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Abstract---This research paper aims at recognizing the study of a set of the accusative nouns and the controversy among scholars on them in one of Arabic Language books which is (Al-Azhar Shareh Edhehar Al-Asrar in Grammar) for Ibrahaim Al-Kassab Al-Roomy Al-Hanafi (deceased 1029 H.) for its importance upon the researchers, where they engaged on studying the explanations that carried out on this book and to pay attention to what included of valuable scientific material. I chose to make my study in the section of the Accusative Nouns and what contained of a grammatical controversy among the grammarians that the book clarified.
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Introduction

This study is based on investigating one of most significant Arabic grammar sections which is the section of the Accusative Nouns in an important book on which the explanations and studies were based on. In this study, I focused on showing the grammatical controversy among the Basri and Kufi grammarians and mentioning their point of views, as well as ascribing these point of views to their owners to the fact of this controversy in directing these point of views on the Accusative Nouns which include the following nouns: (the controversy in preceding the adverbial on its genitive owner, actions of the particle if it in meaning of the past whether between adhering to the circumstantial or nominative, and coming the discrimination as a definite).
Preceding Adverbial to its Genitive Owner:

THE grammarians differed in preceding adverbial to its genitive owner by a preposition, non-additional, and Ibn Al-Kassab mentioned this controversial matter by saying: ("it is not preceding to the genitive adverbial, whether it was genitive by an addition or a preposition; as the adverbial is an adjective to it originally, so it is not situated just when its follower is positioning, and the genitive noun by the addition or by the preposition, is not preceding to the adverbial, and thus, the adverbial is not preceding to it, and so it is not said for example: "I passed through by Zaid as sitter", by preceding the adverbial which is prohibited at all grammarians just at Ibn Kaissan\(^1\)\(^2\). The grammarians over this matter on three sayings:

First: Sebawai directed to non-permissibility of preceding the adverbial to its genitive owner non-additional\(^3\), and this is clarified by his saying: ("and then it has become: I passed through by a man is standing, is not permitted, because it comes before the noun, not before the verb)\(^4\).

Al-Mubarad also said: ("I passed through Zaid as riding")\(^5\). Most of the Basri grammarians followed him, and they showed the reason of the prohibition in this matter:

That the worker of the adverbial is associated by second adverbial and it has its right to be transitive, but it was prohibited from that because the verb in not transitive by the preposition into two things; and they compensated it from the participation in the means to adhere to the delay\(^6\). Ibn Malik reacted the reason of the prohibition by saying: ("We don’t recognize this right till it entails the adherence of the delay by compensating, but it is the adverbial right to be similar to adverb to dispense the means but the adverbial is much dispensable of the means, thus it works in it not as transitive by a letter as a demonstrative noun and the letter of the warning as well as the simile and wish)\(^7\).

Ibn Al-Shjereee mentioned that the grammarians measured the reduced adverbial on the nominative and accusative adverbial, and when contrary both of them adhered the delayed reduced adverbial, because that the nominative and accusative preceding the adverbial on them, because the nominative and accusative are permitted to be preceded to them, as says: ("Kharaja Zaid Musr'i") which means in English (Zaid exited quickly), so the word "musr'i" is adverbial which equivalent to the English word(quickly). Here, we saw how it is permissible to precede the nominative adverbial on the nominative noun, and the accusative adverbial on the accusative noun, but it isn’t permissible to precede the genitive noun on the preposition, so it is prohibited to precede the adverbial on its reduced owner\(^8\).

---

\(^1\) See: Al-Murtajal: 167, and Shareh Al-Kafeyah Al-Shafeyah: 2/746
\(^2\) Al-Azhar Shareh Edhehar Al-Asrar: 342.
\(^4\) Al-Kitab: 2/124.
\(^5\) Al-Muqtadhab: 4/171.
\(^6\) Shareh Al-Ashmooni: 2/15.
\(^7\) Shareh Al-Tasheel: 2/339.
\(^8\) See: Amali Ibn Al-Shujeri: 3/15-16.
Second: Kufi grammarians directed in their view to elaborating in saying that they gave permissibility to precede the adverbial on its genitive owner by the letter if it elliptical as "she passed you smiling", as well as it is permissible to precede the adverbial if its owner is of two nouns, one of them is genitive such as: (I passed quickly by Zaid and Amro), or the adverbial was a verb, such as: I passed by Hind who she laughs, and they prohibited if it is not.

