

# **Deuteronomy and its rulings at Al-Ghalayini, a study balancing modern linguistics**

**Tahsean Jameal Khalaf**

*Department of Arabic language, College of Islamic Sciences, Fallujah University*

**Muhammad Hajj Hadi**

*Department of Arabic language, College of Islamic Sciences, Fallujah University*

## **Abstract**

Praise be to God, the individual, the eternal, who did not give birth, nor was he born, and there was no one equal to him, and prayers and peace be upon the best of creation and the beloved of truth, our master Muhammad, as for after.

The Arabic language still attracts students to it, renews its blood and its sciences, and updates the means of access to it., which follows new paths in the study of this language, and a clear methodology in how to receive it, with his interest in the scientific aspect in his presentation of the issues of the Arabic language, and among those issues and investigations that were raised on the study table are those related to dualism and its definition, conditions and provisions, and this topic may have been studied by The old linguistic lesson, but in this modest research we will strike a balance between the old lesson and the modern one with regard to the subject of Deuteronomy, starting from what Al-Ghalayini said in his book Jami` al-Durus al-Arabiya, which will be the basis for this research and a representative of the old lesson.

## **Introduction**

Praise be to God, the individual, the eternal, who did not give birth, nor was he born, and there was no one equal to him, and prayers and peace be upon the best of creation and the beloved of truth, our master Muhammad, as for after.

The Arabic language still attracts students to it, renews its blood and its sciences, and updates the means of access to it., which follows new paths in the study of this language, and a clear methodology in how to receive it, with his interest in the scientific aspect in his presentation of the issues of the Arabic language, and among those issues and investigations that were raised on the study table are those related to dualism and its

definition, conditions and provisions, and this topic may have been studied by The old linguistic lesson, but in this modest research we will strike a balance between the old lesson and the modern one with regard to the subject of Deuteronomy, starting from what Al-Ghalayini said in his book Jami` al-Durus al-Arabiya, which will be the basis for this research and a representative of the old lesson.

I have made my research this in two demands: the first will be titled Deuteronomy and its provisions in the Ghalayini and the ancient linguistic lesson, and the second: will be titled Deuteronomy and its provisions in the modern linguistic lesson, then the conclusion, with mentioning the most important sources and references on which this research relied, and the nature of my research was based on

mentioning Opinions and their discussion, and the balance between what the old lesson went to and the modern lesson and weighting between them from the researcher's point of view, and God is the Grantor of success.

The first requirement: Deuteronomy and its rulings according to the Ghalayini, and the ancient linguistic lesson.

Al-Ghalayini defined the Muthanna by saying: (an expressive noun, denoting two singular words that agreed with the word and meaning, with the addition of Alif and Nun or Ya and Nun, and it was valid to strip it from them).

And Al-Rumani said: (Deuteronomy is a form built from the one to denote the two).

All the ancients went to this, and I did not find anyone who disagreed with them, including Ibn Jinni in Al-Lama' , Al-Jurjani in Al-Ta'rifat , Al-Zamakhshari in Al-Mufassal , and Ibn Al-Hajib in Al-Kafiya.

Al-Ghalayini mentioned the following conditions in the name to be duplicated:

1\_ That the two terms that are intended to be doubled agree verbally, so it is not said of a book and a pen: two books or two pens.

2\_ If the two terms agree in meaning, then what is different in meaning should not be commendable, and if the wording coincides, then it is not said: The two eyes, for the eye that sees and the wound.

3\_ That the word to be doubled is singular, and neither the plural nor the plural noun nor the noun of the plural gender is commendable, unless it is with the interpretation of the two groups or the two groups, so you say: two camels, two camels.

4\_ That the Muthanna is with the addition of Alif and Nun or Yaa and Nun, so if the noun

indicates the Deuteronomy without an addition, then it is attached to the Muthanna, towards: a pair, and an intercessor.

As for what departs from these conditions, it has been placed under the name of the appendix to Al-Muthanna, which is as follows:

1\_ If the noun denotes two singular words with an addition that is not valid for abstraction, such as: no, both, two, and two.

2\_ What is dissuaded from the door of prevailing, such as the two ages, which is called Omar bin Al-Khattab "may God be pleased with him" and Amr bin Hisham, and the two parents, which is called the father and mother.

