

The Attributed Work To Sibawayh Outside His Book: Analytical Examples

Abdulwahid Bin Muhammad Al-Marshudi

Department of Arabic Language and Literature, College of Languages and Humanities,
Qassim University, Saudi Arabia
wahed0979@gmail.com

Abstract

Sibawayh is the pioneer in grammar and morphology, and his book forms the basis for many subsequent Arabic books. Incorrect attributions could transfer to later grammatical works, leading to erroneous judgments and attributions of opinions. He understands Sibawayh's opinion through his book and observes his statements, evidence, and explanations. The aim is to pave the way for authenticating the views of prominent scholars who influenced the development, foundation, and refinement of Arabic, especially in books composed after the 5th century Hijri. The researcher endeavored to collect examples from some leading figures in Arabic studies who encountered such discrepancies. The results: most of the opinions that should have been attributed to Sibawayh resulted from scholars needing to understand Sibawayh's phrases and intentions, issuing judgments based on the apparent understanding rather than the actual context. Some opinions attributed to Sibawayh outside his book pertain to lost books like 'Al-Wadih' and 'Al-Basit.' This indicates missing links in specific passages of the book, prompting scholars of Sibawayh's heritage to examine and attempt to fill these gaps, which undoubtedly will contribute novelty to the book and its texts.

Keywords: Sibawayh; Arabic; Grammar; Morphology

INTRODUCTION

The book of Sibawayh stands as one of the most significant works authored in Arabic and its sciences. It represents the beginning of comprehensive authorship in the fields of grammar, conjugation, and language. (Al-Andalusi, 1912) 462 AH said about it: "I do not know of a book compiled in any of the sciences, be it ancient or modern, that encompasses all that knowledge and comprehensively covers the aspects of that art except for three books. Among them is Sibawayh's book on grammar. Each of these books did not miss any fundamentals except for those that are of negligible importance." Abu Uthman al-Mazini 249 AH mentioned about it: "Whoever wishes to create a significant book in grammar after Sibawayh should feel ashamed (Al-Zaini, Mohammed & Khafaji, Mohammed. Edited book by Al-Sirafi, 1955)." Al-Mubarrad 286 AH used to say to those intending to study the book: "Have you crossed the ocean? Expressing astonishment and the gravity of the task (Al-Mubarrad., 1994)." Given the tremendous status and esteemed position of this book in the hearts of scholars universally, these scholars have been eager to possess, memorize, explain, comment upon, and summarize it. Thus, accessing it became a symbol of superiority, comprehension, and excellence that distinguishes the adept from their peers. For these reasons, every scholar, especially those specializing in Arabic language, has been keen to include Sibawayh's opinions, statements, evidences,

and terminologies in their works, as this confers strength and solidity upon their own contributions (Al-Tabai, Omar Farouk. Edited book by Bin Fares, 1993).

Some distinguished scholars associated with this book have fallen into the error of attributing certain opinions incorrectly to Sibawayh, misrepresenting or distorting his statements, evidences, and explanations, or misunderstanding his expressions, then wrongly attributing these errors to him. These examples are few but significant and critical because they form the basis for judgments and regulations wrongly attributed to the leader of grammarians and their teacher. They either attribute opposition to the majority opinion of scholars to him, even though their opinion aligns with his, or they diminish Sibawayh's rights by attributing to him what he did not say.

Some of them made mistakes in attributing certain opinions to Sibawayh. My intention is to present these as representations and warnings, emphasizing the necessity of verifying and confirming the attribution of a viewpoint before ascribing it. This task is challenging and requires considerable time and effort. This research opens broad horizons for students of knowledge and researchers in such documentary studies, especially for the distinguished scholars who had a clear and lasting impact on those who came after them. Moreover, Sibawayh's book is the reference and foundation for this research. It is established that no other book authored by Sibawayh has reached us, nor has anything been reliably transmitted from him outside the book. Therefore, the primary means of understanding Sibawayh's opinion and scrutinizing his statements, evidences, and explanations is through his book. The community has accepted and submitted to this understanding. Sibawayh's book emerged early, accompanied by the disagreements among grammarians and linguists, their discussions, explanations, reasoning, guidance, and comments regarding it. Consequently, there arose disparities in interpreting his phrases, elucidating his style, and debating his structure, evidences, and explanations. This greatly enriched the field of Arabic sciences in general and specifically the sciences of grammar and conjugation, due to its elucidation of Arabic rulings, establishment of its foundations, and clarification of the wisdom behind Arabic composition and its coherence.

The sincere and earnest diligence surrounding Sibawayh's book among later Arabic scholars led some of them to misunderstand the book's phrases and style, contrary to Sibawayh's intention. They attributed opinions to him that were not his intended meanings, or they attributed Sibawayh's opinions to others without paying attention to the contents of the book. They relied on some scholars who attributed certain opinions to Sibawayh without verifying and referring back to the book. Furthermore, some presented new opinions that were not from Sibawayh nor found in his book, then mistakenly attributed these to him due to oversight or misunderstanding. Moreover, some distorted his expressions, altering or diverting their meanings and falsely attributing these alterations to Sibawayh.

METHOD

The researcher endeavored to collect various examples from some of the leading figures in Arabic studies who encountered such discrepancies. Understand the reasons leading to such occurrences and to find excuses or justifications for them through thoughtful analysis and interpretation. From this emerged the realization that errors occurred in attributing certain opinions to Sibawayh by eminent language scholars. Those who become aware of these errors must clarify them and restore the truth to its rightful

owners. This is necessary to establish judgments with authentic evidence and reliable transmission.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sibawayh and His Opinions

Rarely do you find a book among biographies, categorizations, or references that does not include a biography of Abu Bishr Amr ibn Othman, known as Sibawayh. He was well-versed in literature, language, and Islamic sciences, associated with esteemed scholars of his time, such as Issa ibn Omar al-Thaqafi (149 AH), Hammad ibn Salama (167 AH), Khalil ibn Ahmed al-Farahidi (170 AH), Yunus ibn Habib al-Basri (182 AH), and others (Al-Makhzumi, Mahdi & Al-Samarrai, Ibrahim. Al-Farahidi, n.d.; Omar, 1996).

