

# Grammatical Semantics in Verbs

## (Semantics in Model Verbs)

Hazim Yousif Naser, Dr. Amir Moqaddam Mottaqi, Dr. Aasaad Khalaf Alawadi

### **ABSTRACT**

*(Was /Kana/)Wa Akhwatouhaor so-called Model Verbs have been called Model, because they do not complete the meaning of the sentence with the presence of the excerpt only, but you cannot get benefit from it unless it is found an accusative after the excerpt, and there are Relatives to (Was /Kana/)and they are(Become, Is becoming, Has continued, Has become, Now, Remain, Became, Has been, (be) still, have been, As long as, Not, has been)and it is considered one of the Transcriptional verbs that enter the syntax of the nominal sentences, but its work is to excerpt subject/Mubtada'/ and become the name of (Was /Kana/)and accused the objective /Khabar/ and become its objective and examples of that : **The boy became ill / Asbha Alwaladu Maridan/** .*

**Keywords:** Model Verbs, Semantics, syntax

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Model verbs have a temporal semantic in terms of *past* or *present* verbs, and an Verbal indicative in terms of their occurrence, and after another temporal term related to the same verbs and not by being past or present, and until we identify this we have to look at the origin of each verb of them. <sup>0</sup>

The grammarians differed in the number of *((Was /Kana/)a) Relatives*, and some of them said it was *(Become, Is becoming, Has continued, Has become, Now, Remain, Became, Has been, (be) still, have been, As long as, Not, has been)*.<sup>0</sup> And some of them joined *(Sar) (Aad, Aad, Ghda, Raha, gaa', Qada)*.<sup>0</sup>

*Sibawayh* clarified his opinion on these verbs, as he said: *((This is the chapter on the verb that goes beyond the name of the subject to the name of the objective and the name of the subject and the objective in it for one thing))*.<sup>0</sup>

Also, *Al-Mubarak* spoke about it, and said: *((This is a chapter that transcends the objective and the name of the subject and the objective in it for one thing and that is: *Become, Is becoming, Has continued, Has become, Not*, and there was no way towards them. I know that this section but rather its meaning: The Subject */Mubtada'/* and the objective */Khabar/*, but rather it entered to tell that This happened in the past, and not by an verb from you to others))*.<sup>0</sup>

The first person who called it “*(Was /Kana)Wa Akhwatouha*” is *Ibn Al-Sarra*j in his speech about *(Semi-subject /Shibhu Alfai’l)*, where he said: (“Semi-subject is two-parts: part of them excerpt with *((Was /Kana)Wa Akhwatouha)* and another part excerpt with letters similar to */(Was /Kana)/a/* and the verb)).<sup>0</sup>

These verbs were called by the ancients with several names, which are Model ((but it is called Model for two sides: the first: because they are not indicative of the event, and the second is that it does not take words with its pre-emptive verbs, unlike the verbs required for the pre-emptive and the accusative, it is done with the pre-emptive utterance)).<sup>0</sup>

*Al-Radhi* believed to say that they are verbs that are meaningful to the time and general verb, and that they similar to other verbs in their semantic to the allotted time and differ from them in the way they indicate the type of verb,<sup>0</sup> as well as they are called transcripts */Al-Nawasikh/*, because they transcribe the rule of subject */Mubtada’/*.<sup>0</sup>

And some of them called it (Transcriptional verbs): (because it copied the fixed ruling before it works, and this according to the objective */Al-khaba/* is agreed upon and has no secret because it was accusative after the excerpt. As for the Subject */Al-Ism/*, it seems that it did not change from the excerpt that was before entering it)<sup>0</sup>. That it transcribes the initiation (because it makes copies, that is, a change).<sup>0</sup>

*Ibn Hisham* explained about the Model Verb, saying: ((Whoever claims that it does not denote the event is prevented from this, they are the *Al-Mubrad*, *Al-Farisy*, *Ibn Janie*, *Al-Jurjani*, *Ibn Burhan* and then *Al-Shaloubeen*, and the correct, that they are all indicative of what is except **Not /Laisa/**)).<sup>0</sup>

Through this it has been found that the relationship between *(Was /Kana)Wa Akhwatouha* is dependent on the structural dimension and not indicative on the semantic dimension, except for the general indication of tense, they are patterns related to the issue of attribution because the transcriber is based on canceling the work of the initiation Subject, so entering it on the subject */Al-Mubtada’/* and the objective */Al-Khabar/* Cancels the initial condition and is one of the getting started elements, as it overthrows the mark indicating the chain */Al-damma/* of transmission, which is the vibrio at one end of the chain */Al-damma/* of transmission, and in this case the original predicate */Al-Khabar/*, that turns into a state of accusation, and the accusation is not from the relationship of the chain of transmission as prescribed.

#### **First: Semantic of *(Was /Kana)Wa Akhwatouha*:**

1 - *An indication between the Verbal and the Nominal(Was /Kana)a*, the difference was made in the veracity of these verbs, among the grammarians who said their verb (the conjugation in the past, the present tense, the imperative and the prohibition and the subject)<sup>0</sup>, and (some of them went to it as letters because they are not indicative of the event as other verbs)<sup>0</sup>.

The evidence for its veracity came from five aspects<sup>0</sup>.

**The First:** the connection of excerpt (subject) pronouns with it towards: (I Was */(Was /Kana)/a/*, They Were */(Was /Kana/)* and We were */Kouna/*).

**The Second:** the connection with feminization *Taa’* to it.

**The Third:** its conjugation towards: (Was /(*Was /Kana*)a/, Be /*Yakon*/, have to/*Kun*/, Not to be/*La Takun*/).

**The Fourth:** Entering the properties of verbs towards them: (Has been /*Qad (Was /Kana*)a/, will be /*Sayakon*/).

**The Fifth:** It was Reported from (*Was /Kana*)to do (*Yektan*).

Therefore, it is one of the verbs included in the subject /*Al-Mubtadaa*'/ and the objective /*Al-Khabar*'/ (so the initiator excerpt the analogy to the subject /*Al-Mubtadaa*'/ and its name is called, and the objective /*Al-Mubtadaa*'/ of the subject is an analogy to the verb and is called its /*Al-Khabar*'/)<sup>0</sup>.

And there are those who said ((*Was /Kana*)*Wa Akhwatuha*) that it is a letter and this is what we found at *Al-Mubarak* in one of his opinion and *Al-Zugagy* they went to that it is a letter indicating the past tense, *Al-Zugagy* says: ((the gate of the letters that excerpt the name and accusative the object /*Al-Khabar*'/)<sup>0</sup>, he made *Al-Zugagy* as letters So he disagreed with all the grammarians in this matter, and he might think that *Al-Zugagy* is not intended by this title to direct the word letter to what we go to, and he sees that it is like the title that includes letters, names and verbs, but whoever removes this confusion is another text mentioned by *Al-Suyuti* in *Al-Hamea*, he says : ((And *Al-Zugagy* went to see that (*Was /Kana*)*wa Akhwatouha* are letters)).<sup>0</sup>

As for *Abdul-Qaher al-Jarjani's* opinion on (*Was /Kana*)in terms of letters or verbs, he says: “(They are unrealistic verbs, meaning that they were taken away from the indication of the event. Rather they refer to time only. If I said: Zaid was standing /(*Was /Kana*)*Zaid Qae'man*/, it was like your saying: Zaid stood for indicating the rise in a past time, and when these verbs were taken away from the evidence, the event compensated for the /*Al-Khabar*'/, and it was not silenced by its perpetrator /*Fai'louha*'/)).<sup>0</sup>

The second opinion that *Al-Jarjani* mentioned is that he treated (*Was /Kana*) the treatment of complete verbs, where he says: ((*Ana* takes the course of all other verbs, then he said: Zaid was (*Was /Kana*)*Zaid*/, and kept silent. And that is if he wanted a meaning that occurred an event, as Allah almighty said {*And if the debtor is in a hard time (has no money)*} (Al-Baqarah 280) , And it is called complete <sup>0</sup>, so we notice here in the Qur'anic verse that it was (*Was /Kana*)complete and not from Model verbs as it denotes a meaning or denotes an event, and this view is what we found among most interpreters that (*Was /Kana*)was a complete past verb reported on *Al-Fatih* In the place of asserting the verb of the condition and (with /*Zou*/) an excreted Subject and the sign of excreting is /*WAW*/, it is one of the five names, and here is the meaning of appreciation of the words (and if a rival with difficulty comes) or the meaning (and if it occurs with difficulty) this is explained by *Al-Jarjani* when he cited the Qur'anic verse<sup>0</sup>, and if I read And if it is difficult, i.e. (if the opponent has difficulty), it is permissible, but the meaning of was /(*Was /Kana*)a/ differs here, i.e. meaning that if the debtor who has debt has difficulty, i.e. meaning whoever has difficulty, then look, i.e. the ruling or the matter is a view, which is the view. But here cannot be violated to Qur'an.<sup>0</sup>