3\_ What is called Muthanna, such as Al-Hassanin and Al-Zaydin, whereby this name refers to a specific person.

This is what Al-Ghalayini mentioned in Al-Muthanna, and what made it a condition for the name in order for it to be two-fold, and the ancients followed up on that, so we see Sibawayh mentioning that he does not commend what came in the manner of: twenty, thirty, and Muslims, and he justified that by not meeting in the name Rifa'an, nor Saban, nor Jaran, It is permissible to praise what is called singular towards: appetizers and arms.

Al-Sirafi Murad Sibaweh explained by saying: (The whole of this chapter is that whatever has a declension sign in it, or the plural of Salem with waw and noun, and ya and noon, it is not permissible to flex it, nor is the plural of salim lest two signs come together in it, because if we name a man with twenty, or Muslims or Muslims or Two hundred or two. It is not permissible for us to say if we dissuade: twenty, nor two hundred, nor two; Because if this had been done, the noun would have combined two nouns and two accusatives, and something like this has gone on.

As for Abu Hayyan, he mentioned the specific conditions mentioned by Al-Ghalayini, that what is meant to be doubled must be singular, and that the two words are in agreement in terms of wording and meaning, and that the doubles be with a valid addition to detachment from it.

And he mentioned what is not commendable from what al-Ghalayini mentioned, and added that it is not permissible to commend the numbers except the hundred and a thousand, and each and some is not commendable, and do with it, and the names of the verbs are like *hihat*, and the spoken nouns towards *tabat evil*, and what ended with (*weh*) towards *Sibawayh*, and the conditional noun towards *where*, And what has no second in existence is towards the sun and the moon, and what is identifiable from knowledge is towards *so-and-so*, and *so-and-so*, and plural and plural, and the relative noun is like that, and the noun of the noun is like this, and the current noun is the course of the verb if it raises a visible noun like *I passed a standing man whose parents are*, and the infinitive is not removed from the infinitive unless he is named to a person

Then he mentioned what is attached to the two, which is two and two, and both are based on the opinion of the *Basrans* because they are singular in pronunciation, and two with us, unlike the *Kufis* who say that they are two in reality.

Likewise, *Ibn Aqeel* did in his commentary on the *Alfiya*, as he said: (*Haddah* - that is, the *Muthanna* - is a word denoting two, with an addition at the end that is valid for abstraction and sympathy for it. So he entered into our saying "a word denoting two" *Muthanna* towards: *Zaidan*, and the words placed for two towards: *intercession* And our saying "with an addition" came out towards: *an intercession*.

And it came out with our saying "fit for abstraction" towards: two, because it is not appropriate to drop the addition from it, so do not be afraid: *praise*. It says: the moon, but it sympathizes with its opposite, not like it, towards: the moon and the sun, which is what is meant by their saying of the two moons)

And he mentioned what is attached to the dual as two, two, both, and both, but he stipulated that they be added to a pronoun such as: *Both came to me, and I saw both of them*, so if they were added to the apparent, they were in the letters *nominative with alif, accusative, and traction with ya*.

And after Al-Ghalayini clarified the conditions for declension in order for the name to be valid for it, he proceeded to mention the mechanism of declension, which is in five forms, according to the type of the last letter of the name to be deified, and we will explain this in four paragraphs as divided by Al-Ghalayini, as follows:

First: The declension of the correct one and its likeness and the incomplete noun: Al-Ghalayini says: (If you doubled the other correct one as a man and a woman and an ablution, or its likeness is like a river and a bucket, or the incomplete one is like the judge and the supplicant, you append the end of it with the sign of the declension without changing it, so it says: *Two men and two women and two ablutions and two farewells Yan*).

This means that the other correct, semi-correct, and incomplete noun whose ending is (*ya*), does not need in its declension except to append the declension sign at the end, without any change in the structure of the word. The judge\_ the two judges, and this is what the ancients went to in flexing the correct and its likeness and the incomplete.

Sibawaih says: (Know that the deuteronomy is in the noun in the noun with the alif and the nun, and in the accusative and the prepositional with the yaa and the noon. As for what is not short or extended, you do not increase it in the deuteronomy until you open the end of it..., and that is your saying: two men, two dates, two buckets, and two fair ones. And two sticks, as well as these things and the like, and it says in accusative and prepositional: I saw two men, and I passed two spiders, as I described it to you. Deuteronomy, according to Sibawayh, in the unrefined and the extended, is by appending the alif and the noun in the noun, and the yaa and the nun in the accusative and the adverb, and opening the last of the noun to be doubled, without making any other change in the structure of the word.

