




REVIEW ARTICLE

Section: *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism*

Al-'Akbarī's method of deduction using poetic grammatical evidence in his book "al-Tabyīn 'an Madhāhib al-Nahwīyīn"

Mohammed Nadi Farghaly Mohammed^{1,2}, Kawthar Saeed Eltom Ali¹, Mohamed Taha Abd Alkhaleek Alagiri¹ , Mohamed Abd Eldayim Elbagoury¹, Khaled Hilal Nasser Alabri¹, AbdUlmalik Ahmed Essayed Shetewy¹, Amr Khater Abd Elghany Wahdan¹ & Gomaa Elsayed Abd Elmaksoud Ibraheem¹

¹College of Education and Arts, Sohar University, Sultanate of Oman

²College of Arts, New Valley University, Egypt

*Correspondence: malagiri@su.edu.om or m.heby@psau.edu.sa

ABSTRACT

This research aims to demonstrate the role of poetic grammatical evidence (Shāhid Nahwī Shi'ī) in the construction of Arabic grammar, shed light on al-'Akbarī's methodology in employing poetic grammatical evidence in his book "al-Tabyīn", define poetic grammatical evidence, its importance, the criteria and controls for its narration, the types of poetic evidence according to al-'Akbarī, and clarify al-'Akbarī's method of deduction using poetic evidence and how he utilized it in preferring between grammatical schools (Madhāhib Nahwīyah) and in constructing his own grammatical doctrine. The research adopts a descriptive analytical methodology. It involved collecting, classifying, and analyzing poetic grammatical evidence, and studying al-'Akbarī's method of deduction using it. Among the most important findings of the research are: identifying the types of poetic grammatical evidence according to al-'Akbarī, showing that the predominant characteristic of his evidence is that it is not attributed to its authors, shedding light on al-'Akbarī's method of explaining poetic evidence, clarifying the main strengths and weaknesses in the ways of using evidence, and demonstrating al-'Akbarī's method of refuting poetic evidence. The research recommends encouraging researchers to filter and sort grammatical evidence, and to alert them to more precise and systematic research on the issue of poetic evidence as an important tool in building the grammatical system, by subjecting these poetic pieces of evidence to academic methodology.

KEYWORDS: error analysis, google translate, machine translation, neural machine translation, statistical machine translation

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 6, Issue 4, 2025

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 25 November 2025

Accepted: 06 December 2025

Published: 07 December 2025

HOW TO CITE

Farghaly Mohammed, M. N., Eltom Ali, K. S., Alkhaleek Alagiri, M. T. A., Eldayim Elbagoury, M. A., Nasser Alabri, K. H., Essayed Shetewy, A. A., Elghany Wahdan, A. K. A., & Elmaksoud Ibraheem, G. E. A. (2025). Al-'Akbarī's method of deduction using poetic grammatical evidence in his book "al-Tabyīn 'an Madhāhib al-Nahwīyīn". *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.58256/hgvm1e29>



Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2025 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Linguists, especially grammarians, have paid great attention to poetry, which is considered an important source of “Samā’” (audition/listening), the first principle of Arabic grammar. As poetry is the “Dīwān” (register/anthology) of the Arabs, it held a prominent position, and some grammatical issues were even based on it. Although grammarians set conditions for citing poetry, namely the condition of time and place (al-Afghānī, 1994, 59, and al-Ḥadīthī, 1974, 105-106), some grammatical rules were established based on a single poetic evidence. It is almost impossible to find a grammatical issue devoid of poetic evidence, whether it supports or refutes it, as the phenomenon is evident in grammar books (‘Id, 1988, 115). Hence, this research aims to shed light on “al-‘Akbarī’s Method of Deduction Using Poetic Grammatical Evidence in His Book ‘al-Tabyīn ‘an Madhāhib al-Naḥwīyīn’”. This research is divided into two sections, as follows:

Section One: Poetic Grammatical Evidence

First: Definition of Evidence (Shāhid)

Evidence: “A sentence from the speech of Arabs or what is similar to it, such as the Holy Quran, characterized by specific features... and serves as proof of Arabs’ use of a word for its meaning or a pattern in composition or speech” (Jabr, 1992, 256).

As for grammatical evidence (Shāhid Naḥwī), it is: “What is brought from the speech of Arabs as evidence for a grammatical operator (‘Āmil Naḥwī), or for an inflectional effect (Athar I‘rābī), or an original or secondary sign of building (Binā’) or inflection (I‘rāb)... equally including the rare and anomalous (Shādh Nādir) and the consistent and regular (Qiyās Muṭṭarid)” (Jabr, 1992, 266).

