي). By saying: “Rather, it is permissible to move the diacritics marks of the second radical to first one, in the passive verb, without assigning it to the pronouns of the speaker or Receiver, and this is permitted in the active verb except in (kād)(كاد) and (zāl)(زال) as al-(kasrah) in the second radical in (fu'ila) (فُعِل) and (fa'il) (فُعِل) those with yā if converted, on the one hand, that each of the two diacritics mark (al-(kasrah)) (.) was (fathah) (.), and turn (wāw) (و) into (yā) (ي) to be less stressed by transferring the diacritics mark of the second letter to the first by, and the yā (ي) is less stressed than the wāw (و), thus the (wāws) and the (yās) become as a one word. While it is difficult to transfer the diacritics marks of the second radical for first radical in the active verb, as when you say: (kād) (كاد) and (Zāl) (زال) are less stressed, because al'alf (أ) less stressed than yā (ي). Therefore, the transfer in (fu'ila) (فُعِل) was better than removing the (kasrah) (.) from the first radical, because that leads to convert the yā (ي) to wāw (و), so you say (Bū'a) (بُوْع), and the less stressed will turn into the more stressed.” (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 295)

We find this combination of such terms with scholars in cases in which one of these terms is closely related to the other, but when the purpose of authoring the book turns to making it an educational book that provides the learners by the appropriate information, so we find binaries or criteria that the author seeks to link educational material with confirming it in the mind of the learner who is getting more and more presence.

Ibn 'Usfour mentioned the pronouns of (speaker and the addressee) by saying: “as in (I was chosen) ('ikhturtu) (اخترت), 'ukhtur: اخثور. If we pronounce by 'ishmām saying 'ukhtir we will say 'ukhtirtu with 'ishmām, and If we pronounce it without 'ishmām saying 'ukhtir we will say 'ikhtirtu with 'ishmām because it's different from bu'tu (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 308)

And it may combine a number of terms that share a specific phenomenon, such as saying: "The future is also based on the active verb or object and active participle and passive participle, the post-consonant being treated with the same three letters. We say: yanqādu , yunqādu , yaqtādu , yuqtādu , muqtādun and munqadun - يُنْقَادُ و يُقْتَادُ، و مُنْقَادٌ و مُنْقَادٌ. Likewise (qāda) and (tād) (قَاد) و (تَاد). Like: qāl & bā'a (قَالَ و بَاعَ)" (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 308*).

The combination of binaries may be related to one of its derivatives, as we find from the link between The multitudes of the few and the multitudes of the multitude, such as his saying: "plural of multitude is not diminutive to its pronunciation, but rather refers to the plural of paucity if the name has plural of paucity. Otherwise, you return to the singular, then the singular diminutive and combined with wāw (و) and nun (ن) if it is for male, and with al'alef (أ) and ta (ت) if it is for female. we say in diminutive of money (fulūs) (فلوس): 'ufaylus, and in men rijāl (رجال): rujaylūn (رُجَيْلُونَ), also dirhams (دراهم): durayhimāt (دريهمات). They said in diminutive of the word things (اشياء) ashya': 'ushyya' and they insulted it as it is." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 308*)

On the other hand, there are terms whose significance becomes clear without linking them to others, and they are used singularly, as he said in defining incorporation: "incorporation is lifting your tongue on one height, and placing it in one place. It is only in the two similar or close or what we call homophones" (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 403*)

The scholars were at first to use this term for other connotations, Sibawayh used it to denote the conditions of sounds. A chapter is devoted to it, and he says at the beginning: "This chapter includes the number of Arabic sounds, their articulations, voiceless and voiced, the circumstances of their articulations, voiceless and voiced their differences" (*Sibawayh, 1988, vol.4, p. 431*), and then he allocates it to introduce some letters as he said: "The chapter of incorporation in the homophone letters that are from the same articulation, and they close if they are incorporate, they are the same as the two letters incorporation

and then he allocates it to introduce some letters as he said: "The chapter of incorporation in the homophone letters that are from the same articulation, and they close if they are incorporate, they are the same as the two letters incorporation, while the statement is well received , only concealment may be permitted , and concealment and silence may be permitted" (*Sibawayh, 1988, vol.4, p. 445*)