Third: Ibn Kaissan, Ibn Burhan and Abo Ali Al-Farsi directed in their views to the permissibility to preceding the adverbial on its genitive owner, and Ibn Malik agreed upon them, as well as Abo Hayan. They proved two reasons for their permissibility as follows:

1. That the genitive noun by the preposition is an object in the meaning, which is not prohibited the adverbial to precede it.
2. Stating by the hearing it in Holy Qur'an by Allah Almighty saying: {And We have not sent you except comprehensively to mankind}, the adverbial here, "kafah" ('all') is preceded to its genitive owner "Anas" ('mankind'). And from poetry it was said that the two words "Hayman" and "Sadeyah" are adverbials by the genitive pronoun. Whereas Al-Zamakhshari rejected who made "kafah" ('all') an adverbial of the genitive noun preceding on it and said: (except "kafah" = "all" to people; because it means to include them all, and Al-Zajaj said: the meaning is "We sent you all to people" to refer to 'warning' and 'forming', so he made it an adverbial from "kafah" (all) to refer to exaggeration as the "ta’a" of the narration and mark, and who made it an adverbial from the genitive noun on the addition). There are a number of the grammarians who opposed to this view and among them: Abo Al-Qasem Al-Thamanini as he said: (And Abo Al-Qasem Al-Thamanini said: that some grammarians permitted preceding the genitive adverbial to it and said: the actor in the adverbial is the verb, and the verb is conjugated in itself, so its object must be conjugated, and thus it is permissible to precede the adverbial to its owner). Whereas Ibn Al-Kassab mentioned the controversy without weighing out any certain view.

"Swa" ('Except') Between the Adherence of the Circumstantial and Nominalism:
The grammarians differed in the exclusiveness of ("Saw", which means 'except'), some of them adhered to the 'circumstantial', and others permitted the 'nominalism' and 'circumstantial', and Ibn Al-Kassab mentioned this by saying: (It is at Al-Zajaj, and Ibn Malik, as "except" in meaning and behavior, says:
"Ja'ani Swaka" (‘No one came to me except you’), by nominal subject and by accusative on object, which is most weighing at Sebawai and at public also to be an adverb of place associated to the accusation and not depart this lest at necessity, and at Kufi grammarians, it comes in two facets, one it used on the circumstantial on negation when lies as a connection, and they said: “who came to me except you”,

The grammarians on this matter are on three views:

First View: The Basri grammarians directed to that ('Saw' = Except) is not but an adverb. Sebawai says: (‘there is also: this is except you’), and he said in another position: (‘when the people came to me except you’, Al-Khaleel (Allah mercy upon him) alleged this is as your saying: “The people came to me without you”, and nobody came instead you, and here "Swaka" means "except you" to mean exclusiveness). Among those who directed to this view was Al-Mubarad, and Ibn Jeni, Al-Jerjani, Ibn Al-Anbari, Ibn Yaeesh, Ibn A'sfour, Ibn Al-Hajeb, and Al-Radhey.

The Basri grammarians proved the correctness of their view by one evidence: by their saying: (“Ja’a Al-Lathi Swaka” = 'He came who in replaced you'), so "Swaka", here in the meaning of 'replacing you', which is situated as a connection, and if it is an adverb, the speech doesn't be true, Ibn Al-Barakat Al-Anbari said: (its positioning here indicates on its circumstantiality, in contrary to others). Thus "Swa" at the people of Basrah is an adverb not conjugated, and not entered by actors and so neither to be as a subject nor an object, as well as not entered by a preposition. Ibn Al-Rabee said: ( And entering "Min" on the adverbs such as entering the preposition, all of them conjugate, and didn't say just what Arab said, and that "Swa" is not used a genitive noun by "Min" and the others except in the poetry). Ibn Malik reacted to those opposed the correctness of situating it as

