

**THE VIEWS OF AL-AALAM AL-SHANTAMRY CONCERNING THE  
ACCUSATIVE, OBJECT-LIKE WORDS IN PRONUNCIATION**

A Study of the Views Mentioned in Al-Durrar Al-Lawameh Ala Himaa Al-Hawameh (The Shining Gems On The Flowing River) by Al-Shanqeetee

A research by:

Manal Abid Hachim Al-Karaawy

The Ministry Of Higher Education And Scientific Research  
Kufa University. Faculty Of Education For Girls  
Department Of Arabic Language

Al-Qadyssia General Directorate Of Education

**First Supervisor**

Dr. Asst. Prof. Nasir Abdil-Elah Dosh

**Second Supervisor**

Dr. Prof. Abdul-Kadhim Mohsen

1438 Hijri

2016 A.D

**Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry's Biography**

**Name and Lineage**

His full name is Abu Al-Hajjaj, Yusuf bin Sulaiman bin Eesa, and some sources named him Ibn Eesa. He was known as Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry, for "Al-Aalam" means that who has a widely cut upper lip, and he gained his last name in reference to his birth place, Shantamrya of Morocco, a large city residing on the majority of the great sea (including the city of Shilb and Seville in the western Andalusia).

**Early Life**

Abu Al-Hajjaj was born in 476 Hijri in the city of Shantamrya of Morocco. He moved from there to the city of Cordoba in 433 Hijri. He studied Arabic morphology, syntax and the Arabic poetry of Cordoba's elite scholars and writers. It is noticeable that he did not dwell in Cordoba for a long time, because he soon left it and moved to Shilb, where he started teaching. The minister Muhammed bin Ammar, in his early age, was one of Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry's students. From Shilb, he moved to Seville, where he joined the royal court of Al-Motadid bin Abad who attended to literature and its origins "for literature had a dying market, and he had a great effect of that". Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry remained in the royal court of Seville to the day he passed away.

### **Legacy**

Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry left us numerous writings and classifications in Arabic syntax and poetry between publications, scrolls, and lost writings. Here, we will examine some of those in details as they fall in the following categories:

#### First: Publications

An illustration of the six-poet's collection which includes the collections of: Imreh Al-Qeys, Al-Thaibani The Genius, Alqamah Al-Fahal, Zuhair bin Abi Sulmah, Turfah bin Al-Abd, as well as Antarah bin Shaddad.

#### Second: Scrolls

- 1- Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry's Enthusiasm.
- 2- An Illustration of Abi Tammam's Theory.

#### Third: Lost writings

- 1- An Illustration of the Poetry Enthusiasm.
- 2- An Illustration of sentences in Syntax for Abi-Alqasim Al-Zujaji.

### **Death**

The sources have agreed that he passed away in 476 Hijree in Seville. Al-Yafei was mistaken when he mentioned Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry's name in the list of deaths of 496 Hijri, whereas Ibn Al-Imad Al-Hanbaly was mistaken mentioning Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry's name in the list of deaths of 495 Hijri. Abu Muhammed Abduljaleel Al-Mursi mourned Al-Shantamry in a poem that starts:

تغنى النجوم و تسقط البيضاء

سيف الغناء فما يدوم بقاء

(The stars sing, and the white ones fall      The sword of ballads, there is no immortality)

### Accusative, Object-like Words in Pronunciation

#### First: Adverb

The definitions of adverb varied among the grammarians about it being an extension in the accusative form that clarifies the status of the preceding subject or object. In Al-Tasheel Illustration, it was defined as: “It is what indicates the status of its annex, including what meaning it carries without being bound by it”. Ibn Malik has mentioned in his One-thousand-line poem:

الحال وصف ، فضلة منتصب ..... مفهوم في حال كـ (فردا أذهب)

Understood by in the case of (I went alone) ..... The Adverb is a description, and accusative extension

Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry shed light on this subject in only one poetic line:

أنا ابن دارة معروفًا بها نسبي ..... و عل بدارة للناس من عار

Is there any shame for those of Darah ..... I am the son of Darah, with it y lineage is known

The indicator in this line is that (معروفًا = favour) is an adverb that confirms the meaning of the predicate, which is pride here. Al-Aalam said: “The indicator in his speech is (معروفًا = favour) and it is in the accusative form corresponding to its defining adverb, because if he said: (Ana ibno Daratin = I am the son of Darah), he will be known to have this lineage, so he said (معروفًا بها = My lineage is known) to confirm it.

