

## “Linguistic Evidence on Issues of Disagreement Between the Kufans and The Basrans”

Fudda suliman muslim Al mashaqaba<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

*This research explores linguistic evidence in matters of scholarly disputes, focusing on both traditional (transmitted) and logical (reasoned and analogical) evidence. Using Ibn Al-Anbari's work as a primary source, the study examines six specific disputes, analyzing various opinions and evaluating their validity. The research also draws on the Quran as the fundamental reference for principles, discussing the theory of causation and different grammatical rules that have been contested. The emphasis is on the type and direction of the evidence rather than the specific disputes. The study is organized into an introduction, which covers the reasons for choosing the topic, previous studies, research problems, and methodology. The first chapter delves into the disputes over transmitted and rational evidence, defining linguistic evidence, comparing the perspectives of Basra and Kufa scholars, and examining specific issues such as the causation in the predicate after the negative particle " لا " and the prohibition of declension in poetic necessity.*

**Keywords:** *Linguistic Evidence, Scholarly Disputes, Transmitted Evidence, Rational Evidence, Ibn Al-Anbari, Quran, Theory of Causation, Grammatical Rules, Basra Scholars, Kufa Scholars.*

### Introduction

In this research, we will address the issue of linguistic evidence in matters of disagreement, as we will study the types of evidence from the aspect of it being auditory transmission and from the aspect of it being rational, logical, and analogical, as reliance was placed on the book of Ibn al-Anbari in dealing with matters of disagreement, while studying a number of controversial issues, which numbered six. Issues, and it was necessary to mention opinions on those issues and indicate whether they were correct from the researcher's point of view or otherwise.

We did not limit ourselves to relying on Al-Anbari's book, but rather the first and main reference in the principles was the Holy Qur'an.

We also started talking about the theory of the factor, whether this factor was narrational or moral, and studying various theories of grammar and rules that had been disputed. The focus was not on the issue as much as the focus was on the type and direction of the evidence.

It is necessary to work hard, toil, and to study to reach the highest ranks and highest peaks, hoping to achieve the greatest degree of excellence that befits the generosity of God, the effort of the researcher, and the effort of the student.

The research was based on the following plan:

\_Introduction: It includes: the reasons for choosing the topic

Previous studies

Research problems

Research Methodology

---

<sup>1</sup> Master's student in Arabic language, Email: [almashaqbtfdt@gmail.com](mailto:almashaqbtfdt@gmail.com).

Chapter One: The controversy surrounding transmission and rational evidence: It includes:

The first topic: defining the linguistic evidence

The second topic: The disagreement between the transmission and mental evidence between the people of Basra and the people of Kufa

The third topic: The issue of saying what is the factor in the predicate after “what” that negates the accusative case.

The fourth topic: The issue of preventing the spending of what is spent on the necessity of poetry.

Reasons for choosing the topic:

I was chosen for this topic for a number of reasons that accompanied my studies and efforts, including:

Shedding light on textual and rational evidence in grammar issues.

Clarifying the difference between textual evidence and rational evidence in language.

Studying a number of grammatical issues from the perspective of linguistic evidence.

#### *Previous Studies*

There was a small number of studies that dealt with the subject of linguistic evidence in grammar and its issues, and among those studies are:

Dr. Saud bin Abdulaziz Al-Arifi: A dissertation for obtaining a master’s degree under the title “Traditional Mental Evidence on the Fundamentals of Belief,” Umm Al-Qura University, 2011 AD.

Dr. Muhammad bin Abdul Rahman bin Abdullah Al-Subahin: Issues of grammatical succession in light of the objection to the transmissional evidence: Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, 2005 AD.

Dr. Muhammad bin Hussein Al-Jizani: “Sharia Evidence in Terms of Transmission and Reason,” Arab Heritage Revival House, Lebanon, 2007 AD.

#### *Research Problems*

There were a number of problems that obstructed my work during research and study regarding this topic, and among these problems were:

There are few studies and references that have dealt with the same idea and topic that we are working on, which has led to it taking a long time to complete the research and complete its information with accuracy and scientific credibility that befits a researcher of an ancient Arabic language.