Second: The Role of Poetic Grammatical Evidence in the Construction of Arabic Grammar

Shaykh Muḥammad al-Ṭanṭāwī states: “Indeed, evidence in grammar is grammar itself” (al-Ṭanṭāwī, n.d., 192). Therefore, grammarians were keen to delve into poetry to use it as evidence, either to prove the validity of their doctrine or to refute the doctrine of their opponents. They coined the term “poetic evidence” (Shāhid Shi‘rī) for these poems (Jijān & Ṣāliḥ, 1966, 24). The Kufan school paid the most attention to poetic evidence (al-Makhzūmī, 1958, 381).

Since poetry was the “Dīwān” of the Arabs, they recited it everywhere, memorized it, and circulated it (al-Nāyilah, 1976, 32). It is a fundamental pillar of “Samā’,” which is considered the first of the three principles of grammar (Suwayḥ, 1986, 11) along with “Qiyās” (analogy) and “Ijmā’” (consensus). Therefore, poetic evidence is a crucial principle in constructing grammatical rules, as it is proof of the correctness or error of a rule. al-‘Akbarī is one of the scholars who wrote on matters of grammatical dispute, and thus he extensively cited poetic evidence used by each group—despite their differing schools and doctrines—to validate their doctrine, as well as poems he used to refute the evidence of his opponents.

Third: Criteria and Controls for Narration

The study observed that al-‘Akbarī was well aware that a preference not based on reliable evidence is merely a baseless argument. Therefore, no issue in his work is devoid of poetic evidence, which gives poetic evidence additional value, strengthening the argument. It rises to be proof for the grammatical rule. al-‘Akbarī may explain the verse or evidence, mentioning everything related to it for clarification. Sometimes he mentions a similar case to support the issue he is discussing.

Fourth: Types of Poetic Grammatical Evidence Regarding Its Attribution to Its Speaker or Lack Thereof

The narration of poetic grammatical evidence by al-‘Akbarī varied in terms of its attribution to its speaker or lack thereof, into several forms:

1. Poetic Grammatical Evidence Attributed by al-‘Akbarī to Its Authors

Through a careful examination of al-‘Akbarī’s “al-Tabyīn”, it was found that he cited approximately twenty-three pieces of evidence attributed to their speakers, as follows:

al-‘Akbarī attributed three poetic grammatical pieces of evidence to each of: al-Nābighah al-Dhubaynī

and al-A'shā. He attributed two pieces of evidence to each of: Imru' al-Qays, Zuhayr ibn Abī Sulmā, and al-Farazdaq (d. 110 AH). He attributed one piece of evidence to each of: al-Muthaqqab al-'Abdī (d. 36 BH), 'Adī ibn Zayd (d. 35 BH), Ṭufayl al-Ghanawī (d. 13 BH), al-'Abbās ibn Mirdās (d. 18 AH), al-Shamākh ibn Ḍirār (d. 22 AH), Abī Dhū'ayb al-Hudhalī (d. 26 AH), Abī al-Aswad al-Du'alī (d. 69 AH), Abī Zubayd al-Ṭā'ī (d. 62 AH), 'Umar ibn Abī Rabī'ah (d. 93 AH), Jarīr (d. 110 AH), and Dhū al-Rummah (d. 117 AH).

2. Poetic Grammatical Evidence Not Attributed by al-'Akbarī to Its Authors, but Attributed by Others

Through the examination of al-'Akbarī's "al-Tabyīn", it was found that he cited approximately thirty-seven (37) pieces of evidence without attributing them to their authors, but these are attributed by other grammarians. This type of poetic grammatical evidence is the most frequent in al-'Akbarī's "al-Tabyīn".

3. Poetic Grammatical Evidence Not Attributed by al-'Akbarī to Its Authors, and Its Attribution is Disputed by Others:

Approximately seven (7) pieces of evidence were found that al-'Akbarī did not attribute to their authors, and their attribution is disputed in books of language, grammar, and dictionaries.

4. Poetic Grammatical Evidence of Unknown Attribution to al-'Akbarī and Others, but Famous in Grammar, Language, and Dictionary Books:

The number of poetic grammatical pieces of evidence of unknown attribution but famous in grammar books reached approximately twenty-one (21).

5. Poetic Grammatical Evidence of Unknown Attribution to al-'Akbarī, and Not Famous Among Others:

"al-Tabyīn" included one piece of evidence of unknown attribution to its author, and the study did not find any mention of it in the language and grammar books consulted. This is the poet's saying:

"There are no kin except those less than your kin to us, and you have no equal, except for the house of Mecca."