The adverb comes as a confirmation, either for its annex or for the whole meaning of the sentence. It comes in a sentence of two definite, rigid nouns, which indicates a fixed adjective derived from this sentence.

The condition for the adverb to happen that the preceding sentence should be preceded by a nominal sentence, along with two definite, rigid nouns.

Al-Radhi (686 Hijri) illustrated in his book, Al-Kafiah Illustration, that it is permissible for the confirming adverb to be preceded by a verbal sentence. He said: “ The confirming does occur

but after a nominal, but it appears that it follows a verbal... and if it followed a nominal, it requires two definite, rigid nouns.”

The adverb is divided due to confirmation and illustration into two major types: a illustrator adverb, which is not useful unless mentioned (جاء سعد ضاحكا = happily came Saad), and a confirming adverb which can be useful and is present in meaning without being mentioned, when its factor indicates it, such as (لا تعث في الأرض مفسدا = do not dwell corruptively on earth), or when its annex indicates it, such as (إليه مرجعكم جميعا = "To him all of you will return", or in a case where the preceding sentence is what indicates the meaning of the adverb such as (هذا أباك عطوفا) = "This is your kind father). However, the Grammarians of both Kufa and Basrah on the occurrence of the confirming adverb after the pronouns.

### **Second: Qualifiers**

It is a noun in the accusative form that shows the gender, type or origin of what precedes it. It uncovers the ambiguity that surrounds the singular form if the ambiguity occurred on a visible entity, and elevates it from its origin if the ambiguity occurred on a hidden entity. In the book (الدرر اللوامع = The Shining Gems), two views for Al-Aalam about qualifiers. The first came with the line:

كم نالني منهم فضلا على عدم 1 ..... إذ لا أكاد من الاقتار أحتمل 2

1) I cannot tolerate being treated as a lower person

2) How many favours have I received from them when I had nothing

Al-Aalam said: “The indicator is in the accusative form after (كم = how many) on the qualifier for the sake of separation, because it is not proper to separate the two parts of the prepositional phrase in Arabic.

The separation of the predicative (كم = how many) and its qualifier accepts only accusative forms, because it is not proper to separate the two parts of the prepositional phrase in Arabic, such as (كم في الدار رجلا؟) = "How many in the house men?", and this separation is not permissible with numeric nouns such as (عشرون لك درهما) = "twenty for you pennies).

Abu Jaafar Al-Nahas 338 Hijri, he mentioned it with the phrase (من الاقتار احتمل) = "I tolerate being exploited), then he added explaining it: he wants: how much favours have I received from them when I had nothing, and when I had something, it stopped. And “ajtameleh: wanting Al-jameel”, which is melting the fat and the hump. He says: their favours reached me when I was poor.”

Ibn Jenni has also mentioned: “if you separate it from the indefinite that makes the predicate a genitive in its accusative form. You say: (كم حصل لي غلاما = How many I have got servants) and (كم زارني رجلا = How many visited me men), so when you separate them, the indefinite turned into the accusative form.

Ibn Yaesh commented on the poetic line saying: the evidence here is that when (كم = how many) was separated from its qualifier which is (فضل = favour) it was modified to the accusative form, because it is not improper to separate the two parts of the prepositional phrase.

Ibn Al-khabbaz said: he wanted to say “كم فضلا نالني = how many favours have I got” and when they were separated, it was changed into the accusative form.

The indicator has come here to show the qualifier (فضلا = favour) in the accusative form, when it was separated from (كم = how many). That happened because it is improper to separate the two parts of the prepositional phrase in Arabic.