### **Research Methodology**

The analytical approach was adopted in studying grammar issues and the controversy surrounding them, in addition to adopting the descriptive approach in describing the issue and the evidence.

### **Chapter One**

The controversy over the transmission and rational evidence

The first topic: Definition of linguistic evidence:

Linguistic evidence is what is formed when a person wants to talk and speak about a reference or thing, as he searches within his system of discretion for the definition that corresponds to that reference or thing, and he has worked to learn it and worked to inherit it from individuals within his society, and what is known as meaning or mental image. After that, it is expressed through an image of an audio nature, which is the mental perception of the sounds occurring within the human mind and thought, and in that place a special process of forming linguistic evidence occurs (Abdel Hafeez, 2008).

There are a group of features that distinguish the linguistic guide, which are:

A - Arbitrariness: (*arbitraire*) means what is not present within the word meanings that bear the inevitable indication of its meaning, so we mention, for example, what clarifies this: the word “tree”.

If, for example, the letter “shin” has its meaning on leaves, the letter “jim” has its meaning on the stem, and the letter “ra” has its meaning on branches, then it can be said that the relationship is natural and that it is inevitable. However, when it is necessary that the matter be the opposite, it must be said that it is an arbitrary relationship of a positivistic nature that has been achieved. It is produced as a result of humility and agreement among the human race.

The evidence for this is the difference in languages. For example, within the Arabic language, the word “chair” is used to indicate a specific matter, subject, or thing. In contrast, the French speaker uses the word “chair.” “chaise” means that it refers to the matter, the subject, and the thing itself. A questioner asks which sounds carry more meaning than the other two words? (Abdel Hafeez, 2008).

B- Line: (*liniaire*) Given that the material support of the linguistic evidence is nothing but sound, this means that, if it is created, the sequence of time is sequenced within a single line in a horizontal arrangement called the “speech runway.” For example, there is the word “sadaq,” whose letters are pronounced in a horizontal manner. The sequence is “S + D + Q”, but if the sequence “Q + S + D” is changed, the meaning changes (Abdel Hafeez, 2008).

There was a major dispute that lasted for a long time, and its events revolved around the rational linguistic evidence and the transmissional linguistic evidence, and how both work in proving the Islamic faith. There are groups and groups that leaned towards the rational evidence, and there are groups and groups that adhered to the transmissional evidence, but this disagreement continues to this day. Present.

It was common for Ibn Taymiyyah that he was one of the most important scholars who adhered to the narrational evidence, and he also rejected the rational evidence, but the real matter is not like this, and Ibn Taymiyyah worked to demolish that opposition, and made it clear that the Holy Qur’an included both evidences: the auditory narrational evidence. And logical and analogical rational evidence.

Abu Al-Barakat Al-Anbari stated that this type of evidence is transmissional evidence, and this can be a strong inference. Because the question was: Is it permissible to be amazed at white and black rather than other colors? The answer of the Kufans was in the affirmative, and for this reason what was required of them was proof of Arab usage, but we find that this evidence did not pertain to the exclamatory, but rather pertained to the superlative (I do), and the Basrans did not object to this on the ground that it does not pertain to the exclamatory, but rather because it is anomalous. Or it comes from the word “a’al,” which has a feminine form of “fa’ala’.” (Taqi al-Din, 1991).

The question cannot be specific to their knowledge that these two witnesses are part of the act of preference. Rather, it reveals the inference of embarrassment. The Kufans took advantage of the approval of the Basrans on the rule that combines (I do) exclamation and (I do) preference in the grammatical conditions of formation. Therefore, they were silent about the narrational evidence, which indicates acceptance of the general idea that they accepted in the general rule (Abu Al-Irfan, 1997).