He was born - may Allah have mercy on him - in the city of al-Baydha, near the city of Shiraz in the region of Fars. As he grew older, he moved to the city of Basra, a center of knowledge, literature, and all fields of learning, a capital of thought and culture at that time. He was raised in the love of knowledge, its people, literature, and its practitioners. He commenced his pursuit of knowledge, as indicated by his biographies narrated by Hammad ibn Salama, in the field of Hadith. After the famous dispute known as "the Zunbur incident" with his teacher and his reprimand from him, he turned to seek knowledge in Arabic. He studied under several scholars, most notably his teacher Khalil ibn Ahmed, who imparted his knowledge to Sibawayh. This earned Sibawayh great stature and respect among scholars and literary figures. He then delved deeper into these sciences, becoming an unparalleled scholar and an outstanding Persian figure in the field. (Abbas, Ehsan. Edited book by Al-Hamawi, 1993; Al-Arqsusi, 1982; Al-Fadl, Mohamed Abu. Edited book by Al-Suyuti, 1979; Al-Khatib, Abdul Latif. Edited book by Al-Anbari, 1998; Ibrahim, Mohamed Abu Al-Fadl. Edited book by Al-Qifti, 1986; Khallikan., n.d.; Qaba'wa, Fakhreddin & Fadel, 1992; Sayed, Ayman Fouad. Edited book by Al-Nadim, 2009) After his renowned debate known as the "Zunbur Incident" with Al-Kisai, he left in a state of sorrow and gloom, journeying back to Fars. He passed away there, far from the incident, and was buried in the year 180 AH, as indicated in biographical references (Al-Fadl, Mohamed Abu. Edited book by Al-Suyuti, 1979; Al-Zaini, Mohammed & Khafaji, Mohammed. Edited book by Al-Sirafi, 1955; Al-Zarkali, 1986).

The book of Sibawayh, it stands as a significant achievement gifted by the divine to the Arabic language and its people. It is an invaluable treasure, encompassing the fundamentals of grammar and conjugation, encompassing phonetic phenomena, rhetorical subtleties, and literary benefits. He exerted his utmost effort in scrutinizing the structures of Arabic, leaving scarcely anything unexplored. He established the rulings and foundations of Arabic language with evidence and examples, traversing a unique path that specialists and others alike accepted, esteemed, and cared for. They revered it, elaborated on it, and offered commentary upon it. His book is simply titled 'Al-Kitab' ('The Book'), a name that did not originate from Sibawayh himself, nor does this name apply to any other book. 'Al-Kitab' became synonymous with his work, prevailing overwhelmingly," as stated by Abu Sa'id al-Sirafi (368 AH: 39) in Akhbar al-Nahwiyyin al-Basriyyin "Sibawayh's book gained such fame and excellence among grammarians that in Basra, when someone would say, 'He read the book,' it was understood to mean Sibawayh's book. Even if someone read half the book, there was no doubt that it was Sibawayh's book."

Consequently, this book transcends being a mere set of rules for teaching Arabic, whether in speech, writing, or style. It elevated to become a source for understanding the essence of this magnificent language, comprehending its principles, and grasping the wisdom of Arabs in its arrangement and composition.

Understanding Sibawayh's Opinion

We will hardly find a book among Arabic literature - be it in terms of voices, structures, compositions, or indications - across different eras without a mention of Sibawayh, may God have mercy on him, supporting a grammatical or morphological rule, explaining it, or reinforcing the opinion of its proponents. Upon investigating the source of this diverse presence in the books of grammarians, you will not stray far from his book. Rarely will you find a well-known opinion of Sibawayh outside of his book. He remains the unique source from which we have consistent knowledge about Sibawayh. Other than his book "Al-Qawafi," which is lost, not much is known about Sibawayh's other writings. "Al-Qawafi" seems related to poetry, bearing norms and structures that may imply linguistic rules incidentally rather than intentionally. Since it is lost, any mentioned content is speculative and cannot be definitively judged. Therefore, any attribution of Sibawayh in any heritage book should not exceed what is in his book. One should not imagine any other source, and this has been commonly acknowledged by scholars throughout generations.

Nevertheless, there are a few rare scholars who believe there are a handful of transmissions attributed to Sibawayh that were not mentioned in his book. These transmissions are not supported, were not passed down by Sibawayh's students, such as Al-Akhfash (215 AH), Qutrub (206 AH), and their students. Instead, they appeared in later generations, such as Al-Zajjaj (Shalabi, 1988)(311 AH) in Ma'ani Al-Quran(Al-Marashli, 1990; Shalabi, 1988) and Khizanat Al-Adab 10(Harun, Abdul Salam. Edited book by Al-Baghdadi, 1997) (357-358), Ibn Khalawayh (370 AH), and Al-Farisi (377 AH). These transmissions are not well-established among grammarians, as they have been discredited by eminent grammarians like Abu Ali Al-Farisi in his response to Ibn Khalawayh after his support for Al-Zajjaj in the issue of deriving the divine name "Allah." Al-Zajjaj mentioned Sibawayh asking Khalil about the origin of the term "Allah," to which he replied that its origin is "ilah" and later mentioned it as "lah."

Abu Ali countered this in his book "Al-Ighfal," stating that what Al-Zajjaj attributed to Sibawayh from Khalil is dubious. He did not say, "I asked Khalil about it," nor did he mention Khalil's other statement, as stated by Al-Zajjaj, that it is "lah." (Ibrahim, Abdullah bin Omar Al-Haj. Edited book by Al-Farsi, 2003). Ibn Khalawayh defended Al-Zajjaj by affirming that both opinions were authenticated by Sibawayh. He claimed that this narrative was established in Al-Zajjaj's account regarding Sibawayh's transmission from sources other than his book. Therefore, it wasn't a mistake. He also supported such narratives about Sibawayh, saying: "Numerous issues have reached us. Sibawayh narrated answers to these issues from Al-Khalil, yet his book does not include any of that." Ibn Khalawayh's response to Abu Ali Al-Farisi in a book called Al-Hazur which is a lost manuscript.

Al-Farisi countered this, saying: "The one who narrates these stories about Sibawayh from Al-Khalil or from Abu Al-Hasan is a fabricator and a deceiver. There is

no doubt about this for anyone who has the slightest attentiveness and awareness. No one accepted or paid attention to them except the ignorant ages, those who have no knowledge of narrators and their narratives, distinguishing their truth from falsehood, their accuracy from their recklessness in narration. I have not known any of our teachers, among them Abu Ishaq, to narrate except what is established in his book." He continued, "We have not come across any narratives attributed to Sibawayh that are not established in his book except for two or three narratives: one transmitted by Muhammad bin Yazeed from Abu Zaid, and another from Ibn Salam" Al-Farisi's refutation of Ibn Khalawayh's opinion in a manuscript titled Niqd Al-Hadhur (Harun, Abdul Salam. Edited book by Al-Baghdadi, 1997). The conclusion drawn from the aforementioned is that Sibawayh's opinions and doctrines are derived solely from his book, not from any other source. This is the consensus among grammarians - a fact found in their works. Rarely can you find anything attributed to Sibawayh that isn't in his book. It becomes evident that understanding Sibawayh's opinion and confirming it relies solely on his printed book, widely circulated among scholars and students since its emergence, starting with Al-Akhfash until the present day.

