

The Axes of the Controversial Linguistic Foundations According to Sibawayh

Mohammad Fadl Thlji Aldalabih¹

Abstract

The primary objective of this research is not to present the controversial aspects between Sibawayh and other scholars, but rather to examine the foundations that Sibawayh used to support his linguistic opinions, which were often opposed by others. The key foundations that Sibawayh relied upon include auditory, analogy, and interpretative axes, as well as deviations from traditional Arab linguistic practices and the languages spoken by the Arabs. Additionally, this research will discuss other relevant foundations throughout. Sibawayh may refer to one of these axes when comparing the opinions of scholars, categorizing some as easy, others as strong, and others with different attributes. The research paper concludes with a series of findings based on this analysis.

Keywords: *Kazakh, English, Latin, origin, experience, research.*

Introduction

We thank Allah Almighty for all the blessings He has bestowed upon us. May peace and blessings be upon His greatest prophets.

This research explores a vital aspect of the discourse surrounding one of the preeminent figures in Arabic grammar, Sibawayh. Renowned as the master of grammarians, Sibawayh's contributions to the Arabic linguistic heritage, particularly through his seminal work, remain unparalleled. His book is a cornerstone for subsequent grammatical treatises. The admiration for Sibawayh's work is well-documented. For instance, Al-Mazni (d. 247 AH) noted, "Whoever wishes to write a substantial book on grammar after Sibawayh's work should feel ashamed." Similarly, Al-Mubarrad (d. 285 AH) emphasized the profundity of Sibawayh's work when he remarked, "Have you sailed the sea to honor it and face its challenges".

Numerous studies have explored Sibawayh's book, each offering unique insights. This research focuses on the foundations Sibawayh used to substantiate his linguistic arguments in opposition to other scholars. Among the aspects the researcher wishes to delve into—after placing my trust in Allah, the Almighty—are the arguments that Sibawayh relied on in his disagreements with other scholars regarding linguistic issues that do not align with his views. His methods ranged from auditory evidence to analogy and interpretative principles, often categorizing opposing views as easy, strong, or nuanced.

To contextualize this analysis, it is beneficial to define the concept of disagreement both linguistically and conceptually. Linguistically, Ibn Manzur described disagreement as "the divergence of two matters that do not agree."² Al-Jurjani conceptually defined it as "a dispute between opposing sides to affirm a right or invalidate a falsehood." Al-Raghib Al-Isfahani distinguished between disagreement and opposition. He stated that "disagreement and opposition occur when each party takes a different path in their views and statements. Disagreement is broader than opposition; every pair of opposites differs, but not every set of different entities qualifies as opposites. Since disagreement in communication can lead to conflict, this term has been adopted to refer to disputes and arguments." Also, disagreement can be defined as "a confrontation between two opinions regarding what should be a matter of individual judgment." Scholars have extensively studied disagreements in grammar. Notable works include *The Differences of Grammarians* (Ahmad bin Yahya Thaalab, d. 291 AH), *What the Basrans and Kufans Disagreed on* (Ibn Kaysan, d. 320 AH), *The Disagreement Among Grammarians* (Abu Hasan al-Rammi, d. 384 AH), and *The*

¹ Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Irbid National University, Jerash-Jordan ; m.fadil2020@yahoo.com

Sufficiency of Learners in the Differences of Grammarians (Ibn Faris, d. 395 AH). These studies highlight how each scholar sought innovative foundations to validate their opinions, whether traditional, analogical, or otherwise.

This paper investigates Sibawayh's argumentative methodologies through the following axes:

The Auditory Axis

Sibawayh often relied on auditory evidence from native Arabic usage, contrasting with scholars like Isa ibn Umar. For example, in the debate over the definiteness of "matar" (rain) in Al-Ahwasi's poetic line, Sibawayh rejected Isa ibn Umar's claim that "matar" functioned like an indefinite noun. Instead, Sibawayh argued that there was no auditory precedent for such usage among Arabs, though he acknowledged the possibility of analogy under specific conditions. Sibawayh's argument included examples from other poets, such as Dhul-Rumma, to illustrate his analytical approach. He quoted "Adara bi-jadhwa," where "adara" is further explained by the prepositional phrase that follows, which causes it to function as a genitive noun.

Sibawayh states: "Regarding the saying of Al-Ahwasi³:

'Peace of God be upon you, O rain, and not upon you, O rain, be peace.'

The reason this is followed by nunnation (a case marker) is that it resembles a noun and is not considered an indefinite noun. It functions similarly to a noun that remains unchanged, distinguishing it from the indefinite article. This distinction is important because nunnation is essential for forming the indefinite article in all contexts, including the accusative case.

Isa ibn Umar used to say, "O rain," drawing a comparison to his phrase "O man," and treating it as if it were indefinite, even when it is case marked and extended like the indefinite. However, we have not encountered any Arab using it in this way, although there is a basis for analogy if it is case-marked and extended similarly to the indefinite⁴.

The extension can be seen in Dhul-Rumma's saying⁵:

"Did you notice that a house has been overshadowed, So that the water of passion either washes away or ripples⁶"

In this line of poetry, the "accusative" of "house" is used, and its term is indefinite, but it has been expanded by the following description, which forms a genitive construction. Therefore, it has come to function like a genitive noun.⁷

7-"The treasury, 1: .294".

8The book, Vol. 2, pp. 203-202

9- Poetry collection by Dhī al-Rumma, p. 389

10- The book, Vol. 2, p. 199

11- The book, footnote, Vol. 2, p. 200

The Differential Axis

Sibawayh argues that it is permissible to use the accusative case in phrases such as “This boy is going for you” and “I passed by a man standing.” This view contradicts the opinions of Yunus ibn Habib and Isa ibn Umar, who distinguish between instances with nunnation and those without. They have argued that in cases without nunnation, there is a difference between stable actions, which are irrevocable, and those that can be remedied.

Yunus ibn Habib contended that the noun is in the accusative when it appears, while Isa ibn Umar maintained that in the phrase “This boy is going for you,” the use of the accusative is valid. Sibawayh supported this by stating that it is acceptable to say, “I passed by a man standing,” thereby making the accusative case acceptable in this context as well.

It is important to note that some grammarians make a distinction between nunnation and non-nunnation. In the absence of nunnation, they classify stable actions, which they see as unchangeable (like those of a taker or necessary actions), differently from actions that can be remedied (such as those of a striker or breaker). They treat these stable actions as nominative in all circumstances and consider necessary actions as accusative only when they occur. Others believe that such actions are accusative when they happen, but nominative in all cases when they do not. This reflects Yunus's perspective, while the first viewpoint aligns more closely with Isa's opinion.⁸

The Auditory and Narrative Axis

Sibawayh relied on the auditory tradition of the Arabs, in contrast to 'Isa ibn 'Umar, who believed that the words “Yazid” and “Taghlib” should not be inflected when used as proper nouns. However, Sibawayh argued that 'Isa ibn 'Umar's stance was inconsistent with established Arabic usage. To support his argument, Sibawayh cited examples from Arabic speech, such as the name “Ka’saban,” which Arabs inflected when referring to a man's name.