The second topic: The disagreement between the transmission and mental evidence between the people of Basra and the people of Kufa:

In inferring the origin of the derivation, whether it is the verb or the infinitive, the Kufans went to a treatment This controversial issue is taking advantage of one of the issues related to embarrassment. In the issue of their nominal (yes and misery) or their actuality, the Basrans fiercely defended their actuality, and the Kufans defended their nominality. However, in this issue (the issue of the origin of derivation) we see the Kufans employing evidence of embarrassment in the issue of (the actuality of yes and bad) They see that some verbs, especially (yes and bad), according to the principle that the Basrans said, are verbs that have no infinitives, which is something that cannot be denied according to the Basrans, and therefore the infinitive comes after the verb..

“The Kufans believed that “yes” and “bais” are nominative nouns, and the Basrans believed that they were past tense verbs that do not take an inflected form, and Ali bin Hamza al-Kasa’i of the Kufans believed that they were nouns.” (Khaled, 2000).

“As for the Kufans, they argued by saying: The evidence that they are two nouns is the entry of the lower case letter into them, because it has been reported from the Arabs that they say: “The man’s blessings are not increased.” Hassan bin Thabit said:

Isn't it a blessing for a neighbor to make up his household with a brother who has few or no money and is a stubborn person?

Citing the verse in his saying: “By the grace of the neighbour,” the Kufans relied on the apparent meaning of this phrase and claimed that “Yes” is a noun in the sense of the praised one, based on the evidence of the preposition being included in it. We have learned that the preposition only applies to nouns, and perhaps they used as evidence the saying of the Rajas. (Taqi al-Din, 1991).

May God grant you a good morning with the blessings of a bird and luxurious youth

The Basrans say: Yes and bad are two inanimate verbs, as evidenced by the introduction of the feminine ta’ into them.

The reliance here was clearly on rational and analogical evidence, not on auditory transmission evidence, and the reason for this is their reliance on the introduction of the feminine ta’, and I find this matter logical (Mahdi, 1958).

"It was narrated on the authority of some eloquent Arabs that he said, “How good it is to walk on a miserable caravan.” Abu Bakr ibn al-Anbari narrated on the authority of Abu al-Abbas Ahmad ibn Yahya Tha’lab, on the authority of Salamah, on the authority of al-Farra’, that a Bedouin was given the good news of a baby girl, and it was said to him: “Yes, the baby is yours!” He said, “By God, it is not as good as a newborn: helping her is crying, and honoring her is stealing.” So they added the lower case letter to them, and the insertion of the lower case indicates that they are two nouns. Because it is a characteristic of names (Abu Al-Irfan, 1997).

Like his saying, may God bless him and grant him peace:

[Whoever performs ablution on Friday will receive it and be blessed]

“And you say: Miserable is the woman carrying the firewood, and as evidence of the conjunction of the nominative pronouns connected to them, you say: Yes and yes, and the relative nominative pronouns are not associated with anything other than verbs. As for the preposition, it may be included in the verbal pronoun on the verb and on the letter as well, but in the preposition it is included on the noun, and it was The reliance here is on transmission and audio evidence, as this is what they understand from the Arabs and from the Noble Prophet Muhammad, may God bless him and his family and grant them peace. An

example of his inclusion of a verb whose action is agreed upon is the saying of Al-Rajaz: (Taqi al-Din, 1991).

I swear to God, his friend does not sleep at night, nor does he mix with the night beside him

An example of its entry into the letter is your saying: “I am amazed that you are playing.” The two groups agree that such a thing occurs from the Arabs, and they also agree that this apparent meaning is not satisfactory, and that the “ba” in the ragged saying “in the sleep of its companion” must be included in the estimation of the noun. Deleted, and the appreciation of speech, by God, there is no night at night with a saying in which its owner slept, so the entry of the “ba” into the verse is a sentence that falls under the subject of a deleted saying, and this omitted saying is an attribute of a descriptor that is also deleted, and this omitted descriptor is the entry of the “ba” when investigated, so if this is the interpretation of the two groups in the saying of the Rajas “in sleep.” Its author, “Let it be the interpretation of Hassan’s statement, “By the good neighbour,” meaning a neighbor in which it is said, “Blessed is the neighbor,” and let it be the interpretation of the other’s statement, “By the goodness of a bird” (Mahdi, 1958), if we accept the validity of this narration, i.e., a bird in which it is said, “Blessings, a bird,” but this narration is not It is correct, and the correct narration is “with the grace of bird” with the addition of the nun and the sukoon of the ayn, and it is the narration of Al-Kisa’i, and if the inclusion of the preposition in the apparent pronunciation of a word does not conclusively indicate that it is a noun, likewise the preposition is not one of the letters that we said: it is one of the characteristics of nouns like the vocative letters. We have seen the widespread Arabic usage that connects the feminine ta’ and the silent nominative pronouns to the words yes and bad without necessity or need for interpretation. Let the correct view on this issue be the doctrine of the Basrans (Mahdi, 1958).

