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Abstract—There have been debates and discussions on linguistics’ argumentations used by both schools Basra and Kufa in order to impose their principles in modification of Arabic Grammar. This kind of scenario contributes some negatives and positives views among the scholars claimed that BaÎra and Kufa were the two cities which permanently rivaled each other. In principle, BaÎra and Kufa do evidence two differing linguistic and grammatical approaches. The school of Basra was generally more philosophically inclined when formulating the system of Arabic grammar while the school of Kufa based its rules on evidence found in classical texts. Although Basra applied more analogy does not mean that Basran scholars did not also refer to the already existent linguistic corpus in the classical texts. In order to re-evaluate the above discussion, the researcher addresses some evidences from the linguistic corpus and analogical approach in Arabic Grammar.

Index Terms—Rival, analogical, anomaly, corpus.

I. INTRODUCTION

Classical Arabic had eight cases: accusative (nasab), genitive (jar), nominative (rafN), apocopate (jazm), a-vowel (fath), i-vowel (kasr), u-vowel (Ìam) and zero-vowel (waqf). Sibawayh divided the endings of the eight cases into four pairs: the accusative and a-vowel, the genitive and i-vowel, the nominative and u-vowel, and lastly the apocopate and zero-vowel. A word which receives different pairs because it is produced by a governor, its ending is not permanent and will be changed based on its position and use in the sentence. This system can be called the process of governing or the concept of al-Nâmîl. Shawqë Õaif believed this kind of rule was unique to Arabic grammar1 and a sufficient proof of its originality. The introduction of short-vowel signs in written language has to be considered a separate development and does not interfere with the original syntax. Arabic as a complete and fully developed language already existed before the arrival of Prophet Ismael used by the tribe QahiÉn and HimyÈr. Arabic was the language spoken by a tribal leader called Jurhum who married the daughter of IrÈm, sÈm’s son after Noah’s flood, and through his offspring Arabic became the language of a great nation2. The offspring of Ishmael arrived and spread the use of Arabic. Arabic was an original language with its unique system of grammar which was already developed thousand years before the rise of Greece. In order to faithfully reflect the transmission process of Arabic we have to concentrate on early manuscripts. However the conflict among the traditional Arab schools of grammar indicated that the differences in intellectual approaches occurred in modifying the Arabic Grammar system. For example, the BaÎra School used philosophical and logical approaches in their analysis, critique, and in modifying and replacing the Arabic Grammar system. Contrary, the KÈfah School concentrated on reading the Holy QurÈn, adÈth and Arabic poetry. NÈsim bin AbÈ NujêÈd, Hamzah ZayyÈt and KisÈ`È, who were from the QurrÈ’ ÈSabÈnah, were also among the thinkers of the school. They worked on hypothetical and contemporary cases [which required analogy].

The aforementioned views have been discussed and clarified by some researchers, historians, linguists and grammarians. They established that the BaÎra School based their approach on analogy and the KÈfah School based their approach on anomaly. However, this research aims to verify the approach of the BaÎra and KÈfah Schools in order to investigate their principles in implementing the linguistic argumentation.

II. THE RIVALRY BETWEEN THE TWO SCHOOLS

The KÈfah School split from the BaÎra school due to the dispute between Sibawayh and KisÈ`, concerning the case of ZanbÈriah [1]. The different views regarding a grammar system continued until the arrival of FarÈ`, who based most of his analysis on analogy. Many historians of linguistics assert that he was influenced by BaÎran scholars, but this claim has been refuted by Shawqë Õaif [2], who argued that FarÈ` was an independent scholar and original in his thought. However, when reviewing the sources, which Sibawayh referred to in his KitÈb, we have to agree that some of them were from the KÈfah School [3]. There is no doubt that there was a substantial exchange of ideas between the scholars of KÈfah and Balrah, as for FarÈ’, who was considered the leader of the KÈfah School, was found with Sibaway’s Al-KitÈb under his pillow, [4] at the time of his death. Thus, to suggest that BaÎra was completely free from KÈfah ideas is erroneous. The analogists’ system of grammar needs to be verified using the anomaly approach such as Sibawayh and JumÈhir al-Nuhaî allowed the use of the samÈN system in the topic of Èl’ (condition) [5]. Both agreed that the word ”bîn” in ZayyÈd System (ZayyÈd appeared suddenly) is a gerund-describing form. In another case, they accepted the ”alÈsh shÈdÈnah” in certain verses, such as “(in that let them rejoice…” FÈ`(k) because the BaÎran School allowed the system in this verses based on qiyÈs, and ”we will carry your sins”). This means that the Balran scholars used analogy. A
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number of propagators of anomaly accepted the use of analogy in some cases, for example, with reference to tawākīd, which became dual dualism. Ibn al-Anbārī, who noted that Sibawayh accepted most of the qira'āt shēdah in his qiyās as he said the qira'āt do not violate (the grammar) because it is customary). [16]. Let us examine some of the cases of analogy (qiyās), anomaly (sama'ēn), and qira'āt shēdah. Grammatical anomalies were found in the classical Arab poetic language. In case the Nāmil is not from the same root as the sentence, it may be analogically measured/analyzed because it is not degraded (as the grammarian) al-Shēdh (plur. as Shawkān), which makes this a case of anomaly. Ibn Malik hinted at another case of anomaly [18].