Fifth: Grammarians' Stance on Poetic Evidence of Unknown Attribution

Poetic evidence received greater favor and attention than other types of evidence, which was evident in the numerous works that addressed poetic evidence, such as "Sharḥ Abyāt Sībawayh" by al-Naḥḥās, "Sharḥ Abyāt Sībawayh" by al-Sīrāfī, "Mu'jam Shawāhid al-Naḥw al-Shi'rīyah" by Dr. Ḥannā Jamīl Ḥaddād, "al-Mu'jam al-Mufaṣṣal fī Shawāhid al-Naḥw al-Shi'rīyah" by Īmīl Badī Ya'qūb, and many other academic researches and dissertations. Grammarians viewed poetry with suspicion and only relied on what was proven to be correctly attributed to its author, whose eloquence was established, whose narrator was trustworthy, and which was free from poetic necessities (al-Ḥadīthī, 1974, 104).

As for poetic evidence of unknown attribution, grammarians were divided into two groups regarding it. The first group, including al-Baghdādī from the ancients (al-Baghdādī, 1996, 1/16) and followed by some modern scholars (Ḥusayn, 1353 AH, 38, al-Nāyilah, 1976, 124, and Dīrah, 1991, 189), allowed the citation of poetry of unknown attribution on the condition that its narrator is trustworthy and reliable, and that the one citing it is a grammarian known for honesty. The second group, including al-Mubarrad from the ancients (al-Mubarrad, 1994, 2/131), and also advocated by some modern scholars (al-Afghānī, 1994, 65, Makram, 1978, 347, and Āl Yāsīn, 1974, 115), emphasized the necessity of knowing the author and thus excluding poetic verses of unknown authors from grammatical evidence. Their argument is that knowing the author removes the suspicion of fabrication and clears up many ambiguities surrounding the evidence.

The study adopts a middle ground, which is the permissibility of citing poetic evidence of unknown attribution on the condition that it is attributed by another trustworthy grammarian. The first opinion opens the door wide to many fabricated pieces of evidence, and the popularity of evidence, its narration by a trustworthy narrator, and its use by a trustworthy grammarian do not necessarily mean it is correct. The second opinion

completely closes the door to many important pieces of evidence that might have tipped the scales in favor of one issue over another. From all this, the study calls on researchers to filter and sort grammatical evidence. That which is attributed should be used as evidence, and if not, it should be excluded. Modern technologies may help in accomplishing this work and facilitate quick and accurate access, research, and investigation in books.

Sixth: al-‘Akbarī’s Employment of Poetic Grammatical Evidence

al-‘Akbarī employed poetic grammatical evidence comprehensively. His evidence varied between those he presented to support the Basrans and reinforce their doctrine, or to refute them, and those he presented as evidence for the Kufans’ doctrine. He often argued against and refuted the latter. al-‘Akbarī would sometimes imagine a question in the minds of his opponents, ask it on their behalf, and then answer it, citing poetry as evidence.

As for his method of refuting poetic grammatical evidence, he sometimes refutes by scientific analysis, and at other times by citing multiple narrations of the poetic verse, which deprives it of its argument. Sometimes he refutes the evidence by deeming it indicative of the poet’s coarse nature. He described nine (9) pieces of evidence as being due to necessity (ḍarūrah) and anomaly (shudhūdh), and he refuted two pieces of evidence because they were of unknown attribution and their authors were unknown.

Seventh: al-‘Akbarī’s Methods of Deduction Using Poetic Evidence in “al-Tabyīn”

al-‘Akbarī cited many poetic pieces of evidence that his opponents used to support their doctrines, in order to complete the discussion of the issue, and then he would refute this deduction and clarify its weakness. al-‘Akbarī’s methods of deduction using poetic evidence are almost exclusively confined to: evidence supporting a doctrine he champions (the Basran doctrine), evidence he uses to refute his opponents (the Kufans), evidence used by his opponents, and evidence he uses to support his own opinion or the doctrine he supports. His evidence varied between known attribution (which is rare) and unknown attribution (which is predominant in his work). He also used a single piece of evidence in some issues, sometimes two, and sometimes several. He also cited half-verses and “arajīz” (rajaz poems), not mentioning the complete poetic evidence, but contenting himself with the specific part of the verse that served as evidence.

Eighth: al-‘Akbarī’s Methods of Refuting Poetic Grammatical Evidence

- He often refutes with argument and analysis.
- He sometimes weakens his opponents’ arguments by stating that the author of what they cited is unknown.
- He sometimes refutes the evidence by deeming it anomalous (shādh).