In all of these examples, they relied on rational and analogical evidence by measuring it on the entry of the feminine sakina ta’, and their reliance was on analysis and knowledge, all of which are rational methods, not textual ones, and in my personal opinion, that is the best and most reliable way to reach the correct answer.

“And among them were those who maintained that they said: The evidence that they are two nouns is that the Arabs say: “O excellent protector and O excellent helper,” so their call to “yes” indicates the nominative, because the call is one of the characteristics of nouns, and if it were a verb, the call would not be directed towards it. They said: It is not permissible to say: What is meant by the call is omitted due to knowledge of it - and the estimation in it is: O God, what a good Protector, and what a good Supporter you are - so the calling letter was omitted because the letter of the calling indicates it, just as the letter of calling was omitted because the calling person indicated it It ran its course, such as the reading of Al-Kisa’i, Abu Jaafar Al-Madani, Ya’qub Al-Hadrami, Abu Abdul Rahman Al-Sulami, Al-Hasan Al-Basri, and Hamid Al-Araj, and that these examples were based on the transmissional evidence, as this is what they transmitted from the Arabs and their sayings without their reliance on the rational evidence (Fathi, 1984).

Except, prostrate to God

He wanted to prostrate, O these people, and as Al-Akhtal said:

Beware, O Hind, the Hind of Banu Badr, even if we live until the end of time

Citing the verse in his saying “Except, O Islam.” The Kufan and Basra groups agree that “ya” is a vocative letter, and that the vocative letter is specific to entering a noun, and it was entered in this verse as an imperative verb by agreement, so the estimation must be its entry. On a deleted name, as if he had said: O Hind, convert to Islam, O Hind, Hind Bani Bakr. This is also narrational and auditory evidence, not rational, as they relied on the sayings of the Arabs, and similar to that, which the author did not seek, is the saying of the other: (Abu Al-Barakat, 2005).

Except, O Aslami, the one with the dark circles and knots, the one with the dark folds and the dark, frizzy hair

The Kufans' statement: "This is specific to what happens after the vocative letter is an imperative verb" is incorrect, as "ya" has entered the pronunciation on verbs other than the imperative verb, and on the letter as well, like the saying of the Raajis:

I wish you and I, Lamis, were in a town where there was no Anis

"A similar matter has been mentioned in the most eloquent speech, and from the insertion of "ya" into the imperative verb, God Almighty says:

{Except, oh, prostrate to Allah} (Surat An-Naml, 25)

And from the entry of "ya" into the letter, God Almighty says:

{I wish I had died before this} (Surat Maryam: 23).

And he said:

{I wish we could be returned and not lied} (Surat Al-An'am, 25)

All of these verses represented a firm and decisive reliance for them on their arguments and goals, so the evidence was narrated and heard from the Holy Qur'an.

Dhul-Rumah said: (Abdullah, 1985).

Oh, peace be upon you, O you who are always afflicted with weariness, and are still drenched by your doses of drops

And some of them insisted on saying: The evidence that they are not two verbs is that they are not properly combined with time like other verbs. Don't you see that you do not say "What a good man yesterday" nor "What a good man tomorrow" and likewise you do not say "What a miserable man yesterday" nor "What a miserable man" "Tomorrow." When time was not properly combined with them, he knew that they were not two verbs.

"And some of them maintained that they said: The evidence that they are not verbs is that they do not act, because disposition is one of the characteristics of verbs, so when they do not act, it indicates that they are not verbs."