The other poetic line where he mentioned the qualifier is:

كم بجود مقرف نال العلا..... و كريم بخله قد وضعه

And a good person downed by his stinginess.....How many despicable has elevated by his generousness

Al-Aalam said: the indicator here is that the word (مقرف = despicable) can be put in the nominative or the accusative form. The word (كم = how many) here indicates numerousness, and it puts the word (مقرف = despicable) in the nominal form as the noun of the nominal phrase, and it is followed by a prepositional phrase. It means: How many times a despicable person was elevated by good deeds. The qualifier can be put in the accusative form because it is improper to separate the two parts of the prepositional phrase. While the qualifier can be made in the genitive form when (كم = how many) and what the preposition has its effect on are separated by necessity.

Among the different meanings of the word (مقرف = despicable) is the qualifier. This is a point where the school of Kufa and the school of Basrah are arguing. The school of Kufa argued that if the (كم = how many) in the predicate position is separated from the noun of the nominal phrase by the adverb and the lowered preposition, such as: (كم عندك رجل = how many you have men) and (كم في الدار غلام = how many in the house servants). However, the school of Basrah thought that it should not be in the genitive form, but it has to be in the accusative form.

This poetic line was a proof on the possibility that a genitive form may be used in such examples. This was refused by the school of Basrah saying: “We have pointed out that it cannot take the genitive form since (كم = how many) is was affects the prepositional phrase afterwards,

since it serves as number added to what follows it, and if it was separated with an adverb, the addition ceases to be, since the separation between the two words of the prepositional phrase with an adverb and/or a preposition is improper, the accusative form was used.

The school of Kufa has this poetic line as an evidence on the fact that the genitive form in this case is permissible, and they deem the separation between the predicative and its (كم = how many) qualifier forgivable. The separation is not forbidden in case the qualifier is still in the genitive form by adding (كم = how many) to it according to the school of Sebaweih, and along a hidden preposition according to Al-Faraa School, and the genitive form on both of these sides is considered weak.

One of the scholars believes that the separation here is a poetic necessity and is not allowed in prose or Quran, but it is needed in poetry for the meter to be balanced.

**Third: “إن = Inna” and its sisters**

Speaking of these linguistic tools, we should be speaking about their role and effect in the sentence. Sebaweih has measured it on the transitive verb, that is why it changes the noun into the accusative form and the predicate into the nominal for, and it was considered of the verbs that has the object preceding the subject. They saying: (إن زيدا قائم = Zaid is standing) and (ضرب زيدا رجل = A man Zaid hit). But, the accusative preceded the nominative, the same difference between the subject and the object. The verb, in terms of original action, has undergone standardized measurements in the different order of the subject and object, because the subject should be ahead of the object, and when these verbs, in action, were branches of other verbs and accounted for them, they were made less by the preceding of the accusative over the nominative to lower it from the level of verbs. Because the object preceding the subject is a branch, and the subject preceding the object is the origin.

And when these semi-verbs acted like the transitive verb, they were treated like them. Because the word which is in the accusative form because of these semi-verbs are accusative, object-like words in pronunciation, and the word which is in the nominative form because of these semi-verbs are nominative, subject-like words in pronunciation.

The school of Kufa used to see that these semi-verbs did not inflect the nominative form on the predicate, rather, it inflects only accusative form on the predicate, because the predicate is originally in the nominative form.

Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry has no view on the concerning the (Noun of Inna = إن) but in this poetic line:

إن الربيع و الجود و الخريف ..... يد أبي العباس و الضيوبا

The hand of Abil-Abbas and the guests ..... The Spring and generosity and Autumn

Al-Aalam said: the indicator here is that (الضيوف = the guests) were treated on the accusative noun of (إن = Inna), and it would be permissible if it was put in the nominative form according to its original status, or of the noun of the nominal sentence, and to hide the predicate.

The grammarians have agreed upon that it is permissible to use the conjunctions with Inna noun after being satisfied with its predicate. It is the same in the above example, where (الضيوف = the guests) are conjoined in the accusative form with the accusative Inna noun. However, they disagreed on whether it should be conjoined with its pronunciation or its position. That is, looking at the former state of Inna noun before Inna occurs.