Ninth: Attribution of Poems to Their Authors

al-‘Akbarī attributed poetic verses to their authors in a few instances. Among those to whom he attributed their poems are: al-Nābighah al-Dhubayānī, al-A‘shā, Imru’ al-Qays, Zuhayr ibn Abī Sulmā, al-Farazdaq, al-Muthaqqab al-‘Abdī, ‘Adī ibn Zayd, Ṭufayl al-Ghanawī, al-‘Abbās ibn Mirdās, al-Shamākh ibn Ẹirār, Abī Dhū‘ayb al-Hudhalī, Abī al-Aswad al-Du‘alī, Abī Zubayd al-Ṭā‘ī, ‘Umar ibn Abī Rabī‘ah, Jarīr, and Dhū al-Rummaḥ. However, the majority of poetic grammatical evidence was not attributed by al-‘Akbarī to its authors.

Section Two: al-‘Akbarī’s Methodology in Deducting Using Poetic Grammatical Evidence

First: al-‘Akbarī’s Methodology in Deduction

al-‘Akbarī attempted to be objective in presenting controversial grammatical issues and strived to demonstrate his neutrality in presenting different doctrines discussing the issue. However, after a thorough study of his book “al-Tabyīn,” we find that he supported the Basran school and defended it, presenting their poetic deductions and adding to them what supported and strengthened them. Although he presented the Kufan doctrine and their poetic deductions, he refuted what they cited, sometimes through scientific discussion and analysis, sometimes by describing it as rare, scarce, and anomalous, and sometimes by stating that its author was unknown.

al-‘Akbarī referred to the grammarians’ doctrines in his book, and rarely did we find an issue where he did not explicitly state the authors of the doctrine. Among the most prominent features of al-‘Akbarī’s

methodology is that he first mentions the doctrines and their opinions on the issue, then he mentions the rational and philosophical arguments of each group, and then he mentions the deduction by “Samā’,” primarily poetic grammatical evidence. He supports the Basrans’ evidence, and then refutes the Kufans by saying: “As for ‘Samā’ or as for poetry, its answer is such and such,” or “it has two answers...” and so on.

A criticism against al-‘Akbarī is that the dominant characteristic of the poetic grammatical evidence he cited is its lack of attribution to its authors. This may be due to the widespread nature of this evidence among linguists and grammarians. Another criticism is that he judged this evidence as rare and anomalous without attempting to discuss it scientifically through analysis. al-‘Akbarī followed the Basran doctrine and supported the evidence they cited. When presenting a grammatical issue, he would first present the Basran doctrine and mention their arguments and evidence, then present the Kufan doctrine with its arguments and evidence, and then refute the Kufans. He followed this approach in most issues in his book.

Second: al-‘Akbarī’s Methodology in Preferring the Basran Doctrine

al-‘Akbarī used poetic grammatical evidence to prefer the Basran doctrine. He sometimes discussed this evidence, and at other times contented himself with mentioning it without discussing it or supporting it with rational proof. Among these pieces of evidence are the following:

1. al-‘Akbarī agreed with the Basrans in their doctrine regarding the operation of the second in “Tanāzu’” (syntactic contention), and he cited as evidence Ṭufayl al-Ghanawī’s saying: (al-Ghanawī, 1997, 32)

“And reddish-brown horses, as if their backs had been run over, and they were clothed in a golden color.”

He made “lawnan” (color) accusative (naṣb). If the first had been the operator, he would have made it nominative (raf‘) with “jarā” (ran over). And also, al-Farazdaq’s saying: (al-Farazdaq, 1987, 606)

“But a fair judgment, if I insulted and the Banū ‘Abd Shams from Manāf and Hāshim insulted me.”

If the first had been the operator, he would have said: “wa sabbūnī Banī ‘Abd Shams” (and Banū ‘Abd Shams insulted me) (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 254).

The Issue of (Ḥāshā) Between Verbalty and Particlehood:

The Basrans held “Ḥāshā” to be both a particle (ḥarf) and a verb (fi‘l) in exception (istithnā’). al-‘Akbarī cited as evidence for their doctrine the poet’s saying: (Ibn Manẓūr, 1414 AH, 14/182)

“Except for my father Thawbān, for Abū Thawbān is not a speechless, dullard man.”

“‘Amr ibn ‘Abd Allāh, indeed he has miserliness regarding abuse and insults.”

He made it genitive (jarr). “Abī” is not added to the possessive “yā” because his name is Abū Thawbān, as indicated by his saying: “inna Abā Thawbān” (indeed Abū Thawbān). Another said:

“There are no kin except those less than your kin to us, and you have no equal, except for the house of Mecca.” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 411).

The preceding verse was not attributed by al-‘Akbarī, and no evidence was found for it in any of the language and grammar books consulted.