The reliance there was on rational evidence, so their argument was the characteristics of actions, and it is natural, logical, and correct in my personal opinion.

"And some of them maintained that they said: The evidence that they are not verbs is that it came from the Arabs: 'Na'im the man Zaid', and there is no fa'il in the examples of verbs at all, so this indicates that they are nouns, not verbs."

As for the Basrans, they argued by saying: The evidence that they are two verbs is the connection of the nominative pronoun with them to the extent of its connection with the verb in the accusative case. It has been reported from the Arabs that they said, "How good are two men, and how good are two men," and Al-Kisa'i narrated that, and they also raised the nominative in the form of "How good a man is." "And wretched is the boy," which is implicit in something like "What a good man Zaid is, and what a wretched boy is Amr," which indicates that they are both verbs (Ibn Aqeel).

They relied on audio and transmission evidence because they adhered to the sayings of the Arabs and measured their rules based on them, and from my point of view this point may differ from one mechanical example to another.

And some of them maintained that they said: The evidence that they are two verbs is their connection with the static feminine ta', which none of the Arabs invert in the pause for ha, just as they inverted it in the form of mercy, sunnah, and tree, and that is their saying, "Blessed is the woman, and miserable is the maid," because this ta is specific to the past tense and does not go beyond it. It is not permissible to judge by the name of what you have called."

They objected to this by saying: Your saying, "This ta' is specific to the verb" is not correct, because it was connected to the letter in their saying, "Rabat, Thamat, and Laat" in the Almighty's saying:

{Then they called out, and she left when she had escaped} (Surat p. 3).

One of the poets said: (Abu Al-Barakat, 2005).

A questioner asked about me whether he lent his eye or not

The Basrans relied on transmissional evidence, and their support was linked to the Holy Qur'an and the sayings of poets.

Some Kufans recite these and similar verses to refute the evidence of the Basrans, which they used as evidence that yes and bad are verbs. They say: You infer that yes and bad are verbs by pairing each of these two words with the feminine ta', and you claim that the feminine ta' is specific to entering verbs, but we do not accept that. Everything that is used as a feminine ta' is a verb, as evidenced by the fact that this ta' was entered on "then", which is a conjunction according to consensus, just as it was entered on "no", which is a negative letter unanimously, and it was entered on "rab" and we and you agree that it is not a verb, so this is the case. Similar to what you contradicted our doctrine when you said: The entry of the preposition into the word is not conclusive evidence of the nominativeness of the word, because the preposition has entered into the pronunciation regarding the verb and the letter, and the vocative letter, which is one of the characteristics of nouns, has entered into the pronunciation regarding the verb whose actuality is agreed upon. And according to the letter, its literal meaning is agreed upon. So, your evidence is not complete, just as our evidence is not complete. What is more likely for your doctrine than our doctrine? Which is one of its special characteristics: sukun, which says: She rose, she sat, she stayed, and she traveled, so you find a ta' and it follows it. With the letter, what you claimed about the specificity of the verb to it is invalidated, and if the specificity is invalidated, then it is permissible for Nayam and Bis to be two nouns to which this ta is attached, just as it attaches to Rabāt and Thāmā. This is based on the fact that yes and bad do not require the ta to occur after them in the feminine, just as verbs are required. Do you not see that your saying, "The woman stood up, and the girl sat down," is not permissible in the capacity of speech, unlike your saying, "What a good woman, and what a miserable girl," which is good in the scope of speech? The difference between them became clear (Abu Al-Barakat, 2005).

"This objection that they mentioned is invalid. As for the ta' that is connected to rabat and thamma, even if it is feminine, it is not the ta that is in Naamat and Misery, and the evidence for that is from two aspects. One of them is that the ta in "The woman was blessed, and the girl was miserable" was attached to the verb to feminize the noun to which it was attributed. The verb is attached to it in their saying, "The woman rose" to feminize the noun to which the verb was attributed, and the ta' in "I raised, and then" was attached to feminize the letter, not to feminize anything else. Don't you see that you say "I raised a man who was dishonored" just as you say "I raised a woman who was honored," even if it was like the ta in "blessed and miserable" when it was permissible for it to be affirmed with the masculine, just as it is not permissible for it to be affirmed with the masculine in your saying "The man was blessed, and miserable was the boy." So when it was permissible for the ta to be affirmed with the masculine noun (Abduh al-Rajhi).