Sibawayh also differed with 'Isa ibn 'Umar on the placement of evidence in the following verse:

“I am the son of Jalal and the one who climbs the ridges...

When I put on the turban, you will recognize me.”

Sibawayh interpreted the placement of evidence based on its narrative context. Thus, his disagreement with 'Isa ibn 'Umar was based on two key axes: the auditory axis and the narrative axis.

In his work, “The Chapter on What Verbs Decline When Named After a Man,” Sibawayh stated that “just as Yazid and Taghlib become like Tanb and Ya’mal when they are used as nouns.”

Contrary to Arabic usage, Isa ibn 'Umar did not inflect these words. Sibawayh argued, “We have heard Arabs inflect a man’s name as كَعْسَبًا (Ka’saban), which is derived from الكَعْسَبَةُ (al-Ka’sabah), meaning a fierce enemy with closely matched strides.”

The Arabs also recited a verse by Suhaym ibn Wathil al-Yarbu’i:

“I am Ibn Jala and the one who strides through the valleys.

Whenever I put on the turban, you will recognize me.”

12-The book, Vol. 2, p. 21.

Sibawayh interpreted this as referring to the man called “Jala⁹” rather than aligning with 'Isa ibn 'Umar's perspective. He clarified that “fa'ala” here does not indicate morphological weight (as it would be “fa'lal”) but derives from a verbal form.¹⁰

The Analogical Axis

Sibawayh believes that when dealing with diminutives, if there are two **yā's** at the end following the diminutive **yā**, the final **yā** should be omitted. This opinion was not accepted by either Abu Amr ibn al-Ala or Isa ibn Umar. Both disagreed with Sibawayh's approach, though Sibawayh maintained that Yunus ibn Habib's opinion was correct and aligned with the rules of Arabic, as it adhered to the analogies found in the speech of the Arabs.

Sibawayh stated

"Know that if there are two **yā's** after the diminutive **yā**, you omit the last one, and the resulting form becomes **fu'ayl**, following the rules of Arabic. For example:

- In عطاء ('Atā): عُطَيٌّ ('Uṭayy)
- In قضاء (Qadā): قُدَيٌّ (Qudayy)
- In سقاية (Saqāya): سُقَيَّةٌ (Suqayyah)."

He continued

"Similarly, this applies to أحوى (Aḥwā), except for those who say أُسْوِدٌ (Usaywid). Do not decline it because the addition is established at the beginning, and its rarity does not demand attention as much as the rarity of يَضَعُ (Yaḍa)."

Regarding Isa ibn Umar's opinion, Sibawayh said

"Isa used to say أُحَيٌّ (Uḥayy) and would decline it, but this is incorrect. Abu Amr, on the other hand, would say أُحَيٌّ (Uḥayy). If this were permissible, I would say for عطاء ('Atā): عُطَيٌّ (Uṭayy), because it has a **yā** like this **yā**, and it follows a broken **yā**. Similarly, I would say for سقاية (Saqāya): سُقَيَّةٌ (Suqayyah), and for شاول (Shāw): شُوَيٌّ (Shuwayy). As for Yunus, his statement is أُحَيٌّ (Uḥayy), as you see, and it is the analogy and the correct form."

This affirms the correctness of Sibawayh's statement regarding أُحَيٌّ (Uḥayy).¹¹

Here is a translation of the provided text into English

"If this were permissible, I would say for عطاء ('Atā): عُطَيٌّ (Utiyy), because it contains a **yā** like this **yā** and also a broken **yā**. I would say for سقاية (Saqāya): سُقَيَّةٌ (Suqayyiyah), and for شاول (Shaw): شُوَيٌّ (Shuwiyy). However, Yunus's statement is أُحَيٌّ (Uhayyu), as you can see, and it is the analogy and the correct form."¹²

13-The book, Vol. 3, pp.

14-The previous one, same, Vol. 3, f206-207 footnote p. 206"

15-The jokes in the interpretation of Sibawayh's book, vol. 2, p. 941.

The Axis of Arabic Speech Conventions

Sibawayh believes, as did al-Khalil ibn Ahmad, that it is not permissible in Arabic to say: "This man is the brother of Zayd" when intending to liken the man to Zayd, as such a construction is considered both ugly and weak. It may be permissible in cases of poetic necessity, and this exception allows us to say: "This is a short one, the tall one" when intending to compare the short one to the tall one in the given structure.

It is well-known in Arabic speech that it is not permissible to describe an indefinite noun with a definite one. Similarly, it is considered improper for a definite noun to serve as a state for an indefinite one, except in cases of poetic necessity. However, the degree of unattractiveness is even greater when it comes to attributes, as such usage directly contradicts the speaker's statement.

Here, we encounter two issues: the discrepancy in the attribute and the lack of compatibility. According to Sibawayh, "In terms of the state, there must be agreement in definiteness and indefiniteness, as established in the speech of the Arabs, except where poetic necessity dictates otherwise."

Sibawayh elaborates

"Al-Khalil, may God have mercy on him, claimed that it is permissible for a man to say: 'This is a man, the brother of Zayd,' if the intention is to liken him to the brother of Zayd. However, this is both ugly and weak and only permissible in cases of necessity. If this were allowed, I could say: 'This is a short man, the tall one,' intending 'like the tall one.' Such a construction is not permissible, just as it is improper for a definite noun to serve as a state for an indefinite noun except in poetry. This is even uglier in description because it contradicts the original statement. Thus, it does not agree in state, just as it differs in description."¹³

From the preceding text, it is evident that Sibawayh identified two key reasons:

1. **Grammatical Reason:** It is not permissible for an indefinite noun to be described by a definite noun, and there must be agreement in definiteness and indefiniteness according to the norms of Arabic speech. A definite noun cannot serve as a state for an indefinite noun, except under the condition of poetic necessity.
2. **Rhetorical Reason:** As highlighted in his statement, "This is a short man, the tall one," such a construction is rhetorically unacceptable. Sibawayh explains that if a speaker were to use such phrasing despite its unattractiveness, they would contradict their own speech, confuse their audience about their intended meaning, and deviate from the linguistic correctness that aligns with the norms and practices of Arabic speakers. Furthermore, this construction fails to achieve the intended meaning of comparison that al-Khalil sought.¹⁴

The Rhetorical Axis

Sibawayh held a different perspective from that of his teacher, Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad al-Farahidi, regarding what is known as "the genitive case by proximity." Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad maintained that "the genitive case by proximity is not permitted unless the two adjacent nouns are equal in definiteness or indefiniteness, singularity, duality, and plurality."¹⁵ In contrast, Sibawayh did not consider it necessary to adhere to the condition imposed by Al-Khalil.

16-The book, Vol. 3, pp. 471 - 472.