Third: al-‘Akbarī’s Methodology in Proving His Opinion

al-‘Akbarī employed poetic grammatical evidence to argue for his opinion. For example:

al-‘Akbarī refuted the opinion of those who said that “lawlā” (if not for) is specific to nouns, and he cited poetry as evidence for the occurrence of a verb after it, by the Hudhalī poet’s saying: (al-Sukkarī, 1965, 1/88)

“Lo, Asmā’ claimed that I do not love her, so I said, ‘Yes, indeed, were it not for my preoccupation distracting me.’”

Meaning: If it were not for that, my love for her would have become apparent. Another said: (Ibn Manzūr, 1414 AH, 4/545)

“Umaymah said when I visited her, ‘Why did you not shoot some of the black arrows?’”

“May no rain fall on you! I have indeed shot them, were I not limited, and there is no excuse for a limited one.” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 242).

It was said that the singular vocative (munādā mufrad) is built (mabnī) because it occupies the position of something built. The taqdīr (estimated form) in your saying: “Yā Zayd” (O Zayd), is “Yā anta” (O you) . al-‘Akbarī cited as evidence for this the poet’s saying: (al-Aḥwaṣ, 1990, 268)

“O Abjar ibn Murrah, O you! You are the one who divorced when you came.” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 441).

al-‘Akbarī cited as evidence the permissibility of omission (ḥadhf), which he described as frequent, the poet’s saying: (Ibn Abī Rabī‘ah, 2004, 132) “The abode was erased at Matālī‘ and Abān.”

He meant: “The houses were erased” (darasa al-manāzil) (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 451).

Fourth: al-‘Akbarī’s Methodology in Refuting the Kufan Doctrine

al-‘Akbarī cited many of the Kufans’ deductions using poetic grammatical evidence. This indicates his academic honesty in presentation and discussion. However, he soon refutes and weakens these pieces of evidence, even citing other poetry to refute what they maintained. Among these pieces of evidence are the following:

The Kufans held that the imperative verb (fi‘l al-amr) for the second person is inflected with jussive (jazm), and they said that the origin of “qum” (stand up!) is “litaqum” (so that you may stand up) . al-‘Akbarī mentioned their poetic evidence, stating that the omission of the “lām” (particle of purpose) was explicit, as in the poet’s saying: (al-Baghdādī, 1996, 9/11)

“Muḥammad, every soul sacrifices itself for you if you fear any harm.”

And another’s saying: (Sībawayh, 1988, 3/8)

“Like the companions of the gnat, scratch your face, woe to you! Or let whoever cried, cry.”

Meaning: “wa li-yabki” (and let him cry).

al-‘Akbarī refuted this deduction by saying: “As for the poetry, it is indicative of narration (khabar), not imperative (amr), except that the ‘yā’ was omitted from the end of the verb due to necessity, and the origin is ‘tafdī’ and ‘yabkī’. Another answer is: the ‘lām’ was omitted, and the present tense prefix remained, and the verb’s form did not change, unlike our issue” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 178-180).

The Kufans cited as evidence for the operation of the second of the two disputants (mutanāzi‘ayn) the saying of Imru’ al-Qays: (Imru’ al-Qays, n.d., 39)

“If I only strived for the slightest living, a small amount of wealth would suffice me, and I would not seek more.”

He made “qalīlun” (a small amount) nominative (raf‘) with “kafānī” (sufficed me).

al-‘Akbarī refuted Imru’ al-Qays’s verse by saying: “As for the verse of Imru’ al-Qays, the accusative case (naṣb) in it corrupts the meaning, because his aim is to magnify his status, and that if he were striving for a trivial matter, a small amount of wealth would suffice him. If he had made it accusative, this meaning would be reversed” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 257).

The Kufans held “Ḥāshā” to be a verb, and al-‘Akbarī cited as evidence for them the saying of al-Nābighah: (al-Nābighah, 2005, 34)

“And I do not exclude anyone from the people.”

This is the rule of the verb. al-‘Akbarī refuted this by saying that the particle is superfluous, and the superfluity

of particles is common. He cited as evidence for this the poet's saying: (al-Baghdādī, 1996, 4/159)

“We strike with the sword and hope with ease.” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 413).

Fifth: al-‘Akbarī’s Methods of Refuting Poetic Grammatical Evidence

1. Multiple Narrations of the Evidence

The Kufans permitted the preposing of the “tamyīz” (specification/distinguishing noun) to its operator if it was a “mutaṣarrif” (declinable/changeable verb or noun), and some Basrans agreed with this . al-‘Akbarī cited their poetic evidence, the poet’s saying: (al-Sa‘dī, 2007, 290)

“Does Salmá abandon her beloved leaving him to separation? And a soul would not find pleasure in separation.” He preposed “nafsān” (soul) to its operator.

al-‘Akbarī responded to their evidence by saying: “The correct narration is:

‘And my soul would not find pleasure in separation.’