This is not a point were Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry prefer it. He extracts his answers from the way he raises the possibilities of (الضيوف = the guests). It is possible that mentioning this particular poetic line is a prove that Al-Aalam, like other grammarians, prefers the first possibility, it should be conjoined with its pronunciation, because pronunciation is a known and reliable proof in the Arabic language.

**Fourth: The predicate of (كان = Was)**

Perhaps the first to ever speak about (كان = Was) was Abu-Ahmed Al-Faraheedy. Entitled *Accusatives of Kana and its Sisters*, He mentioned “ Their sentence: (كان زيد قائما = Zaid was standing), that is, in meaning, is like the object that preceded its subject, like saying: (ضرب عبد الله = Abdullah hit Zaid).

Sebaweih put Kana and its sister under the title: “This is the chapter where the present participle transits into the past participle, and both of them into one thing... then it was mentioned for its importance, but was not mentioned with the first, and it is not allowed to be exclusively for the subject.” He did not mention in this chapter but: (كان – يكون – صار – مادام – ليس) = Was – is – become – still – not).

Al-Sayooti mentioned that Sebaweih means the noun and predicate by the present and past participle for Kana and its sister.

Ibn Yaeesh has mentioned that Sebaweih did not mentioned their tools, but few of them, then noted the rest of them saying: “ They did not inflect on the verb that we may not need the predicate. He wanted what was not included in the action, so he did not dispense an accusative that represents the action”.

Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry mentioned the subject of Kana and its sisters only once in his book *The Shining Gems*, he said:

لا تقرين الدهر آل مطرف ..... إن ظالما أبدا و إن مظلوما

Be you right or wrong ..... Do not approach the House of Mutref for eternity

He said: “The indicator in this poetic line is that what followed (إن = If) was put in the accusative form in accordance to what have preceded (إن = If). Nominative form is not allowed here because it is the adjective of the second person.”

This poetic line is one of Sebaweih’s proofs on the possibility of omitting Kana and its noun which is the second person pronoun following the conditional (إن = If). The original is: “إن كنت = If you were wrong). And removing Kana along its noun, but keeping its predicate has been numerously mentioned with the conditional (إن = if) and (لو = if). A good example for this will be what have just preceded in the above poetic line: (إن ظالما أبدا و إن مظلوما = Be you right or wrong).

#### **Fifth: The noun of Negative (لا = No)**

It is also called the acquittal “no”. It comes along the nominal phrase, and it puts the noun in the accusative form, be it not a singular. It puts the predicate in the nominative form. If the noun was singular, it is turned into the accusative form. It negates the essence of the predicate from all its related nouns whether it was specification or generalization.

And with the negative (لا = No), the Schools of Basrah and Kufa had a disagreement. The school of Basrah consider it a negative, present form of (إن = If), and that is why they turned its noun into the accusative form. It did not work but with the indefinite, because it is an answer for the indefinite. It includes the meaning of (who) and that it why it is associated with the indefinite, and they became one thing. The school of Kufa, however, said that it is not the present form of (إن = If), the way of the indefinite is to have its descriptions preceding it. They say: You have a man, and when (لا = No) is inserted and the predicate is delayed, the noun is put in the accusative form along with it, and they did not put its (التنوين = nunation), because it is a lacking accusative.

As for Al-Aalam, he had two views on this in his book *The Shinning Gems*. The first was the poetic line:

أرى الحاجات عند أبي حبيب ..... نكنن و لا أمية في البلاد

Have rot and there is no Ummaya in the country ..... I see the goods with Abi Habeeb

Al-Aalam said: “the indicator here is the accusative (Ummaya), being acquittal of the meaning of There no one like Ummaya.”

The negative (لا = No) does not work but with the indefinite, that it, it does work with a definite. Sebaweih has emphasized that saying: “Note that definites are not like indefinites in this particular subject. Because (لا = No) never works with a definite.” Sebaweih has put a solution for what looks like a definite, and (لا = No) worked in it meaning (مثل = like), or the very ambiguous examples that leads to the indefinite area. It is a point where he and Al-Aalam met, as both estimated the definite that occurs after the negating (لا = No) as an omitted word estimated as (أمثال = examples).