Misinterpretation and Errors in Attributing Opinions to Sibawayh

Reasons for Misinterpretation and Errors in Attributing Opinions to Sibawayh
Many grammarians and linguists, when discussing a certain issue, establishing a contrast, or justifying a ruling, strive to exhaustively explore and examine it. They delve into their knowledge and understanding of the matter, aiming to satisfy their thirst for knowledge and benefit students of knowledge. This leaves a lasting impact and mention of their contributions in their lives and even after their passing.

One of the methods used in this exploration is to gather the opinions of eminent grammar scholars about the issue, followed by commentary based on the additional knowledge and insights acquired. Sibawayh, the leader of grammarians and the master of Arabic, was among the first to organize the foundations of this art, gather its scattered elements, solidify its issues, and its chapters. Therefore, when later scholars mention Sibawayh's opinion, cite his statements, rely on his reasons, and use his guidance, it elevates their status among scholars and students of knowledge.

Hence, many later scholars are keen on including Sibawayh's opinions, statements, reasoning, and justifications in their books. This is a result of their commitment to the truth, and they earnestly strive for it due to various reasons and circumstances. However, because of this, some later grammarians fell into misconception when they included what they believed to be his opinions and attributed them to him, contrary to what is in his recognized book of authentication. No one doubts that these scholars acted with diligence and enthusiasm, but they deviated from the truth. Those who understand the circumstances of these scholars and the sincerity of their intentions and religious integrity wouldn't doubt that this was not their intention.

There are possibilities for such errors in attributing things to Sibawayh beyond his book. Scholars have strived to understand the reasons behind these mistakes, mentioning several, which vary in proximity to reality, logic, and their differences, among these reasons:

1. The possibility that these opinions and attributed statements to Sibawayh, conflicting with his book, were transmitted, heard, or encountered by Sibawayh through a channel other than his book. This possibility is plausible and has been mentioned by some early

and later scholars. This possibility gains strength if the transmitter of Sibawayh's opinions was contemporary to him, having heard them directly from him or transmitted those opinions with a connected chain attributed to Sibawayh. However, if the transmitter of those opinions belonged to generations that did not live contemporaneously with Sibawayh nor with his students—and all these transmissions that are standing on this basis—then this possibility becomes weak and unreliable. For such a transmission to be acceptable from Sibawayh outside of his book, there must be evidence to authenticate this transmission, such as phrases like "I heard Sibawayh," or "Sibawayh told us," or similar statements that attribute the information to Sibawayh or his students through a connected chain of transmission. But verifying and proving such a scenario poses difficulty and hardship due to the loss of many books written by his famous students who could possibly have transmitted narrations from Sibawayh beyond his book, like Qutrub (206 AH), Al-Akhfash (215 AH), and others. The opinions attributed to Sibawayh in Tafsir books. Authentication and Assessment by Mohammed al-Sattouri and Ibrahim Assaf (page 7). Therefore, proving such evidence is considered rare and almost impossible.

2. Another aspect evident in Sibawayh's book, repeated in numerous instances: he mentions his opinion on a particular issue in multiple chapters and places. This is because the book is among the earliest compilations that did not adhere to a consistent method or a clear approach. Its chapters were not definitively organized, and its terminologies were not precisely defined. Sibawayh's style and manner of presenting the book's issues resembled scattered papers, depending on how he discussed the issue. He revisited certain topics in different sections of the book, as he crafted his book in the language and styles of the Arabs, in their rhetorical and eloquent manner. Thus, his opinions were not conclusively formed; rather, until the end of his days, Sibawayh continued to modify and amend. This is evident because no one read it to him, nor did he read it to anyone during his lifetime. He lacked an introduction or conclusion similar to complete books. Consequently, in some matters, you won't find a clear and definitive Sibawayh's opinion in a single place. Instead, his opinion becomes clear and complete when examining multiple scattered references in his book where he discussed the issue, dividing some matters across various sections and separating them with chapters different from their essence (Al-Hadithi, 1967) Abdul Khaleq Adhaima (M. A. Khaleq. E. book by A.-Mubarrad. Adhima, 1994) (1404 AH) states: "Sibawayh did not aim for his discourse on a single issue to be confined to one specific place in his book; rather, he scattered his discourse and separated it (M. A. Khaliq. Adhima, 1975) Examples of this include his discussion of "iidhan " in the accusative case for the present tense. Adhaima noted that Sibawayh presented it in multiple chapters. Sibawayh's method of presenting such issues posed a challenge for some scholars to ascertain his accurate opinion. Some scholars suffice with whatever Sibawayh stated at one point without tracing his opinions on the matter in other contexts. Sibawayh might have contradicted or refuted his previous opinion elsewhere, leading the transmitter to believe that this was Sibawayh's opinion in his book, attributing it to him and dismissing other opinions that might actually represent Sibawayh's view more accurately.
3. The ambiguity in Sibawayh's expressions and the difficulty in his style in some instances posed a challenge for scholars to explain and simplify his book for students of knowledge. Despite its surface appearance as a reason for scholars to refrain from explaining and clarifying the book, it stimulated many Arabic scholars' eagerness to

compete in explaining its mysteries and resolving its complexities, prompting them to give it complete attention through explanations, commentaries, and elaborations.

Ibn Kaysan (died 299 AH) said: "We studied Sibawayh's book and found it where it deserved to be, but we found its wording needing explanation and clarification because it was written in a time where its people were accustomed to such expressions. Hence, we relied on their opinions (Harun, Abdul Salam. Edited book by Al-Baghdadi, 1997). This ambiguity and variation between difficulty and ease, brevity, and elaboration had a notable impact on the misunderstanding of some of the book's texts. Consequently, this led to the misattribution of some opinions to Sibawayh, contrary to what is in his book. Dr. Khadijah Al-Hadithi (1439 AH) says: "In some of his phrases, there is ambiguity that requires the reader to dwell on them for a long time, to scrutinize them in order to understand Sibawayh's intention. Perhaps the difficulty in some chapters is because Sibawayh paved a path that nobody before him had paved (Al-Hadithi, 1967).