As for Al-Mubarrad, Sibawayh differed a little in his saying: (As for what was correct, if you wanted to fold it, you would accept its construction, and add alpha and noun in the noun, and ya and noun in the lowered, and the accusative entered into the lowered.... And that is your saying in the noun: Zaidan and Umar. Anne and Jafar And thirsty, and two spiders, and if the noun is stretched, and it is deflected, and its hamza is original - then it is based on this. And two lives, and two readings..., even if it is stretched out and turned away instead of a ya' or a waw, so it also says: Two garments, two garments, and two covers, and turning to the waw in this is permissible, and it is not good). Alef and Nun are nouns, and Yaa and Nun are accusative and traction, and many examples are mentioned for that, which say: Al-Zaydan, Al-Imran, Al-Qiraan, and two robes, and it was mentioned that the extended extended hamza that I spurred from Waw or Yaa is permissible in the heart, but it was mentioned that it is not good, as the radiator here distinguished cases The extended one, and clarified when the increase is attached to it

without change, and when the heart is permissible or not.

Ibn Malik mentioned this in detail by saying: ( If a non-compliant and an extended one whose hamza is praised instead of an original or an addition, the sign will be attached without change, as long as it does not imply that someone else is usually praised. The unrefined and the extended and restricted one pervades the other correct as a man and a woman, and the other defective one runs the course of the correct one. Like a thrower, a thrower, an invader, an invasion, and the deficient ailment as a shag and a judge, and the agitated one who is not stretched out like bribes, water, women, and crippled, and the stretched one whose hamzat is originally like a reciter, and he is a lot of reading, so all of these and their like do not change in deuteronomy more than opening the other and catching the sign previously mentioned). In this brief detail, Ibn Malik sees that what was not limited, which was the last of a fixed thousand, and the extended one whose hamza is extra or instead of the original, is commendable without any change in the structure of the word, and that includes the correct one, its likeness, and the incomplete one.

As for Abu Hayyan, he elaborated in his hadeeth on how to be deified, but he did not deviate from what Ibn Malik said.

Al-Hamalawy also went to the fact that the correct, similar, and incomplete, if it is intended to be doubled, a thousand and a nun are added at the end of it, or a yaa and a nun is a accusative and an adverb, without doing anything else.

This was said by most of the contemporaries who followed the old lesson, such as: Dr. Mohamed El-Masry , Dr. Hashim Taha Shalash and his companions , d. Fakhruddin Qabawa , d. Muhammad Fadel Al-Samarrai.

Secondly: Al-Maqsoor Indication: Al-Ghalayini said: (If you invoke maqsoor, then if it is tertiary, you invert the alif and wawa, if its origin is waw, and ya if its origin is ya', so you say in the indicative of 'asa' 'aswan', and in the indicative of the fati', 'boys'.

A thousand may have two origins, so it may have two sides, and that is like a millstone, for it is ya' in the language of those who said "Rahit" and waya in the language of those who said "Rahut", so it is permissible to say in its duality "Rahyan wa Rahawan".

And if it is limited to the triple, then you invert the alif yaa in any case, so you say in Deuteronomy pregnant, Mustafa, and hospitalized: two pregnant, chosen, and hospitalized).

Al-Ghalayini clarified here that the noun that is shortened has three conditions, namely:

The first case: to be ternary: in this case, the noun that is inscribed with the heart of the alif is commendable to what it was originally, provided that the alif has a single origin to which it returns, so it says in the boy: the boys, and it says in the stick: the stick.

The second case: that it is triple, but it has two origins, as in Al-Raha, it is yay in one language, and ayat in another language, so the two languages are praised, saying: Rahyan, and Rahwan.

The third case: that it is above the trio, and in this case the alpha jaa turns over in each case, so it says in Mustafa, pregnant, and hospital: two mustafa, two pregnant, and two hospitalized.

And if we went back to Sibawayh's book, we would find this similar to it, and from that he said: (Know that the imperfect if it is on three letters, then the thousand is a substitute, and it

is not an addition like the addition of a pregnant thousand.