Likewise, at Al-Mubarred, he says under the heading (chapters of incorporation) (abwāb al'idghām): "(This is the section of the articulation sounds), which is divided into their numbers voiceless and voiced, stressed, less stressed, Qalqalah, long and short vowels" (*Al-Mubarred, no date, vol.1, p. 192*)

He returns to the chapter of the incorporation of the two similar letters by defining incorporation: "First, the meaning of incorporation, we can know that if the two letters are one or have the same sound, then we turn the first letter into a consonant by butting sukūn (سكون) and it incorporate it with the second letter, so when we said (incorporation) this

means that there is no diacritics marks between them because they have the same articulation of sound, also as we said cut and broke (qatta'a ,kassar)(قَطَعَ, كَسَرَ), as well as Muhammad (مُحَمَّد) and mu'abbad (مُعَبَّد) , and Bakkar (بَكَّر) did not go, this is the meaning of incorporation". (*Al-Mubarred, no date, vol.,1, p. 197*)

As for Ibn al-Sarrāj , we found him presenting incorporation in the same way as others by saying: "The origin of the Arabic letters is twenty-nine letters." (Ibn Al-Sarrāj ,no date, vol.3, p. 399). He said that incorporation is to combine between two consonant sounds without any separation *between* them (no diacritics marks). There are two type of incorporation: Inserting a letter in a letter which is repeated and the other one: inserting a letter into a letter that is close to it. (*Ibn Al-Sarrāj ,no date,405*)

Al-Zajāji defines it by saying: "The meaning of incorporation is merely introducing a letter As the Arabs said, I bridled the bridle in the horse, that is, I inserted .in a letter and deriving it into it." (*Al-Zajāji, 1985, p. 151*). Al-Fārābi presented it by saying: "This is the reason of the incorporation, which is inserting some letters together, and replacing each other with one another." (*Al-Fārābi,2003, vol.2, p. 395*)

Ibn 'Usfour does not settle for definition of incorporation when the matter needs clarification, as he says in explaining the occurrence of incorporation: "The reason for this; is that the pronunciation of similar letters at the same time is difficult, because you need to use the same articulation sounds twice frequently at the same time.

If the two letters are different , then this is not the case , because the one who works in other does not work in the another. Also letter to its first position , so the tongue doesn't fluently in the pronunciation as it fluently in others , rather it similar to bound . when it was heavy , what I mentioned to you the tongue was lifted with them one lever , so that the work would be reduced and the speech of them on the tongue would be less ." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 403*)

He shows the cases where the incorporation occurs and the expected difficulties by saying: "If they are two vowels, the first one must be consonant, or followed by a vowel. So if it is a consonant then it may be a soft sound, or both vowel and soft sound: If it is a soft sound, it should be incorporate, if it is acceptable, as in the following example: I am afraid of Yassir (أخشى ياسراً) (akhsha yāsiran) , I am afraid of waqed (أخشى واقداً) (akhsha wāqidan). But if it was both vowel and soft sound as in: waqed conquer (يغزو واقداً) (yaghzu wāqdan), hit Yassr (أضربي ياسراً) (adribi yāsiran), In order to distinguish the consonant sound from incorporation and double the incorporation in the word. As for (conquered) (مغزوّ) (magzuwun), they tolerated the disappearance of the vowel because incorporation is stronger than vowel .Also, it is similar to (qūwil) (قُؤُول) that the first sound is consonant and vowel ,so the two letters should not be the same, but they must be the same as in "conquers and wāqidun" (يغزو واقداً) because the word didn't comes after the letter Wāw (و) as in (Yaghzu Rashid) "يغزو راشد" (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 415*)".