4. The focus of grammarians and linguists on the book made them pay extreme attention to explanations, comments, abbreviations, and comprehension. Some manuscript copies of the book contain intermingling between these explanations and the actual text of the book. This might lead to assumptions that these explanations and opinions belong to Sibawayh, differing in clarity and proximity to the original text based on the skills and proficiency of the explainer. Some meticulous scholars have the ability to decipher Sibawayh's expressions and explain his obscure passages in a manner challenging for those unfamiliar with this art to differentiate between the original text and the commentary. With the passage of time and the multiplication of copies, the distinction might blur, leading to the mixing of some book phrases with the explanations and comments provided by commentators. Al-Suyuti (911 AH) states, "As I appended annotations from the words of Al-Akhfash and others in the text of the book of Sibawayh (Al-Sharif, 1987). Abdul Salam Haroun (1408 AH) also remarks, "The annotations contain traces of serious discussions encompassing many observations and explanations that date back to different eras. Often, they overshadowed the text, making it difficult to distinguish between them. These additions have been placed at the bottom of the pages whenever identified. However, in some cases, I left them when they became intricately woven into the text. Nevertheless, some contemporary researchers, including Dr. Khadija Al-Hadithi, believe such occurrences are rare. They argue, "All manuscript copies of the book were transmitted with their chains of transmission and were not susceptible to accidental additions. The early scholars were meticulous in their handling of the book, its narrations, and chains of transmission, with each of them employing a symbol to indicate any additions made to their copy of the book. As the book spread in study circles in Basra, Kufa, Baghdad, and Andalusia, with every reader or teacher having their own copy or sometimes a personalized version. Consequently, they would mark symbols signifying each of them and indicating what was appended or contributed to the text of the book. Dieremberg conveyed some of these texts in the introduction to his edition of the book, stating, "If the symbol was 'Mah,' it is the copy of Al-Mubarrad in his handwriting. If the symbol was 'J,' it is the copy of Al-Zajjaj. If it was 'B' or 'Indahu,' it is from Abu Bakr ibn Al-Sarraj (Al-Fatli, n.d.). If the symbol was 'Q,' it is indeed the copy of Isma'il ibn Ishaq Al-Qadi. If the symbol was 'Fa,' it is from Ali... (Al-Hadithi, 1967). This well-documented text strongly indicates the difficulty of such occurrences, despite the instances mentioned by Al-Suyuti and Abdul Salam Haroun being rare. It's implausible

- that everything attributed to Sibawayh contrary to his book is due to this reason (Al-Suyuti., 1992).
5. Understanding the late grammarians' texts related to Sibawayh and the debates surrounding them beyond Sibawayh's intentions leads to distortion of meaning and alteration of phrases. Consequently, attributing opinions to Sibawayh statements is an error. It arises from a misunderstanding of his text divergent from Sibawayh intent, leading to the issuance of flawed judgments and the derivation of erroneous conclusions deviating from correctness and truth. Therefore, anyone attributing statements to Sibawayh should either cite his text explicitly or declare that it's the interpreted meaning of Sibawayh text, not his exact words. This precision and clarity in references allow others the space to investigate and retract if they've misunderstood or falsely attributed opinions. It prevents falling into incorrect attributions, criticism, and labeling of one's precision in attributing opinions.
 6. Quoting from Sibawayh book indirectly, where some scholars' students attribute opinions to Sibawayh without exerting effort to refer directly to the book itself, review Sibawayh text, and understand his intentions. Absolute confidence in a narrative's source without consulting the book itself might lead to misattribution, such as Al-Ashmuni's statement, " Sibawayh explicitly stated this as narrated in the explanation of Al-Kafiya (Saad, n.d.).
 7. The possibility of certain texts from Sibawayh falling out of some copies of the book while existing in others means someone who accessed the version where Sibawayh opinion is present would definitively attribute it to Sibawayh. However, someone who didn't have access to that version criticizing the attribution of this opinion to Sibawayh would be mistaken in their attribution, and the truth would be contrary to their critique. This possibility, mentioned by some late scholars, is a weak assumption that scarcely provides evidence for the incorrect attribution to Sibawayh contrary to his book. There's no confirmation from any copy of the book supporting this theory. On the contrary, evidence suggests that the book has some additional supplements, as indicated by Al-Suyuti, saying, "As I appended annotations from the words of Al-Akhfash and others in the text of the book of Sibawayh (Al-Sharif, 1987).

Analytical Examples of Statements Attributed to Sibawayh Contrary to His Book

The First Model; Sibawayh perceives that the present tense verb, when used as a response to an oath, necessitates its affirmation according to the conditions mentioned in his book. He explicitly stated this ruling in multiple instances within his book. He said - may God have mercy on him - "Know that the oath confirms your speech. So, if you swear on a non-negative action that doesn't occur, the 'lam' is attached, and the 'lam' attaches the hidden or heavy 'nun' at the end of the word. For example, your statement 'By God, I will indeed do it (Harun, 1983). In another instance, he mentioned: "I asked him about his saying, 'As if he doesn't know that, so God forgives him,' and 'This is true as you are here.' He claimed that the operative word in 'as if' is the 'kaf' and 'ma' isn't dropped from 'here.' This is to avoid the word's resemblance to 'as if' as they imposed the 'nun' in 'I will indeed do it' and the 'lam' in their saying, 'If he does (Harun, 1983). In a third instance: "Among its contexts - the 'nun' of affirmation - is the verb used for command and prohibition, such as your saying 'Do not do that,' and 'Strike Zaid.' These are the heavy 'nun.' And if you soften it, you say, 'Do that,' and 'Do not strike Zaid.' And among its contexts: the verb that the 'lam' of the oath is not attached to. Thus, it doesn't acquire the hidden or heavy 'nun,' but it's necessary for

it as the 'lam' in the oath. In these multiple instances within Sibawayh's book, he explicitly and clearly affirms that the present tense verb, under specific conditions, when responding to an oath, requires affirmation with the 'nun,' whether it's heavy or light.

Abu Ali Al-Farsi (377 AH) made an error in attributing a statement to Sibawayh contrary to his book. He clarified that the addition of the affirming 'nun' to the present tense verb used in response to an oath is not obligatory. He then claimed that this was the apparent speech of Sibawayh. He said in *Al-Hujja Liqurra' Alssabaah* (Dief, n.d.) (6/344) "As for Ibn Kathir's statement *لَأُقْسِمُ بِيَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ* the 'lam' may accompany one of the 'nuns' in most cases. Sibawayh narrated and approved that. Just as the 'nun' didn't attach to the verb in the verse, similarly, the 'lam' didn't attach to the 'nun' in the poet's saying (*Diwan Amer Ibn Al-Tufayl*, 1379; Harun, Abdul Salam. Edited book by Al-Baghdadi, 1997):