If the deficient is one of the daughters of the waw, the waw appears in Deuteronomy; because if you move, it must be a y or a wow; The one who is the first.

And if the defective is from the daughters of the yaa, the yaa is revealed... And the number of its letters is four letters plus if it is an alif instead of the letter that is from the same word, or it is an addition that is not a substitute. The daughters of the waw are like the daughters of the ya'; Because I have dinner and the like, if it was really, it would have turned into a yaa. So when it became if it was a verb, it would only be from the ya', then this grammar of the names became transformed into the ya', and it became like the one whose number of letters is three and it is one of the daughters of the ya'. Likewise, it is significant, because if the speech had a verbal verb, it would only be from the ya', because it is four letters like al-A'sha, and the meem is extra like the alif, and the more the letter increases, the farther from the waw, ... As for what the alif is extra, then it is like: pregnant, muzzi, dafla, and dhafri, His denunciation can only be with the ya', because if you came to the verb from these names with the addition, it would only be from the ya' like his salqat, and that is what you say: Hablian, Moazian, Daflayan, and Dhafryan). This is exactly what Al-Ghalayini mentioned, except that Sibawayh hinted at a very important matter that Al-Ghalayini did not mention, which is why we need to change the name that is restricted to Deuteronomy? So we understand from his saying: (because if you move it must be a ya' or a waw), that the alif is a consonant and the punctuation mark begins with a consonant, so it must be omitted to join the consonants, or move the first, so if the movement appears on the alif, either a ya' or a

waw is reversed as it was originally. Then he separated what was superfluous to the trio, so he mentioned what the alif was in it instead of the waw and the yaa, and what was extra in it, and both of them commend by turning the alif in it into a yaa, and perhaps that is why the Ghalayini did not elaborate that.

It is for this reason that al-Mubarad went, and he said: (And if the praise is limited, then it is made up of three letters. I looked at its origin: If it was from the waw, I showed the waw, and if it was from the ya', then I showed the ya'. Two heads and two sticks: two sticks, and I saw two heads, two sticks, and as for what It was from Ya, so your saying is in Raha: two rhian, and Hasi: two stones, and I only did that, because the alif of Deuteronomy appends the alif that was in the position of the lam, and likewise the ya of Deuteronomy, and they are static, so it is not permissible for it to meet A; it must be deleted or moved, and if it was deleted, the blame would have gone So I stirred and returned each space back to its origin, so if the maqsour was composed of four letters or upwards, then it would be folded with a ya' of whatever origin it was). In this, Sibawayh agreed on how to fold the maqsour noun, but he did not mention what had two origins as Rahi, so he made it on one language. He also explained the reason for the change in the name of the cabin, in addition to what Sibawayh alluded to.

, and he says: (When the last of the noun, if it is folded, is deserving of a fathah, and the alif does not accept a vowel, it must, when meeting deuteronomy, delete or replace a letter that is subject to movement. If it is a fourth or so, the "y" is inverted, whether it is substituted for "w" as given, or "substituted" for "sentence", or "extra" as pregnant and aborted.

And if it is a third, it is returned to the waw if it is replaced by an endowment, and to the ya' if it is replaced by a gift, and it may have two origins, so it is permissible in it to have both sides as a millstone, because it is a yai in the language of those who said: Rahi and wawiyah in the language of those who said: Rahut, so whoever doubled it to say: Rahyan and Rahwan (And the ya' is more) , if Sibawayh had alluded to the reason for the change in the dualization of the noun al-maqsoor, then Ibn Malik had made that clear and detailed, and he mentioned that the reason is the meeting of two consonants, the first being the alif in the noun al-maqsoor, which represents the mother of the word, and the second is the alif that is a sign. The declension and deletion fall into confusion with the singular in the case of the noun and the addition, so the designation of the heart.

According to their doctrine, Abu Hayyan , Ibn Aqil , Al-Hamlawi , and Dr. Hashem Taha Shalash and his companions , and many others.

Third: Deuteronomy of the Extended: Al-Ghalayini says in the Deuteronomy of the Extended: (If you are extended, then if its hamza is original, it remains as it is, so it says in the second of Qur'a and Wudu': Two Qur'ans and two Wudu's.

And if it is more feminine, it is inverted wawa, so it says in the deuteronomization of Hasna and Sahara: Hassanawa and Sahrawan.