The impact of (Ummaya), as it is considered a definite undergoing the (لا = No) context, according to grammarians, is interpreted into two directions: The first is what Sebaweih and Al-Aalam had estimated as genitive, but does not become definite by this process, so the genitive was removed and its role was the genitive noun.

The other is what this part of science is characterized with, as if he said: “There is no generous in the country.

The other place where Al-Aalam’s view on this was clear is the poetic line:

لا هيثم الليلة للمطي ..... ولا فتى مثل ابن خبيري

And no lad like that of Khaiber ..... There is no Haitham tonight for these animals

Al-Aalam said: “The indicator here is when (لا = No) puts (هيثم = Haitham) in the accusative form, which is definite noun, although it does not work but with indefinite words, and he allowed it. He wanted to say: No one is like Haitham in fixing these horseshoes. And therefore, this became a common example, and (هيثم = Haitham) was put in the negated sentences like: (A case and there is no Abal-Hassan for it), meaning Ali bin Abi Talib (AS), and (There is no judge like Abi Hassan for it). And this example is like the first in its interpretation.

This is what we can conclude from the previous details about the Accusative, Object-like Words in Pronunciation:

1. Many grammatical issues that we came across here were a point where Schools of Kufa and Basrah disagreed. Such as the differentiation between the predicative (كَمْ = How many) and its qualifier. Al-Aalam did not openly conform to any of those schools, but it is obvious from his views that he followed or preferred the School of Basrah.

2. Al-Aalam Al-Shantamry did not deviate from his grammatical methods in portraying the analysis aspects that every word might undergo – with the words that contain more than one – being content with portraying it once, and analyzing it in another.

Footnotes:

Its Translation in: Al-Thakheera, Ibn Bassam: 2/474, Mojam Al-Odabaa, Yaqoot Al-Hamawy: 20/60, Anbah Al-Rowah: 4/59, Wafayat Al-Ayan, bin Khalkaan: 7/81, Bughyat Al-Woah, Al-Sayooti, Mohammed Abul-fadhl Ibrahim: 2/256.

Al-Thakheera : 2/478, Nafh Al-Taib: 4/75

Mojam Al-Odabaa 20/61, Tabakat al-Nohaa Wa Al-Loghaween: 548

Anbah Al-Rowah 4/59, Wafayat Al-Aayan 7/81

Al-Mojab, Abdul-Wahid bin Ali Al-Tamimi Al-Marakeshi: 247

Anbah Al-Rowah 4/95, Wafayat Al-Aayan 7/81

Al-Mojab: 114

Wafayat Al-Aayan 7/81

Al-Bayan Al-Maghrib, Ibn Athari Al-Marakeshi: 3/284

Miraatol Jinan: 3/159

Shatharatol Thahab: 3/403

Al-Thakheera: 2/487

Sharh Al-Tasheel for Ibn Malik: 5

Tawdeeh Al-Maqasid Wa Al-Masalik in Sharh Alfeyat Ibn Malik, Al-Muradi: 2/131

Deewan Ro'ba: 189

Al-Durrar Al-Lawameh: 1/514, Tahseel Ayn Al-Thahab: 271

Sharh Ibn Aqeel: 2/207

Shuthoor Al-Thahab: 247, Sharh Al-Ashmooni: 2/185

Sharh Al-Radhi on Al-Kafya, Radhi Al-Deen Al-Istrabadi: 1/687

Surat Yunus: 4

Al-Mansoob on Al-Taqreeb, Dr. Ibrahim bin Sulaiman Al-Noaimi: 12

Ibid: 13

Awdah Al-Masalik: 1/331

Mojam Al-Naho, Abdulghani Al-Dokr: 112

Deewan Al-Qatami: 30, Al-kitab: 1/259

Al-Durrar Al-Lawameh: 1/540, Tahseel Ayn Al-Thahab: 301

Al-Mogtadib: 3/55

Sharh Abyat Sebaweih, Al-Nahhas: 230

Al-Lameh in Arabic: 207

Sharh Al-Mofassel: 4/131

Tawjeeh Al-Lamah, Ibn Al-khabbaz: 399

The line is argued upon between Anas bin Zaneem Al-Kinani

Al-Durrar Al-Lawameh:1/540-541, Tahseel Ayn Al-Thahab: 302, Al-Nukat About Sebaweih's  
Al-Kitab: 1:267-268