(20) See: Shareh Al-Tasheel: 2/314, which is the opinion of Al-Ramani as well: See: Shareh the Book of Sebawai: for Armani: 1/564.
(21) See: Moghni Al-Labeeb: 188.
(23) See: Tawjeeh Al-Lam'a: 224.
(24) See: Moghni Al-Labeeb: 188.
(30) See: Al-Lam'a in Al-Arabia: 69.
(38) Al-Baseet: 2/883.
a connection that the preposition is dealing with it as an adverb even it is not an adverb originally, and if it is called an adverb this is on metaphor\(^{39}\). Second View: The Kufi grammarians directed to that ("Swa") to be a noun and an adverb\(^{40}\), Al-Zajaji followed them\(^{41}\) and Ibn Malik\(^{42}\). They opposed to the correctness of what directed to from two sides:
First: it is a noun and in the place of ("Ghair" = 'just, only or except') which not obliged circumstantial and they enter to it the preposition and proved that by the poet's saying:
Tujanifo A’n Jou Al-Yamamah Naqaty…. Wa Ma Qasdto Min Ahlaha Lswaka\(^{43}\). The evidence here: ("Lswaka") is entering the preposition ("Lam").
Second: narrated of some that he said: ("Atani Swaka") by nominative and proved it is correlated the circumstantiality\(^{44}\). Ibn Al-Anbari reacted to the pretexts of the Kufi grammarians:
What they enchanted in the poetry is permissible, because it is from the necessity of the poetry and they used ("Swa"= except) in the place of ("Ghair" = just or just) for the necessity because in a meaning of ("Ghair")\(^{45}\), and Ibn Yaeesh added that they have no evidence for its deviation, scarcity and abstention in the case of choosing speech and expansion and so it is from the necessity\(^{46}\). Whereas stating it by some Arabs as ("Atani Swaka") is a narration related by Al-Far’a solely, which is odd and there is no pretext for it\(^{47}\). For his part, Ibn Malik justified a reason of his choice for this view as he said: ("I chose what they directed to for two reasons: One of them: a consensus of the scholars of language on a meaning of the saying: "Qamo Swaka" ('They stood except you'), and the second: there is who judged of its circumstantiality and it is not conjugated\(^{48}\). Then, he mentioned that it was occurred in Arab’s speech in their prose, in poetry, and it was added or started with and the other of the uttering factors\(^{49}\), and from that the Prophet’s saying (Allah prayer and peace be upon him) { I asked my Lord not to inflict on my nation an enemy except from themselves}\(^{50}\).
Third: Al-Ramani and Al-Ekberi directed to that ("Swa") is an adverb mostly and not as an adverb in little\(^{51}\), and Ibn Hisham chose this view\(^{52}\), and followed by Sheikh Khalid Al-Azhari\(^{53}\). Abo Al-Qasem disagreed the grammarians as he considered ("Swa") a noun correlated to addition, and has no relation with the circumstantiality.
Al-Zajaji said: (Whereas the adverbs like: "behind", "in front of", "between", "below", "above", "towards", "at", "with", and what similar are more of the adverbs,}

(\(^{39}\) See: Shareh Al-Tasheel: 2/316.
(\(^{40}\) See: Al-Enssaf: 1/252, Al-Tabyeen: 419, Tawjeeh Al-Lam’a: 244. Shareh Al-Mufsal: 2/61-62, and Ertisaf Al-Dhreb:
3/1546.
(\(^{41}\) See: Shareh Al-Tasheel: 2/316.
(\(^{42}\) See: The Sentences in Grammar: 61/62.
(\(^{43}\) See: Al-Enssaf: 1/253.
(\(^{44}\) See: Al-Enssaf: 1/254.
(\(^{45}\) See: Shareh Al-Mufsal: 2/62.
(\(^{46}\) See: Al-Enssaf: 1/255.
(\(^{47}\) Shareh Al-Kafeyah Al-Shafeyah: 2/716.
(\(^{48}\) Ibid: 2/717.
(\(^{49}\) Verfied by Muslim from the section of the Seditions: 19, and Malik in Al-Mot’a the section of Holy Qur’an: 35, and Ibn Majah in the Seditions: 9, Ahmmad: 4/123,332, which is from the evidences of Shareh Al-Kafeyah Al-Shafeya: 2/717.
(\(^{51}\) See: A’wdhah Al-Masalik: 2/241
(\(^{52}\) See: Shareh Al-Tasreeh Ala Al-Tawdheeh: 1/560.)
and in what we mentioned there is an evidence on the rest, whereas nouns such as: "shabih", "shabeeh", "Swa", "Saw'a", "Qurba", "Lada", "Kol", and so on. What understood of his speech that he directed to that ("Swa") is a noun and has no relation with the circumstantiality, whereas Ibn Al-Kassab was sufficed in presenting the grammatical views in this matter without choosing any certain view.