And if it is replaced by a waw or a yaa, or it is more appended, then it is permissible for the two faces to remain as they are, and to be replaced by a waw, so it says in the alternating: two garments and two garments, two covers and two covers. And it says in Al-Mazydah to join Albawan and Albaaan, and Qobawan and Qobaan, and Harbawan and Harbaan.

And correcting the hamza, i.e. leaving it as it is, in the alternating form of waw or ya' is first. And her heart is wawa in the increase to catch up better.

And what was before the alif - which is for the feminine - waw, it is permissible to correct its hamza, so that no wawan will come together, and there is nothing between them except the alif, so you say at random: two nights and two nights).

Al-Ghalayini has detailed here the cases of the extended noun at Deuteronomy, which are of four conditions, as follows:

1\_ If his hamza is original, it remains as it is, saying in the Qur'an: two recitations.

2\_ If his hamza is more feminine, it is turned wawa, saying in Hasna and Sahara: Hasnawan and Sahrawan.

3\_ If it is replaced by a waw or a yaa, or it is added to the appendage, it is permissible for it to have both sides, remaining as it is, or changing it to a waw, saying in the replaced one: two clothes or two garments, and saying in the added appendix: two boxes or two boxes.

4\_ What was before the alpha\_ which is for the feminine form\_ wow, it is permissible to correct its hamza so that it does not meet and awan, there is nothing between them except the alif, so you say in a random way: two evenings or two evenings.

This is the detail of what Al-Ghalayini went to, and he followed the doctrine of the ancients.

Sibawayh says: (Know that every stretched out was in the second, so it is in the duality... in the same way as the end of it was not sick from other than that. And that is similar to your saying: Albaan; this is the best of the most.

If the one who is stretched does not go away, and the last of it is an increase, then it is a sign of femininity, because if you bend it, you replace it with a wawa, as you do that in your saying: Hanafi.

And know that many Arab people say: Albawan and Harbawan, likening it and the like to red, where the weight of this grammar was its weight, and the other was plus as the last was red plus, and where it stretched as it stretched red.

And some people said: They are clothed and covered, and in a robe of redawan, so they made what was the last of it instead of something of the same letter in the status of an alaba, because it is in the tide like and in the abdal, and it is the same as it is gone, so when it was like the case of the alba, except that the last of it instead of something of the same letter followed Alabaa, as followed by the red Alabaa, and the waw was lighter for them, as it was similar to the hamza. And Albawan is more than you say Kaswan in the speech of the Arabs, due to its resemblance to red).

Sibawayh mentioned the three cases mentioned by al-Ghalayini, that the hamza is either original, so it is treated as the correct one in duality, or it is added to the feminine, so it changes the waw, or it is added to the appendix or replaced by a waw and a yaa. says otherwise.

As for Al-Mubarrad, he mentioned, along with the correct deuteronization, two cases for the extended one, namely: if the extended one is deflected and its hamza is original, and if it is deviated and its hamza is replaced by a waw or a yaa, then the two aspects are mentioned in it to remain as the correct one and the heart to a waw, and he did not mention the rest that it is for the feminine.

Al-Sirafi mentioned to the extended four types, namely: (his hamza is original, and it is like your saying: a man reciting and ablution, and the second type is what his hamza was turned from an original letter like their saying: cloak, robe, and its origin is equal to my garment, and if the waw and yaa fall on one end and preceded by an extra thousand, the hamza is reversed, And the third type: what the hamza in it is turned from a non-original letter ya plus, as they say: Alba, Harbaa, Harsha, and the like.

And the original was Alabai, and the Ya'a is superfluous, and the fourth strike: what its hamza was reversible from the feminine alif, as you say: red, beetles, and Ashra, and the like), and he mentioned the ruling of each of them, and he said: (As for the first three aspects, the door is in its duality of the hamza, as you say: two readings, and two ablutions, Two robes, two garments, two coats, and two chameleons.

It is permissible in the waw, but the hamzah was the face; Because it appears in the speech, and it is more in the speech of the Arabs in the direction of: two readings, and two garments.