وقَتِيلَ مَرَّةً أَتَأَرَنَّ فَإِنَّهُ فَرَعٌ وَإِنَّ أَحَاهُمْ لَمْ يُتَّارِ

Al-Sakhawi (643 AH) followed this error made by Abu Ali (Al-Farsi, n.d.), claiming that affirmation through the addition of the 'nun' in the present tense verb when responding to an oath is only obligatory in the case of an oath. When the 'lam' (meaning "I swear") accompanies the verb in response to the oath, the 'nun' becomes necessary to differentiate between the 'lam' of the oath and the 'lam' of commencement. However, the omission of the 'nun' in the oath is weak. Sibawayh mentioned this and cited the reason for its weakness, which resulted in the disappearance of the distinction. Sibawayh narrated from them, "By God, I will strike him. This narrative is not in the printed version of Sibawayh's book, but it is in *Al-Ashmuni* 2: 496 and *Al-Khudari* in *Hashiat Alkhudari Alaa Ibn Aqeel* 2: 689). And based on this language, Ibn Kathir read: "لَأُقْسِمُ بِيَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ", without the 'alef' among a certain group. Al-Sakhawi supported this by saying it is correct because Arabs say, "No, that's not the case." Just as they omit the 'lam' and retain the 'nun,' similarly, they omit the 'nun' and retain the 'lam.' Both retained letters indicate the omitted one (Al-Sakhawi., 2002). As evident from the preceding explanation, there was an error in attributing Sibawayh's opinion due to Abu Ali's particular understanding of Sibawayh's phrase or his partial access to Sibawayh's text. Al-Sakhawi also followed Abu Ali without referring back to the book, resulting in a wrong judgment due to the incorrect attribution of Sibawayh's opinion in this matter (Al-Najjar, Sharif. Edited book by Al-Farsi, 2004).

The second model; is about Sibawayh's mention in the chapter of "astonishment" regarding the construction of the "af'ala" verbal form, which is built based on the verbs following the patterns of "fa'ala," "fa'ila," "fa'ula," and "af'ala." He, may God have mercy on him, says: "And its construction is never from 'fa'ala,' 'fa'ila,' 'fa'ula,' and 'af'ala' because they did not intend to act upon it. They made it an example to follow, thus it was similar. This is something that is not of the verb, like 'lata' and 'maa,' even though it comes from 'hasuna' and 'karoma' and 'a'ataa'..." (Harun, 1983). This is a clear statement from Sibawayh indicating the standard of forming the 'af'ala' for astonishment from these verbs, including those that follow the pattern of 'af'ala,' such as 'a'ataa.' Furthermore, scholars who came after Sibawayh, like Ibn As-Sarraj (I-Banna, Mohamed Ibrahim. Edited book by Al-sarraj, n.d.) (316 AH), added clarification. He says: "If someone says, 'maa a'ataahu!' ('What! He gave him!'), and it comes from 'a'ataa' which means 'to give,' they omit the additions because the root is 'a'ataa' 'yue'ti' when someone gives, just like 'walia' and 'awla' when someone is in charge of something. Similarly, As-Sirafi (367 AH), the explainer of *Al-Kitab*, states: "As for your statement, 'maa a'ataa Zaidan!' ('What! Zaid gave!') where the origin is 'a'ataa,' the

'hamzah' preceding 'a'ataa' before the astonishment is an addition because it comes from 'ataaa ya'too' when someone gives, so they omitted this extra 'hamzah,' making it 'ataa,' then they added the 'hamzah' for the astonishment. Ar-Rudhi (686 AH) attributed this statement to Sibawayh, saying: "It is also built, according to Sibawayh, from the pattern 'af'ala' for actions heard from others, like 'maa a'ataahu lil-ma'roof!' ('What! He gave him for goodness!') and 'maa abghadani lahu!' ('What! I despise him!')."

However, Ibn Ya'ish (643 AH), may God have mercy on him, differed from the majority of grammarians on this matter. He attributed to Sibawayh a disagreement regarding the standard formation of the 'af'ala' verbal form for astonishment from the verb that follows the pattern of 'af'ala.' He said: "The general rule is that the verbs that can be used for astonishment fall into two categories:

1. includes those that have an addition, whether it is originally part of the three root letters or not
2. this text discusses the derived verbs related to colors and defects, where the action extends beyond the original three root letters, whether they were part of the root or not. If an extra hamzah (glottal stop) is added to express astonishment, it diverges from the pattern of "af'ala." They say, "maa a'ataahu lid-dirahim" ("What! He gave him for money!") and "maa awlaahu lil-khayr!" ("He put him ahead for goodness!"). Such formations are limited to what the Arabs have spoken. Astonishment from "fa'ala," "fa'ila," "fa'ula" is a consistent analogy, and from "af'ala," it is heard but does not exceed what has been reported from the Arabs (Al-Halabi, n.d.). This attribution to Sibawayh suggests that he heard the construction of "af'ala" for astonishment from verbs following the pattern of "af'ala." This contradicts what is explicitly stated in the book. Perhaps the reason for this discrepancy is:
 - a. Ibn Ya'ish might have had access to a version of Sibawayh's book with a distortion in his statement regarding this matter. Hence, Ibn Ya'ish misunderstood Sibawayh's intent, and the accurate version of Sibawayh's statement might have been: "...its construction is never from 'fa'ala,' 'fa'ila,' 'fa'ula.'" Then he began mentioning the second form of astonishment. Abu Hayyan (Hindawi, Hassan. Edited book by Al-Andalusi, 1998) (745 AH) mentioned this in addressing the reason for the incorrect attribution of Sibawayh's lineage to Ibn Ya'ish. However, this argument is weakened and rebutted by Sibawayh's own words thereafter: it comes from 'hasuna' and 'karoma' and 'a'ataa'" (Even if he was handsome, generous, and gave).
 - b. Ibn Ya'ish understood from Sibawayh's words that the construction of the astonishment form is from the pattern of "af'ala," without any evidence permitting astonishment from it at all. In the end of his book, Sibawayh mentions, "Don't you see that you don't say 'maa ajwabahu,' but they say 'maa ajwada jawabahu' (Harun, 1983) This emphasizes that the hamzah in 'ajwab' is not for emphasis like 'azlam,' hence, there's no argument for allowing astonishment from 'af'ala' whatsoever. The preferable interpretation is to take Sibawayh's words at face value without interpretation or alteration. Ibn Malik (672 AH) said: "The extension to the pattern 'af'ala' in forming the verb for astonishment is not limited to what is heard but is established by analogy. What has not been heard is judged based on what has been heard unless there is another preventing factor. This is the opinion of Sibawayh and his authentic followers. There's no difference between a hamzah added for emphasis, like in 'a'ataa,' and a hamzah added for other purposes, like in 'aghfaa' (Al-Sayyid, Abdul Rahman & Al-Makhtun, 1990).