"With the masculine, it indicates the difference between them, and the other side: that the ta' that follows the verb is consonant, and this ta that follows these two letters is vowelized, so the difference between them is clear. As for "laat," we do not accept that the ta is added to it, rather it is a word that is related to it, even if we accept that there is an additional ta in it, so the answer has four aspects: two aspects that we mentioned in Rabat and Them, and two aspects that we will mention now. One of them is that Al-Kisa'i

used to stop it with a h, so he used it as evidence that he asked Abu Faqas al-Asadi about it, and he said: “Wala,” so it is not in the same position as the ta’ in Rabat and Them, and not. It is in the same position as the ta’ in blessings and misfortunes” (Mahdi, 1958).

The second aspect: that the ta’ in (Lat Hayna) is connected to ‘hiyn’, not ‘without’. This is also mentioned by Abu Ubaid al-Qasim bin Salam, and he said that they add the ta’ to ‘when’ and ‘wan’ and ‘now’, so they say: ‘I did this when such-and-such is at the time of such-and-such, and at the time of such-and-such, and ta’alaan’, meaning: when Such-and-such, such-and-such time, and now (Abu al-Barakat, 2005).

The poet, Abu Wajza al-Saadi, said:

The passionate ones, there was no Atif in the past, and the restaurants in the past, where was the restaurant?

We notice here the reliance on transmission and audio evidence, as they relied on the Holy Qur’an and it was their first and last argument.

In my own opinion regarding the centrality of this issue, I find that relying on transmission evidence; Due to the reliance and reliance on the most important principles, which is the Holy Qur’an.

The third topic: Question: [The statement about the factor in the predicate after “ma” that negates the accusative case](Abu Al-Barakat, 2005).

The Kufans held that “ma” in the language of the people of Hijaz does not function in the predicate, and it is in the accusative case by deleting the genitive letter, and the Basrans held that it acts in the predicate, and it is in the accusative case (Abu Al-Irfan, 1997).

As for the Kufans, they argued with it. They said: We only said that it does not work in the predicate, and that is because the analogy in “what” is that it does not work at all; Because the letter is only a factor if it is specialized, such as the letter of reduction when it is specific to nouns, it is used in it, and the jussive letter is used in it when it is specific to verbs, and if it is not specific, then it must not work like the interrogative letter or conjunction; Because it sometimes applies to the noun, such as “whatever Zaid is standing,” and sometimes it applies to the verb, such as “what Zaid will stand up to,” so since it is common between the noun and the verb, it must not work; That is why it was neglected and did not work in the language of Bani Tamim, and this is standard evidence. Rather, the people of Hijaz used it because they likened it to lis in terms of meaning, and it is a weak resemblance, so it was not able to work in the report as lis did; Because it is not a verb, and it is not a letter, and the letter is weaker than the verb, so it is invalid for it to be in the accusative case with what, and it must be in the accusative case by deleting the lower case letter; Because the basic principle is “what is added to the qa’im,” so when the subjunctive letter is deleted, it must be in the accusative case. Because the adjectives are in the accusative case, so when they are gone, they remain behind them, and for this reason it is not permissible to make the accusative case if the predicate is presented, such as “Zaid is not standing” or the letter of exception is inserted such as “Zaid is not but standing” because it is not appropriate to enter the b with them; It is not said, “There is no one who will stand up, and no one will stand up except Zaid,” so that indicates what we said (Abu Al-Barakat, 2005).