*Al-Jarjani* cites in poetry in the Stanza of *Thou-Ramah* the significance of (*Was /(*Was /Kana*)a*/):

*And if it is only an explanation of an hour ... a few, then I am useful to me, a few*<sup>0</sup>

Or winding an hour, and the meaning and that there is no explanation for an hour, that is, as if he said: If there is no other reason to explain a little, then the matter is like this.<sup>0</sup>

Here it is clear to us that the grammarians mentioned (*Was /Kana/*) three types, i.e. they have three meanings, either being (complete, transitive or Model), so complete as we explained above is that it is sufficient for the Subject, for its indication that the thing is in itself, and the transitive and its existence is like non-existence in terms of syntax, And what is Model is to determine the thing on the adjective<sup>0</sup>, and all the words contained therein are included under one of these types, and in some words all these types are tolerated, as in the Allah almighty's saying: "*Verily, therein is indeed a reminder for him who has a heart or gives ear while he is heedful.*" (Qaf 37) In this verse, it can be considered Model, so (a heart) is *Ism* for it, and (it has) related to *Khabar* for it, and it is complete (heart) is a subject for it and (he is) related to it, and it is excessive, so (it has a heart) is a noun */Mubtada'/* and */Khabar/*, and if there is a pronoun in it The matter was *Ism* for her, and he (had a heart), */Mubtada'/* and */Khabar/*, told her. As for the meaning of the verse, interpreters explained it as being for someone who has a heart, that is, a conscious heart, because whoever does not understand his heart is as if he has no heart.<sup>0</sup>

*Abdul-Qaher al-Jarjani* showed the full and Model connotation of (*Was /Kana/*) and how to express it and the semantic meaning it gives, as well as clarified the third meaning of (*Was /Kana/*) that it could be transitive as it is a more grammatical opinion of that and set an example of this meaning towards: (The best of them was Zaid */Inna Afdalahum (Was /Kana/ Zaid/)* then we notice Here it was transitive, and if it was deleted, the meaning would not be disturbed and martyred in the poetic stanza of his *Sheikh Abu Al-Hussein*:<sup>0</sup>

*The horses of the firstborn of Abu Bakr were sublimated*

*over what was the compromise of the Al-arabo*<sup>0</sup>

The witness that *Al-Jarjani* wanted here was (*Was /Kana/*) transitive, and the meaning of the words (on *Al-Musawama Al-Arab*).

Then *Al-Jarjani* touched on the fourth and final beating of (*Was /Kana/a/*), which is to come up with a meaning of (Become */Sara/*) martyred in the poetic Stanza:

*By the end of the desert, it was like a mourning*

*cat, it was a bed of her eggs*<sup>0</sup>

This stanza, which *Al-Jarjani* was martyred, cannot mean its meaning on any type (*Was /Kana/*) advanced.

In this witness, we find that the grammarians clarified to us the meaning of (*Was /Kana/*) here in the meaning of (Became */Sara/*), For example, *Ibn Al-Hajib* shows us that if it is complete, then it must be (chicken) an adverb, then it must be (eggs) in the event that it is chicken and it is spoiled, and the excess is not verbally meaningful (as for the word we will become (chicken)) and the meaning is to inform the eggs that it is (Chicks), in which the pronoun of the affair is not possible, such as the excuse of the transitive, and the model is not straightened because it leads to the opposite of the meaning, because he feels here that the chicks are a precedent over the eggs, so the meaning was the eggs are chicks and it is the opposite of it, because the chicks were eggs so when it was leading to the opposite of the meaning it was not possible to carry On that, and when it was not

possible to get him to one of these aspects, he must be defrauded in a meaning that comes out against him, and he was forced to (Become /Sara/) and the meaning on it.<sup>0</sup>

And through the foregoing, it became evident or known that the model (*Was /Kana/*) gives to this meaning, I mean that it comes out of the meaning (Become /Sara/), and therefore (*Was /Kana/*) in the previous stanza under this third type.

And from the Qur'anic evidence on this meaning, as Allah Almighty said *{And the heaven shall be opened, and it will become as gates, and the mountains shall be moved away from their places and they will be as if they were a mirage.}* (Al-Nabba 19-20), so we find that with the interpreters that (*Was /Kana/*) with the meaning of (Become /Sara/)<sup>0</sup>, In the explanation of the *Al-Kashaf*, we find an explanation of the meaning: ((The large number of its doors opened for the descending of the angels, as if they are only open doors, as his saying and the earth blew us eyes as if all eyes explode and it was said: The doors are roads and paths, i.e. scraping and opening their place and become ways that are not blocked by something that was a mirage as it said it was a waste) means that it becomes something everything, to separate its parts and emissions of its jewels)<sup>0</sup>. In the interpretation of *Al-Baydaway* we find this meaning to him, where he says: ((And it was doors, and it became a lot of cracks, as if all doors or gates were doors. And it was a mirage like a mirage, as you see in the image of the mountains, and it did not remain true to its fragmentation and fragmentation))<sup>0</sup>. As for the author of the interpretation of the balance, in the Almighty's saying "It was a Doors", it shows two opinions in its interpretation, one of which is: the estimation that it was with doors, and the second: there were ways in it that were not before<sup>0</sup>, and that what matters to us is the second opinion that it (*Was /Kana/*) went to Meaning (Become /Sara/), and in the second verse of the Almighty saying *{So it was a mirage}* that is, meaning: "(The running of the mountains and their ramming ends in them to be worn, blown up, and their formation as an abundant deed, like the fluffy cushions as mentioned by God Almighty. Mirage in this meaning))<sup>0</sup>.

Among the Qur'anic evidence for this topic is the Almighty saying: *{And the mountains will be powdered to dust, so that they will become floating dust particles. And you (all) will be in three groups.}* (Al-Waqi'ah 5-7). In the interpretation of this verse to know (*was /Was /Kana/a/*), we also find it in the meaning of (Become /Sara/), when *Al-Alousy* means (Become /Sara/) in terms of among them that it (Become /Sara/) because of the dust, that is, it turned into dust spattered and dispersed, and also in (You Were /Kontom/) meaning that (*Was /Kana/*) also meaning It has become any and you have become wives, i.e. three classes, and each variety is with another class in existence or in dhikr, it is a husband)<sup>0</sup>, and also we saw the owner of the interpretation of the scale gives the same connotation to (*Was /Kana/*) for the previous interpretation of the verse that it is in the meaning of (*Was /Kana/*) where he says: ((*And it was an aerosol spilled*) is the dust and it was said: it is the atom of the dust appearing in the sunbeam entering from the skylight, and the dispersions are separated, and the meaning is apparent, and in his saying (*and you were three husbands*) the husband in the meaning of the type and discourse to the common people))<sup>0</sup>. Likewise, the Qur'anic verse in the Almighty saying: "*And (remember) when We said to the angels: "Prostrate yourselves before Adam." And they prostrated except Iblīs (Satan), he refused and was proud and was one of the disbelievers (disobedient to Allāh)." (Al-Baqarah -34).*"

The grammarians authorized this meaning, because the Arabs borrowed these verbs and anticipated each other's place, so they signed (*Was /Kana/*) location (Become /Sara/) because of their closeness in the

meaning because (*Was /Kana/*) when it was interrupted, it moved from state to state, that is, when we say: (I was absent And I am now present /*Qad Kontou Ghaiban wa Ana Alan Hadiran/*) So too (*Become /Sara/*) has said moving from state to state, towards your saying: (Zaid has become rich) that is, he has moved from state to state to this state as they used (came) in the meaning of (*Become /Sara/*) in their saying: (What was your need?) Because (came) that benefits movement and movement as it was (*Become /Sara/*) as well<sup>0</sup>.

In spite of the fverb that this meaning, which you denote, is acceptable to the grammarians, the opinion of *Dr. Fadel Al-Samarrai* has another opinion, as he said: ((And what I see is that it was not in the meaning of becoming, but has another meaning, because if you replaced (*Become /Sara/*) with (*Was /Kana/*) not blocked Closing it, so if I said instead of the Almighty's saying: {So if the sky was split, then it was a rose like paint} (Al-Rahman 37). Basar is the transformation and the process and this transformation may be after a period of time, as if you say: the clay became a stone and Muhammad became an old man, so the moment may require a long time other than (*Was /Was /Kana/a/*), it folds the time and Allah Almighty said (so it was doors) meaning that this matter from the past as if this is its existence, and about {*Then when the heaven is rent asunder, and it becomes rosy or red like red-oil, or red hide*} (Al-Rahman 37), And it became a rose, or instead of the Almighty saying: (And the sky opened and it was doors and the mountains walked and it was a mirage) And it became doors and a mirage that did not find the meaning as it was then. So, what is meant is a transformation and becoming a process and this transformation may be after a while, as if you say: the clay has become a stone and Muhammad has become an old man. And towards {*and the mountains were clouded, and it was an aerosol wasted*} as if her new condition occurs before looking and watching, as if it were like this since ancient times))<sup>0</sup>

It seems to the research that *Dr. Al-Samarrai* is right in what he went to in one of the aspects, which is the lack of congruence of the meaning of replacing (*Was /Kana/*) with (*Was /Was /Kana/a/*), because if the intention was to match it, the first would have been to replace (*Was /Kana/*) with (*Was /Was /Kana/a/*), but it seems that (*Was /Was /Kana/a/*) Here I have taken from (*Become /Sara/*) the meaning of transformation and transition only which *Ibn Yaish* referred to in explaining of *Al-Mufasal*, and retained the significance of the interruption of time, which suggested that *Al-Musnad* is characterized by *Al-Musnad* from its first existence and it is one of its meanings, and this substitution is at the highest level of rhetoric and accuracy in to say, and it might be that the grammars hinted at it to that effect, and they carried it on it.