Another case is their acceptance of the accusative case in ñï-nil mu'imra, i.e., the phenomenon of the accusative case in a future tense verb such as Báa'al, which is also mentioned by al-Raťi stated in his Sharḥ al-Kīfāyah (al-Anbārī entitled Al-Insīf Fī Masā'il al-Khilāf Bayna aš-Ša'b al-Bašrīna wa al-Kīfāyena). This has been illustrated by al-Akhfash al-Awsēt who noted that Sibawayh accepted most of the qira'āt shēdah in his qiyās as he said the qira'āt do not violate (the grammar) because it is customary.) [16]. Let us examine some of the cases of analogy (qiyās), anomaly (sama'ēn), and qira'āt shēdah. Grammatical anomalies were found in the classical Arab poetic language. In case the Nāmil is not from the same root as the sentence, it may be analogically measured/analyzed because it is not degraded (as the grammarian) al-Shēdh (plur. as Shawkān), which makes this a case of anomaly. Ibn Malik hinted at another case of anomaly [18].

A third case is their acceptance of the accusative case in ñï-nil mu'imra, i.e., the phenomenon of the accusative case in a future tense verb such as Báa'al, which is also mentioned by al-Raťi stated in his Sharḥ al-Kīfāyah (al-Anbārī entitled Al-Insīf Fī Masā'il al-Khilāf Bayna aš-Ša'b al-Bašrīna wa al-Kīfāyena). This has been illustrated by al-Akhfash al-Awsēt who noted that Sibawayh accepted most of the qira'āt shēdah in his qiyās as he said the qira'āt do not violate (the grammar) because it is customary.) [16]. Let us examine some of the cases of analogy (qiyās), anomaly (sama'ēn), and qira'āt shēdah. Grammatical anomalies were found in the classical Arab poetic language. In case the Nāmil is not from the same root as the sentence, it may be analogically measured/analyzed because it is not degraded (as the grammarian) al-Shēdh (plur. as Shawkān), which makes this a case of anomaly. Ibn Malik hinted at another case of anomaly [18].

A third case is their acceptance of the accusative case in ñï-nil mu'imra, i.e., the phenomenon of the accusative case in a future tense verb such as Báa'al, which is also mentioned by al-Raťi stated in his Sharḥ al-Kīfāyah (al-Anbārī entitled Al-Insīf Fī Masā'il al-Khilāf Bayna aš-Ša'b al-Bašrīna wa al-Kīfāyena). This has been illustrated by al-Akhfash al-Awsēt who noted that Sibawayh accepted most of the qira'āt shēdah in his qiyās as he said the qira'āt do not violate (the grammar) because it is customary.) [16]. Let us examine some of the cases of analogy (qiyās), anomaly (sama'ēn), and qira'āt shēdah. Grammatical anomalies were found in the classical Arab poetic language. In case the Nāmil is not from the same root as the sentence, it may be analogically measured/analyzed because it is not degraded (as the grammarian) al-Shēdh (plur. as Shawkān), which makes this a case of anomaly. Ibn Malik hinted at another case of anomaly [18].

A third case is their acceptance of the accusative case in ñï-nil mu'imra, i.e., the phenomenon of the accusative case in a future tense verb such as Báa'al, which is also mentioned by al-Raťi stated in his Sharḥ al-Kīfāyah (al-Anbārī entitled Al-Insīf Fī Masā'il al-Khilāf Bayna aš-Ša'b al-Bašrīna wa al-Kīfāyena). This has been illustrated by al-Akhfash al-Awsēt who noted that Sibawayh accepted most of the qira'āt shēdah in his qiyās as he said the qira'āt do not violate (the grammar) because it is customary.) [16]. Let us examine some of the cases of analogy (qiyās), anomaly (sama'ēn), and qira'āt shēdah. Grammatical anomalies were found in the classical Arab poetic language. In case the Nāmil is not from the same root as the sentence, it may be analogically measured/analyzed because it is not degraded (as the grammarian) al-Shēdh (plur. as Shawkān), which makes this a case of anomaly. Ibn Malik hinted at another case of anomaly [18].