As for those who made it a waw, it is because they considered the hamza to be between two thousand heavy. Because the hamzah is from the exit of the alif, so it becomes as if it were three alphas, and some of these three are more important in the heart than some, so the weakest of them is in the heart of the hamzah and wawa what the hamzah in it is original, such as recitation and contentment, and after it what the hamzah in it is inverted from an original letter as a garment, and a garment for its participation in the first in that The hamza is neither extra, nor inverted, from extra, and as for Alba, turning the hamza in it to the waw is more and better; Because the hamza in it is inverted from an extra letter, so it resembles the feminine alif in red and ten).

Al-Sirafi, in this division of his, agreed with the doctrine of those who preceded him, but he gave the ruling of Deuteronomy in a different way. He made the survival of the hamza the first in the first three cases, and made the fourth closer to the heart. He showed the stages of preference in the heart and the preservation of the hamza according to the originality of the hamza, and its reversal from the origin of wawi or ya'i, then he made what the hamza added to femininity closer to the heart.

Like them, Ibn al-Hajib did, and he said: (And the extended one, if its hamza is original, is affirmed, and if it is feminine, it is turned and wawa, otherwise it is two faces).

Ibn Malik went to the Sibawayh school of thought in Al-Mamdud, and it was mentioned that the original hamza is the first with it when the deuteronomy remains, and the additional hamza attached to it has two sides.

And this is the doctrine of the ancients and the contemporaries who followed their doctrine, such as Abi Hayyan , Ibn Aqil , Al-Hamlawi , Muhammad Al-Tantawi , Fakhr Al-Din Qabawah , and many others who agreed with them, and they only differed in the primacy of the heart or keeping the hamza among us, according to what they heard about the Arabs.

Fourth: Deuteronomy of what is omitted at the end of it: Al-Ghalayini says: (If what is intended to be dualized is omitted from the other, then if what is omitted from it is returned to it when adding, it is returned to it when deuterating, so it says in the deuteronomization of father, brother and father-in-law: its origin is father, brother and father-in-law, parents, brothers and father-in-law, And in Deuteronomy, Qadi Wada' and Shajian, two judges, Farewell and Shajyan, as it says in the addition: your father, your brother, your father-in-law, your judge, your farewell and your



Shajik. And blood and a mouth... Its roots are: my hand, tomorrow, blood and mouth..., two hands, two glands, two blood and two mouths...).

Al-Ghalayini explained that if the noun is omitted from the other, then it is based on two things:

1\_ That it refers to what was omitted from it when adding it, such as when you say father, brother, judge, and others, as it is omitted from the other, and when adding it, you say: your father, your brother, and your judge.

2\_ That the noun is something that does not refer to what was omitted from it when added, so it is doubled and nothing is returned to it, as it says in hand, blood, and mouth, which is rooted: my hand, blood, and mouth, so when added it says: your hand, your mouth, and your blood, and likewise when it is doubled, it says: two hands, two blood, and two.

This is the doctrine of the ancients as well. Ibn Malik said: (It is done in the deuteronomy of the omitted lam what is done in the addition only, and it may have been said: Aban, two brothers, two hands, two bloods, two bloods, two mouths, and two mouths. And they said in a same: a same on the pronunciation, and two on the original).

And Abu Hayyan says in the deuteronization of the incomplete, the other omitted: (The incomplete in analogy is like: Qadi, and without analogy: brother, father and father-in-law in most languages, and in some languages they are a response to his mother, so she says: two judges and two brothers, and parents, and father-in-law, and Hanwan).

Likewise, Al-Suyuti said: (And do not say a triple fa'a, his eye, and his lam, if instead of the connection, otherwise there is no longer any addition to the best ).

And like them, Al-Hamalawy said in the other omitted: (And if it is incomplete, the yaa is omitted as a farewell judge. I repeated it in Deuteronomy, and it says: Two judges and two farewells).

Here, he confirms what al-Ghalayini went to, that the other deleted from which what was deleted from it is referred to when added, is returned to it when denoting.

This issue has been clarified by many contemporaries, says d. Muhammad al-Tantawi: (The incomplete Ya' remains at the deuteronomy, and if it was omitted before it for the sake of enlightenment, it must be returned) , then he mentioned that the basis for refuting the omitted or not is the addition, so what is mentioned when adding it is answered when the deuteronomy.

As for dr. Fakhr al-Din Qabawah mentioned another basis for refuting the omitted form at the Deuteronomy, and he said: (As for the omitted form of the other without analogy, then if it is expressed in letters and the omitted is one letter, it is returned to it in Deuteronomy what was omitted from it towards: fathers, brothers, and father-in-law, and if it is not expressed in letters It does not return to him what was deleted from it, such as: two hands, and two days...).