**Actions of the Active Participle if it is in a Meaning of the Past:**

One of the controversial issues in which the grammarians disagreed about it is the issue of the actions of the active participle in the meaning of the past or gone, where many of the grammarians didn't give permission to operate it in past or gone, and some of them permitted its action in the past and to this matter, Ibn Al-Kassab referred by saying: (So it is not said that "Zaid Dhareb Amr Amiss" (Zaid was hitting Amr yesterday) and as Allah Almighty saying: {While their dog stretched his forelegs})

The grammarians on this matter are in two views:

**First view:** Sebawai and the Basri Public as well as most of the Kufains directed to that it is impermissible that the participle works if it in meaning of the past, so it is not permitted to say: ("Hatha Dhareb Zaid Amiss" (This is not hitting Zaid yesterday) and ("Qatel Baker Amiss") (Killing Baker yesterday), because it is running in the path of the common nouns. Sebawai justified non-working of the participle in the past: as he said: ("Je'to Ith Abdullah Qa'im" (I came as Abdullah is standing), and " Je'to Ith Abdullah Yaqoom" ( I came as Abdullah stands). He said in another position: ("Dhareb Zaid" is not working on "Dharbto Zaid", and "Dharbto Amr")

Whereas Ibn Al-Waraq I found him enquiring about the action of the participle saying: (Why is permitted to the participle to work as the verb, if it is referred to the adverbial and reception and this meaning is not permitted in it if it is referred to the past or gone, and obliged with one facet, which is the genitive case?), and he answered by saying: (Because the origin of the nouns is not to work except in the genitive case, and the origin of the verbs is to work in the object). They protested for the correctness of their view, that there is no resemblance between the past verb and the participle in its meaning, and Ibn Yaeesh said: (If it in a meaning of the past, you don't work it since there is no present between it and the past just when you see that "Dhareb" is not on the pattern of "Dharab", and not like it in its particles and stillness). Ibn Akeel said: (it is similar to the verb which is in its meaning is quasi to it in meaning but not in uttering and say: "Hatha dhareb Zaid Amiss" (This is hitting Zaid yesterday), but it could be in a genitive addition).

---

(55) Surat Al-Kahaf, from Ayah: 18.
(56) Al-Azhar Shareh Edhehar Al-Asrar: 250.
(59) Al-Kitab: 2/127.
(60) The Reasons of Grammar: 1/301.
(61) The Reasons of Grammar: 1/301.
The summary of the grammarians' views aforementioned showed that the secret in the condition of the actions of the participle is the resemblance, i.e., its resemblance to the present verb bearable on it which refers to the present and future, so if the participle was a referential of the past tense the resemblance of the present verb removed, and thus there is no facet to its work. Through the previous views the matter clarified that what pushed the Basri grammarians and Sebawai to not work the participle as a past is that the participle works if refers to the adverbial and reception.

Second view: Al-Kessay maintained that the participle works in a meaning of the past, which is permitted to say: ("Hatha Dhareb Zaid Amiss")65, Hisham and Ibn Madha'a agreed upon him. Ibn Yaessh said: (Al-Kessay from the Kufains directed to the permissibility of working participle if it is in a meaning of the past, and to say: "Hatha Dhareba Zaid Amiss")66. Al-Kessay inferred the correctness of what he directed to by the following:

Firstly: Allah Al-Mighty said: {And their dog stretched his forelegs at the entrance}67, where ("Basset") (means stretched) was worked in the forelegs, which is past.