So, ‘nafsī’ (my soul) is the subject of ‘kāna’” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 396).

2. Coarseness of the Poet’s Nature

al-‘Akbarī mentioned that the doctrine of al-Sīrāfī and a group of scholars is that the “alif” of the “maqṣūr” (shortened noun) in all three cases is a substitute for the “tanwīn” (nunation). He mentioned their poetic evidence, such as the poet’s saying: (al-Dhubaynī, n.d., 464-465)

“Indeed, you, son of Ja‘far, are the best youth.”

Then he said:

“And many a guest knocked on the tribe’s door at night,”

“Found provisions and conversation he desired,”

“Indeed, conversation is a part of hospitality.”

al-‘Akbarī refuted this deduction by saying that it is due to the coarseness of the poet’s nature, and that it falls under the category of permissible “iqwā” (rhyme defect) in poetry. The second answer is that it came in the dialect of those who do not substitute the “tanwīn” with an “alif” in the accusative case. The third answer is that the substituted “alif” resembles the “alif” that is a “lām” (last radical of a word), and the resemblance between two things may attract one to the other, as in their saying: “Marartu bi Zaydin al-Ḍarībī al-rajulī bi al-jarr” (I passed by Zayd, the striker of the man, with genitive case) by analogy with your saying: “Marartu bi al-rajulī al-ḥasan al-wajhī” (I passed by the man, the handsome of face), and this is by agreement (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 191).

3. Compulsion (Idṭirār), Necessity (Ḍarūrah), and Anomaly (Shudhūdh)

The Kufans cited as evidence for the permissibility of the “lām” entering the predicate of “lakinna” (but) the poet’s saying: (Ibn Manẓūr, 1414 AH, 13/391)

“But I am afflicted with her love.”

al-‘Akbarī refuted this evidence by saying: “The ‘lām’ is superfluous due to poetic necessity” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 354).

The Kufans permitted the preposing of the “tamyīz” to its operator if it was a “mutaṣarrif” (declinable/changeable verb or noun), and some Basrans agreed with this . al-‘Akbarī cited their poetic evidence, the poet’s saying: (al-Sa‘dī, 2007, 290)

“Do you abandon Salmá for separation, her beloved? And a soul would not find pleasure in separation.”

al-‘Akbarī indicated the permissibility of its being a “tamyīz” as a poetic necessity that deviates from analogy

and usage (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 396).

4. *Maintaining the Rhyme (Qāfiyah)*

The Kufans cited as evidence for the operation of the second in “Tanāzu’” the poet’s saying: (Sibawayh, 1988, 1/78)

“So return to the heart a passionate desire, and ask, if a question could be returned to us.”

“And we are often concerned with it, and we see eras in which the slender, shy women lead us.”

He made “al-khurd” (the slender women) accusative (naṣb) with “narā” (we see) and not with “yaqtadn” (they lead).

al-‘Akbarī refuted this opinion by saying: “The second [answer]: his saying ‘al-khurd’ was operated by the first because the rhymes are in the accusative case; so he preferred the operation of the first to maintain the rhyme” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 257).

5. *Unknown Author (Majhūl al-Qā’il)*

The Kufans permitted the addition of “nīf” to tens, as in your saying: “khamsata ‘ashara” (fifteen) . al-‘Akbarī cited their evidence, the poet’s saying: (al-Jāhiz, 1424 AH, 6/566)

“He was burdened by his toil and misery with a girl of eighteen years of his life.”

He added “thamānī” (eight) to “‘ashar” (ten). And because the name of the first is not the same as the second, for the meaning of “khamsata ‘ashara” is “khamsah wa ‘asharah” (five and ten), and such a thing can be added . al-‘Akbarī refuted this evidence by saying: “The answer to the verse is that its author is unknown” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 433).

6. *Refuting the Kufan Doctrine Without Stating a Reason*

al-‘Akbarī was fair in presenting the Kufans’ argument regarding the necessity of the first operating in “Tanāzu’”. Then al-‘Akbarī refuted their doctrine and the poetry they cited by saying: “As for the poetry, there are two answers for it:

One of them: there is no argument in it” (al-‘Akbarī, 1986, 257).

Conclusion

Displaying the types of poetic evidence according to al-‘Akbarī and his methods of deduction.

al-‘Akbarī’s frequent reliance on poems not attributed to their authors, depending on the fame of the evidence in the books of his predecessors. This is a methodological flaw. Furthermore, a criticism against al-‘Akbarī is that the dominant characteristic of the poetic grammatical evidence he cited is the lack of attribution of the poems to their authors, perhaps due to the widespread nature of this evidence among linguists and grammarians. Another criticism is that he judged this evidence as rare and anomalous without attempting to discuss it scientifically through analysis.