**2- Mediate its Khabar and present on it.** The basic principle in this matter is that the Model Verb comes and his name and its /*Khabar/*, for example we say: (*Muhammad was standing*) like the verb and the subject and the object in it, and if it came to other than this authorship it was for a reason required by the place and as if you said: (Muhammad was standing ) Or (he was standing Muhammad) or (standing was Muhammad)<sup>0</sup>, and the presentation of *Khabar* of these verbs and their delay is divided into two parts: Presenting its *Khabar/* according to its names /*Asmao'ha/*, and that was permissible by the grammarians as a whole<sup>0</sup>, if there is nothing to prevent that, following /*Al-Khabar/* of /*Al-Mubtadaa/*.

As for the opinion of *Abdel-Qaher Al-Jarjani* on the issue of presenting its *Khabar*, which is based on the name of (*Was /Kana/*) *Wa Akhwatuha*, it is identical to the opinion of the grammarians that it is permissible, and this is similar to the phrase "Striking Zaid Omar" towards {*fit was a starting Zaid*} (Al-Rum 47), in the verse provides (truly) *Khabar* (*Was /Kana/*) on its name which is (Victory of the Faithful) and here he likened *Al-Jarjani* to presenting the object of the verb to the subject towards (Omar hit Zaid)<sup>0</sup>, and in the verse

that *Al-Jurjani* cited we find that most of the commentators They showed the significance of glorifying the believers, raising their status, qualifying for Sunni dignity, and showing preference for a precedent and a merit, as they made them deserving of Allah to support them<sup>0</sup>, and the author of the interpretation of the balance mentioned a narration in this meaning and in the context of his interpretation of the preceding verse where he said: ((And in it And the narration came from *Umm al-Dardaa* that she said: I heard the Messenger of Allah, may Allah's prayers and peace be upon him and his family, saying: There is no one who responds from his brother's offer, but it was really for Allah to return from him the fire of Hell on the Day of Resurrection and then read: {*And it was true that we support the believers*}, Then we note the introduction here for the sake of serving trotting T on the name to take care of him and care because the Arabs present the statement that is more important to them and they mean by him<sup>0</sup>.

And *Abd al-Qaher al-Jarjani* mentioned this issue with another example towards: (who was your brother), as he indicated that he ((two sides, one of them: that your brother) accused it as *Khabar* that was made (from) a *Mubtadaa'*, and here you make in (*Was /Kana/*) mention to return to it raised with his name that he is, and if It happened because the name could not tolerate the brother, except that it was a *Khabar* for him, and a *Khabar* that was only set. The second face: that you raise the brother and say: Who was your brother? And that if you made your brother a name, and you make of a story that was, and it should be in a place of monument, and a duty Submission, because the interrogation requires the utterance of the speech))<sup>0</sup>, and through the foregoing, *Al-Jarjani* mentioned two aspects in the issue of the first submission: that the name of the interrogative be *Al-Ism* and the sentence (*Was /Kana/*)and its hidden name and its *Khabar*, a *Khabar* for it, and the second opinion: it is a post-lift ( Was) given its name and made the name of the interrogative in the place of a monument of *Khabar* was presented.

*Then Al-Jarjani* touched on clarifying the issue with another example, which is (ie) because it is verbalized, so when you say: (Which one was your brother?) So (i.e. here is *Al-Ism* and the sentence (your brother was) a sentence of a verb and a Subject in a position of *Khabar* for *Al-Mubtada'*(i.e.) And the male attributed to him who is the name of (*Was /Kana/*)and this first face, and here he mentioned a sentence of a verb and a subject so we take the words as a matter of forgiveness, or the transcriber has erred in the expression, and we cannot say here that this opinion is the same as the opinion of **the Kufic**, but the second face is When you say (Which one was your brother?) Here, you raised the brother (*Was /Kana/*) and made any *Khabar*, this is evidence that it is permissible to provide *Khabar* that was on her own, and here he sees that they made his *Khabar* something that must be submitted and is a question, and if this talk is not permissible, it is not permissible to say: (a starting point) Zaid was the one who applied the decree to Can, and it is also inferred that if the effect of the verb is not permissible: (Zaid was struck), it is not permissible for the object to have a question about: (Which of you struck?)<sup>0</sup>.

From the point of view of the speaker, it is noticeable from what was presented in *Al-Jurjani's* speech, but from the point of view of the speaker, here the meaning of presentation varies according to the difference in meaning, as indicated by *Dr. Fadel Al-Samarrai*, where he says: I wanted to tell him to make it *Ism* for the model verb, which I wanted to tell him to make it *Khabar*, and you do not have to make it whatever you want from them *Ism* or *Khabar*, and the meaning is not the same. If you say, for example (with a strong religion, with a preserved offer) the meaning is correct, but if you say (It has a strong offer, with a solid religion)

It is not a saying about its release, then it may be with a view that is not of a religion, as it has been proven that the meaning of the two sentences is different, and so if you insert the defective verb in the two sentences. It is true, but if I said (there was no preserved offer except with a solid religion) I did not make the statement, then this statement is not based on its release, and if the meaning of the two sentences was one in the inventory, then their meaning would be in one but not limited to one).<sup>0</sup>

We conclude from this to limit the issue to what is permissible to provide *Khabar*(*Was /Kana/*) without disagreement over what many grammatists narrated<sup>0</sup>, and here we see that *Al-Jarjani* agreed to present the *Khabar* on (*Was /Kana/*), and here the presentation here is for the sake of specialization or may provide the *Khabar* for attention And take care.

### **The Second: The Semantic of speech Pronoun *Ism* of (*Was /Kana/*):**

It is the custom of the Arabs that they may present a sentence with a pronoun that the sentence explains, after which it is called the pronoun, and the coffins call it the pronoun of the unknown, and in places of intimacy and glorification they say: (He is Zaid is a starting point) and meaning: (*Was /Kana/*): (Zaid is an absolute) meaning of the pronoun is the meaning of the sentence. The meaning will be like this: the matter is increased as a starting point, or the matter is increased as a starting point: it means the matter beyond. <sup>0</sup>

This pronoun comes with the Subjects involved in *Al-Mubtada'* and the *Khabar* towards *Ina Wa Akhwatouha* and his sisters and his sisters, and he and her sisters, and it works in these Subjects. it says that Zaid is going, the distrverb is the conscience of the matter and (Zaid is going) in the places of the *Khabar* of the matter<sup>0</sup>.

In this regard, *Abdel-Qaher Al-Jarjani's* interpretation of the Almighty's saying: "*Is it not a sign to them that the learned scholars (like 'Abdullâh bin Salâm who embraced Islâm of the Bani Israel knew it (as true)?*" (Al-shuaraa-197).As *Al-Jarjani* stood towards this verse, interpreting the reading of Ibn Aamer {if they had no sign to teach him} by using the verse and raising the verse<sup>0</sup>. The story is *Ism* for (be) and (to teach it) a late beginner, and (a verse) is an advance *Khabar*, and its interpretation of this came in accord with what was mentioned by the grammarians in the section (Beginning), that if two names meet, one of which is knowledge and the other is negligence, it is not permissible to inform about the negations with knowledge. *Al-Jarjani* says: ((Know that appreciation is: (Or the story is that the scholars of the Bani Israel should know a verse) as you say: (The knowledge of the Bani Israel is a verse) as you say: (Zaid was not a starting point) You want: (This story was not) so (to know it) A beginner, and (a verse) his experience, and it was presented to him as you say: (from the beginning of Zaid), and as they say: (Tamimi I), (the one who wants you) is based on the above in the chapter on initiation, and it may not be (a verse) raised as the name (be) Because (knowing it) is knowledge, as it is like your saying: (The knowledge of the Bani Israel, but I am more informed than it.) If you make (a verse) the name of (*Was /Kana/*), you must make (to teach it) a place of the accusation that it is the *Khabar*(*Was /Kana/*), then you make the negation *Ism* ( It was) and knowledge is the *Khabar*, as your saying: (He was a young man, Zaid) and (he was the starting point of life) and that is corrupt, and it is not permissible except in the necessity of poetry))<sup>0</sup>.