A third case is their acceptance of the accusative case in ñï-nil mu'imra, i.e., the phenomenon of the accusative case in a future tense verb such as Báa'al, which is also mentioned by al-Raťi stated in his Sharḥ al-Kīfāyah (al-Anbārī entitled Al-Insīf Fī Masā'il al-Khilāf Bayna aš-Ša'b al-Bašrīna wa al-Kīfāyena). This has been illustrated by al-Akhfash al-Awsēt who noted that Sibawayh accepted most of the qira'āt shēdah in his qiyās as he said the qira'āt do not violate (the grammar) because it is customary.) [16]. Let us examine some of the cases of analogy (qiyās), anomaly (sama'ēn), and qira'āt shēdah. Grammatical anomalies were found in the classical Arab poetic language. In case the Nāmil is not from the same root as the sentence, it may be analogically measured/analyzed because it is not degraded (as the grammarian) al-Shēdh (plur. as Shawkān), which makes this a case of anomaly. Ibn Malik hinted at another case of anomaly [18].

A third case is their acceptance of the accusative case in ñï-nil mu'imra, i.e., the phenomenon of the accusative case in a future tense verb such as Báa'al, which is also mentioned by al-Raťi stated in his Sharḥ al-Kīfāyah (al-Anbārī entitled Al-Insīf Fī Masā'il al-Khilāf Bayna aš-Ša'b al-Bašrīna wa al-Kīfāyena). This has been illustrated by al-Akhfash al-Awsēt who noted that Sibawayh accepted most of the qira'āt shēdah in his qiyās as he said the qira'āt do not violate (the grammar) because it is customary.) [16]. Let us examine some of the cases of analogy (qiyās), anomaly (sama'ēn), and qira'āt shēdah. Grammatical anomalies were found in the classical Arab poetic language. In case the Nāmil is not from the same root as the sentence, it may be analogically measured/analyzed because it is not degraded (as the grammarian) al-Shēdh (plur. as Shawkān), which makes this a case of anomaly. Ibn Malik hinted at another case of anomaly [18].
in the form of established by the Kufan school, such as the verb for tawwûb (Arabic grammar) was analogically measured if it (a case) was analogically measured when he remarks, [27] Arabic grammar (nahu) follows/is based on analogy & (analogy) can be used for everything.

Mahdî al-Makhzîmî [28] supports Suîfî in this matter when he remarks. [29] (Arabic grammar) was analogically measured if it (a case) was unknown to the Arabs). There are cases of analogy established by the Kufan school, such as the verb for ta'ânjî in the form of al-muhallî [29] based on al-muhallî, with the particle al derived from [30]. Saîd Jasmîn-Zayb, states in his al-Qiyîs fê al-Nahwi al-'Arabî – Nash'atuhu wa Talawwuruhu that the Baîrân and the Kufan were propagators of anomaly (anomalists), is incorrect.) [31]. This idea is supported by Mahdî al-Makhzîmî [32], who asserts that the Kufan school did not only distinguish themselves through the application of anomaly, but also through the intellectual aptitude of its grammarians. Farî, for example, based his grammatical principles on philosophy, and did not hesitate to formulate his own ideas on invisible ùwÎ (see also Shawqî Öaîf, The Princess in the Science of Grammar, ed., Emil Yaacob, Ed. Beirut: Scientific Library, 1995, ch. 2, pp. 192–195.

The case study here is Analogically it was possible to allow the precedent of mafînûl bih mahsûr than jênî.

The evidence of opposing or differing views on grammar produced in Balra and Kufa does by no means necessitate the assumption that both schools were actively engaged in an intellectual battle with each other. Different methodologies and approaches did not develop isolated from each other but alongside each other. Different grammatical theories developed by Kufan and Balra grammarians did indeed complement each other, and not oppose each other.

IV. Conclusion

The evidence of opposing or differing views on grammar produced in Balra and Kufa does by no means necessitate the assumption that both schools were actively engaged in an intellectual battle with each other. Different methodologies and approaches did not develop isolated from each other but alongside each other. Different grammatical theories developed by Kufan and Balra grammarians did indeed complement each other, and not oppose each other.
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