Al-Insaf fi Masael Al-Khilaf: 1/247:248

Ibid: 1/248

Ibid: 1/248 (Investigation margin)

Masael Nahaweiah fi Daraer She'rya, Kareem Mirza Al-Asady (Deewan Al-Arab on the web)

Bonyat Al-Jumlah bain Al-Tahleel wa Al-Nadharya, Al-Munsif Aashoor: 287

Al-Eedah fi illal Al-Naho:64

Al-Insaf fi Masael Al-Khilaf: 1/167

Al-Bayt for Ro'ba, Deewanoho: 179

Al-Durrar Al-Lawameh:1/480, Tahseel Ayn Al-Thahab: 290

Al-Kitab: 1/285 Hema' Al-Hawameh

Al-Jomal:45

Al-Kitab: 1/45-46

Ibid: 1/45-46

Hemah Al-Hawameh: 1/16

Sharh Al-Mufasssal: 7/90

Deewan Layla Al-Akeelya: 109

Al-Durrar Al-Lawameh:1/231, Tahseel Ayn Al-Thahab: 183

Al-Kitab: 1/345

Awdah Al-Masalik: 1/183, Al-Hemah: 1/121, Sharh Al-Shawahid Al-Shaerya fi Omahat Al-Kutub Al-Nahweya:3/21

Maghna Al-Labeeb aan Kutub Al-Aareeb, Ibn Hisham: 1/33, Sharh Al-Kafeya: 4/257

Maghna Al-Labeeb: `1/313

E'tilaf Al-Nusrah fi Ikhtilaf Nuhat Al-Kufa wa Al-Basrah, Al-Zubaidi: 160

The poetic line is and arguable issue, and mostly say it is for Abdullah bin Al-Zubair, His Deewan: 147

Al-Durrar Al-Lawameh:1/311, Tahseel Ayn Al-Thahab: 350

Al-Kitab: 2/296

“La” in the Holy Quran, A Grammatical Study, Naeem Salih Saeed Naeraat: 24

Sharh Al-Shawahid Al-Shaerya fi Omahat Al-Kutub Al-Nahweya:1/297

Al-Bayt Bila Nasabah in Al-Kitab: 2/296, Al-Mugtadib: 4/362

Al-Durrar Al-Lawameh:1/313, Tahseel Ayn Al-Thahab: 350, Al-Kitab: 1/354, Al-Mogtadib: 4/362

## **The Conclusion**

After wandering in the hallways of the grammatical courts in that period of time through Aalam Al-Shantamry and the ideas he had. We can summarize the important results of this study as follows:

- Apart from historical issues or the fact that Aalam Al-Shantamry is related to the School of Basrah, his views showed this relation without having to state that himself or following other sources that dealt with his life and grammatical orientation. He walked on Sebaweih's footsteps, especially that he assigned two books to illustrate Sebaweih's *The Book* and its addendums, (النكت = *The Jokes*) and (تحصيل عين الذهب = *Obtaining the Golden Eye*).
- The previous point does not imply that Aalam Al-Shantamry does not have the freedom of thought, or he had no free will on his views, because we see him arguing against the School of Basrah and Sebaweih and arguing with the School of Basrah when he thought it was right to do. This proves the distinctive personality of Aalam Al-Shantamry and shows his pride with his own personality and intellectuality, even if these sources were few.

Through the different grammatical views provided by Aalam Al-Shantamry, it is clear that he wrote his book (النكت = *The Jokes*) before writing (تحصيل عين الذهب = *Obtaining the Golden Eye*). In the issue of (كأين = How many) which was mentioned in his book (تحصيل عين الذهب = *Obtaining the Golden Eye*), he did not elaborate on the subject since he has already elaborated on it in his previous book (النكت = *The Jokes*).

## **Sources and references**

Inbah Alrwaia on Inbah Alnahat. Jamaal Aldeen Abo Hassan Ali Bin Yousif Alkaffti, investigation: Mohammed Abo Alfadil Ibraheem, Cairo, Cultural books Foundation, Beirut, The first edition, 1986.