17-The book, Vol. 3, p. 361

18-The Rhetorical Principles in Sibawayh's Book and Their Impact on Rhetorical Research, p. 3.9 Dr. Ahmed Saad Muhammad

When Al-Khalil observed that Sibawayh allowed the genitive case based on proximity even if the neighboring nouns differed, he pointed to a poetic verse—mentioned in Sibawayh's text—by the poet Al-Ajjaj as a counterpoint. For instance, when we say, "This is a dilapidated burrow of a lizard," it is clear from a semantic perspective that "dilapidated" cannot describe the lizard but must refer to the burrow. Additionally, the indication provided by the dual form does not concern the lizard. This observation suggests that Sibawayh employed semantic reasoning to support his grammatical stance.

Sibawayh explicitly permitted "the genitive case based on proximity even if the neighboring nouns differed,"¹⁶ and he relied on the poet's statement in the following example:

Sibawayh wrote

"Al-Khalil, may God have mercy on him, said: They do not say except, 'These are two dilapidated burrows of a lizard,' because the lizard is singular, and the burrows are dual. They err when the second noun matches the first in number and is also masculine or feminine. For example, they say: 'This is a dilapidated burrow of lizards,' because 'lizards' is feminine, 'burrow' is feminine, and the numbers align. This is the opinion of Al-Khalil, may God have mercy on him. However, we do not see this or the first instance as anything but equal, because when one says, 'This is a dilapidated burrow of a lizard,' it is clear that the adjective does not describe the lizard, just as it is clear in the dual form that it does not pertain to the lizard."¹⁷

This highlights Sibawayh's use of semantic interpretation to validate his grammatical opinion, which differed from the stricter conditions laid out by Al-Khalil.

The Estimative Axis

Sibawayh challenged and weakened the position of Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad regarding the estimation of what is omitted in the sentence, "Indeed, he is the poor fool." Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad believed that the word "the poor" was in the nominative case based on his interpretation of the sentence.¹⁸

Al-Khalil interpreted the statement, (Indeed, the poor man is foolish), as analogous to (Indeed, we, Tamim, are going). Grammarians refer to this as "the separation between the name of 'Inna' and its predicate, and similar structures by way of objection."¹⁹ This construction is permitted because it involves a specification of the first part of the sentence, even if the second part is in the nominative case by implying a subject.

Al-Khalil likened this to the phrase, (We, Tamim), due to the specification implied within the structure.

The Estimative and Auditory Axis

The discussion under the estimative axis includes the opinions of both Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad Al-Farahidi and Yunus ibn Habib. Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad argued that the accusative case in the sentence "ضربَ أَيُّهُمَ أَفْضَلَ" (Strike whichever is better) is due to ellipsis. He estimated the omitted part to be: "ضرب الذي يقال له أَيُّهُم"

19-The 19-book, the footnote, Vol. 1, p. 437

20-Controversial issues between Al-Khalil and Sibawayh, p. 56, Dr. Fakhr Saleh Suleiman Qadara, House of Hope for Publishing and Distribution, 1st edition, 141 H - 199 M."

21- The book, Vol. 1, p. 437

22-- The book, Vol. 2, p. 76

23-- The jokes in the interpretation of Sibawayh's book, by the knowledgeable al-Shantamari, Vol. 1, p. 480

أفضلُ" (Strike the one who is called 'whichever is better'). Al-Khalil supported his argument with a poetic excerpt from Al-Akhtal.

When Sibawayh asked Al-Khalil about the phrase "ضرب أيهم أفضل", Al-Khalil responded that the analogy in this case favors the accusative case. He explained it as equivalent to saying: "ضرب الذي أفضل" (Strike the one who is better), asserting that "أيًا" (whichever) in contexts other than conditions or questions functions as "الذي" (the one who). Yunus ibn Habib, on the other hand, likened it to the phrase "أشهد إنك لرسول الله" (I bear witness that you are the Messenger of Allah).

Sibawayh, however, believed that "أيًا", whether in the genitive or not, is equivalent to "من" (who), as seen in phrases like: "أي أفضل" (Which is better?) and "أي القوم أفضل" (Which of the people is better?).

Sibawayh also noted that Al-Khalil and Yunus viewed the "dhamma" in the phrase "ضرب أيهم أفضل" (Strike whichever is better) as equivalent to diacritical mark : the "fatha" in numerical expressions like "خمسة عشر" (fifteen), and to diacritical mark : the "fatha" in "من الآن إلى غد" (from now until tomorrow), applying this reasoning to "بأيهم" when it deviated from its typical usage.

Sibawayh relied on conventional Arabic speech in his analysis and found Al-Khalil's interpretation far-fetched, deeming it only acceptable in poetic necessity. He argued that if Al-Khalil's view on names were valid, it would permit phrases like "اضرب الفاسق الخبيث" (Strike the wicked evildoer), meaning "the one who is called the wicked evildoer."

Sibawayh said:

"Know that 'any,' whether it is added or not, is equivalent to 'who.' Don't you see that you say: 'Which is better?' and 'Which of the people is better?' So, both the added and non-added forms are treated like 'who.' I asked Al-Khalil, may God have mercy on him, about their saying: 'Strike any of them who is better.' He said: The correct form is to use the accusative, just as you would say: 'Strike the one who is better,' because 'any' in contexts other than conditional or interrogative means 'the one who.' Al-Khalil claimed that 'any of them' in 'Strike any of them who is better' functions narratively as if saying: 'Strike the one who is said to be the better of them.' He likened this to the statement by Al-Akhtal:

"I spent the night with the girl in a house, so I spent the night without any hardship or deprivation."²⁰

Yunus argued that it was akin to the statement "I bear witness that you are the Messenger of Allah," and that the verb "strike" is suspended.²¹ The reference point in Al-Akhtal's verse lies in the nominative case of "hardship" and "deprivation." According to Al-Khalil, this construction serves as a narrative, implying "I spent the night as if it were said to me, 'There is no hardship or deprivation.'" He added that it is impermissible to use the nominative case by implying a subject, much like it is impermissible to say "Zayd is neither standing nor sitting" by implying "he is neither standing nor sitting."²²

Yunus's claim about the suspension of the verb "strike" was criticized by Abu Sa'id al-Sirafi, who argued that suspension occurs only in interrogative contexts, such as "Look at which of them is in the house" or

²⁰ Diwan Al-Akhtal. pp 84

25-The Book, Vol. 2, pp. 398-400"

²² "The book, the margin, Vol. 2, pp. 399-400."