Ibn 'Usfour mentions cases in which the rule of incorporation differs by saying: "as in the exclamation verb because it has no present tense it is rarely so heavy, also, it resembles names, and therefore they unvoveled the verb as: what a tall person! (ما أطوله!) (mā 'atwaluhu!) Similar to (taller than) (أطول منه) ('atwalu minhu). Likewise, they also turned the ya in (ramawa) (رَمَوَ) if they wanted to marvel, to wāw, as in (fu'ila) (فَعِلْ) . But if it is female as in (throw) (رَمِي) (ramw,alrami)" (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 334*).

He continued his comments by saying: "if it is accompanied the singular, it will be either a compensation of what has been deleted or not. In case if it has not been compensated, it might be appeared as: (muhyiyah) and (mu'yiyah). The reason here is embodied in (muhyiyat) and (muhyiyīn). To illustrate, the diacritic occurred in a structure where incorporation is not allowed such as: (muhī) and (mu'ī)" (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 367*).

He did not satisfy with mentioning the cases only, but he clarifies the dialects that occur in them, and he says: "As for other Arabs, they are incorporate and considered to be accidental indeclinable, because the Arabs may take into account the accidental in some places. The origin of the second sound must be a vowel and not a consonant, since it becomes vowelled if it is combined with pronouns as in: response (رُدَا, رُدُوا, رُدِّي) (ruddā, ruddū, ruddī) Thus, they have not merged in ('ashdid bihumrati thawbih) because these letters did not follow it. Also, its Consonant has been (juzima) (sukūn was added) to the diacritic because s it is, it inflective a" (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 417*).

He followed the others in definition of some terms provided by other scholars that have been settled in its pronunciation and connotation meaning. The only differentiation occurs by replacing a letter by another or transferring the reference in terms of defining some characteristics of sounds. He defined the voiced letter by stating that: "it is a voice which we Focused on and used according to its occurrence that is not used until it has been accredited. Regardless the fact that (m) and (n) in clear voices are uttered by using both mouth and nostrils until it has a specific annotation." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 426*).

In this regard, he is consistent with the opinions of others. The definition provided by Ibn Jenni is considered enough when he stated: "it is a voiced letter that is used in its occurrence that is not used until it comes along with the breath. Regardless the fact that (m) and (n) in a voiced letters are uttered by using both mouth and nostrils, so this is the voiced description" (*Ibn Jenni, 2000, vol1, p75*).

Surprisingly, the definition offered by both Ibn 'Usfour and Ibn Jenni is similar. The only difference between them is confined on altering the position of the preposition from its occurrence. Another crucial difference that Ibn Jenni has deleted (the occurrence of the voice) from the definition. Also, he found that Ibn 'Usfour has deleted the characteristic of voice. He regarded them as a considerable padding so he deleted it.

Furthermore, Abu Al-Bārkat al-Anbārī argued that voiced are regarded as letters that have been adopted according to their occurrence that is not used until it comes along with the breath. Manifestation is revelation. Therefore, it has been called as voiced (*Al-Anbārī, 1999, p290*).

It is clearly obvious that Ibn 'Ufour has deleted the synonym revelation. He might be right in this deletion because revelation is a term that has specific connotations in phonetics and Tajweed (recitation of Holy Quran) which is not completely different from phonetics.

Likewise, his demonstration of whispered voice conception by indicating that a whispered letter is a weak voice that comes along with the breath i.e. if the single letter has reoccurred again or with a soft letter with it, such as ssss, kkkk, sesesesese, kekekeke. The breath comes with the letter, but if it is voiced letter such case will be impossible (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Ufour, 1996, p. 426*).

Taking into consideration the definition provided by ancestors, Ibn Jenni has provided such concept by using terms that are not completely different from this definition: "the whispered letter is a weak voice that comes along with the breath and you might consider that you could repeat the letter along with the voice into ssss, kkkk, and hhhh. However, voiced letter could not be able to do that." (*Ibn Jenni, 2000, vol.1, p75*)

In respect of gerund alteration, it can be noticed when Ibn Jenni used the phrase – (you consider that you can repeat the letter). In this respect, Ibn 'Ufour used consider that corresponds to considering. Also, the explicit gerund (takrīr-repetition) corresponds to the (gerund - Mu'awal/infinite) ('an tukarira-to repea)t. Although Ibn 'Ufour imitates Ibn Jenni in his definitions including the definition he provided with a delicate variation. He added another explanation to his definition that is considered helpful in determining the concept by indicating: alone or with a soft letter with it which was not indicated by Ibn Jenni .