The owner of the scale indicated in the significance and meaning of the verse that there is a reference to the verses that preceded it and to the result extrverbed from previous stories, and what it includes from the



threat and reprimand to the infidels, and in it a defense of the prophethood of the Prophet (*may Allah's prayers and peace be upon him and his family*) and by protesting it by mentioning it in the Sibling of the first and the knowledge of scholars, the Bani Israel, and defending his book by protesting that it is not from the demons or from the poems of the poets He and his family (peace be upon him) should be informed by scholars of the Bani Israel that they know him by his name mentioned in their books and it is a report of his being a guide)).<sup>0</sup>

And *Al-Jarjani* added that *Sheikh Abu Ali Al-Farsi's* assertion of saying in this verse came in response to *Abu Ishaq Al-Zajaj* ((because he said: (Aya) name (*Was /Kana/*)) and this is an omission without any suspicion. It is not *AbuIshaq* who does not think this is doctrine), how it has been found impossible to make Newlines is informed about it, and knowledge is *Khabar*, and there is no disagreement about the corruption of that, and it is in poetry not much, but it is still slipping in this matter in particular, as if he thought that the speech is a shame of knowledge))<sup>0</sup>.

*Al-Jarjani* inferred to prove what he said: "If (*Ina*) was not fully related, there would not have been more in the Almighty's saying: " *What was the answer of his people except that they said* " (Al-Naml 56), " *What did they say?* " (Al-Jathyah -25), The monument is to be (*Ina*) the name (*Was /Kana/*) and to refrain as the refrain is the monument of knowledge if two knowledge does not come together to say: (it was released in excess) then (to teach him) like his saying: (that they said) and if the knowledge was to make the denial *Ism* is not permissible It remains only to be in (Be */Yakoon/*) the pronoun of the story, as Allah Almighty said {*for it does not blind to sight*} (Hajj 46), so know it))<sup>0</sup>.

The significance of the pronoun of conscience and the intention of this ambiguity, then the interpretation, is a sign of maximizing the matter and exaggerating the matter, for this the content of the interpreted sentence must be something great that he takes care of<sup>0</sup>.

The pronoun of the matter and the story in its different situations, but it wants to exaggerate in maximizing that story, exaggerating its importance and obtaining eloquence in it, from the side of its harms first and its interpretation second, because if the thing is vague then the souls aspire to understand it and have a yearning for it<sup>0</sup>.

*Ibn Aamir* had read (*Was /Kana/*) by virtue of feminization and (a verse) by raising<sup>0</sup>, and the grammarians and commentators mentioned famous interpretative faces for reading the raising and the monument in this verse, one of which is: by raising (a verse) that it is the name of (it was Model) and (to teach him) the *Khabar*<sup>0</sup>, And this aspect of interpretation has been weakened by a group of grammarians and commentators, because it contradicts what they mentioned in the chapter on starting from the meeting of two names: one of which is knowledge and the other is negation, as it is not permissible to tell about the knowledge of deniers. *Al-Jarjani* weakened him, because he says: ((Corrupt is not permissible except in the necessity of poetry))<sup>0</sup>, and *Ibn Yaish* lives by saying: ((This is weak and is not like him except in poetry and the place of necessity and strengthens the first aspect of reading the community))<sup>0</sup>.

Second: By raising (a verse) that it is a prejudice, and (to teach it) a late beginner, and in the (conscience) of the story is its name, and the sentence is a report (it was Model) according to an estimate: (or if the story did not have knowledge of the scholars of the Bani Israel with a verse).<sup>0</sup>And it may be (a verse) the name of (the deficient was) and tell it (to them) and (to teach it) a substitute or *Khabar* of deleted *Al-Ism*<sup>0</sup>, this

interpretation of the reading of the lifting of (Aya) by making it a **Khabar** provided to (was the deficient), and (that He teaches him) a late beginner, and the pronoun of the story is **Ism** for (**Was /Kana/**) and the sentence of **Al-Mubtada'** or the **Khabar** is in the place of erecting a **Khabar** (it was Model) with an estimate: (or if the story did not have knowledge of the scholars of the Bani Israel with a verse), then a group of grammarians and commentators, including them **Al-Jurjani**<sup>0</sup>, and **Makki Al-Qaisi** by saying: ((The best thing is to obscure the story, so the feminization is carried on the feminization of the story))<sup>0</sup>. In fverb, this aspect of interpretation came in line with what was decided by **Sibawayh** and followed by the grammatists in the matter of starting from that if there is a combination of knowledge and denial, the right to know is to be a beginner, and the right to deny that it is **Khabar**<sup>0</sup>.

Third: To be (**Was /Kana/**) complete and (a verse) by raising an Subject, and (to teach it) a substitute or a precedent deleted in the meaning of (or no verse) for them<sup>0</sup>, and this third aspect of reading the lifting in (a verse) by making it a verb of (was And (**Was /Kana/**) complete, and (to teach it) instead of (a verse) or a precedent omitted **Khabar** on the meaning of (or if there was no verse) referred to him, Ibn Hisham by saying: ((If you estimate (it is) complete, then the word is related to it and (Aya) is the one who did it, and (to teach him) instead of (a verse) or a story for a deleted person (that is, to teach him))<sup>0</sup>.

Fourth: by setting up (a verse) as a **Khabar** provided to (it was Model), and (to teach him) the name, and to appreciate the words: (or if the scholars of the Bani Israel did not have a verse) (), and it is also permissible (or they have no verse) to feminize And the monument (verse) (), but reading the audience except Ibn Amer with the monument (verse) that it is **Khabar** provided to (was Model), and (to teach him) the name, and appreciation of the words: (or if they had no knowledge of the scholars of the Bani Israel a verse) then he indicated To her a group of grammarians and commentators, as the glass chose it by saying: ((If I say (it is) then the choice is a monument (a verse) and it is (to teach it) the name (**Was /Kana/**) and it is (a verse) **Khabar(Was /Kana/)**)<sup>0</sup>, and **Al-Tusi** because it is ((the most powerful in Arabic, because (a verse) is an accusation and (to be taught) is knowledge, and the accusation is its **Khabar**, and Sibuei only permits this except in the necessity of poetry))<sup>0</sup>.

After presenting this range of opinions regarding the reading of the raising and the monument in (a verse) from the verse of Allah Almighty {**Have they not had any sign that the scholars of the Bani Israel taught him**} (Al-Shuaraa-197), and he mentioned the interpretative aspects of each reading that the first reading is: the reading of the audience bin However, it is **Khabar** presented to (it was Model) and (to teach him) the name (**Was /Kana/**) is the right thing, because (a verse) he denies and (to teach him) knowledge, then this verse came in line with what the grammarians mentioned in the chapter on starting that if two names one of them is knowledge The other is negligence, so the right to know is to be **Al-Ism** and the right to deny that it is **Khabar**, and the second: reading Ibn **Amer Al-Rifa'a** in (Aya) as it is a **Khabar** provided to (he was Model) and (to teach him) a later beginner, because it needs to cover up the story to be **Ism** for (It was Model) until this aspect of the reading is consistent with what they mentioned in the chapter on initiation, and in this case when estimating the conscience of the story, or the so-called conscience of the matter, here it has an indication which is either the intention of the thumb, then the interpretation, or maximizing the matter and exaggerating the matter, or He just wants to exaggerate that story, or For the significance of the meaning of allocation, as we said (Zaid is the

starting point), or affirmation asserts in addition to glorification and glorification, and the research sees the first opinion is right and that, as is known, lack of appreciation is first of appreciation.