The Third Model: This passage delves into Sibawayh's book discussing the usage of the preposition "kaaf" (ك) and its inability to precede a pronoun in construction. However, if a poet is compelled to do so, he can omit the pronoun when using "kaaf." Sibawayh says: "This is a section on what doesn't allow pronoun omission in prepositions, specifically 'kaaf' in expressions like 'Anta kazayd' ('You like Zayd'), 'hatta', 'mudh', and 'dhalika.' They omitted it as they found themselves satisfied with expressions like 'mithli' and 'shabahi,' so they dropped it. However, poets, when compelled, omitted the pronoun in 'kaaf' according to analogy." He cited verses from Al-Ajaj to illustrate this, like: *وَأَمَّ أَوْعَالَ كَهَا أَوْ أَقْرَبَا* "Wa amma aw'alina kaha aw aqraba" (Hallat al-Dhanabat Shamalan Katiban Yanthur:) ('And as for the first or the closest'). Al-Ajaj also said: (Al-Sutli, n.d.) *فَلَا تَرَى بَعْلًا وَلَا حَلَاتِلًا كَهُ وَلَا كَهِنَّ إِلَّا حَاضِلًا*. ('So you don't see any heights or charming places, like him or them, except barren'). They compared it to using 'lahu' and 'hunna.' If a poet had to, he could add 'kaaf' to himself, saying: "ma anta Kay", And "Kay" Is Wrong ('You are not like me, No am I like you'), although there isn't a letter in Arabic that opens before the pronoun in an addition" (Harun, 1983). Sibawayh's stance was comprehended by the majority of grammarians, including Ibn Asfur (669 AH), who stated that sometimes a preposition is used in a necessary way, such as in Al-Ajaj's verse. The preposition 'kaaf' carried a connected pronoun and its usage extended based on speech context. It only carries a pronoun either apparent or detached. The flowing is similar to the apparent, and it's said, "I am not like you, and you are not like me." Al-Kissa'i narrated from some Arabs that they asked: "Who surpassed in dealing with challenges among you?" They replied: "He used to be like me, but when he had to change, he replaced it from its ruling to another ruling, and it's 'mithl.' So, he made it carry a connected pronoun, just like it carries a detached pronoun, similar to 'mithl.' However, the author of the book "Al-Wadhih" in grammar attributed a different stance to Sibawayh compared to what's in his book, as Abu Hayyan reported: "It's also mentioned in 'Al-Basit' that there's an instance of the accusative pronoun in expressions like 'Anta ka'ana' ('You were like me'), And like 'Anta ka'hoo' ('You were like him'), and the people of Kufa objected to it. In "Al-Wadhih," Sibawayh and his companions permitted 'Anta kay' ('You are look like me') and "Ana kaka" ('I look like you') but weakened by Al-Kisa'i, Al-Farra', and Hisham (Al-Farra., 1983) (Mohammed, Rajab Othman. Edited book by Al-Andalusi, 1998). Al-Baghdadi (1093 AH) mentioned this statement attributed to Sibawayh, affirming that this attribution is entirely inaccurate. He mentioned that Abu Hayyan attributed absolute permission to Sibawayh, saying: "In Al-Wadhih, Sibawayh and his followers allowed saying 'Anta kay' and 'Ana kaka,' but Al-Kisa'i, Al-Farra', and Hisham weakened it.

He also noted In "kitab al-tadhkirah" a disagreement regarding the inclusion of 'kaaf' before 'yaa' and 'kaaf', where Sibawayh and his followers allowed 'Anta kay' and 'Ana kaka', but this was weakened by Al-Kisa'i, Al-Farra', and Hisham, They argued that it was infrequent in Arabic speech (Harun, Abdul Salam. Edited book by Al-Baghdadi, 1997). The narrative by Al-Baghdadi seems to indicate confusion or a possible error in attributing these statements to Abu Hayyan or conflating them with quotes from Al-Wadhih. This might suggest that it was a mistake or misinterpretation by the editor. The possibility exists that Al-Baghdadi might have misconstrued Abu Hayyan's lack of refutation as an endorsement. However, this suggestion seems unlikely for Al-Baghdadi, known for his meticulousness and authentication, which makes it less probable. Hayyan to the author of 'Al-Wadhih'. The person seemingly isn't Abubakr Al-Zubaydi (397 AH), the author of the printed book 'Al-Wadhih', as this citation isn't found in it. It might be

another writer I'm not familiar with. Also, what Abu Hayyan attributed in his 'Tadhkira' isn't present in the printed version I have seen. Perhaps there's something in 'Al-Irtashaf' quoted from the author of 'Al-Wadih', yet it's possible that the phrase 'and in Al-Wadih' was omitted to match the two phrases perfectly. Abu Hayyan often uses identical phrases in his various books.

The fourth model: Some scholars attribute an opinion to Sibawayh that Sibawayh did not mention in his book, and no one other than him conveyed it from Sibawayh. It may be a misattribution to Sibawayh by this transmitter, as stated in the Sharh Ashear Al Hudhaliyyin by Abu Sa'id al-Sukkari (275 AH) after the verse of Hudhayfah ibn Anas (*Diwan Al-A'sha Al-Kabeer*, 1927):

نجا سالمٌ والنفسُ منه بشدقيه ولم ينجُ إلا جفنٌ سيفٍ ومِثْرًا
أوربته وغادر قيساً في المكّر وعفّزراً وطاب عن اللّغاب نفس

'Salem escaped, except by his eyelid, and none survived except a sword and a scabbard. And his soul tasted sweetness, then bitterness, leaving Qays in deceit and betrayal.' Al-Sukkari said, 'In the handwriting of Abu al-Tayyib, Brother of Al-Shafi'i said: Sibawayh said, as if he said: "Escaped and did not escape," as you say: "Spoke and did not speak," if his speech was weak, and he placed "a sword's edge" as a detached exception (Faraj, Abdul Sattar. Edited book by Al-Sukkari, n.d.). I did not find this citation in Sibawayh's book, nor in well-known grammar books, let alone finding the mentioned evidence. The editor of Sharh Ashear Al Hudhaliyyin, Professor Abdul Sattar Farrag (1402 AH), commented on this citation attributed to Sibawayh by saying: 'I did not find it in the printed Sibawayh's book, and perhaps it has been omitted from it. Justifying the omission of evidence implies weakness and looseness, given the high status of Sibawayh's book and its esteemed position among Arabic scholars, ancient and modern. They meticulously scrutinized its texts and expressions, yet none of them mentioned anything indicating the existence of the mentioned evidence. This is particularly noteworthy among those concerned with the book's evidence, as special authors like Ibn al-Nahhas (338 AH), al-Sirafi (368 AH), and al-Shantamari (476 AH) wrote specifically on its evidence. None of them indicated this evidence, or mentioned that there is an omission of some of the book's evidence. Some even mentioned that there are additional verses to the book's evidence, not from Sibawayh. Some of them indicated variations in their narration or assessed their authenticity (Al-Masri, 2000) (Nash'at Alnawh: 98, 95), without indicating any omission in the book's evidence. Those who have traced the compiled sources of the grammarians' evidence and its occurrences, both ancient and modern, did not find any instance or occurrence of this evidence in Sibawayh's book.