"Know if Zayd is in the house or Amr." ²³Similarly, Al-A'lam al-Shantamari deemed Yunus's explanation weak, stating that suspension nullifies the action of the verb in such cases.²⁴

Sibawayh concluded:

"Their use of the dhamma in 'Strike whoever is better' is akin to the fatha in 'fifteen' and 'from now until tomorrow.' This form was applied to 'whoever is better' when it diverged from the usual forms of its counterparts. Rarely does an Arab say: 'The one who is better, strike,' or 'Strike whoever is better,' without including a pronoun... Al-Khalil's interpretation, in this instance, is far-fetched and permissible only in poetry or necessity. If this were permissible for names, one could also say: 'Strike the wicked one, the vile one,' meaning 'the one who is called the wicked one, the vile one.' Yunus's argument similarly lacks alignment with conventional linguistic norms."²⁵

Sibawayh's insights into "from now until tomorrow" emphasize structural consistency, as rare constructions contradict standard grammatical analysis. For example, it is uncommon for an Arab to say "Bring what is beautiful" without specifying, as in "Bring what is better."²⁶

The Axis Based on Frequent Usage

Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad al-Farahidi believed that the Arabs' attempt to simplify their speech led them to omit the preposition "lam" in the phrase "Lah a book" and to drop the "alif" and "lam" in "Laqetituhu amsi" (I met him yesterday). However, Sibawayh had a different perspective on the word "amsi." According to Sibawayh, we do not add a preposition and its object after the word "amsi," as demonstrated in the phrase "Dhahaba amsi bima fihi" (He went yesterday with what he had). Sibawayh also mentioned that not every preposition can be omitted.

Al-Khalil claimed that expressions such as "May your father be cursed" and "I met him yesterday" can be interpreted as "To Allah be the curse on your father" and "I met him yesterday." In this case, the preposition and definite article were omitted for easier pronunciation. However, not every preposition is left out, as the object of the preposition is often included, which makes these phrases seem like a single letter, thus rendering them somewhat improper.

Nevertheless, they might omit the preposition in frequently used phrases, as simplification is more necessary in common speech. However, Al-Khalil's argument about the use of "yesterday" is weak, since one can say "he went yesterday" using the complete form without issue.²⁷

Standard axis

Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad believed that the word "لن" (lan) is composed of two parts: "لا" (la) and "أن" (an). He observed that the alif and the hamzah were omitted for ease of pronunciation, as seen in the phrase "وَيُلْمِهِ" (waylum mih), which is intended to mean "وَيُلْمُهُ" (waylu ummuh). However, Sibawayh challenged this idea of composition, claiming that "لن" functions as a single word without any addition of either letter. If we

27-- The book, the margin, Vol. 1, p. 400

28-- The commentary on Sibawayh's book, the margin Vol. 2, p. 108, from the explanation of Al-Sirafi, Vol. 2, p. 229

29-- The book, Vol. 2, pp. 400-401

²⁶ "Explanation of Sibawayh's Sentences, Volume 2, Page 5, Dr. Mahmoud Suleiman Yaquout, Dar Al-Ma'rifa Al-Jami'ya, Alexandria, First Edition, 1992."

31-The Book, Vol. 2, pp. 162-164."

were to accept Al-Khalil's view, it would not be correct to say "أما زيداً فلن اضرب" (amma Zaydun falan adhrīb), since we are dealing with a noun in this case. Sibawayh used analogy to refute Al-Khalil's opinion.

The same reasoning applies to Sibawayh's rebuttal of Al-Khalil's assertion that the hamzah in the definite article "أل" (al) is original. Sibawayh argued that it is an addition, based on examples like "إيم الله" (aymu Allah) and "لئيم الله" (laymu Allah). Furthermore, the opening alif in "أيم" (aym) is analogous to the alif in "أحمر" (ahmar), as they share a similar structural representation due to this addition.

Sibawayh stated that Al-Khalil argued that the term "Lan" does not mean "no" but is often omitted in speech due to its frequency. He compared this to phrases like "Wailihi," which means "Woe to his mother," and "Yawma'idhin," which is treated as a single letter. He noted that "Hala" is similarly treated as a single expression, even though it consists of "Hal" and "La."

On the other hand, some scholars contend that "Lan" is not a combination of two words but rather a term consisting of two letters without any additions. They liken it to "Lam," which is part of the jussive particles, where neither letter is an addition. If we accept Al-Khalil's claim, I would not say, "As for Zaid, I will not strike," because this statement involves a noun and a verb that are connected. It's as if he is saying, "As for Zaid, there is no striking for him."²⁸

Sibawayh stated: "Al-Khalil claimed that the definite article 'al-' and the letter 'lam' that defines it are considered one entity, similar to 'qad.' He argued that 'an' is not separate from this grouping, unlike the interrogative 'alif' in the phrase 'A-ureed?' In this case, the 'alif' is akin to the 'alif' in 'Aym Allah,' as it is connected, just like the 'alif' in 'Aym.' This opinion was narrated to us by Yunus from Abu Amr, and it reflects his viewpoint. The evidence that the 'alif' in 'Aym' is a connected letter lies in their expression: 'Eym Allah,' followed by 'Eym Allah.' They pronounce the 'alif' in 'Aym' at the beginning, likening it to the 'alif' in 'Ahmar,' because it is also considered an additional letter, similar in function."²⁹

What can be included under the analogical axis is what Sibawayh stated in his disagreement with the opinion of Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad, who argued that "Iyyā" is a marker for a hidden noun in the genitive case. Sibawayh did not accept this view because "Iyyā" is a marker for the accusative case and cannot be in the position of the genitive. However, the implicit nature of the genitive exhibits similarities in its markers with those of the accusative in contexts where "Iyyā" only appears in cases of addition to the self, as in the phrases: "with me," "to me," and "with me".

Sibawayh states: "Al-Khalil mentioned that if a man were to say, 'Iyaka nafsika,' I would not reproach him, since this 'kaf' is in the genitive case. Furthermore, someone I trust informed me that Al-Khalil once heard a Bedouin say, 'When a man reaches sixty, then beware of the young women.'³⁰

It is not permissible for 'Iya' to serve as a marker for a hidden noun in the genitive case because 'Iya' functions as a marker for the accusative case. Therefore, the accusative cannot occupy the position of the genitive. However, the markers for hidden genitives are akin to those for the accusative and do not take their places with 'Iya,' unless you append a preposition, such as in your expressions 'bi' (with me), 'li' (to me), and 'indi' (at my place).³¹

The Auditory and Analogical Axis

Sibawayh relies on the auditory evidence from native Arabic speakers in his response to Yunus ibn Habib and some other grammarians regarding their acceptance of the phrases "adriban Zayd" and "adriban Zayd."

²⁸ The book, vol. 2, p. 5

33-Book, Vol. 3, pp. 324-325"

³⁰ 34-"Book, Vol. 1, p. 279

They believe it is permissible to have a consonant after the alif without it being assimilated with the preceding letter. However, Sibawayh argues that this usage is not reflected in the speech of the Arabs and lacks a standard for comparison. He states, "As for Yunus and some of the grammarians, they say: 'adriban Zayd' and 'adriban Zayd,' but this was not said by the Arabs, and it has no counterpart in their speech. A consonant does not occur after the alif unless it is assimilated."³²

Regarding the reliance on the analogical axis, Sibawayh has a distinct view regarding the diminutive forms of the words "eye" and "ear." He believes that when these terms are used as names for men, their diminutive forms do not require the addition of the letter 'h' (ه). In contrast, when the word "stone" (حَجَرٍ) is used as a name for a woman, the 'h' is indeed added. Yunus ibn Habib, however, argues in favor of adding the 'h,' referencing the word "Azeena," which Sibawayh does not accept.