The definition offered by Ibn 'Ufour differs from Abi Al-Barkāt al-Anbārī in providing such term since al-Anbārī only provided a brief description by saying: "the meaning of whispered letters is the weak voice in its occurrence, it comes along with the voice. Therefore, it is disappeared. Whispering means the low voice. Therefore, it has been regarded as whispered voices." (*Al-Anbārī, 1999, p290*). He did not mention the method for indicating the whispered voices, but he rendered an equivalent term despite that such synonym does not indicate the required meaning.

Also, when he provided the stressing (alshadeed) term by indicating: " alshadeed is a letter that voice cannot comes with it due to the limitation of the voice. If one said (alhaqq) and (alshatt), followed by (maddah)(long vowel) in (q) and (t) it would be impossible (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Ufour, 1996, p. 426*). He added the reason of the difficulty of voice flowing. Considering Ibn Jenni

definition when he indicated that stressing is the letter in which the sound is not allowed to be flow. Is not it clear that (Alhaqq and alshatt) followed by (maddah)(long vowel) in (q) and (t) it would be impossible” (*Ibn Jenni ,2000,vol.1, p75*)

The only difference between both scholars is that Ibn 'Usfour only justified the reason by indicating the limitation of the voice. Otherwise, the definition and the examples are similar. It should be noted that Ibn 'Usfour's definition completely differs from al-Anbārī by defining the stressing letters as "Strong letters in which sound cannot come along with it. For this purpose, it has been called as stressing letters” (*Al-Anbārī,1999,p290*)

Such case is repeated in the whole characteristics of the sounds that are provided by Ibn 'Usfour, such as soft, voices between soft and stressed, boisterous and openness, superiority, repeated and non-repeated, impregnable, apical, and non-apical sound. He followed the definition provided by ancestors in general and Ibn Jenni in particular. The difference between them is that Ibn 'Usfour provided one facet of vowelization along the diversity in using the explicit gerund, the infinitive, or the verb.

Upon addressing some terms that depend on senses, it seems that he tends to elaborate it until it became easy and accessible for learners. As he stated in the presentation of (rawm) and (’ishmām) as saying "some Arab when they transfer (kasrah) from (a) to (f) (’ashamma al-dhammah) to it which indicate that (f) in its origin occurred with (dhammah) i.e. combining your lips and uttering them without uttering any (dhammah). If (dhammah) has been uttered, it will be considered as (rawm) not (’ishmām). Al-Zajāji said that "it is only occurred by verbal communication by lips (almushafaha). He indicated that such practice is only seen. However, some morphologists and whole readers add (kasrah) between ((dhammah)) and (kasrah). As such, it have been called as (’ishmām) letters.” (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 425*).

Ibn 'Usfour represents what has been indicated by Ibn Al-Warāq precisely concerning the differentiation between (’ishmām) and rawm. As such: "the difference between them that (’ishmām) is a clear voice for The sighted person not for the blind. because it depends on mouth after completing the letter while (rawm) is a clear sound for every person.” (*Ibn Al-Warāq,1999,p156*) As Ibn Jenni indicated: "(’ishmām) is for eyes not ears while the (rawm) occurs when the voice barely moves. Do not you notice that you differentiate between masculine and feminine in such situation by saying: (’anta/ you) and (’anti/you)? If you did not notice the variation in voice, you will never notice the difference (*Ibn Jenni ,no date,vol.2, p330*)".