Nothing remains except the possibility of attributing the citation of this verse and the judgment upon it, as mentioned by someone other than Sibawayh. The mention of the witness and the commentary on it is found in what is almost mentioned in the book of Usul by Ibn al-Siraj. Perhaps the transmitter misunderstood the matter and thought that what Ibn al-Siraj mentioned was from Sibawayh. Furthermore, I have only come across the attribution of the poem to Hudhayfah ibn Anas in this book. A group of linguists and researchers, such as Abu Ubaidah (209 AH) in his Mujaz (Sazkin, Mohamed Fouad. Syarh book by Ubaydah, n.d.)⁽²⁾, al-Jawhari (Attar, 1984) (393 AH) in his Sehad (Al-Tantawi, n.d.) and Ibn Farris (395 AH) in al-Sahibi⁽⁴⁾, attributed it to Abu Khurasha al-Hudhali. It is possible that this text has been inserted into al-Sukkari's statement, as indicated by the

editor of the book (Faraj, Abdul Sattar. Edited book by Al-Sukkari, n.d.) Al-Sukkari is a trustworthy authority in the field of language."

The Fifth model; Ibn Hisham (761 AH) mentioned in 'Mughni al-Labib' in the chapter 'Instances where the pronoun refers to a later, stated, and arranged object' the following: 'The sixth: That the explicit visible noun after the pronoun is attributed to the verb by implication, like 'I struck him, Zaid.' Ibn Asfour said: 'Al-Akhfash approved it, and Sibawayh forbade it.' Ibn Kaysan said: 'It's permissible by consensus transmitted from Ibn Malik.' As an illustration of this, they cited: 'O Allah, send blessings upon him, the Merciful and Compassionate.' Al-Kissa'i said: 'It's a description.' The majority reject describing the pronoun. As for his saying: *قَدِ أَصْبَحْتَ بِقَرْقَرَى كَوَانِسَا فَلَا تَلْمُهُ أَنْ يَنَامَ*

الْبَائِسَا 'He became like a wretched bird in the morning, so do not blame him for sleeping as the wretched do. Sibawayh said: 'It implies 'I criticized him (Al-Ansari, 2000).

Ibn Hisham attributed to Sibawayh that the explicit noun after the pronoun is accusative to imply the verb 'I criticized.' Al-Shumunni (872 AH) followed him and said: 'And Sibawayh said it implies 'I criticized' in the commentary⁽²⁾ The wretched one is the one whose need intensified, and this is also a compassionate trait, so there's no reason to make the understood nominative perform the action of criticizing, but it should rather imply 'I have mercy.' I say: Intensified need is also a criticizing trait, so perhaps Sibawayh judged 'I criticized' for this reason (Mustafa, n.d.). Al-Qazwini (1150 AH) also followed this in Ghina al-Arib. Al-Shumunni's direction would be accepted even if there weren't a valid explicit text from Sibawayh that doesn't tolerate interpretation or direction. But what is in Sibawayh's book contradicts this. Sibawayh said - may God have mercy on him: 'From this compassion, and compassion is with the destitute, the wretched, and the like, and it's not with every quality or every noun, but compassion is with what the Arabs show compassion for. Al-Khalil claimed that he says: 'I passed by him, the destitute, in exchange,' and in it lies the meaning of compassion, and exchange as in 'I passed by your brother.' He also said: *قَدِ أَصْبَحْتَ بِقَرْقَرَى كَوَانِسَا فَلَا تَلْمُهُ أَنْ يَنَامَ الْبَائِسَا* 'So I became in a state of a wretched bird in the morning, so do not blame him for sleeping as the destitute do (Harun, 1983). So, Sibawayh explicitly states that the accusative placement of the noun after the pronoun is due to compassion, not criticism. Therefore, some grammarians criticized Ibn Hisham and pointed out his mistake in attributing this to Sibawayh.' Al-ddamaminy (827 AH) said:

Sibawayh said: 'It implies 'I criticized.' This is a compassionate trait, so there's no reason to make the understood nominative perform the act of criticism, but it should rather imply 'I have mercy' Al-Baghdadi (1093 AH) said: 'The destitute is a characteristic for the object pronoun, which is the 'him' in 'do not blame him,' and according to Sibawayh, it is possible for the 'him' to be accusative with an implied factor for compassion (Rabah, Abdul Aziz & Dakaq, Ahmed. Edited book by Al-Baghdadi, 1978). Al-Dasuqi (1230 AH) said: 'Sibawayh should have implied 'I have mercy' instead of 'I criticize,' because the destitute refers to the poor, and his saying 'do not blame him' also indicates that. So, according to Sibawayh, without resorting to substitution and making it an interrupted description, the action 'have mercy' should be inferred, as compassion suits despair (Al-Dusuqi, n.d.) Al-Amir (1232 AH) said: 'His statement 'I criticized' should be 'Do you have mercy?' because showing compassion to the destitute is more appropriate than blame in this context (Al-Amir, n.d.). Dr. Abdullatif Al-Khatib, the editor of Al-Mughni, mentioned: 'There is

nothing in Sibawayh's text indicating the interpretation of criticism. The authors of the footnotes responded that it is interpreted (Al-Dimamini., 2012).