In addressing the grammatical point raised by Yunus ibn Habib and a few others about the phrase "adriban Zayd" (and similar constructions), Sibawayh relies on auditory evidence from native Arabic speakers. He critiques the notion that a consonant can follow the letter 'alif' without being assimilated with the preceding letter, emphasizing that he has not heard this form of speech from Arabs. He asserts, "Yunus and some grammarians claim 'adriban Zayd and 'adriban Zayd,' but this expression was not used by the Arabs, and there is no equivalent in their speech. A consonant does not occur after the 'alif' unless it is assimilated."

What relates to relying on the analogical axis is what Sibawayh observes regarding the diminutive forms of the words "ayn" (eye) and "udhn" (ear). If either of these words is used as a man's name, the diminutive is formed without adding the suffix -hā. This is based on the analogy that the suffix -hā is added to the word "ḥajar" (stone) when used as a woman's name. However, Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb adds the suffix -hā by analogy with the word "Udhaynah." This is a perspective Sibawayh does not share.

Furthermore, the words "ṭurrā" (entirely) and "qāṭibatan" (altogether) are, according to Sibawayh, equivalent to the word "waḥdah" (alone). He argues that the construct here resembles the expression: "kallamtuhu fāhū ilā fiyy" ("I spoke to him, mouth to mouth"). This, according to Yūnus ibn Aḥmad, demonstrates similarity in structure. However, Sibawayh does not perceive a resemblance between them due to the alignment between the beginning and end of the structure in "ṭurrā" and "qāṭibatan," which differs from the structure "fāhū ilā fiyy." Here, Sibawayh implies that

It is only permissible for it to carry the meaning of a deleted verb, as in the phrase: 'I spoke to him, directing my mouth towards him.' This is different from saying, 'I passed by them all completely,' because the latter does not require a deleted verb ;instead, the agent in this case is what has already been mentioned.³³

Al-A'lam Al-Shantamari explained that the meaning of Sibawayh's statement, 'his mouth towards me is not like the first,' indicates that Yunus considers 'alone' to be equivalent to 'united or solitary,' using it in the context of passing by him. When Sibawayh says, 'I spoke to him, his mouth towards me,' it implies a face-to-face conversation.³⁴

Sibawayh further explained that when you refer to a man by a specific name or title, you diminish it by omitting the 'h.' He suggested that you leave out the 'h' in this case, as you included it in 'stone,' which is also a woman's name.³⁵ Yunus retains the 'h' and emphasizes it with the phrase 'a little ear,' referring to it as a diminutive".

35- Book, Vol. 2, pp. 362-363

36- Book, Vol. 3, p. 527"

Yunus claimed that "وَحْدَهُ" is equivalent to "عنده." He also stated that terms such as "طراً" and "قاطبة" are equivalent to "وَحْدَهُ." Yunus considered this additional term to be similar to his expression "فَأَهْ إِلَى فِيَّ." However, he noted that they are not the same because, in his view, "فَأَهْ إِلَى فِيَّ" is the primary term in the first context, while here, it is not the first.³⁶

The Interpretive Axis

Yunus ibn Habib believes that it is permissible for the word "المسكين" (the poor man) to be in the accusative case as an adverbial phrase in the following structure: "مررت به المسكين" (I passed by him, the poor man). However, Sibawayh argues against this, stating that adverbial phrases cannot contain the definite article "ال" (the).

Sibawayh offers an alternative interpretation that he considers valid, where "المسكين" is interpreted as a direct object, as in "لقيت المسكين" (I met the poor man). In this case, the emphasis is on the verb, which Sibawayh believes is preferable to relying on an implied subject.

Sibawayh explains: "As for Yunus, he says: 'مررت به المسكين' (I passed by him, the poor man) in the sense of 'مررت به مسكيناً' (I passed by him as a poor man). This is not permissible because it should not be treated as an adverbial phrase while containing the definite article. If this were acceptable, then 'مررت بعبد الله الظريف' (I passed by Abdullah the witty) would also be valid, implying 'witty.' However, it is better to interpret it as if he said: 'لقيت المسكين' (I met the poor man), as he implied an action. It seems that those who interpreted it this way did so to avoid describing the implied action, which makes their interpretation of it as a verb more appropriate.³⁷"

Under the interpretive axis, we can include Sibawayh's description of Yunus ibn Habib's interpretation of our statement: "If there is no righteous one, then there is a wicked one." Yunus ibn Habib interpreted it as meaning, "If I passed by a righteous one, then I would encounter a wicked one." Sibawayh rejected this interpretation because it suggests an action after "if there is no" that differs from the action implied after the phrase "if there is no" in the structure: "If there is no righteous one, then there is a righteous one." This represents one aspect of the discussion. Additionally, it is not permissible to imply a preposition in this context.

Sibawayh stated: "Yunus claimed that some Arabs say, 'If there is no صالح (good), then there is a طالح (bad),' meaning 'If I had not passed by صالح (good), I would have passed by طالح (bad).' This is an ugly and weak argument because it implies another verb after 'if there is no,' which differs from the implication in the statement: 'If there is no صالح (good), then there is a طالح (bad).' It is not permissible to imply a preposition in this context.³⁸"

Al-Sirafi shared a similar opinion, reflecting Sibawayh's view. He disapproved of Yunus's statement for two reasons: first, it is necessary to imply singular concepts, and the rule of implication dictates that only one idea should be suggested. Second, it is inappropriate to imply a preposition except in specific cases where it has been substituted for.³⁹

37-The Book, Vol. 1, Margin, p. 377

38-The jokes in the Interpretation of Sibawayh's Book, the Most Knowledgeable Al-Shantamari, Vol. 1, p. 403

39-The Book, Vol. 3, p. 484

40-The Book, Vol. 1, p. 377"

41-"The book, vol. 2, p. 76."

Meanwhile, Abu Ali Al-Farisi noted, "This is disapproved because it requires the implication of two verbs: one is what you would imply regarding *صالح* (good), and the other is 'I passed by.' The intended meaning would be: 'If I had not passed by *صالح* (good), then I would have passed by *طال* (bad).' This is disapproved, just as it is incorrect to imply two verbs when instructing someone to command an absent individual. Furthermore, it is particularly disapproved because you are implying a preposition along with these verbs.⁴⁰"

The Non-Need-Based Axis

Sometimes, we can observe the intersection of two axes that Sibawayh relies on when he disagrees with other scholars. He often refers to the opinion of Al-Khalil, which, to the best of my knowledge, when mentioned by Sibawayh without further commentary, indicates his acceptance of it. This is evident when he refutes the opinion of Yunus ibn Habib, who claimed that the word "Labbayk" is a singular name that emerged in this form through addition. However, Sibawayh disagrees, arguing that, based on Khalil ibn Ahmad's views on duality, this is only one aspect of the discussion.