This is the doctrine of the Ghalayini and the ancient lesson in Deuteronomy and its rulings, and it remains for us to mention the opinion of the modern scholars on it.

The second requirement: Deuteronomy and its rulings in the modern linguistic lesson.

The modernists did not go far from the ancients in the provisions of Deuteronomy, as they see that the noun that is intended to be deuteronized must be looked at at its end. singular, to become a sign of its inflection, as well as ya.

the modernists held:

First: Al-Maqsoor: Dr. says. Abd al-Sabour Shaheen: (And affixing this suffix - meaning the declension sign - to the correct noun is easy... As for affixing it to the word ending with another long vowel "alif", it needs some analysis, due to the large number of successive movements). He divided the maqsoor into two groups :

The first sect: that which had an alif after two letters.

The second sect: that which has an alif after three or more letters.

And he said about the first group: (In such words, the mother of the word is referred to in the case of the deuteronomy as it is in the original, ya kata or waw) , and this does not differ from the doctrine of the ancients in the limited name, which was three-constructed, but the dispute lies in the reason for returning the alif to its origin The wawi or the ya'i, the ancients, as we previously stated, said about the reason for the return of the alif to its origin: (When the last of the name, if it is folded, is deserving of a fathah, and the alif does not accept movement, it must, when meeting deuteronomy, delete or replace a letter that is moveable, so the deletion was refused because it was Confusion occurs in the singular in the case of the noun and the genitive, so the heart is specified). As for the hadith scholars, d. Abd al-Sabour: (So a word like: al-Fatta ( alfataa ') attaches to it the suffix of the dual in the nominative case. So it becomes like this: al-Fatta + that ( alfataa + aani '). its place, with the movement at the end of the word shortened to half of it, so the word becomes al\_fata\_y\_aani ), and so he said in the stick.

The change that occurred in the structure is a phonetic change, and the reason is the length that consists of the meeting of the alif, which is the mother of the word, and which the hadith scholars consider as a long vowel, with the long fatha, which is the sign of the two-fold inflection; A syllabic structure is formed that is rejected in Arabic, so this imbalance must be avoided by returning the ya' or waw to the word , so the final form of the word boy, boys, is a vowel bia, which expresses a semi-vowel, so this is in line with the syllabic structure of Arabic.

As for Dr. Diziza Saqal says about the duality of the stick and the boy, and the reason for the return of the alif to its origin: (And what happened here is that the second hole in the stick turned into a dhimma, after which a long opening occurred, "which is the sign of the inflection." It was formed by sliding from the dhimma "u" to the "aa " aperture. "Wow. Likewise, the second in a boy turned into a crumb, after which a long hole fell, and it was formed by sliding " i\_a " ya, and so he corrected the pronunciation of the word). And what did Dr. Diziza differs in terms of the way in which the alif is transformed into waw or yaa, but the result is the same, as she sees that the alif represents a long movement consisting of two openings, the second of which turned into a damma, then a long opening came after it, which is the sign of the Muthanna. As for a boy, the alif turned into a fatha, then a kasra, and a slip occurred between them after adding the long fatha to the twofold sign, and it became a yaa. I do not find this analysis palatable because the reason for transforming the alif into a hole and a dam, or into a hole and a crumb, is not clear to me from Dr.'s analysis. Dziza, so does the second slot turn into a vocal bug, or is it just an assumption? Perhaps Dr. will answer. Hussam Al-Nuaimi about this question when he says in the process of dividing the end of the

verb that is feared when it is doubled: (Indeed, the cleavage became into a short vowel “fathah”, and half of the vowel from the origin of what is in the verb, which is ya’, because the alif does not have half a vowel from it), and this analysis is very convincing, as it relies on the root of a thousand to determine what the long aperture turns into when it splits into two short ones.

As for the second category, which precedes a thousand or three letters onwards, d. Abd al-Sabour, according to the opinion of the ancients, is that it changes the ya’ in all cases, whether its origin is wawi or ya’.