CONCLUSION

Most of these falsely attributed opinions to Sibawayh originated from later Arab scholars. This complexity is due to the multitude of copies of his book, making it difficult for scholars to discern Sibawayh's opinions among multiple versions. Moreover, scholars often rely on their teachers' interpretations without directly accessing Sibawayh's opinions in his book. There is no any false attribution to Sibawayh among his direct students or the students of his students. Errors in attributing opinions to Sibawayh began after his passing, nearly two centuries later. Some claim there are narrations of Sibawayh differing from his book, but this assertion holds little validity, especially if the narration lacks proper authentication to Sibawayh. Abu Ali Al-Farsi mentioned this, and Shannaa refuted those who supported this claim. Engaging in works related to Sibawayh's book necessitates researchers to consult Sibawayh's texts in various sections of his book, alongside its explanations and commentaries. This approach yields numerous benefits, influencing the researcher's understanding of Arabic sciences, solidifying the fundamentals of the art and its branches, and fostering critical reading of Arabic heritage in their mind.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, Ehsan. Edited book by Al-Hamawi, Yaqut. (1993). *Mu'jam Al-Adiba*.
- Adhima, M. A. Khaleq. E. book by A.-Mubarrad. (1994). *Al-Muqtadab*.
- Adhima, M. A. Khaliq. (1975). *Faharis Kitab Sibawayh Wa Dirasa*.
- Al-Amir, Mohammed. (n.d.). *Hashiyat al-Amir Ala Mughni Al-Labib*.
- Al-Andalusi, A. A.-Q. Said. (1912). *Tabaqat Al-Umam*.
- Al-Ansari, I. Hisham. (2000). *Mughni Al-Labib 'An Kutub Al-A'arib*.
- Al-Arqsusi, M. Naeem. E. book by A.-D. (1982). *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala*.
- Al-Dimamini. (2012). *Sharh Al-Dimamini ala Al-Mughni al-Ma'roof bi al-Hashiyah al-Masriyyah*.
- Al-Dusuqi, M. M. Arefa. (n.d.). *Hashiyat al-Dusuqi ala Mughni al-Labib*.
- Al-Fadl, Mohamed Abu. Edited book by Al-Suyuti, J. (1979). *Bughiyat Al-Wu'ah Fi Tabaqat Al-Lughawiyyin Wa Al-Nuhat*.
- Al-Farra. (1983). *Ma'ani Al-Quran*.
- Al-Farsi, A. Ali. (n.d.). *Al-Tawfiqiyya Library*.
- Al-Fatli, A. Hussain. E. book by I. al-S. (n.d.). *Al'usul Fi Alnahw*.
- Al-Hadithi, Khadija. (1967). *Kitab Sibawayh Wa Shuruhu*.
- Al-Halabi, I. Y. (n.d.). *Sharh Al-Mufasssal*.
- Al-Khatib, Abdul Latif. Edited book by Al-Anbari, A. A.-B. (1998). *Nuzhat al-Alba fi Tabaqat al-Adiba*.
- Al-Makhzumi, Mahdi & Al-Samarrai, Ibrahim. Al-Farahidi, K. ibn Ahmad. (n.d.). *Al-Ain*.
- Al-Marashli, Yousef. E. book by A.-Z. (1990). *Al-Burhan fi Ulum al-Qur'an*.
- Al-Masri, Mohamed. E. book by A.-F. (2000). *Albulght Fi Tarajim 'Ayimat Alnahw Wallugha*.
- Al-Mubarrad. (1994). *Al-Muqtadab*.
- Al-Najjar, Sharif. Edited book by Al-Farsi, A. A. (2004). *Al-Masa'il Al-Munthura*.

- Al-Sakhawi. (2002). *Al-Mufaddal Fi Sharh Al-Mufassal Bab al-Huruf*.
- Al-Sayyid, Abdul Rahman & Al-Makhtun, M. Badawi. E. book by I. M. (1990). *Sharh Al-Tasheel*.
- Al-Sharif, A. Mukhtar. E. book by A.-S. (1987). *Al'Ashbah Walnazayir Fi Alnahw*.
- Al-Sutli, A. Hafiz. (n.d.). *Diwan Al-Ajjaj*.
- Al-Suyuti. (1992). *Hama' Al-Hawami' Fi Sharh Jama' Al-Jawami'*.
- Al-Tabai, Omar Farouk. Edited book by Bin Fares, A. (1993). *Al-Sahibi Fi Fiqh al-Lughah al-Arabiyya Wa Masa'ilaha Wa Sunan Al-Arab Fi Kalamha*.
- Al-Tantawi, Mohammed. (n.d.). *Nasha'at al-Nahw Wa Tareekh Ashhar Al-Nuha*.
- Al-Zaini, Mohammed & Khafaji, Mohammed. Edited book by Al-Sirafi, A. S. (1955). *Akhbar Alnahawiyyin Albasariyyin*.
- Al-Zarkali, Khairuddin. (1986). *Al-A'lam*.
- Attar, A. A. Ghafur. E. book by A.-J. (1984). *Al-Sahih*.
- Dief, Shoukry. E. book by I. M. (n.d.). *Al-Sab'a fi al-Qira'at*.
- Diwan Al-A'sha Al-Kabeer*. (1927).
- Diwan Amer ibn al-Tufayl*. (1379).
- Faraj, Abdul Sattar. Edited book by Al-Sukkari, A. S. (n.d.). *Sharh Ash'ar al-Hudhaliyyin*.
- Harun, A. Salam. S. book by S. (1983). *Al-Kitab*.
- Harun, Abdul Salam. Edited book by Al-Baghdadi, A. Q. (1997). *Khzanat Al-Adab Wa Lubab Lisan Al-Arab*.
- Hindawi, Hassan. Edited book by Al-Andalusi, A. H. (1998). *Altadhyil Waltakmil Fi Sharh Kitab Altashil*.
- Ibrahim, Abdullah bin Omar Al-Haj. Edited book by Al-Farsi, A. A. (2003). *Al-Ighfal*.
- Ibrahim, Mohamed Abu Al-Fadl. Edited book by Al-Qifti, A.-W. (1986). *Inbah Al-Ruwa' Ala Anbah Al-Nuha*.
- Khallikan., I. (n.d.). *Wafayat Al-A'yan Wa Anba' Abna' Al-Zaman*.
- I-Banna, Mohamed Ibrahim. Edited book by Al-sarraj, A. al-Qasim. (n.d.). *Amali al-Sahili*.
- Mohammed, Rajab Othman. Edited book by Al-Andalusi, A. H. (1998). *Irtishaf Al-Darb Min Lisan Al-Arab*.
- Mustafa, M. A. (n.d.). *Al-Munsaf min al-Kalam ala Mughni Ibn Hisham*.
- Omar, Y. Hassan. (1996). *Sharh Al-Razi ala Al-Kafiya*.
- Qaba'wa, Fakhreddin & Fadel, M. Nadim. E. book by A.-M. (1992). *Al-Janna al-Dani fi Huruf al-Ma'ani*.
- Rabah, Abdul Aziz & Dakaq, Ahmed. Edited book by Al-Baghdadi, A. Q. (1978). *Sharh Abiyat Mughni Al-Labib*.
- Saad, T. A. Raouf. (n.d.). *Hashiyat al-Sabban ala Sharh al-Ashmuni*.
- Sayed, Ayman Fouad. Edited book by Al-Nadim, A. A.-F. M. bin I. (2009). *Al-Fihrist*.
- Sazkin, Mohamed Fouad. Syarh book by Ubaydah, Abu. (n.d.). *Mujaz al-Quran*.
- Shalabi, A. J. Abdoh. S. book by A.-Z. (1988). *Ma'ani Al-Quran Wa I'rabuhu*.