Sibawayh maintains that there is no need to use the singular form. When the term is clarified, it becomes obvious that it is not equivalent to "*عليك*" (upon you). He cites a poetic line to support his argument, stating: "Yunus claimed that '*البيك*' (Here I am) is a singular name, but it appears in this form in the genitive, similar to saying '*عليك*' (upon you). Khalil, on the other hand, asserted that it is a dual form equivalent to '*حواليك*' (around you). There is no need to employ the singular in this context because, when the term is clarified, it reveals that it does not equate to '*عليك*' and '*إليك*' (to you). For instance, you do not say: '*البي زيدا*' (Zaid responded) and '*سعدى زيدا*' (Sada responded).

He also said: ⁴¹

"I called upon what befell me, Miswar,

So, I responded, I responded, to the hands of Miswar."

If '*البيك*' were equivalent to '*على*' (on), he would have said: '*أفلبى يدي مسور*' (he responded to the hands of Miswar), because one would say: '*على زيدا*' (on Zaid) when clarifying the subject.⁴²"

The Axis Based on Poetic Necessity and the Speech of the Arabs

Yunus ibn Habib believed it was permissible to compare the word "*منه*" to "*أية*." He based this view on hearing a Bedouin say, "*ضرب من منا*" (He struck a man). However, Sibawayh argued that Yunus ibn Habib's observation was far-fetched. He asserted that if such a comparison were permissible, it would only apply in a poetic context, and it did not reflect common usage among the Arabs, with only a few using it.

Sibawayh stated: "As for Yunus, he was comparing (*منه*) to (*أية*), saying: *منه، منه، منه* when he mentioned (O young man)... This is far-fetched. This way of speaking is only acceptable when a poet uses it once in poetry without it being widely recognized again.⁴³" He gave an example:

42-The book, Vol. 1, pp. 262-263

43- The book, the margin, Vol. 1, p. 262

44- The commentary on the book of Sibawayh, Al-Farisi, Vol. 1, p. 174

⁴⁵ This verse is one of the fifty unknown verses, attributed to a Bedouin from the Banu Asad tribe, as cited by Al-Suyuti. See the book, footnote, Vol. 1, p. 351.

46-The book, Vol. 1, pp. 351-352.

"They came to me, and I asked: Who are you? They replied: We are the jinn. I said: You are in darkness."⁴⁴

Furthermore, Yunus claimed to have heard a Bedouin say, "Who struck whom?" This statement is unlikely, as it is not commonly spoken by the Arabs, nor is it used by many of them. Evidence for this can be found in "منون," where the term is gathered out of necessity, typically used only in pause. It is the plural form of "من."⁴⁵

The Axis Based on the Appropriateness of Silence Over Speech

Sibawayh based his argument on the appropriateness of silence over speech when addressing Yunus ibn Habib's viewpoint about the use of the genitive case for the word "Musab" in the phrase "How many a man is afflicted." Sibawayh contended that silence is not appropriate in this context, similar to the phrase "How many a man." He opposed Yunus ibn Habib's assertion, arguing that "How many a man is afflicted" is equally inappropriate, just like "There is a lord in it." If there were an appropriateness in expressions that are not suitable for silence, then there should also be appropriateness in those that are.

From Sibawayh's argument, it is clear that distinguishing between the agent and the acted-upon is relevant in both contexts: speech suitable for silence and speech unsuitable for silence. This is illustrated in the examples that will be discussed later in Sibawayh's text. Additionally, Sibawayh noted that the distinction between what is suitable for silence and what is not occurs in contexts different from those previously mentioned. For instance, Al-Sirafi pointed out that Sibawayh's phrase "In the house, Zayd is standing" is complete with the inclusion of "in the house," whereas in the phrase "By Amr, Zayd is a guarantor," it is inappropriate because you would not say "By Zayd, Amr" and then remain silent.⁴⁶

Sibawayh stated: "Whoever says, 'How many a man is afflicted there!' without acknowledging its awkwardness is indicating, 'There is no support for you in it, nor a brother for you on Friday, nor a brother for you to recognize.' The genitive case in 'How many a man is afflicted there!' is a reference made by Yunus, who argued that the expression does not suffice if you merely say, 'How many a man is there?' Both what is sufficient for speech and what is not sufficient are equally awkward when you separate each component from the preposition and the governed noun."⁴⁷

Do you not see that the awkwardness of 'How many a man is afflicted there!' is similar to that of 'How many a man is in it'? If one were considered correct in terms of expression, the other would also be correct, just as it is universally accepted that you should maintain a clear connection between the doer and the acted upon in expressions that are suitable for silence.

For example, consider your phrases: 'Indeed, there is Zayd afflicted there,' and 'Indeed, there is Zayd standing in it,' as well as 'There was Zayd afflicted there,' and 'There was Zayd afflicted in it.' The distinction between what is appropriate for silence and what is not can be made in contexts outside of this discussion.⁴⁸

47-House of Samir bin Al-Harith. See the book, the footnote, Vol. 2, p. 41

48-The book, Vol. 2, p. 411

49-The same source, footnote, Vol. 2, p. 411"

50-Al-Sirafi, the book, Vol. 2, the margin, 281

51-The book, Vol. 2, pp. 280-281"

The Languages of the Arabs-Based Axis.

Sibawayh and Yunus ibn Habib had differing views on how the word "عُرُوَّةٌ" should be pronounced. Yunus believed that a sukoon (a diacritical mark indicating no vowel) should be placed on the letter before the waw, resulting in the pronunciation "عُرُوِيٌّ". In contrast, Sibawayh argued that a fatha (a short vowel "a") should be placed before the waw, leading to the pronunciation "عُرُوِيٌّ". He based his argument on the language of the Banu Jirwah tribe, an Arab group.

Sibawayh stated: "You should not pronounce عُرُوَّةٌ as anything other than عُرُوِيٌّ. If you apply a sukoon on the letter before the waw in the word فُعْلَةٌ, from the so-called 'daughters of waw' which do not fall under فُعْلٍ, and omit the h, the waw itself does not change, because what precedes it is a sukoon. This consistency of the waw is supported by the way the Banu Jirwah tribe pronounces it, as in their term جُرُوِيٌّ. On the other hand, Yunus treated the 'daughters of yā' and the 'daughters of waw' as equivalent, claiming that in عُرُوَّةٌ it should be pronounced as عُرُوِيٌّ.⁴⁹ However, our position is that it should be pronounced as عُرُوِيٌّ."