Alnsaf fi Massa'al Alklaaf, Abo Barakat Bin Alnbari, with it the book of Alintsaaf min Alnsaaf: Mohammed Muhi Aldeen Bin Abd Alhameed, Dar Alfker, Beirut.

Awdah Almasalik fi Alfayt bin Malek Abo Mohmmmed Abdallah bin Jamaal Aldeen Bin Yousif Alnsari, Authorship of Muhi aldeen bin Abd Alhameed, , Manshoraat Almaktabah Alaasria, Sidon, Beirut.

Iatlaf Alnsra fi Aktlaf Nahat Alkufa wa Albasra, Abd Allateef bin Abi Bakir Alshrji Alzubeedy, tah: Tareq Aljenabi, Aalam alketib wa Matebat Alnahda Alarabia, T1, Beirut, 1987.

Iedah fi Alel Alnhawo, Authorship of Abi Alqassim Alzujaji investigation: Mazin Almubark, Daar Alnafae.

Bagyat Alwaat fi Tabakat Al-lugaween wa Alnohat, Jalal Aldeen Abd AlRuhamn Alsuti, investigation: Mohammed Abo Fadil Ibraheem, printed in Aessa Albabi Alhalebi, The first edition, 1967.

Bagyat Alwaat fi Tabakat Al-lugaween wa Alnohat, Jalal Aldeen Abd AlRuhamn Alsuti, investigation: Mohammed Abo Fadil Ibraheem, printed in Aessa Albabi Alhalebi, The first edition, 1967.

Albayan Aljumlaa bain altahleel wa Nadreea, Tunis Almunsef Aashur, University of Tunis, The first edition.

Albayan Almgreb fi Akbar Alindlas wa Almgraab, bin Adari Almurakshi, Dar althekafa, Beirut, third edition, 1983.

Tahseel Ain Aldaheb min Mawn Juhar Aladab fi Alm Majazzat Alarab, Abo Alhagag Yusif bin Sulaiman bin Aessa Alalm Alshntmeri, (476 HJ), investigated and commented on by Dr. Zumeer Abd Almusen, Sultan Muassae, Beirut, second edition, 1994.

Tudeeh Almakasid wa almsalik bsharh Alfaya bin Malek, Almuradi Almarouf babin om Qassim (749 HJ), Dar Alfker Alarbi, Cairo, The first edition, 2001.

Aljumaal Fi Alnhawo, Alkaleel bin Ahmed Alfarheedy, investigated by Faker Aldeen Qbawa, Muassat Alresalae, Beirut, The first edition, 1985.

Alderar Alwama Sharah Jam Aljuamah, Ahmed bin Alameen Alshnkeeti, Wada Alhuwashia: Mohmmmed Basil Ayon Alsod, Dar Alkutib Alalmia, Beirut, The first edition, 1999.

Dywan Ruba bin Alajaj, Waleem bin Alward Albursi, Dar Abin Aqutaeeba, Kuwait.

Althakeera fi Mahsin Ahel Aljazeera, Abo Alhassan Ali bin Basam Alshmentari, investigated: Ihsan Abass, Dar Althakafa, Beirut, Lebanon, 1997.

Shatherat Aldehab Fi Aqeel min Althehab, Abin Alemad Alhinbli, Abd Alqadir Alarnawut, Muhmood Alarnawut, Dar Abin Katheer, The first edition, 1986.

Shareh Abin Aqeel Alaa Alfayat bin Malek, Qady Aldudat Bahaa Aldeen AbdAlallah bin Aqeel Alaqueeli wa maho Ketab Munha Aljaleel investigated Shareh abin Aqeel: Mohmmmed Mujeer Aldeen abd Alhameed, Manshurat Thawi Alqura, Qom, The first edition, 1389.

Shurah Abyat Sibawayh , Abo Jaffar Ahmed bin Mohammed Alnuhas, investigated by: Dr. Zuheer Qazi Zahid, Dar Alnasher: Aalem Ketab. The first edition.