Ibn 'Usfour did not indicate the scientists' dispute in determining rawm and (’ishmām) in letters as A'ulkburi when he provided them. In this regard, he indicates the scholars' dispute by stating: "in respect of (’ishmām) occurs when you point out by your lips to (dhammah) rather than (kasrah) or (fatha) which is realized by eyes not ears. Surprisingly, it is considered for a

certain group of people as (rawm). It has been called to indicate the lightness of movement, (kasrah) is not allowed nor (fatha) because they might distort the embedded movement of the lips” (*Ukburī, 1995, p. 197*)

The employed approach by Ibn 'Usfour in presenting terms in an accessible and easy manner made him avoid mentioning the disputes that occurred between scholars regarding these terms even if things led to replace a term by another. (Rawm) for some scholars is considered as (‘ishmām) for others and vice versa.

He adopted a certain approach in constructing Grammatical terms without justifying his selection such as his dealing with passive and active voice when he lifted these terms and has taken instead of them (mabni lilfa'il) and (mabni lilmaf'ul) by saying: "it is allowed in the present and in the verb that is (mabni lilmaf'ul) active participle and passive participle as it's in the past verb: (sūyira) and ('uwina)." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 309*).

Such brevity is found in Ibn Darstawayh when he indicated: "similarly, the passive participle, but the last letter of it has (fatha) as the case in the verb of the object. To make (fatha) and (kasrah) as a difference between the subject and the object as the case in (mīm) such as (mukram) and (mu'tā) (*Ibn Darstawayh, 1998, p122*). Likewise, Ibn Seedah (‘ushita alrajulu) as the formulation of the verb of the object (dhahaba māluhu) quoted by Al-Lihyani (*Ibn Seedah, 2000, vol.3, p179*) as existed among Sibawayh who prepared it as (‘gudat as gudat ‘lba’r ‘gudu gudah) thus it occurred as the formulation of the verb of the object.” (*Ibn Seedah, 2000, vol.5, p357*)

The ancestors used for such concepts various terms. To illustrate, Al-Mubarred used a concept (the verb in which it has unknown subject) the structure of these verbs resemble the consonant verbs concerning the affixes. On the other hand, (af'ala) verbs such as (‘uqīma abdullāh) take the diacritic of w letter because it occurred before (‘uqwima abdullāh). (*Al-Mubarred, no date, vol.1, p.105*)

On specific occasions, Ibn Jenni used two terms, namely subject and object. However, the three letter verbs that do not have any additional verbs are consisted for subject and verbs are consisted for object (*Ibn Jenni, 1954, p20*). In certain cases, both terms are used as (built for known & built for unknown). In this regard, he indicated that the difference between the present in the active and passive voice that are considered from the subjects that have exceeded three letters. Accordingly, Abu Othmān indicated that the difference between yof'alu which means that something is done on the verb while yaf'alu which means that verb is doing something the diacritic is done after adding (dhammah) on the first letter subsequent by (fathah). After that, (kasrah) was added to the letter that precedes the last letter followed by (fathah). Another instance is embodied in the following verbs – (yastakhriju) that stands for extracting something while (yustkhraju) means that something is done on the action of the verb. Also, (yantaliq) and

(yuntalaqu) except yatagāfalu when it has (fathah) on (ya'falu) has remained in yuf'alu. Similarly, yataghafalu that stands for someone neglecting something and (yotaghafalu 'anhu) which means something that is neglected. In the same vein, there are non-additional verbs such as (yasma'u) and (yosma'u) which means heard" (*Ibn Jenni, 1954, p93*).

Ibn 'Usfour has adopted one of Ibn Jenni 's approach. A thorough investigation in both terms indicates that Ibn 'Usfour's selection among both terms was inappropriate since the above-mentioned terms (active and passive voice) indicate the concept more precisely because every verb requires a subject whether a subject or subject of the predicate. On the other hand, adjunct rather than the object might take the place of subject.