### **Third: Semantic of *Kana* to the Interruption:**

The grammarians differed in the Model indication (*Was /Kana/*) of interruption. *IbnMalik* said: ((And specialized was synonymous with (not removed) a lot)<sup>0</sup>. *Abu Hayyan* said: ((And most of the grammarians went on that (*Was /Kana/*)requires interruption like all the previous verbs, and some of them went to the fverb that it does not require it ... which we grabbed from the mouths of the elders if it was indicative of the past time interrupted like any other past verb)<sup>0</sup>. *Al-Suyuti* said: (“Specialized was synonymous with (still removed) a lot, that is, it comes as a sign always, even if the original rule is to indicate what happened to it in the past with its interruption at a people... or its silence on the interruption and lack thereof in others ... It is always a function that is mentioned in the attributes of Allah Almighty)<sup>0</sup>. Many examples of the charverberistics of Allah Almighty include the words of Allah Almighty {*And Allah was Forgiving, Most Merciful*} (Al-Nisa' 96), and Almighty saying: {*And Allah was all-seeing*} (Al-Nisa'134), And Almighty saying {*We are all about everything*}. (Al-Anbiaa' 81)

As for *Abd al-Qaher al-Jarjani*, he did not differ from the opinion of the grammarians. He sees that (*Become /Sara/*) had two meanings as well, a sign of interruption in the past and a sign of permanence and what is received, and he explains this by saying: ((Because it was and is indicative of time only, the benefit will only be obtained after coming with the *Khabar* as you are If I said: Zaid in the past was not words until you came with *Khabar*, then you say: Zaid your brother in the past, and so if I said: Zaid with what is received, it is not permissible until you say: it is divorced or outward, but it is likened to what went past and what was drained, because it was left tense only)<sup>0</sup>, and here we see with *Al-Jarjani* the semantic meaning of permanence or interruption is the completion of the sentence and according to the context of the *Khabar*, so it is always indicative as the Almighty said {*And Allah was aware of knowledge*} (Al-Nisa' 148), and the author of the interpretation of the balance explained in the Almighty's saying {and Allah was Hearing knowingly} In it, there is an indication of the place of affirmation of the prohibition that is learned from Allah Almighty's saying (Allah does not like speaking openly), that is, it is not necessary to speak out badly from saying that it is not wronged, because Allah hears the word, knowing it knows<sup>0</sup>.

As for the indication (*Was /Kana/*) of a break with: (this poor man was rich)<sup>0</sup>. It does not concern either of them, which defines its meaning as context or context, as if it takes it as an intermediate doctrine between the two doctrines. Perhaps he was among his followers with this *Al-Zamakhshari* view, which holds that “(the phrase“ the existence of something in a past time was a matter of thumb ”and that there is no evidence of a previous lack or an emergency outage)).<sup>0</sup> And close to this contented opinion, which believes that the continuation of the Almighty's saying {*And Allah was a knowledgeable hearing*} (Al-Nisa' 148), ((It is learned from the presumption that God should be a visionary, not from the word (*Was /Kana/*), do not you see that it is permissible (Zaid was sleeping for half an hour then he woke up), and if I said: Zaid was hitter, he did not benefit to continue)<sup>0</sup>.

It is summarized from the foregoing that the grammarians refer to (*Was /Kana/*) sign of interruption of three schools of thought<sup>0</sup>:

The first: He thinks that it benefits interruption.

Second: He believes that it does not restrict him, but rather requires continuity and continuity.

The third: He thinks that it does not concern one of them, but rather tolerates each of them, which is likely to tip one of the stakeholders, but it is context and context.

What appears to be the research is that the original in (*Was /Kana/*)denotes the absolute of the past is a verb, and if it is combined with what is impossible to be confined to the past such as the attributes of Allah (glory be to Him and some) and some of the Holy Qur'an's information, it must be borne upon it, and it indicates that if we said: He will be forgiven Allah is for those who repent, because it is impossible for the hearer to imagine that the forgiveness of Allah (glory be to Him) is confined to the present and the future under the pretext of the indication of the present tense on them. The forgiveness of Allah (glory be to Him and the Almighty) is limited to the pretext of the significance of the verb on the past, so the indication (*Was /Kana/*)if it comes from the context of the fverb that Allah (Glory be to Him Almighty) forgives those who deserve forgiveness and have mercy on him at all times, as well as it is said in the rest of the Quranic verses.

#### **Fourth: the Semantics of Almost /Kada/ and her sisters:**

It is the second type of model verbs, which is (*KadaWa Akhwatouha*) and has singled out the grammar for this type as its own chapter, because the *Khabar* of *KadaWa Akhwatouha* does not come in general, but it is stipulated that the verbal sentence must be present tense, and this is about: the rain almost came down, and the grammarians did not differ about The division of these verbs, although there is a variation in their statistics to some extent, and the verbs of this section are of three types:

**First:** What was established to denote the proximity of the *Khabar*, which is three: (*Kada, Awshka, Karoba*).

**Second:** What was established to signify his hope, which is three: (*Asa, Ikhoulouqa, Hra*).

**Third:** What was established to indicate the initiation of it, which is much of it (*Ansha', tafaq, Jaala, ualaqa, akhaza*), i.e. the division of these verbs into three types: (approach - hope - initiation) is a foregone conclusion<sup>0</sup>.

And *Abdul-Qahir Al-Jarjani* stated in the sentences: ((And among the verbs are verbs that take place in the course of the tools and specialize in different rulings, the first of which: it was and its sisters, and the second: the verbs of the approach, which are with *Al-Jarjani* are verbs))<sup>0</sup>.

He also says in the book the Hundred Subjects: ((The eleventh type of thirteen types: verbs called the verbs of the approach, which raises one name, and focuses the *Khabar*, and the present tense verified her in estimating the source, which is four verbs:

**TheFirst:** (*Assa*). Toward: Zayd may come out, meaning: near Zaid the exit, meaning: greed and hope, and perhaps Zaid means that he will leave.

**Thesecond:** (*Kada*), towards: almost added.

**TheThird:** (*Karoba*), towards: distress Zaid come out.

**TheFourth:** (*Awshaka*), about: Zaid is about to come out, and Zaid is about to get out. <sup>0</sup>

What the research sees is that *Al-Jurjani* did not mention the verbs of hope except (*Assa*) and from the verbs of the approach except (*Kada*) in the book *Al-Muqtisad*, as for (distress and is about).<sup>0</sup> And he mentioned in his book the 100 Subjects, while the verbs of initiation which are: (make, bite, and take, Commented, and created) it was never mentioned. What we will talk about here is (*KanaWa Akhwatouha*), while (perhaps) we will talk about it from the topic of rigid verbs.<sup>0</sup>

As for the issue of *Khabar* of these verbs, the grammarians stipulated in their *Khabar* that they be an verbal sentence<sup>0</sup>, and the grammarians already required three things: one of them: that it raises the conscience of the name, and the second: that it be present, and the third: that it is accompanied by that, these verbs enter the sentence of the beginning And the *Khabar*, but its *Khabar* is only present.

Verbs were placed in the language, as we mentioned earlier, to signify event and time. Of course, this understanding varies from one researcher to another according to what the systems require, as expressed by *Abdul-Qaher Al-Jarjani* in the signs of miracles, where he says: (If we say: (the sun rises), the presence of the verb (rises) indicates that the sun rises at the time of uttering this phrase, That is, at the time of its pronouncement, but the meaning is completely different if we say: (The sun almost rose), the sunrise here has approached a lot, and that the sun did not verbally shine, so the temporal significance differed due to the increase in the verb (Almost /*Kada*/)<sup>0</sup>. (*Almost /Kada*/)led in the sentence a special meaning which is the indication of the imminence of the occurrence of the *Khabar* from the case which is (brightness), and for that reason it was called an approach of verb and therefore this verb has led the transformative sentence (the sun almost shines) to a meaning completely different from the original meaning of the sentence (the sun rises ).

And *Abdul-Qahir Al-Jarjani* explained the above issue, which is the indication of the verb (*Almost /Kada*/)as is the case in the Book of *Al-Muqtassid*in terms of its grammatical connotation, where he indicated that the verb in your saying: "Zaid is almost raised" raised, and if his location does not fall into the name, he likened it to your saying: "Zaid was It may be said: (Zaid was almost standing) as you say: (Zaid was standing), and if it was so the verb was the location of the name in the estimate, and if it did not appear to the word, but rather left the use of the name of the subject here, he did not say: (almost Zaid exists) for the sake of almost being the subject of approximation of the case and the name of the subject whose formula does not refer to the situation without the past, do you not see when you say: (I passed with an existing man yesterday and increased now and tomorrow, then when the subject's name was not subject to the case as he put (he does)), and he was (almost For the approximation of the case, follow the example of (he does), to be more evidence of the requirement (*Almost /Kada*/)because if it was said: (Almost more has existed), he may think that it is in the indefinite and past future, and if the matter is what we describe, the verb was not raised in your saying: (Al-Zaid almost rose) If their refusal to use the name here prevents his appreciation, it must be said in your saying: Never do so: You are set up without a verb at all, because he does not use the word verb to set him up, and that is not by anyone saying that the monument must have a Subject. And you should be appreciated towards saying: "Do not be distrverbed, or behold," as you say: "yourself, O enemy." It was not in this verb that they did not say: "Do not exceed you." As you say: "Spread you and more"<sup>0</sup>.

*Al-Jarjani* continues to say: ((So, also, when I found the words steadily to raise the verb in every position suitable for the name, you must estimate the name as it does not appear to the word about it to say in (almost added)(Al-Zayd rose almost) This was stated in the Stanza:

*She refused to understand, and what she almost became depressed,  
and how similar she separated her as she whistled<sup>0</sup>*

Thus some of our companions narrated it and mentioned that he found it in the old script and the meaning on that is that you do not see you say: I spoke, and I almost did not speak and returned, and I almost did not return))<sup>0</sup>, The meaning: He says: I returned to my people after I returned to them because I was on the verge of damage, and how similar it was, so I regretted it.