Secondly: Al-Kessay related of Arabs their saying: "Hatha mar be Zaid amiss" (this passed Zaid yesterday), who worked it as in the genitive case, and Allah Al-Mighty saying: {[He is] the cleaver of daybreak and has made the night for rest}68. The grammarians reacted to what Al-Kessay protested for by saying: the Ayah is on the tale of the adverbial, and Al-Zamakhshari said ( "Basset Theraaihe" = stretching its forelegs is a tale of past adverbial; because the participle is not working if it was in meaning of the past)69, whereas what Arabs related by saying: ("Hatha mar be Zaid amiss") = (this is passing by Zaid yesterday), there is no evidence for it70, and the grammarians directed to that the adverb and genitive have the smell of the verb71, and Al-Radhey said: (The adverb and the genitive are only be in accusative case)72. Al-Radhey Al-Esterbadi said: (Al-Sarafi said: the best thing to say here is that the accusative of the participle as a second object is a necessity, which is not added to it)73, whereas Ibn Al-Kassab was sufficed to present the matter without choosing any certain view.

The Distinction Comes AS Definite

The distinction: is an indefinite in meaning of (Min), which is nominative for a sentence, singular number, ambiguous amount, resemblance or difference, such as: ("Tasbaba Zaid A’raqn")74 which means (Zaid poured with sweat), and ("Taba Zaid Nafsan") which means (Zaid pleased himself), and as Allah Almighty saying:

---

64 Alfaiate Ibn Malik: 3/181. See: ‘Awdhah Al-Masalik to
67 Surat Al-Kahaf, from Ayah: 18.
68 Surat Al-A`am: from Ayah: 96.
69 Al-Kashaf: 2/709.
72 Shareh Al-Radhey: 3/417.
73 Shareh Al-Radhey: 3/418.
74 See: Ham'a Al-Hawam'a: 2/336.
(Wa Isht'ala Al-Ra 'is Shebah) which means (My Head Filled With White)\(^{75}\), that is the white of the head burned\(^{76}\). The grammarians differed in coming the distinction as a definite, and for that Ibn Al-Kassab referred when said: (the distinction is not but an indefinite for being originally, and getting the wanted purpose, which is nominative of the positional thumb, in contrary to the Kufains\(^{77}\), who cited the verse by saying: the self-pleased Oh, Qais of Amro)\(^{78}\).

The grammarians on this matter divided into two views:

First: the Basri grammarians and on top of them Sebawai directed to that it is impermissible to define the distinction, and not to be just an indefinite, because the purpose behind is the distinction of the countable noun of it, and other than it cannot be done except by the indefinite for being lighter than the definite\(^{79}\). The evidence for that is Sebawai’s saying (that it is not working in indefinites and it not to be but an indefinite)\(^{80}\), and among those who directed to this view, Al-Mubarad\(^{81}\), Ibn Al-Saraj\(^{82}\), and Al-Zajaji\(^{83}\). Al-Mubarad said: (the distinction is not to be a definite)\(^{84}\). Ibn Al-Saraj said: (To be known that the nouns which are on accusative case in distinction should not be but indefinite one refer to the genders)\(^{85}\). The Basri grammarians protested for being come an indefinite in several matters:

1. The distinction shows what preceded, as Ibn Yaeesh said: (Be known that distinction, Exjesus, and illustration are one, and the intended thing is lifting ambiguity and removing confusion)\(^{86}\).
2. The distinction is illustrated by the indefinite, because it is lighter than the nouns\(^{87}\).
3. The distinction is similar to the adverbial as each one of them is mentioning for showing and lifting ambiguity, if you said: "I have twenty", it could be meant kinds of the countable nouns, but when you say: "Dirham" or "Dinar", so you removed this ambiguity\(^{88}\).
4. If it is a definite, so it permitted to come elliptical, Al-Shatebi says: (if it is defined correctly, then its ellipsis would be correct also, but its ellipsis is not true and it never come in their talking)\(^{89}\). The Basri grammarians construed what has come in Holy Qur’an as accusative on the distinction, which is a

---

\(^{75}\) Surat Mariam: Ayah 4.

\(^{76}\) See: Ham'a Al-Hawam'a: 2/340.


\(^{78}\) Al-Azhar Shareh Edhehar Al-Asrar: 348-349.

\(^{79}\) See: Shothoor Al-Thahab: 1/315, and E'telaf Al-Nusreah: 44.

\(^{80}\) Al-Kitab: 1/204-205.

\(^{81}\) See: Al-Muqtadhab: 3/32.

\(^{82}\) See: Al-Ossoul in Grammar: 1/222.