Ibn 'Usfour has developed a previous method used by predecessors by changing its structure to indicate its essence such as the use of subject pronouns or object pronouns by indicating: "if I added it either to subject or object pronoun, (ekhtartu) which stands for choosing certain thing instead of saying (ekhtūra). Other who use the diacritic by rendering (ekhtūra), those who use (ekhtartu) then they used the diacritic. On the other hand, if diacritic has not been used, (ekhtūr) will be used because it will not cause any confusion as (bi'tu) which means bought something. Justifying them resembles the justification of (qāla//something that has been said) and (bī'a/ something that has been bought)." (*Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p. 308*)

Scholars have employed the object pronoun without defining any of its categories as Ibn 'Usfour who tended to use the object by indicating "adding the subject to the object pronoun resulting in different meaning and pronunciation. Therefore, if you seek to correct a sentence, then you have to delay the subject such as: Zaid beat a boy and Allah Almighty saying: (And when ,Ibrahim {Abraham p.b.u.h) was put in different types of trials by his Lord's (Allah's) command)." (*Ibn Jenni, no date, vol.1, p.295*)

Ibn Al-Anbārī used his term without any definition by indicating that: "isn't obvious that the third letter of the object pronoun does not has sukūn when the verb is attached with it because in the case of separation God Almighty said: And [remember] when the hypocrites and those in whose hearts is disease said, "Allah and His Messenger did not promise us except delusion"". He did not add Sukūn to the end of the verb except in the separation case (*Ibn Al-Anbārī, 1999, p.80*). Unlike Allah saying: "Call to mind that when We invited Moses" because it does not have the intention of separation. Similarly, Al-Ukburī has used it by indicating: "with regard to the second one since object occurs after the subject and the delay is acceptable. Considering the verb occurrence after the object pronoun such as (Zaid darabthu) that stands for Zaid has been beaten. In this respect, (dhammah) above the subject Zaid is preferable." (*Al-Ukburī, 1995, vol.1, p.467*)

Some scholars have used a number of terms for indicating them. Ibn 'Usfour followed their uses without any discrimination, like the use of soft, extended, and vowel letters to indicate the

following three letters 'alif/', wāw/ w, yā/y. Ibn 'Usfour usually uses them. Vowel letter terminology is used as in the following proverb: "Abu Al-Hasan Al-'akhfash claimed that w (wāw) letter cannot be turned into Hamza unless ('alif/ ') for plural and (wāw/w) for inna have been merged either as (yā') or (w) and (y)." Turning the vowel letter which occurs after ('alif/') is not permissible instead in (fū'ila) plural such as (baya'a/buying) that is modified into (boway'). (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p.228). Also, his saying (qum/stand up) and (bā'a/buy) whose origin is ('aqūmu/go) and ('abī'u /buy) then Ā in letter has been moved into the diacritic of its precedent letter. Most importantly, when (fatha) was inserted into this letter Wasl has been removed because it might be occurred for Saken. Accordingly, it was removed, then Sukūn was added to the last letter and vowel letter was removed due to the convergence of two Consonant." (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p.294)

An extended term in other places is used for other purpose as follows: "as the case for any letter that become for (Maddah). Contrary to ('alif/ ') in (Fā'il) since it is considered for maddah. If (maddah)letter is necessary then it will be merged such as: Magzuwwun, (wāw/w) letter in (mafūl) was merged with the following letter when it was essential since it occurred inappropriate term (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p.309). The reason behind using soft term lies in merging (alnūn/ n) alone out of the whole consonant letters while (nūn/n) letter resembled the annotation in (yā/y) because annotation is regarded is considered as superfluowing a sound in letter. Similarly, soft is regarded as super flowing a sound in vowel letters." (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p.437)

Two terms might be merged into (maddah)and soft as in: "one of them are preceded with Consonant letter from (maddah)and soft letters. On the other hand, if one of them is preceded with diacritic as (tafarraqa bikum) and (wahiya talaqqafu). Finally, if one of them is preceded with Consonant from (maddah)and soft letters as the saying of Allah almighty: (walā tayammamū 'alkhabīth/ do not even aim at getting anything which is bad) and (walā tafarraqu/ and be not divided) (walā tanāza'ū/ and not be disputed). On the other hand, if it is preceded with Consonant except (maddah)and soft letters then Allah saying (fa'in tawallaw/But if they turn away) and ('Wiz talaqawnahu/hen you received it- وَإِذْ تَلَقَّوْنَهُ) (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p.456).