Additionally, regarding the Alawis, they are defined as "the people of *Al-'Aliyah, which refers to the area above Najd extending to Tihamah and beyond Mecca."^{*}

The Axis Based on quoting the Words of the Arabs and the Opinions of Scholars

One of the points of contention between Sibawayh and Yunus ibn Habib regarding the word "أُخْتٌ" (sister) is that Yunus ibn Habib asserts it can be used in the form "أُخْتِيٌّ", while Sibawayh disagrees. Sibawayh relies on the opinion of Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad, whom he considers a standard authority, alongside what he has learned from the Arabs. Sibawayh states: "When you add to (أُخْتٌ), you should say (أُخُوِيٌّ); this is the correct form according to the standard. This standard is based on Al-Khalil's view that when you pluralize a feminine noun with the تاء (taa), you drop the تاء. Moreover, we have heard from the Arabs that the plural of هُنْتُ is هُنَوَاتٌ. The poet even said: 'I see Ibn Nizar has turned away from me and bored me, regarding هُنَوَاتٌ; all of them are consecutive.'⁵⁰

Sibawayh compares this to the case of the sister. Yunus, however, claims the phrase "my sister" is correct, which Sibawayh argues is not supported by analogy.⁵¹

Additionally, Sibawayh addresses comments made by Yunus about substituting diacritical mark : "the Fatha" for "the kasra" in the phrase "min quddām," which Yunus considers definite and thus prevents it from being declined, claiming it to be feminine. Although Sibawayh acknowledges this view, he points out that it is not supported by any usage among the Arabs. Sibawayh recalls asking his teacher, Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad, about the phrase "min dūn" and other similar constructions. Al-Khalil indicated that the Arabs treat them like nouns that can be declined, as these phrases appear in a genitive case and are part of circumstantial conditions. Each is considered an indefinite noun unless added to a definite noun, similar to the words 'أَيْمُنٌ' (right) and 'أَشْمَلٌ' (left), which are both indefinite nouns.

Sibawayh continues: "I asked him about his statements regarding phrases like 'from below,' 'from above,' 'from underneath,' 'from before,' 'from after,' and 'from behind?' He said: "Treat these like established names

52-The book, Vol. 2, pp. 280-281.

53-The book, Vol. 3, p. 384

*The book, the margin, Vol. 3, p. 291

54-Unknown speaker, see the book, the margin, Vol. 3, p. 361

55-The book, Vol. 3, pp. 360-361"

because they are added and used as non-circumstantial... and they are indefinite unless added to a definite noun, just as 'أَيْمُنٌ' and 'أَشْمَلٌ' are indefinite.' We consulted with the Arabs and found that they agreed, treating them similarly to saying 'from the right' and 'from the left.' Conversely, Yunus would say 'from the front,' considering it definite and claiming its femininity prevented it from being declined. This is his viewpoint, but no one among the Arabs endorses it."

We spoke with the Alawis and the Tamimis, and they expressed phrases like "from Qudaidima" and "from Wurayyia," regarding them as indefinite nouns, just as one would say "in the morning," "in the evening," "at dusk," or "at noon." This was the consensus we gathered from the Arabs.⁵²

According to Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad, Sibawayh disagreed with Yunus ibn Habib on the use of the letter 'alif' in the vocative case. Yunus believed it was not permissible to attach 'alif' to the adjective in a vocative phrase, such as "O Zayd, the charming one." In contrast, Sibawayh argued that the 'alif' of the vocative applies to the noun being addressed, rather than to the adjective that describes it.

Sibawayh stated, "The 'alif' of the vocative is intended for the noun it is added to, similar to how it appears at the end of a singular noun. It does not apply to either the added noun or the adjective. Instead, the 'alif' is meant for the noun itself, not the description." He noted that Yunus mistakenly attached the 'alif' to the adjective, as seen in phrases like "O Zayd, the charming one" and "O the two charming ones of Sham." Al-Khalil, may God have mercy on him, criticized this approach, pointing out that one should say "O Qinsronah," since this is a singular noun.⁵³

Sibawayh referenced the opinion of Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad to explain why the word "رجلاً" (rajulan) is in the accusative case in the poetic verse that will be discussed later. He attributed this to an implied verb. This was Al-Khalil's viewpoint, which Sibawayh used to support his argument, contrasting it with the perspective of Yunus ibn Habib. Yunus believed that "رجلاً" was in the accusative case due to a wish and that the tanween (nunation) was added out of necessity.

Sibawayh stated: "I asked Al-Khalil, may God have mercy on him, about his assertion:⁵⁴ 'Is there not a man whom God has rewarded well, who points to a result that stays?' He claimed that there is no wishing involved, as if to say: 'Do you not see me as a man whom God has rewarded well?' In contrast, Yunus argued that it is an obligatory noun with diacritical mark : "tanween".⁵⁵ The evidence in the previous line of poetry is the nominative case (man) and its tanween. Sibawayh believed this is based on an implied verb, with "Ala" functioning as a particle of urging; the intended meaning is 'Do you not see me as a man?' If it were a matter of wishing, the word that follows would be in the accusative case without tanween, according to Al-Khalil and Sibawayh's view. Yunus contends that it is in the accusative due to wishing, adding tanween for necessity. Sibawayh's interpretation is stronger because his case does not require this necessity, and the urging particles are appropriate for implying a subsequent verb.⁵⁶"

Sibawayh disagrees with Yunus ibn Habib regarding the grammatical case of the word "المسكين" (al-miskin) in upcoming constructions. Yunus maintains that it appears in the accusative case as governed by the verb, while Sibawayh argues that "المسكين" may also appear in the nominative case. He cites both Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad Al-Farahidi and Ibn Abi Ishaq in support of his position. Sibawayh declares: "As for Yunus, he claims that he does not elevate anything out of compassion by suggesting something that forces an

56- Book J3, p. 89 2 - 291

57- Book, J2, p. 226"

58-Amr ibn Qaas, or Qanaas al-Muradi al-Mudhaji, see the book, vol. 2, p. 308

59-The book, vol. 2, p. 308

60-The book, the margin, vol. 2, p. 308"

elevation. For example, if he says 'I hit him,' he only uses 'المسكين' in relation to the verb. Similarly, if he says 'I hit both of them,' he would say 'المسكين' while still relating it to the verb. Likewise, when I passed by him, he refers to 'المسكين' in the nominative case, relating nominatives to nominatives, genitives to genitives, and accusatives to accusatives. Yet he asserts that the way we interpreted the nominative is incorrect. This is the opinion of Al-Khalil, may God have mercy on him, and Ibn Abi Ishaq.⁵⁷

Before I conclude this research, I want to emphasize an important point: Sibawayh referred to some previously mentioned arguments when evaluating the opinions of certain scholars based on their strength, clarity, and other considerations. This is evident in his comparison of the views of Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad and Yunus ibn Habib. Sibawayh relied on the speech of the Arabs when assessing these opinions. Yunus ibn Habib asserted that his view was stronger than Al-Khalil's concerning the vocative form of the word "القاضي" (the judge). Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad maintained that the vocative should be "يا قاضي" (O judge), without omitting the "ي" (yā), because the noun is not indefinite. Conversely, Yunus ibn Habib proposed "يا قاضن" (O judge), omitting the "ي". Sibawayh favored this latter view, arguing that Arabs often omit such elements in contexts beyond the vocative, making the omission in vocative contexts more understandable, especially since they tend to drop the tanween (nunation) as seen in the following constructions "يا حار" : (O Harith), and "يا صاح" ,, (O friend)⁵⁸.