Shurah Alashumoni ala Alfait abin Malek Almusama Manhej Alsalk Ala Alfait Abin Malek, investigated and explained Shwahuwo Mohammed Muhai Aldeen Abd Alhameed, Mustafa Albabi Alhalbi wa Awladho, Egypt, Second edition, 1939.

Shurah Altasheel Almusama Tamheed Alqawid bishurah Taseel Alfawid, Lmuhab Aldeen Mohammed bin Yusif bin Ahmed Almuraof Yanader Aljaeesh (778 HJ), A study and investigation by: Prof. Dr. Ali Mohammed Fakir, and others, Dar Alsalam.

Shurah Alradi Ala Alkafya, Correction and commentary by Yusif Hassan Omar, Manshurat Jamaa Kazanows, Benghazi.

Shurah Almfasil, Muwfik Abo Albaqa Yayeesh bin Ali Yayeesh, Presented and put margins and their indexes by: Dr. Ameel Badeeh Yaqub, Dar Alkutib Alalmia, Beirut, The first edition, (1422HJ-2001).

Fawat Alwafyat wa Althail Alyahama, Mohammed bin Shakir Alkutbi, investigated by: Ihsan Abass, Dar Althakafa, Beirut, 1973.

Alketab, Abo Bashir Amro bin Athuman bin Qanbir (180HJ), Abd Alsalaam Mohammed Haroon, Muktebat Alkanji, Cairo, Third edition, 1996.

La Fi Quran Alkareem, The study of language semantic, Naeem Salih Saeed Nayerat, Master, Graduate School of the University of Alnbao Palestine 2001.

Allamaa fi Alarabya, Abo Alfatha Authman bin Jani Almousli (Almutafa: 392HJ), investigated by: Faaz Faris, Dar alkutib Althakafya, Kuwait.

Murat Aljunan wa Aubrat Alyaktan fi Maarfa Ma Yatbar min Hawdth Alzaman, Abo Mohammed Afeef Aldeeb Alyafy, Dar Alkutib Alalmia, Beirut, first edition, 1997.

Almustafi fi Alnahwo, Hassan Abd Alkareem Alshuraa, Manshurat Daleel Ma, first edition, 1434 HJ.

Almujab fi Tareekh Akhbar Almugrab (min Fatah Alndals elaa Aker Asur Almuhtadeen), Abd Alwahed Almurakshi, Set and corrected commented the footnotes: Mohammed Saeed Alaarayn, Mohammed Alarbi Alalmi, Matbat Alesteqama blcairo, first edition, 1949.

Mujam Aludbaa, abo Abdallah Yaqut bin Abdallah Alrumi, Achieved and adjust texts and prepared its indexes and presented by: Dr. Omar Farooq Altaba, Muassat Almaarf , Beirut, Lebanon, first edition, 1999.

Almujam Almufasil fi Alnahwo Alarabi, Dr. Azeez Fwal, Dar Alkutib Alalmia, Beirut, first edition, Lebanon.

Mugani Labeeb Aan Kutib Alaareeb, Abin Husham Alansari, investigated by: Mazin AlMubark, Mohammed HamidAllah, Dar Alfakir.

Almuktabeb, Abo Alabas Mohammed bin Yazed Almubrad, investigated by: Mohammed Abd Alkalek Admya, Wyzarat Alokaf Almjles Alalaa Ishuan alislamia, Commission of the Revival of Islamic Heritage, Cairo, 1994.

Almansoub Ala Altakreeb, Dr. Ibraheem bin Sulaiman Alnaymi, web research.

Alnaketh fi Altafseer Ketab Sibawayh wa Tabeen Alkhfi min Lafdo wa Shurah Abyato wa Garebto, Alhujaj bin Yousif bin Sulaiman bin Aessa alaalm Alshmentri, read and checked it texts by Dr. Aessa Murad, Dar Alkutib Alalmia, Beirut, first edition, 2005.

Humaa Alhuamaa, Fi Shuraah Jama Aljuwamaa, Abd Alrahman bin Yousif bin Abi Bakir Alsyouti, investigated by: Ahmed Shams Aldeen, Dar Alkutib Alalmia, Beirut, first edition, 1998.