Also, he combined between soft and vowel in saying: yā/y is not merged in a consonant letter as previously illustrated and then it will be merged in wāw/w because it resembled it in terms of softness and vowel, but wāw/w letter was turned into yā/y whether at the beginning or at the end because the purpose of merging is mitigation and (y) letter is softer than (w) letter. Therefore, w is replaced with (y). In addition, (w) is from the tongue while (y) is from mouth letters." (Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour, 1996, p.437)

Such a case is common among the ancestors. For example, Sibawayh employed (ali'tilāl& al'illah/ morphological impairment) in some cases and the vowel in other cases by saying it does

not occur with (kasrah) except with (h) because I'rāb occurs on (y) that is followed by morphological impairment such as alshaqā'u and alshaqāwah. (W) remains with the (h) letter, but changed if it does not exist. However, the (w) letter requires (fatha) because it is yaf'al and its (y) letters have are vowels (*Sibawayh, 1998,vol.4, p.92*). In other cases, (maddah)and softness are combined by saying: "if it is combined as it,s in duality then it will be followed by two affixes: first, (maddah)and soft letter (*Sibawayh, 1998,vol.1, p.18*). Also, his statement that soft letters are (maddah)letters by stating: soft letters are (maddah)letters in which the sound is stretched, such as ā, wāw, yā" (*Sibawayh, 1998,vol.3, p.426*)

Al-Mubarred employed both vowel and w attachments together by indicating: "Al-Khalil claimed that (yawma) as taken from (yumtu) it should be like this if it is a verb because (w) attachments if it has been moved into (fa'ultu) such as (alqawl) and (alhawl) both of them have vowel letter. (dhammah) with y and w shall occurred with (yaf'alu) and al (dhammah) should come with (y), but they are not. Therefore, they were not considered as a verb. In the same vein, the gerunds (wayl), (wayh), (ways), and (wayb) which contain vowel and are not considered as a verb as in ('ā'ah) because the whole letters have vowels (*Al-Mubarred, no date,vol.1, p.222*). In other places, (maddah)and soft letters are combined by stating: "it is permissible to make it (sakinah) in these sentences: (hāza gulāmī/ this is my son) and (zaid dharabanī/beat me) because all of them indicate a similar thing. Therefore, the optimal solution was to compensate what has been deleted. The diacritics are heavy in (maddah)and soft letters. Thus, sukūn has been added in order to mitigate it" (*Al-Mubarred, no date,vol.4, p.248*). Al-Musawwatah (voweled letters) description was added by saying: "(maddah)and soft letters are regarded from apposition letters while the voweled soft letters are: 'alif, y and w" (*Al-Mubarred, no date,vol.1, p.61*).

However, Al-Rummāni combined between maddah, soft, and the vowel as a whole by saying: (maddah)and soft letters constitute the diacritics and the sound might be stretched, such as y, w, 'alif. Vowel letters are defined as the letters that are changed by turning them into sustained vowels, such as hamzah, maddah, and soft letters (*Al-Rummāni, no date, pp83-84*).

Ibn Jenni indicated them without providing a definition for them by saying: "I know that some of the diacritics are (maddah)and soft letters, such as 'alif, y, w. since these letters are three their diacritic are three, such as (fatha), (kasrah), (dhammah). To illustrate, (fatha) occurs after ('), (kasrah) after y, (dhammah) after the small w. Accordingly, there diacritic will be appropriate." (*Ibn Jenni, 2000, vol.1, p.33*)

It remains without limitation, definition, approximation, or justifications for its designation until Al-Anbārī clarified it with these names by saying: "the following letters (y, w, 'alif) are considered as soft and (maddah) letters. In respect of (maddah) because its name can be stretched while soft letters because it has a soft and wide pronunciation since ('alif) is considered the widest letter; it has been called as (hāwi) because it is settled in the throat. (*Al-Anbārī, 1999, p.290*) On the other hand, morphological impairment is defined as the letters that are changed by turning some of them into voweled letters (*Al-Anbārī, 1999, p.290*)"