Second: Al-Mamdoud: The scholars divided Al-Mamdoud according to what they found in the old lesson, and they differed in analyzing how to praise it. Abd al-Sabour Shaheen: (If the hamza was feminine, it was dropped, and replaced by a waw, then it is said in a desert: Sahrawan. Its place is wow, so it is said in a garment: two garments, because its original material: KSW ). And the difference here is in his saying (the hamza has been dropped), which was not said by the ancients. The ancients went to the fact that the hamza is due to its origin, and we do not find a reason for dropping a letter without mentioning the reason for this deletion.

What remains of the provisions of Deuteronomy, the last of which has been omitted, and the modernists agreed with the ancients that what is mentioned in the addition is mentioned in the Deuteronomy. As for d. Abd al-Sabour says: (Arabic has known words whose endings have been omitted for no reason, such as: father and brother... and these last ones are referred to it, which is the lam in the case of duality, if it is necessary to return it in the case of lineage, as it is said in it: my father, and my brother... It is said: Two fathers and two brothers). Likewise, said Dr. A dozen

scaffolds with its reliance on addition instead of ratios in measurement.

Dr. has violated Abd al-Sabour regarding what is not returned to him that was deleted from the ancients and said that it is permissible in it for both sides, so he said: (And if the omitted is something that does not need to be returned in the lineage, the two matters are permissible. This is what I did not find an explanation for except that it may be an illusion of analogy based on lineage.

### **Conclusion:**

And after this presentation of the provisions of Deuteronomy for the two teams, I find that the ancients’ reasoning for the morphological changes that the structures of the maqsura and elongated nouns were subjected to were closer to the reality of the structure, with evidence that the ancients, when they said about the inversion of the alif in the maqsour like the boy and the stick, they justified that by returning to what it was originally, which is supported by The reality used for these names, the origin of the alif in the boy: yaa, and its origin in the stick: waw, and the texts support that.

As for the inversion of the hamza into the extended one, which is a hamza for the feminine form wawa, which the hadeeth scholars said about it being dropped as we mentioned previously, the principle in the hamza is that it is changed from a waw or a yaa, and the hamza did not change into a yaa according to the ancients because of the similarity, as Ibn Malik said: ( The waw was first, because it is more similar to the alif, but the hamza was left because of its closeness to the alif, and the yaa was like it in the approximation of the alif, so it was left out, and designated as the waw).

As for the phonemic analysis, the hadith speakers, although they were right in their analysis of the phonetic structure, but I find that some of them missed the user side of the language, which is what Dr. Abdul Sabour Shaheen, saying: (We do not create the language, but we study the linguistic reality as it is) , and this is what I did not find in the analysis of d. Dziza Saqal in the duality of the maqsour, so this basis should be accompanying every phonetic, morphological, or synthetic analysis.

### References

- 1 Research in Arabic Voices, d. Hossam Al Nuaimi.
- 2 The resorption of the hit from the tongue of the Arabs, Abu Hayyan Al-Andalusi.
- 3 Conjugation of names, d. Mohamed El-Tantawy.
- 4 Conjugation of nouns and verbs, d. Fakhruddin Qabawa.
- 5 Definitions, Jurjani.
- 6 The Mosque of Arabic Studies, Sheikh Mustafa Al-Ghalayini.
- 7 Borders message, Al-Rumani.
- 8 Shaza al-'Urf in the art of morphology, Ahmed al-Hamlawi.
- 9 Explanation of Ibn Aqeel on the verse of Ibn Malik, Ibn Aqeel.
- 10 Explanation of facilitation, Ibn Malik.
- 11 Explanation of Sibawayh's book, Abu Ali al-Sirafi.
- 12 Arabic Exchange, Dr. Muhammad Fadel Al-Samarrai.
- 13 Exchange and phonology, d. A dozen scaffolds.
- 14 Sufficient in grammar, Ibn al-Hajib.
- 15 The Book, Sibawayh.
- 16 Luminous in Arabic, Ibn Jinni.
- 17 Al-Mufasssal, Al-Zamakhshari.
- 18 The brief, the cooler.
- 19 The audio clip in Arabic, d. Good morning.
- 20 The phonetic approach to the Arabic structure, d. Abdul Sabour Shaheen.
- 21 The polite in the science of drainage, d. Hashem Taha Shalash and his companions.
- 22 Morphology and linguistic system, Dr. Mohamed Al-Masry.
- 23 Hama Al-Hawame' in explaining the collection of mosques, Al-Suyuti.