The study adopted a middle ground, which is the permissibility of citing poetic evidence of unknown attribution on the condition that it is attributed by another trustworthy grammarian. The argument for accepting evidence of unknown attribution opens the door wide to many fabricated pieces of evidence, and the popularity of evidence, its narration by a trustworthy narrator, and its use by a trustworthy grammarian do not necessarily mean it is correct. The argument for rejecting all evidence of unknown attribution completely closes the door to many important pieces of evidence that might have tipped the scales in favor of one issue over another.

Indicating al-‘Akbarī’s academic integrity and objectivity in the soundness of transmission and presentation of different opinions with all their arguments.

Demonstrating al-‘Akbarī’s academic integrity through his presentation of all opinions with complete neutrality, then his support for what he deems correct, and then his refutation of others’ arguments.

Clarifying al-‘Akbarī’s method of grammatical explanation for poetic evidence through his scientific discussion of some evidence and refutation of it . al-‘Akbarī also accused some evidence of anomaly and rarity without discussing it.

Displaying al-‘Akbarī’s academic personality and his approach to controversial grammatical issues, and his method of presenting different doctrines and ways of preferring between them.

Attempting to highlight the main strengths and weaknesses in the methods of using poetic evidence in grammar by dividing it into types of evidence.

Clarifying that many poetic grammatical pieces of evidence in “al-Tabyīn” – which is one of the most important books on grammatical disagreement – are not attributed to their authors, and there is evidence whose attribution is disputed, and some are of unknown authors.

Revealing al-‘Akbarī’s method of refuting poetic grammatical evidence, and it showed that some of the refutations do not adhere to precise scientific methodologies . al-‘Akbarī often judged the evidence as being due to the coarseness of the poet’s nature, or that it falls under the category of poetic necessity that deviates from analogy and usage, or that the author of the poetic verse is unknown. Sometimes he refutes the evidence without stating a scientific or methodological reason, contenting himself with merely mentioning that there is no argument in it.

Recommending the necessity of establishing methodological controls for citing poetry with the aim of refining grammar and removing superfluous evidence that might complicate it.

Recommending researchers to filter and sort grammatical evidence; what is attributed should be used as evidence, and if not, it should be excluded. Modern technologies may help in accomplishing this work and facilitate quick and accurate access, research, and investigation in books.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge Sohar University, Sultanate of Oman, for their support of this research.

Authorship and Level of Contribution

All authors contributed to the literature research, data collection, analysis, and interpretation of the collected data.