References

- Al- Zamakhshari, Jarallah(1993),Almufssal fi Sinā'at Ali'rāb , investigated Ali bin Melhm , Beirut, Lebanon:Al helal bookshop
- Al-Anbārī, Abu Al-Barakāt(1999), Asrār Al-'arabia, Dar Al'arqam Bin Abi Al-'arqam, Al-Andulsi, Abu Hayyān(1994),Al- mubdi' Al-mulkhas min Almomti', investigated by Mustafa Al- Nammās, (no publisher name or place)
- Al-Eshbili, Ibn 'Usfour,1996, Almomti' Alkabeer Fi Altasreef, investigated by Fakhir Al-deen Qabawah , Beirut , Lebanon: Maktabt Lebanon nāshirūn
- Al-Fārābi Abu Ibraheem (2003), Diwan Al-Adab, investigated by Ahmed Mukhtar Omar, Cairo, Egypt: dar alshaeb lilsahafih w altiba'ah w alnashir
- Al-Harawi, Abu sahil,(1420H) 'isfār al-fasīh , investigated of Ahmed bin Sa'eed Qashash , Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah , saudia: Islamic University
- Al-Khattābi,Abu sulimān(1982), Ghareeb Al- Hadeeth , investigated by Abdul Karim Gharabawi, Beirut ,Libanon: Dar Al-fikr
- Al-Mubarred, Abu Al-Abbas (no date), Al-Moktadab, investigated by Muhammad Abdul Khaliq 'udaymih Beirut , Lebanon: 'alam Al-kutub
- Al-Nahhās, Abu Ja`far (2004), 'umdat alkuttab ,investigated by Bassam Al-Ghani, Dar bin Hazm
- Al-Rummāni, Abu Alhasan (no date) , risalat manazil al-hurūf , investigated by Ibrahim al-Samarā'i,Amman ,Jordan: Dar Al-Fikr
- Al-Ukburī Abu Albaqā` (1995), allubāb fi 'ill albina' wal'I'rāb, Investigated by Abdulilāh-Nabhan, Damascus, Syria:Dar Al-Fikr
- Al-Zajaji, Abu Alqāsem, (1985), Allāmāt , investigated by Māzen Al-Mubārki, Damascus ,Syria: Dar Al-Fikr
- Ibn Al-Sarrāj,Abu bakr (no date),fundamentals in grammar , investigated by abd al -Husayin Al-Fatli, Beirut,Lebanon:Alrisālah foundation
- Ibn al-Sekkīt, Ya`qoub(2002) 'islāh al-mantiq, investigated by muhammad mir'ib , Cairo, Egypt: 'arab heritage reviving
- Ibn al-Warraq, Abu al-Hasan (1999), 'ilal 'annahw, Investigated by Mahmoud Jassim al-Darwish, Riyadh,saudia: Al-Rushd Library
- Ibn Darstawayh, Abdullah bin Ja`far (1998), Tasheeh Al-Fasih, Investigated by Muhammad Badawi al-Mukhtoon, Cairo, Egypt: The Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs.
- Ibn Jenni , Abu al-Fath (no date) Alkhasa'is , Cairo, Egypt: Egyption General book authority
- Ibn Jenni , Abu Al-Fath (1954) Al-Munsif, shareh kitab Al tasreef li 'abi Othman Al- Mazini , Dar Ihyā' Al-Turāth Al-Qadeem.
- Ibn Jenni , Abu al-Fath (2000), sir sinā'at il'rāb, Beirut, Lebanon: dar Al-Kutub al-'eilmiyah,
- Ibn Saydah, Ali bin Ismail (2000), Almuhkam w almuht Ala'zam, Investigated by Abdel Hamīd Hindāwi, Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Kutub Al- 'eilmiyah,
- Qabawah, Fakhr Aldeen (1981), Ibn Asfour and Al-Tasrif , Beirut,Lebanon: Dar Al-Afāq Al Jadeedah
- Sibawayh, Othman bin Qanbar (1988) Al-Kitab, investigated by Abdul Salām Muhammad Harūn, Cairo.Egypt: Al-Khānji library