As for the Basrans, they argued that they said: The evidence that “what” is in the accusative of the predicate is that what it resembled is not; So it is necessary to perform the action of not, and the action of not is in the nominative and accusative, and the similarity between it and not is in two ways: One of them is that it applies to the subject and the predicate, just as it does not apply to the subject and the predicate. The second is that it denies what is in the adverb, just as not denies what is in the adverb. The similarity between them from these two aspects is strengthened by the entry of the b into its predicate just as it enters into the predicate not. So if it is proven that it has It is similar to neither of these two aspects, so it must take its course. Because they make a thing the same as a thing if it resembles it in two aspects. Don’t you see that what is not inflected by something that resembles a verb in two aspects has its effect in preventing genitiveness and nouns? Likewise here: when you resemble something that does not have two aspects, it



must do its job; So it is necessary to raise the noun and put the predicate in the accusative case, based on what we have explained, so the reliance here was on the transmissional evidence (Abu Al-Barakat, 2005).

As for the answer to the words of the Kufans: As for their saying, “The analogy requires that it should not be done,” we said: This was the analogy, except that there was found between it and there is no similarity that required that it should be done, and that is the language of the Qur’an, where God Almighty said:

{This is not a human being} (Surat Yusuf: 31).

And the Almighty said:

{They are not like their mothers} (Surat Al-Mujadila: 2).

Their saying, “The people of Hijaz did it due to a weak resemblance, so it was not possible for it to be used in the predicate.” We said: This resemblance made it necessary for it to do its job, and it is in the nominative case and the predicate is in the accusative case, although we have acted in accordance with this weakness; Its action is invalidated if its predicate precedes its noun, or if an exception letter is inserted, or if it is separated from its subject by a light, and had it not been for that weakness, it would have to be performed in all of these situations (Abu Al-Barakat, 2005).

As for their claim that the basic principle is “what is added to a standing person,” we do not accept it. Rather, the basic principle is that it does not exist, but it was introduced for two reasons. One of them is that it was inserted as an affirmation of the negation, and the second: to be in a predicate of what, in contrast to the lam in the predicate of that; Because what it denies is what it affirms if, so it made the b in its predicate something like “Zaid is not going to stand up” to be opposite the lam in something like “Indeed, Zaid is standing” just as you made the “sin” the answer to “won’t.” Don’t you see that you say “he will not do it” so the answer is “he will do it” and so you made “maw” the answer. Why, don’t you see that you say “when he does” so the answer would be “he did” and if you deleted “why” and said “he does” then the answer would be “he did” without having; This indicates that there was an answer for what, and so it is here (Abu Al-Barakat, 2005).

In my own opinion on this issue, I find that relying on rational evidence is more correct and sound, as it is a grammatical issue that must be based on clear rational foundations without relying on transmission.

Section Four: Issue: [Preventing the use of what is used in the necessity of poetry]

The Kufans held that it is permissible to leave out the inflection of what is inflected in the necessity of poetry, and Abu Al-Hasan Al-Akhfash, Abu Ali Al-Farisi, and Abu Al-Qasim bin Burhan among the Basrans went to him. The Basrans held that it is not permissible, and they unanimously agreed that it is permissible to inflect what is not inflected in the necessity of poetry, and their reliance was on The rational evidence (Abu Al-Barakat, 2005).

As for the Kufans, they argued that they said: The evidence that it is permissible to leave the morphology of what is morphological in necessity of poetry is that this came up often in their poetry, so their reliance was on the transmissional evidence. Al-Akhtal said: (Ali, 1998).

The Blues called for the battalions when they fell... in the youth of the raiders of the treacherous borders.

The Arabic had the right for him to say “Al-Azaariqa” because they added the ta in the plural instead of the relative ya’ that is in the singular. They said: Al-Muhallaba, and the Ash’ari, in the plural of Ash’ari and Muhallabi, but he deleted the ta’ when he was forced to establish the meter, and Al-Kata’ib: the plural of Katiba, which is the group. From the army, and the battalion calls on the marauding horses from a hundred to a thousand, and hot: they fell, and Shabib: He is Shabib bin Yazid bin Naim Al-Shaibani, and he was one of the heads of the Kharijites during the reign of Abd al-Malik bin Marwan.

In my opinion, in this matter, relying on narrational evidence is more correct than relying on rational evidence, because the poets had their poetic eloquence and fluency, especially since the pre-Islamic era.