\(^{83}\) Shareh Jumal Al-Zajaji for Ibn A'sfour: 2/423.

\(^{84}\) Al-Muqtadhab: 3/56.

\(^{85}\) Al-Ossoul: 2231.

\(^{86}\) Shareh Al-Mufasal: 2/36.

\(^{87}\) See: Shareh Al-Mufasal: 2/37.

\(^{88}\) See: Shareh Al-Mfasal: 2/36.

\(^{89}\) Al-Maqaed Al-Shafeyah: 3/526.
definite: As Allah Almighty saying: \{except one who makes a fool of himself\}⁹⁰, and \{Which was thankless for its means of livelihood\}⁹¹ by several interpretations such as: first: that ("Nafsaho" = himself) is an object to the verb ("Safha" = makes a fool of himself), because it is in meaning of ("perished")⁹². He rejected this interpretation that the inclusion of the verbs meaning of some of them is not measured and so Abo Hayan directed to say: ("the inclusion is not measured")⁹³. Second: that is "Nafsaho" = (himself) is accusative on similarity of object, Abo Hayan said: (or similar to object on the others saying)⁹⁴. He also rejected this interpretation, that this saying is impermissible and for that he referred by saying: (while it is similar to object so it is specific of adjective and is not permitted in the verb)⁹⁵. Third: that "Nafsaho" is assertion for omitted confirmer, and the estimation is: "except who makes fool of himself", Abo Hayan said: (or assertion for omitted confirmer estimated as who made himself fool)⁹⁶. But, this saying is in contrary to the original because the origin is to mention the assertor and the confirmer, and omitting the confirmer and maintaining the assertor is not permitted on the view of the verifiers like Ibn Malik and Abo Hayan. Al-Sayouty referred to this by saying: (in asserting the omitted a controversy, as Al-Khaleel, Sebawai, Al-Mazni, Ibn Taher and Ibn Kharoof were permitted it, it is said: in "who hit himself Zaid", who himself hit Zaid)⁹⁷.

Forth: that "Nafsaho"=(himself), is accusative on the type of the reduced and the estimation is "Safha fi Nafsaho"= (makes fool of himself), so when the genitive noun omitted the noun got accusative, Abo Esshaq said: (that he makes fool of himself in meaning he makes himself fool, and the preposition omitted in non-positional and Allah Almighty said: \{There is no blame upon either of them. And if you wish to have your children nursed by a substitute\}⁹⁸, and the meaning is to get your children nursed, so the preposition is omitted unconditionally)⁹⁹. He also rejected this interpretation that the omission of the preposition confined on hearing without measuring it and from this the saying of Abo Hayan: (And dropping the preposition is not measured)¹⁰⁰. What stated definite with "Aleph" and "Lam" in the poetry¹⁰¹ was interpreted by the Basri grammarians, that "Aleph" and "Lam" are additional, and Al-Sayouty referred to this by (making "Lam" additional)¹⁰². I have to say that what all the Basri grammarians directed to of the saying depend on the interpretation, estimation and ellipsis, and it is known that the sayings which have no interpretation, estimation and ellipsis are better than the sayings that have interpretation, estimation and ellipsis and the

---

(⁹⁰) Surat Al-Baqrah: Ayah 130.
(⁹¹) Surat Al-Qassas: Ayah 58.
(⁹²) Majaz Al-Qur'an: 1/56.
(⁹⁶) Ibid.
(⁹⁷) Ham'a Al-Hawama: 3/171.
(⁹⁸) It is stated in the text of Al-Zajaj in this figure, but it is stated in Holy Qur'an by the narration of Hafis of Asim.
(¹⁰¹) Previously verified.
(¹⁰²) Ham'a Al-Hawama: 2/345.
The evidence is the saying of Al-Radhey: (the origin is non-estimation, without a necessity to it).\(^{103}\)