Sibawayh wrote: "I asked Al-Khalil about the term 'qadi' in the call to prayer, and he said: I prefer (Ya Qadi) because it is not in the indefinite form, similar to my preference for (this qadi). As for Yunus, he said: Ya Qad. Yunus's statement is stronger; as it was customary for the Arabs to omit in contexts beyond the call, they were more likely to do so in the call, since it allows for omissions. They omit the tanween and say: Ya Har, Ya Sah, and Ya Ghulam, come".

Sibawayh also relied on an interpretive framework when comparing the views of Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad and Yunus ibn Habib. He described Yunus's interpretation as easier than that of Al-Khalil concerning the word "تنزلون" (tanziloon) mentioned in a line of poetry that will appear later in Sibawayh's text. Yunus's interpretation presented a nominative case, while Al-Khalil based his interpretation on a saying by Zuhayr: "There is nothing that precedes this," which Sibawayh considered a distant interpretation. He recounted: "I asked Al-Khalil about the saying of Al-A'sha: 'If you ride, then riding horses is our custom, or if you descend, then we are a group that descends'"⁵⁹.

Al-Khalil responded that the discussion here revolves around whether your statement is this or that. If he had said, "Will you ride?" it does not negate the meaning, becoming similar to your statement: "And there is nothing preceding." In contrast, Yunus said, "I emphasize it as a beginning," as if he meant to say, "Or are you descending?" Yunus's interpretation is clearer. Al-Khalil, however, made it analogous to Zuhayr's saying:⁶⁰ "It has become clear to me that I cannot reach what has passed, and there is nothing preceding if it is coming." The association in this context is based on the assumption that it is as distant as stating, "And there is nothing preceding".⁶¹

Under the interpretation axis, Sibawayh expresses a preference for Al-Khalil's view over that of Yunus ibn Habib regarding the diminutive form of the word "Qaba'il" when referring to a man. Yunus ibn Habib

61-The book, Vol. 2, p. 77

62-The book, Vol. 2, p. 77"

63-Diwan Al-A'sha,p. 48

64-Diwan of Zuhair, p. 287

65-The Book, vol. 3, pp. 50-51"

argues that the hamzah is omitted, resulting in "Qubayil," while Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad maintains that the correct diminutive form should be "Qubay'il." Sibawayh supports Al-Khalil's position, stating that it is the better option.

Sibawayh explains, "If you want to create a diminutive of a man named 'Qaba'il,' you should say 'Qubay'il.' Alternatively, you could say 'Qubayil' if you prefer to omit the hamzah." He adds that while Yunus argues for "Qubayil" by omitting the hamzah—considered redundant—Al-Khalil's opinion is ultimately superior.⁶²

Finally, we can conclude with the following key results:

1. Sibawayh predominantly relied on the topics of Arabic speech and the opinions of scholars.
2. A significant disagreement arose between Sibawayh and other scholars regarding the interpretation of grammar.
3. Most grammatical disputes were noted between Yunus ibn Habib and Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad.
4. When refuting the opinions of other scholars, Sibawayh relied on the following topics:
 1. The auditory axis
 2. The differential axis
 3. The auditory and narrative axis
 4. The analogical axis
 5. The axis of Arabic speech conventions
 6. The rhetorical axis
 7. The estimative axis
 8. The estimative and auditory axis
 9. The axis based on frequent usage
 10. The standard axis
 11. the auditory and analogical axis
 12. The interpretive axis
 13. The non-need-based axis
 14. The axis based on poetic necessity and the speech of the Arabs
 15. The axis based on the appropriateness of silence over speech
 16. The languages of the Arabs-based axis

66-The book, vol. 3, p. 439."

17. The axis based on quoting the words of the Arabs and the opinions of scholars.

The interpretive axis played the most significant role when Sibawayh preferred one scholar's opinion over another.

References

- The Rhetorical Foundations in Sibawayh's Book and Their Impact on Rhetorical Research, Dr. Ahmed Saad Muhammad, Publisher: Al-Adab Library, Ain Shams University, 1st edition, 1419 AH – 1999 AD.
- Definitions, Al-Sharif Al-Jurjani (d. 816 AH), Edited by Muhammad Sidqi Al-Manshawi, Dar Al-Fadila, Cairo.
- Commentary on Al-Fara'id on the Facilitation of Benefits, by Al-Damamini, Edited by Dr. Muhammad Al-Mufadi, Riyadh, 14.3 AH - 1983 AD.
- Commentary on Sibawayh's Book, authored by Abu Ali Al-Hasan bin Ahmad bin Abdul Ghafar Al-Farisi, Edited by Dr. Awad bin Hamad Al-Qawzi, 1st edition, 141 AH – 199 AD.
- The Clarification of Important Definitions, Abdul Raouf Al-Manawi, Edited by Abdul Hamid Saleh Hamdan, Year of Publication 1410 AH - 1990 AD, 1st edition, Al-Ilm Books, Cairo, p. 40.
- The Conjunctions in Sibawayh's Book, Dr. Adnan Muhammad Salman, 1st edition, 1965 AD, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research Press.
- Vocabulary in the Strange Words, Al-Raghib Al-Isfahani, Edited by Muhammad Sidqi Kilani, house of knowledge, Beirut.
- 8- The Jokes in the Interpretation of Sibawayh's Book, by Abu al-Hajjaj Yusuf ibn Suleiman ibn Isa, known as Al-A'lam al-Shantamari, edited by Zuhair Abdul Mohsen Sultan, Publications of the Arab Institute for Manuscripts, Arab Organization for Education, Culture, and Science, 1st edition, Kuwait, 14.7 AH - 1987 AD.
- Khizanat al-Adab, by al-Baghdadi, Bulaq 1299.
- 8- Diwan al-Akhtal, edited by Anton Salehani, Beirut, 1891 AD.
- 9- Diwan al-A'sha, edited by Rudolf Geyer, Vienna, 1927 AD.
- 10- Diwan Dhī al-Rummah, edited by Carlyle Henry Hayes, Cambridge, 1919 AD.
- 11- Diwan Zuhayr ibn Abi Sulma, House of Books, 1363 AH.
- 12- Explanation of Sibawayh's Jumla, by Mahmoud Suleiman Yaqub, house of knowledge al-Jami'iya, Alexandria, 1st edition, 1992 AD.
- 13- Explanation of Al-Mufassal, by Ibn Ya'ish, Al-Alam al-Kutub, Beirut, Al-Mutanabbi Library, Cairo.
- 14- Al-Kitab, by Sibawayh, edited by Abdul Salam Muhammad Haroun, published by Al-Khanji Library, Cairo, 3rd edition, 14.8 AH - 1988 AD.
- 15- Lisan al-Arab, by Ibn Manzur, 1/896, Dar al-Hadith for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution, Cairo.