## Conclusion

We reach the conclusion of the research after a great effort through which we tried to clarify the idea of the disagreement between the audio transmission evidence and the standard rational evidence. We clarified that issue through the evidence of the principles from the Holy Qur'an and what was adopted in the books of trustworthy scholars, such as Al-Anbari. We explained the meanings of the evidence in terms of its being rational and in terms of its being Transferrable, while clarifying the difference between both, and clarifying the disagreement between scholars and points of view. The study was based on the applied analytical method, through studying verses and evidence and clarifying opinions. There are many criticisms directed at the Book of Insaf, but it did not lose its scientific value, but rather was considered a reliable source. It is a source from which literature, research and studies are absorbed. Among the most important results that the research has led to are:

The lack of references for studying the Kufi doctrine. Abu Al-Barakat, with his book in which he presented the Kufi doctrine in the best and most accurate presentation, filled a large part of this deficiency. Despite his victory or inclination on most issues to the Basrans rather than the Kufans, we cannot judge him to be unfair because his book was written for issues. The dispute has no origins, it was merely a presentation and a ruling.

Our first endeavors lay in the desire to reach the dream despite the presence of conflicts and conflicts, hoping from God for success for every moment that devoted the effort of a researcher and the effort of a student.

## References

- Abdel Hafeez Abu Al-Souf (2008): An applied session on the linguistic evidence: University Center: Mila.
- Abdo Al-Rajhi: Lessons in Grammatical Schools: Part: First: Edition: First: Arab Heritage Revival House: Beirut\_Lebanon.
- Abdullah bin Youssef bin Ahmed bin Abdullah bin Youssef Abu Muhammad Jamal al-Din Ibn Hisham (1985): Mughni al-Labib on the books of Arabs: Verified by: Mazen al-Mubarak and Muhammad Ali Hamdallah: Part: First: Edition: Sixth: Dar Al-Fikr: Damascus, Syria.
- Abu Al-Barakat Al-Anbari (2005): Fairness in matters of dispute between the Basrans and the Kufans, and with it redress from fairness, written by: Muhammad Muhyiddin Abdul Hamid: Dar Al-Tala'i.
- Abu Al-Irfan Muhammad bin Ali Al-Sabban Al-Shafi'i (1997): Al-Sabban's Footnote to Al-Ashmouni's Explanation of Ibn Malik's Alfiyyah: Part: Three: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah: Beirut\_Lebanon.
- Ali bin Muhammad bin Isa Abi Al-Hasan Nour Al-Din Al-Ashmouni Al-Shafi'i (1998): Al-Ashmouni's Explanation on Ibn Malik's Alfiyyah: Part: Fourth: Edition: First: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah: Beirut\_Lebanon.
- Fathi Bayoumi Hamouda (1984): Disputed Issues of Justice: Part: First: First Edition: Dar Al-Nahda: Cairo, Egypt.
- Ibn Aqeel Abdullah bin Abdul Rahman Al-Uqaili Al-Hamdhani Al-Masry: Explanation of Ibn Aqeel on the Alfiyyah of Ibn Malik: Verified by: Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abdul Hamid: Part: First: Edition: First: Dar Al-Turath: Cairo, Egypt.
- Khalid bin Abdullah bin Abi Bakr bin Muhammad Al-Jarjawi Al-Azhari Zain Al-Din Al-Masry (2000): Explanation of the Declaration on Clarification: Part: Second: Edition: First: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah: Beirut\_Lebanon.
- Mahdi Al-Makhzoumi (1958): The Kufa School and its approach to studying language and grammar: Mustafa Al-Babi Al-Halabi Library and Printing Company: Cairo, Egypt.
- Taqi al-Din Abu al-Abbas Ahmad bin Abdul Halim bin Abdul Salam bin Abdullah bin Abi al-Qasim bin Muhammad Ibn Taymiyyah al-Harrani (1991): Preventing the Conflict of Reason and Transmission: Verified by: Dr. Muhammad Rashad Salem: Part: First: Edition: Second: Imam Muhammad bin University Saud Islamic: Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- The Holy Quran