And the advent of the *Khabar* of these verbs was singular and rarely stated, except in the necessity of poetry, as stated in the previous house is the words of the poet:

*She refused to understand, and what she almost became depressed,  
and how similar she separated her as she whistled*

We note that the witness in his saying: (I almost blatantly) where the *Khabar* of (*Almost /Kada/*)came (which is (bleak)) is a single name on the original and this is anomalous, but the analogy is the use of the verb (), and their saying in the proverb: (Perhaps al-Ghuwair is miserable), so he said Siboh and Abi Ali It is from the Basrians that (misery) is a miserable *Khabar*<sup>0</sup>, which is singular and made essential by a rare anomaly, and the doctrine of the public and the Kufic is that his experience is omitted and appreciation (to be miserable). What the audience said.

It is a similar indication between (*Almost /Kada/*) and (May */Assa/*) that you can use (*Ana*) with *Khabar*(*Almost /Kada/*)likening it to (May */Assa/*), and it may be similar (May */Assa/*) to (*Almost /Kada/*), but they delete In poetry (*Anna*) from (May */Assa/*) as in poetic stanza:

*Perhaps the anguish that I have been in,  
behind him will be a close vagina<sup>0</sup>*

And the witness: The occurrence of the *Khabar*, may the present tense be abstrverbed from (*Anna*) and that is a few. <sup>0</sup>

#### **Semantics of negative for ALMOST /KADA/:**

The grammarians disagreed on the meaning of denial (*Almost /Kada/*) on three opinions:

**Thefirst:** that negating it is negation, proving it is proof, like all other verbs.

**Thesecond:** That her negation is proof, her proof is negative.

**Thethird:** that negating it in the past is proof, and in the future like all other verbs.

And on the first doctrine there are many grammarians and interrogators<sup>0</sup>, as this view was mentioned and *Ibn Al-Hajib* tended to him, where he said: (The correct view is that if the negation entered into (*Almost /Kada/*) he was with her like all other verbs in the absence of that meaning, then the meaning of (what almost) did not matter. This is known from their language in all other verbs, to run (*Almost /Kada/*) its course, so if something came in contrast to this known rule, it must be interpreted))<sup>0</sup>.

As for the second doctrine, it was said by a group of grammarians<sup>0</sup>, the first agrees in the case of proof, but in the negative, on the contrary, the confirmation (*Almost /Kada/*) is a denial of the *Khabar*, and its negation is a confirmation of it, where he said in the spirit of meanings: ((It was said in the proof is a negation, In the negative, there is proof: the meaning of (almost Zaid came out) a boat and did not go out, and it is corrupt because its meaning is the exit approach, but as to whether or not it is a mental matter is beyond the meaning, and if what he said was true, it would be (a boat) and the like, and no one said it))<sup>0</sup>.

This is contrary to the measurement of the linguistic situation, and that is why it is popular among the people of syntax, Abu Al-Ala 'Al-Ma'ari enjoined him, saying:

*I mean this era what is the word  
in my tongue and trample  
If used in the form of infidelity, it is proven,  
and if it is proven, it takes the place of disbelief*

*Al-Shehab Al-Hijazi* answered by saying:

*This riddle almost clogged my idea,  
and I almost cured it with roses  
This is an answer that satisfies the first people,  
and refuses to understand each country*

And here is a literary story mentioned by *Sheikh Abd al-Qaher* in the signs of miracles, because *Anbasa Al-Ansi*, the poet, said: *Dhu al-Ramah* presented *the Kufa*, and he stood up to his camel with a *Al-Haie'ba* chant, his first poem:

*A two places May peace be upon you both  
in the distance and far away would like and advise*

Until he reached his saying:

*If a loving opinion is changed,  
Rais Al Hawa can no longer love the love of water.*

In the present, *Ibn Shibrama* called to him: *O' Ghilan* - the name of *Dhul-Ramah*: I see him have left.

He said: Then he hanged his camel and made it late and thought about, then he said: (I did not find) Awad (Almost not)<sup>0</sup>.

*Anabsa* said: When I left, my father spoke, and he said to me: *IbnShibrama* made a mistake when he denied *Dhul-Ramah*, and *Dhul-Ramah* sinned when he changed his hair because *IbnShibrama* said, but this is as Allah Almighty says: “*some darkness over some of it, when it turns out.*” (Al-Nour 40). He did not see her nor was he hard enough.

This guidance for the saying of *Dhul-Ramah* is based on the first saying, which means: If the love of every lover changes, he does not approach my love of change, and if he does not approach it, then it is far from him, then this is more than he says: He did not leave because he may not be yesterday, and he is close to the wound, unlike the informer About him denying *Al-Barah's* approach. And the opinion of these people is reversed, because your saying: (Almost Zaid rises) means: proving the approach to standing, and this is a proven meaning, and taking the negation of the verb is not from its subject, but it is a mental issue, which is that if something is judged by the proximity of existence, it is known that it does not exist, and it is meaningful (*Almost /Kada/*) proven<sup>0</sup>, and he is close to standing up, and if their saying is correct, it would be correct for our saying to be: near the rise of Zaid. Meaning: It is not near Zaid. This is known for its corruption, and as Allah Almighty says {*and if they were close to fascinating you*} (Al-Israa 73). Likewise, Allah Almighty said: “*When he puts out his hand, he can barely see it.*” He informed the denial of the vision that he would say: He did not see it, because he who did not see may approach the vision unlike someone who has not been close. The companions of the second view inferred the return of *Dhul-Ramah* from his house, which is among the people of the tongue, as is well known.

As for *Abd al-Qaher Al-Jarjani's* opinion regarding the significance of the negation (*Almost /Kada/*) in terms of showing that the original in (*Almost /Kada/*) is that its negation is to deny the first verb as is the saying of the first, except that it may use its negation to signify the occurrence of the verb after slow and effort, and after it occurred far away in Think. *Abdel-Qaher* indicated that this was a custom made, and it is intended to compare the case of one who did the matter after trouble and effort with a state of distance from the verb.

As for inference in exile, Allah Almighty said: “*They slaughtered it and did not do anything.*” (Al-Baqarah 91). His answer is that ((it is carried on two times, that is: they slaughtered it after repeating the matter to them by slaughtering it and they almost did not slaughter it before that, and they did not approach the slaughtering, but they denied it with the greatest denial, according to the evidence of their saying:)) {*Do you take us for fun?*} (Al-Baqarah 67), and if he understands the evidence from it, then because the proof of the verb is understood from the context, that is, the Almighty saying {then they slaughtered it} not from “almost” as mentioned above, and for this reason the evidence did not help in our saying: Zaid died and could hardly travel, when it was not contextual))<sup>0</sup>.

This is the view of *Abu Al-Fath bin Jani*, *Abdul-Qaher al-Jarjani* and *Ibn Malik* in Al-Tasheel. *Ibn Malik* said in the facility: ((It denies almost informing that the verb is difficult or not, and not approaching it))<sup>0</sup>. He apologized in the explanation of *Dhul-Ramah* for changing his house as he changed it to pay the possibility of such use. Here is the saying of *Dhul-Ramah*, so it is not a mistake for *al-Jarjani*, and as it was stated in the



signs of miraculousness ((*Dhul-Ramah* mistook when he changed his poetry to *Ibn Shibrama's* saying, but this is as Allah Almighty says: “some darkness over some of them, when he turns out his hand”) <sup>0</sup>

And violating the original principle requires presumption as it was decided, and may make the Almighty saying: (So slaughter it) is a presumption of this use in the aforementioned verse.

Here the research sees that the opinion that says context, that is, the context of the verb, that gave the indication of negation, and as they say the emergence of the context is presented in advance of the appearance of *Dhu al-Qurain*, that is, as if we said: (I saw a sea), then the mind goes to the known sea, and if we say (I saw a sea speaking), here is the indication of the context The presumption of speech is given to the author of the presumption.

As for the owners of the third school of thought, they protested the evidence of the owners of the second school of thought, observing the time, and its corruption has become clear.

And in the verse of Allah Almighty *{When He brings out His hand, He can hardly see it}* (Al-Nur 40). *Ibn Yaish* sees that he saw her after the diligence and despair of her vision, and most interpreters say that the meaning does not see his hand<sup>0</sup>, because the negation of the vision approach is more informed than the negation of the vision itself<sup>0</sup>, but *Ibn Yaish* inferred his opinion by saying evil arises<sup>0</sup>:

***She refused to understand and was almost depressed***

He is also quoted on the Almighty's saying: *{they slaughtered it and did almost what they did}* (Al-Baqarah 91). Because there is presumptive evidence for it and it is his saying (*Fa'bat*). As in the verse, there is evidence indicating that they *{FaZabahouha}*.