Second view: The Kufi grammarians and Ibn Al-Tarawa directed to that the distinction could be a definite,\(^{104}\) and they protested against the correctness of what they directed to of the hearing from Holy Qur'an, Allah Almighty saying: {except who makes a fool of himself},\(^{105}\) and His saying: {that was insolent in its way of living},\(^{106}\) and from the Prophetic Hadeeth: {Blood shed}.\(^{107}\) Al-Far’a said: (His saying, Allah Almighty: {Except who makes a fool of himself}),\(^{108}\) Arabs put "Safha" on "Nafsaho", which is indefinite, as well as Allah Almighty saying: {That was insolent in its way of living},\(^{109}\) which is from the definite as indefinite, because it is explained speech, and the explained speech is mostly in Arabs speech indefinite, as your saying: "I bored him patiently", and his saying: Allah Almighty said: {But if they give up willingly to you anything of it}.\(^{110}\)\(^{111}\) They also protested by the poet’s saying who referred to the expression "wa tabto alnafs" = (pleased the self).\(^{112}\) The evidence here: the permissibility of defining the distinction in his saying (wa tabat alnafs = pleased the self) on the view of the people of Kufa,\(^{113}\) and this is also referred to by Ibn Al-Kassab,\(^{114}\) and he rejected the pretext of the Kufains concerning an increase in the speech and estimation of it: wa tabto Nafsan= to please a self.\(^{115}\) They also protested against the prose of Arab by their saying: ("Ma fa'alat alkhamsat a'sher aldirham" = What fifteen dirham did)\(^{116}\), and they said "Zaid made a fool of himself", and "Abdullah has pain in his head"\(^{117}\). It’s clear from Al-Far’a’s speech that the origin and most in the distinction to be indefinite (and the explained in most of the speech is an indefinite)\(^{118}\), but this abundance didn’t prevent him to accept what stated of Arabs as definite without estimation or interpretation, whereas Ibn Al-Kassab mentioned the views in this matter and he rejected a pretext of the people of Kufa as we said without weighing out a certain view or bringing a new view or alternative opinion.

\(^{103}\) Shareh Al-Radhey: 1/303.
\(^{104}\) See: Tawdheeh Al-Maqased and Al-Masalik: 2/727.
\(^{105}\) Surat Al-Baqrah: Ayah 130.
\(^{106}\) Surat Al-Qassas: Ayah 58.
\(^{108}\) Surat Al-Baqrah: Ayah 130.
\(^{109}\) Surat Al-Qassas: Ayah 58.
\(^{110}\) Surat Al-Ness’a: Ayah 4.
\(^{112}\) Previously verified.
\(^{113}\) See: Al-Badee in the Science of Arabic: 1/207.
\(^{114}\) See: Al-Azhar Shareh Edhehar Al-Asrar: 349.
\(^{115}\) Ibid.
\(^{116}\) See: The Meanings of Qur'an for Al-Far’a: 2/33.
\(^{117}\) See: Al-Ossoul in Grammar: 2/230.
\(^{118}\) The Meanings of Qur’an for Al-Far’a: 1/79.
Conclusion

After accomplishing the writing of this research paper I concluded the following results:

1- Ibn Al-Kassab has pursued highlighting the controversy on the accusative nouns which is the topic of the controversy among the grammarians.

2- Ibn Al-Kassab has proved that the adverbial does not come forward its owner whether it is genitive by addition or by preposition because the adverbial is belonging to the owner of the adverbial which is abstaining at all grammarians except Ibn Kaissan.

3- Ibn Al-Kassab keened in his presenting the controversial matters to mention the views of Basri and Kufi scholars and ascribing these views and sayings to their owners.

4- Ibn Al-Kassab mentioned that the grammarians do not permit the actions of the participle in meaning of the past and the others permitted operating it in the past as he mentioned that Al-Kessay of the Kufains who permitted operating it if it in meaning of the past and he cited by Allah Almighty saying {And their dog stretched its forelegs}.

5- Ibn Al-Kassab mentioned that the views of the grammarians in syntax (Swa=except), some of them said that it is not but an adverb, others said that it is a noun and an adverb, the rest said it is mostly an adverb and non-adverb in little, whereas another group of the grammarians considered it a noun correlated to an addition and has no relation to the circumstantiality.

6- Ibn Al-Kassab mentioned the controversy of the scholars in using the distinction of the accusative noun as a definite as the grammarians prevented that the accusative noun to be a definite and not to be but an indefinite in contrary to the Kufi grammarians and they protested in what stated by the hearing, and Ibn Al-Kassab talked about that and reversed the Kufains' pretext but without bringing a new view.
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