References

- Ibn Rabī'ah, Labīd, (2004), *Dīwān Labīd ibn Rabī'ah*, compiled by: Ḥamdū Ṭammā, Beirut, Dār al-Ma'rifah.
- Ibn Manẓūr, (1414 AH), *Lisān al-‘Arab*, (3rd ed.), Beirut: Dār Ṣādir.
- al-Afghānī, Sa‘īd, (1994), *Fī Uṣūl al-Naḥw*, Damascus: Directorate of University Books and Publications.
- Āl Yāsīn, Muḥammad Ḥusayn, (1974), *al-Aqḍād fī al-Lughah*, Baghdad: al-Ma‘ārif Press.
- Imru’ al-Qays, (n.d.), *Dīwān Imru’ al-Qays*, edited by: Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, (5th ed.), Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif.
- al-Aḥwaṣ, al-Anṣārī, (1990), *Shi‘r al-Aḥwaṣ al-Anṣārī*, collected and authenticated by: ‘Ādil Sulaymān Jamāl, introduced by: Dr. Shawqī Ḍayf, (2nd ed.), Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī.
- al-Baghdādī, ‘Abd al-Qādir (1996), *Khizānat al-Adab wa Labb Lubāb Lisān al-‘Arab*, edited and annotated by: ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, (3rd ed.), Cairo, Maktabat al-Khānjī.
- al-Jāhīz, ‘Amr ibn Baḥr, (1424 AH), *al-Ḥayawān*, (2nd ed.), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah.
- Jabr, Yaḥyá ‘Abd al-Ra‘ūf, (1992), *al-Shawāhid al-Lughawīyah*, *Majallat al-Abḥāth lil-Najāḥ*: Vol. 2 - 6.
- Jijān, Mujhid, and Ṣāliḥ, Muḥammad, (1966),
- al-Naḥw al-‘Arabī Madhāhibuhū wa Taysīruhū*, Egypt: Maṭba‘at Muṣṭafá al-Ḥalabī.
- al-Ḥadīthī, Khadijah, (1974), *al-Shāhid wa Uṣūl al-Naḥw fī Kitāb Sībawayh*, Kuwait: Kuwait University Publications.
- Ḥusayn, Muḥammad al-Khiḍr, (1353 AH), *al-Qiyās fī al-Lughah al-‘Arabīyah*, Cairo: al-Maṭba‘ah al-Salafīyah.
- Dirah, Dr. al-Mukhtār Aḥmad, (1991), *Dirāsah fī al-Naḥw al-Kūfī min Khilāl Ma‘ānī al-Qur’ān lil-Farrā’, Dār Qutaybah lil-Ṭibā‘ah wa al-Nashr*.
- al-Dhubyānī, al-Shamākh ibn Ḍirār, (n.d.), *Dīwān al-Shamākh ibn Ḍirār al-Dhubyānī*, authenticated and annotated by: Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Hādī, Egypt: Dār al-Ma‘ārif.
- al-Sa‘dī, al-Mukhabbil, (2007), *Dīwān al-Mukhabbil al-Sa‘dī*, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir.
- al-Sukkarī, (1965),
- Sharḥ Ash‘ār al-Hudhalīyīn*, authenticated by: ‘Abd al-Sattār Aḥmad Farrāj, reviewed by: Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir, Cairo: Maktabat al-‘Urūbah.
- Suwayḥ, Muḥammad ‘Āshūr, (1986), *al-Qiyās al-Naḥwī Bayna Madrasatay al-Baṣrah wa al-Kūfah*, al-Jamāhīrīyah House for Publishing, Distribution and Advertising.
- Sībawayh, ‘Amr ibn ‘Uthmān, (1988), *al-Kitāb*, edited by: ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, (3rd ed.), Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī.
- Ṭanṭāwī, Shaykh Muḥammad, (n.d.), *Nash‘at al-Naḥw wa Tārīkh Ashhar al-Nuḥāt*, (2nd ed.), Dār al-Ma‘ārif.
- ‘Aṭā‘allāh, Qāsim Kitāb, (2001), *al-Shāhid al-Shi‘rī al-Shādh fī Kutub al-Naḥw Ḥattā Nihāyat al-Qarn al-Khāmis al-Hijrī*, University of Babylon.
- al-‘Akbarī, ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥusayn, (1986), *al-Tabyīn ‘an Madhāhib al-Naḥwīyīn al-Baṣrīyīn wa al-Kūfīyīn*, edited by: Dr. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-‘Uthaymīn, (1st ed.), Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī.
- ‘Īd, Dr. Muḥammad, (1988), *al-Istishhād wa al-Iḥtijāj bi al-Lughah Riwayāt al-Lughah wa al-Iḥtijāj Bihā fī Ḍaw’ ‘Ilm al-Lughah al-Ḥadīth*, (3rd ed.), ‘Ālam al-Kutub.
- al-Ghanawī, Ṭufayl, (1997), *Dīwān Ṭufayl al-Ghanawī*, annotated by: al-Aṣma‘ī, authenticated by: Ḥasan Fallāḥ Awghlī, (1st ed.), Beirut: Dār Ṣādir.
- al-Farazdaq, (1987), *Dīwān al-Farazdaq*, annotated and edited by: Professor ‘Alī Fā‘ūr, (1st ed.), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah.
- al-Mubarrad, (1994), *al-Muqtaḍab*, authenticated by: Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Khāliq ‘Uḍaymah, (3rd ed.), Cairo: Committee for the Revival of Arabic Heritage.
- al-Makhzūmī, Dr. Mahdī, (1958), *Madrasat al-Kūfah wa Manhajuhā fī Dirāsāt al-Naḥw wa al-Lughah*, (2nd ed.), Egypt: Sharikat Maktabat wa Maṭba‘at Muṣṭafá al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa Awlāduh.
- Makram, Dr. ‘Abd al-‘Āl Sālim, (1978), *al-Qur’ān al-Karīm wa Atharuhū fī al-Dirāsāt al-Naḥwīyah*, (2nd ed.), Kuwait: Mu‘assasat ‘Alī Jarrāḥ al-Ṣabāḥ.
- al-Nābighah, Ziyād ibn Mu‘āwīyah, (2005), *Dīwān al-Nābighah al-Dhubyānī*, compiled by: Ḥamdū Ṭammā, (2nd ed.), Lebanon: Beirut.
- al-Nāyilah, Dr. ‘Abd al-Jabbār ‘Alwān, (1976), *al-Shawāhid wa al-Istishhād fī al-Naḥw*, (1st ed.), Baghdad: al-Zahrā’ Press.