And *Dr. Fadel Al-Samarrai* suggested the opinion of *Ibn Yehish* at the beginning. He said: ((It seems to me that the opinion mentioned by *Ibn Yehesh* is more correct in terms of the Almighty saying: *{Am I better than this one who is insulting and hardly shows}* (Al-Baqarah -71). Moses (peace be upon him) There is no doubt that Moses was indicating the significance of the multiple arguments mentioned by the Qur'an with Pharaoh. If we had gone to the first opinion, he (peace be upon him) would have been dumber not clarifying or approaching the expression)<sup>0</sup>. What appears to be the significance of the evidence in this verse is not derived from the term (Almost */Kada/*), but rather is derived from several clues, the most important of which are:

- 1- The many arguments mentioned by the Qur'an and cited by *Dr. Fadel Al-Samarrai*.
- 2- Moses (peace be upon him) was sent by Allah Almighty and it is impossible for Allah to send a messenger that does not appear, because it is inconsistent with the desired purpose which is to communicate the message to the people.
- 3- The speech was made by Pharaoh does not require him to conform to the situation, because it does not exclude that Pharaoh had intended to mocking Moses (peace be upon him) and belittling him.

In spite of this, *Dr. Fadel Al-Samarrai* later combined the two views and said: ((And it is possible to combine the two views by saying that the original is what we mentioned and the first meaning can be sought with the clues)<sup>0</sup>.

## II. RESULTS

1- Abd Al-Qahir al-Jurjani believes that that with regard to Kana (was) and its sisters in terms of their significance being nouns, verbs, or extra. The first opinion is that they are unreal verbs, which means that the significance of the event is disregarded. Rather, they indicate time only. If you say, Zaid was, in such example, the significance of the event is disregarded. The second opinion that Al-Jarjani mentioned that (was) is dealt as perfect verb. He inferred by the Almighty saying (And if the debtor was in straitened circumstances) (Al-Baqarah 280). Then we note here in the Quranic verse that (was) is mentioned as a perfect verb not as deficient verb, as they indicate a meaning or signify an event. The third opinion or the third meaning of (was) is that it could be a redundant, as is the most grammarians think about it. He gave an example 'Zaid id the best'; we note that (was) is a redundant and if it is deleted, the meaning will not change.

2- Abd Al-Qahir Al-Jurjani considers the issue of prioritizing the Kana predicate in accusative case based on the name of Kana and its sisters, as it corresponds to the opinion of the grammarians that it is permissible, and he inferred, by saying of Almighty Allah: "And was due from us to aid those who believed" (Al-Rum 47). Prioritizing the Kana predicate over the subject due to the care and attention.

3- Al-Jurjani clarified the issue of assessing the story's pronoun as a name for (was) thinks that the pronoun of the matter and the story regardless of its conditions. But he wants to magnify the glorification of that story and exaggerate its matter, and clarify rhetoric in it, in terms of point of hiding it first and interpreting it secondly, because if the thing is ambiguous, souls are looking forward to understanding and longing for it.

4- As for that Kana indicates to discontinuity, we think that Abd Al-Qahir al-Jurjani did not detract from the opinion of the grammarians that (Kana) has two meanings also; the significance of discontinuity in the past, the significance of permanence and the future.

5- The research shows is that the origin of (Kana) that it denotes the abstract absolute past. So if it is combined with what is impossible to be limited to the past, such as the attributes of Allah (glorified and exalted be He) and some stories of the Noble Qur'an, it must be meant that. As it is demonstrated to us if we say, He forgiveth those who turn to Him, because it is impossible for the hearer to imagine that Allah's forgiveness (Glorified be He) is limited to the present and the future under the pretext of the present tense indicating them. Rather, He knows with certainty that His (Glorified be He) forgiveness includes all times. Likewise if we say, Allah forgive those who turn to Him. It is also impossible for the hearer to imagine that The forgiveness of Allah (those who turn to Him) is confined to the past under the pretext of the significance of the verb on the past. So the significance (Kana) if it came from the presumption that Allah (Glorified be He) would forgive and

have mercy on those who deserve forgiveness at all times, and it is also said in the rest of the Qur'an verses.

6- Abd Al-Qahir al-Jurjani thinks the significance of the negation of (Almost) as he indicated that the origin of (Almost) that its negation is to deny the verb in the first. But it might use its negation to indicate the occurrence of the verb after slow and effort. After its occurrence was far from thought. Abd Al-Qahir Al-Jurjani indicated that use was made in custom and the intent is to simulate the case of the one who did the matter after effort and suffer, to a situation of the one who is far from the verb. The research shows that the opinion of the context, i.e. the presumption of the verb, is the one that gave the significance to the negation. As they say, the emergence of the context is preceded on the appearance of the presumption owner, i.e. as if we say, (I saw a sea), then here the mind goes to the well-known sea, and if we say (I saw a sea speaking), here is the significance of the presumption.

## REFERENCES

- 1- Muhammad Abul Fotouh Ghoneim, indications of incomplete verbs: An article published on the Internet.
- 2- Abu Bakr Abd al-Qaher ibn Abd al-Rahman al-Jarjani d. 471 AH, Book of the Economist in Sharh al-Ihidah, under: Kazem Bahr al-Marjan, Dar al-Rashid Publishing 1982 AD, 1/397.
- 3- Abdullah bin Yusuf bin Ahmed bin Abdullah bin Yusef Abu Muhammad Jamal al-Din Ibn Hisham d. 761 AH, Mughni al-Labib on the books of Al-A'areeb, ed. Mazen Al-Mubarak, and Muhammad Ali Hamd Allah, Dar Al-Fikr - Damascus 6, 1985 AD, 3/13.
- 4- Amr bin Othman bin Qanbar al-Harithi, loyal to Abu Bishr, nicknamed Sebwayh d. 180 AH, under: Abd al-Salam Muhammad Harun, The Book, Al-Khanji Library - Cairo, Ed .: 3, 1408 AH - 1988 AD, 1/45.
- 5- Muhammad bin Yazid bin Abd al-Akbar al-Thamali al-Azdi, Abu al-Abbas, known as al-Mardarad T: 285 AH, under: Muhammad Abd al-Khaleq great, al-Muqtaseb, scholar of books. Beirut, 3/97.
- 6- Abu Bakr Muhammad ibn Al-Sirri bin Sahl al-Nahawi, known as Ibn al-Sarraj, d. 316 AH, Usul in grammar, under: Abd al-Hussein al-Fattli, The Resala Foundation, Lebanon - Beirut, 1/92.incomplete, inkəm' pl
- 7- Sheikh Radi al-Din Muhammad ibn al-Hasan al-Istrabadi al-Grammar 686 AH, Explanation of Al-Radhi Ali Al-Kafiyah by Ibn Al-Hajeb, investigation, correction and comment: Dr.. Yusef Hassan Omar, University of Qar Yunis - Libya, D: 1395-1975 AD, 2/290.
- 8- Abd al-Rahman ibn Abi Bakr, Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti d. 911 AH, Hama al-Hawamah in explaining the collection of mosques, under: Abd al-Hamid Hindawi, The Tawfiqia Library - Egypt, 1/111.
- 9- Ibn Hisham Al-Ansari, Explanation of the Badriya in the Science of Arabic Linguistics, edited by: Prof. Hadi Nahr, Dar Al-Yazouri - Amman, 2/4.
- 10- Abbas Hasan T. 1398 AH, Comprehensive Grammar, Nasir Khusraw Spreads - Tehran T: 7, 1425 AH, 1/544.

- 11- Abdullah Muhammad Talib al-Kanana, the conflict between grammatical structures, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Thaqafi, PhD thesis, 31.
- 12- Yaish bin Ali bin Yaish Ibn Abi Al-Saraya Muhammad bin Ali, Abu Al-Buqaha, Muwaffaq Al-Din Al-Asadi Al-Mawsili, known as Ibn Yaish and Ibn Al-Sanea d.643 AH, Al-Mafsil explanation by Al-Zamakhshari, presented to him by: Dr. Emile Badi Yaqoub, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut - Lebanon, i : 1, 1422 AH - 2001 AD, 7/89.
- 13- Abdullah bin Yusuf bin Ahmed bin Abdullah bin Yusef, Abu Muhammad, Jamal al-Din, Ibn Hisham d.761 AH, explained the paths to the millennium Ibn Malik, under: Yusuf al-Sheikh Muhammad al-Buqai, Dar al-Fikr for printing, publishing and distribution, ed: 4, 46.
- 14- Abu Abd al-Rahman al-Khalil bin Ahmad bin Amr bin Tamim al-Farahidi al-Basri, The Camel in Grammar, T. 170 AH, ed: Dr. Fakhr al-Din Qabawa, ed .: 5, 1416 AH 1995 CE, 41.
- 15- Mahmoud bin Abdul Rahim Safi T: 1376 AH, the table in the translation of the Noble Qur'an, Dar Al-Rasheed, Damascus - Al-Iman Foundation, Beirut, ed .: 4, 1418 AH, 3/79.
- 16- Ibrahim bin Al-Sirri bin Sahl, Abu Ishaq Al-Zajaj d. 311 AH, The Meanings of the Qur'an and its Arabic, under: Abdul Jalil Abdo Shalabi, The World of Books - Beirut, ed: 1, 1408 AH - 1988 AD, 1/359.
- 17- Abd al-Qadir bin Omar al-Baghdadi d. 1093 AH, under: Abd al-Salam Muhammad Harun, Treasury of Literature and Pulp to Bab Lisan al-Arab, Al-Khanji Library, Cairo, ed: 4, 1418 AH - 1997 AD, 2/322.
- 18- Abu al-Qasim Mahmoud ibn Amr bin Ahmed, al-Zamakhshari, Jarallah, revealing the mysterious facts of the revelation, T. 538 AH, Arab Book House - Beirut, i: 3- 1407 AH, 4/391.
- 19- Ibn Aqeel, Abdullah bin Abd al-Rahman al-Aqili al-Hamdani al-Masri d. 769 AH, Ibn Aqeel explained Ali Alfiyya Ibn Malik, under: Muhammad Muhyiddin Abd al-Hamid, Dar al-Turath - Cairo, Egypt House for Printing, Saeed Jawdah al-Sahar and Co., ed .: 20, 1400 AH 1980 AD, 1/269.
- 20- The Diwan of Amr bin Ahmar Al-Bahli, Tah: Muhammad Muhyiddin Minu, Dubai: Qandil, i: 1, Mino, Muhammad Muhyiddin, 1956, issue date 2017-1438 AH, 119.
- 21- Uthman ibn al-Hajib Abu Amr, the clarification in Sharh al-Mufassal (i. Awqaf al-Iraq), under: Musa Bani al-Alili, Ministry of Endowments - Iraq 1402 AH - 1982 AD, 2/80.
- 22- Muhammad al-Taher bin Muhammad bin Muhammad al-Taher bin Ashour al-Tunisi d.193 AH, Tahrir and Enlightenment (Editing the good meaning and enlightening the new mind from the interpretation of the glorious book), Tunisian Publishing House - Tunisia 1984 AH, 5/30.
- 23- Nasir al-Din Abu Saeed Abdullah bin Omar bin Muhammad al-Shirazi al-Baidawi d. 685 AH, Anwar al-Tanzil and Asrar al-Ta'wil, under the title: Muhammad Abd al-Rahman al-Maraashli, House of Revival of Arab Heritage - Beirut, i: 1- 1418 AH, 5/279.
- 24- Sayyid Muhammad Husayn al-Tabatabai, Al-Meezan fi Tafsir al-Qur'an, Al-Alamy Foundation for Publications - Beirut - Lebanon, ed: 1, issue date: 1417 AH - 1997AD, 20/166.

- 25- Shihab al-Din Mahmoud bin Abdullah al-Husayni al-Alusi d. 1270 AH, The Spirit of Meanings in the Interpretation of the Great Qur'an and the Mathani Seven, under: Ali Abd al-Bari Attiyah, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya - Beirut, ed: 1, 1415 AH, 14/131.
- 26- Dr. Fadel Saleh Al-Samarrai, The Meanings of Grammar, Dar Al-Fikr for Printing, Publishing and Distribution - Jordan, ed.: 1, 1420 AH - 2000 AD, 1 / 217-218.
- 27- Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muhammad ibn al-Sayyid al-Batliusi d.521 AH, Al-Hallal fi Sharh verses of the Camel, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut-Lebanon, ed: 1, 1424 AH - 2003 AD, 160.
- 28- Abu Muhammad Makki bin Abi Talib Hammush bin Muhammad bin Mukhtar al-Qaisi al-Qayrawani, then Al-Andalus al-Qurtubi al-Maliki d. 437 AH, revealing the faces of the seven readings, publications of the Arabic Language Academy in Damascus, ed.: 1, 1394 AH / 1974AD, 2/152.
- 29- Yahya bin Hamza bin Ali bin Ibrahim, Al-Husseini Alawi Al-Talbi, nicknamed Al-Moayad Billah 745 AH, Al-Tariq for the secrets of rhetoric and the sciences of the facts of miracles, the Racial Library - Beirut, ed: 1, 1423 AH, 2/142.
- 30- Uthman bin Saeed bin Othman bin Omar Abu Amr al-Dani d. 444 AH, Facilitation in the Seven Readings, Othman bin Saeed bin Othman bin Omar Abu Amr al-Dani d. 444 AH, Under: Otto Trezel, House of Arab Book - Beirut, i: 2, 1404 AH / 1984 CE, 166 .
- 31- Abu Al-stay Abdullah bin Al-Hussein bin Abdullah Al-Akbari d.616 AH, The statement in the translation of the Qur'an, under: Ali Muhammad Al-Bajawi, Issa Al-Babi Al-Halabi and Co., Year of Publication: 1976, 2/1001.
- 32- Abu Ali al-Fadl ibn al-Hasan al-Tabarsi, Majma 'al-Bayan fi Tafsir al-Qur'an, Dar Al-Murtada - Beirut 1427 AH-2006AD, 8/61.
- 33- Muhammad bin Abdullah, Ibn Malik al-Tai al-Jiani, Abu Abdullah, Jamal al-Din d. 672 AH, Explanation of Facilitation of Benefits, under: Dr. Abdul-Rahman Al-Sayed, d. Muhammad Badawi Al-Mukhtoon, Abandoned for Printing, Publishing, Distribution and Advertising, Ed.: 1, 1410 AH - 1990 AD, 55.
- 34- Abu Hayyan Muhammad bin Yusuf bin Ali bin Yusef bin Hayyan Atheer Al-Din Al-Andalusi d.745 AH, Sharif beating from the tongue of the Arabs, under: Rajab Othman Muhammad, review: Ramadan Abd Al-Tawab, Al-Khanji Library in Cairo, ed: 1, 1418 AH - 1998 AD, 2 / 95.
- 35- Abu Abdullah Badr al-Din Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Bahadar Al-Zarkashi d. 794 AH, Al-Burhan in the Sciences of the Qur'an, under: Muhammad Abu Al-Fadl Ibrahim, ed: 1, 1376 AH - 1957 AD, House of Revival of Arabic Books Issa Al-Babi Al-Halabi and his partners, then photographed by Dar Al-Marifa Beirut - Lebanon, 2/142.
- 36- Abdul-Qaher Al-Jarjani T 471 A.H. The Hundred Factors, Dar Al-Minhaj Jeddah, ed.: 1, 1430 AH, 60-61.
- 37- Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim bin Qutaybah al-Dinuri d.276 AH, Poetry and Poets, Dar Al-Hadith - Cairo, 1423 AH, 1/312.

- 38- Khalid bin Abdullah bin Abi Bakr bin Muhammad al-Jarjawi al-Azhari, Zain al-Din al-Masri, explaining the statement on clarification or the declaration of the content of clarification in grammar, and he was known as al-Qawqad T 905 AH, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya - Beirut - Lebanon i: 1, 1421 AH - 2000 AD -1 / 203.
- 39- Abu Amr Uthman bin al-Hajib, the grammar d. 646, Explanation of Al-Wafia, Numismat Al-Kafiyah, translated by: Dr. Musa Banai Alwan Al-Alili, Al-Adab Press in Najaf, 1400 AH 1980 AD, 369.
- 40- Abd al-Rahman bin Ishaq al-Baghdadi al-Nahawadi al-Zajaji, Abu al-Qasim d. 337 AH, letters of meanings and adjectives, translated by Ali Tawfiq al-Hamad, The Resala Foundation - Beirut, ed: 1, 1984 AD, 67.
- 41- Sharif Al-Murtada Ali bin Al-Hussein Al-Musawi Al-Alawi (355 - 436 AH), Amali Al-Murtada (deceiving benefits and pearls of necklaces), under: Muhammad Abu Al-Fadl Ibrahim, House of Revival of Arabic Books (Isa Al-Babi Al-Halabi and Co.), ed.: 1, 1373 AH - 1954 AD, 1/332.
- 43- Abu Bakr Abd al-Qaher bin Abd al-Rahman al-Jarjani d. 471 AH, Evidence of Miracles in the Science of Meanings, Under: Mahmoud Muhammad Shaker Abu Fahr, Al-Madani Press in Cairo - Dar Al-Madani in Jeddah, Ed.: 3, 1413 AH - 1992 AD, 212-213.
- 44- Muhammed bin Jarir bin Yazid bin Katheer bin Ghaleb al-Amili, Abu Jaafar al-Tabari d. 310 AH, Jami al-Bayan in the interpretation of the Qur'an, under the title: Ahmad Muhammad Shaker, The Resala Foundation, ed: 1, 1420 AH - 2000 CE, 13/195.