

**How to Cite:**

Dhafer, N. A. A., & Al-Hiti, A. N. H. (2022). The rhetorical controversy of Bahaa Al-Din Al-Subki In Arus Al-Afrh Book. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S5), 4026–4032.  
<https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS5.10050>

## The rhetorical controversy of Bahaa Al-Din Al-Subki in Arus Al-Afrh Book

**Nisreen Awad Adham Dhafer**

University of Anbar, College of Education for Humanities  
Email: [nes20h2028@uoanbar.edu.iq](mailto:nes20h2028@uoanbar.edu.iq)

**Prof. Dr. Abdel Nasser Hashem Al-Hiti**

University of Anbar, College of Education for Humanities  
Email: [abd.hashim@uoanbar.edu.iq](mailto:abd.hashim@uoanbar.edu.iq)

**Abstract**---Among the scholars in matters of disagreement, there must be consideration and scrutiny of opinions and evidence that results in the response of some of them to each other. Al-Subki's explanation was distinguished by his many responses to grammarians, rhetoricians and others. This phrase was mentioned in many places in more than 150 subjects. His responses were characterized by tenderness, detail and persuasion, and she also smiled with calmness, discipline, and observance of the literature of disagreement. In many of his responses, you find apologizing to the world and trying to direct his opinion in a way that brings him closer to the truth. It was as if the issue had two sides and his opinion one of them.

**Keywords**---disagreement, rhetoric, sobky, Arus Al-Afrh.

**Introduction**

This Paper starts by talking about Al-Subki's methodology in responding to the scholars in this book, and I will try to mention the most important scholars who were mentioned in the response and to limit one or two witnesses to each of them, selected for a variety of evidence distributed among the three sciences, Al-Ma'ani, Al-Bayan and Al-Badi'.

Bahaa Al-Din Abu Hamid Ahmed bin Ali bin Abdul Kafi bin Ali bin Tammam bin Al-Subki Al-Shafi'i, who died in Rajab in the year seven hundred and seventy three in Makkah at the age of fifty-four years. It was taken from his father Taqi Al-Din, Abu Hayyan, Al-Taqi Al-Sayegh, Al-Badr Ibn Jama`ah and Al-Mizzi. He excelled as a young man and had the upper hand in Arabic, meanings, and statement, and he taught Al-Mansuriya and others and the Levant district on

behalf of his brother. Most of the Egyptians used to serve him because of his great generosity, and his father admired and praised him. He has “Arus Al-Afrh fi Sharh Takhlees Al-Muftah” and he proceeded with a lengthy explanation on “Al-Hawi” and a lengthy explanation on “Mukhtasar Ibn Al-Hajeb” and completed a piece on “Sharh Al-Minhaj” by his father. It has superior systems and a court of sermons. (Mustafa bin Abdullah al-Qustantini al-Othmani 2010 AD, 2/294)

### **Reply to Ibn Malik**

Al-Subki responded to Ibn Malik’s views in many places in this commentary, including in the chapter on the verb of the condition and its answer, and that the principle in the verb of conditions and its answer is that they are to receive and receive is with the present verbs (Al-Mubarrad 1431 AH 249/2, and Al-Zamakhshari 1993 AD 439). It is contrary to the original, and this departure from the original is sought by the people of the statement, that is why Al-Qazwini said: (It does not contradict that wording except for a joke, such as highlighting the non-occurring in the context of the event due to the strength of reasons...) (Jalal al-Din al-Qazwini 1997 AD 30) One of the issues of this section is that the act of the condition If it was in the past and it was with the word (was), then the audience is that it benefits the reception, and the cooler went to the fact that the verb of the condition if the word (was) remained as it was from the past because it was stripped to denote the past tense (Al-Subki, 64v / 65r, and Jalal Al-Din Al-Qazwini 1997, / 50 / 51).

However, what Al-Subki was surprised by Ibn Malik - even if his opinion was with the majority in this - is that as Al-Subki said: (And among the wonders that Ibn Malik may not be the verb of the condition is the past of the meaning with was or otherwise, then it is possible for the answer verb to be in the past of the pronunciation and the meaning. Coupled with a fulfillment with an apparent or estimated limit, such as the Almighty’s saying: “If he steals, previously his brother has stolen before.” (Yusuf: 77)

And the Almighty’s saying: "But if his shirt is torn from the back, then she has told a lie and he is speaking the truth" (Yusuf 27 (Al-Subki, 64v / 65f) and that is because Ibn Malik said in the facilitation: With the word “was” or other, it was interpreted as being related to a future action, which is the condition or the penalty in reality, but it was omitted for an acronym.. (Ibn Malik 1990/492) and he said: “The condition is not the future meaning of the word “was” or other than the interpreter” (Ibn Malik 1990 92/4)

### **His opinion about occurred the answer in the past, based on two aspects:**

**The first:** He mentioned the occurrence of the answer in the past in word and meaning, but in the form of weakening, so he said: (The answer may be in the past participle of the pronunciation and the meaning coupled with a fa’ with an apparent or a predicate) (Ibn Malik 4/92 1990), then he made it clear in his explanation that its occurrence in the past word with a conditional word and meaning is the conditional verb With the word “was” and its interpretation in him in the verse “If he steals, then a brother of his has stolen before” (Yusuf: 77) to

omit the verb of the condition and its interpretation: If he is among those who steal, he has stolen (Ibn Malik 1990 92/4).

That is to say, on the interpretation that the verb of the condition is past, but it is not permissible for the verb of the condition to be past participle in word and meaning, so Al-Subki's objection is valid and in its place, as it is necessary from that that the answer to the condition is true and the verb of the condition has not yet occurred, and this is impossible. In the future and the answer is in the past, then the conditional must precede the condition, which is rationally impossible, and the correct interpretation of all of this is based on the letter of the answer or something else) (Al-Subki, 64 /65) and the other side: what he mentioned in the evidence of clarification after he mentioned the hadith of Abu Hurairah, may Allah be pleased with him, that the Prophet prayed Allah, peace and blessings be upon him, said: (Whoever prays the Night of Decree out of faith and in the hope of reward, his previous sins will be forgiven) (Muhammad Zuhair Nasir, 1422 AH/116/Hadith No. (35).

And in another hadith, he said: (These two events included the occurrence of the condition in the present tense, and the answer in the past is a word without meaning, and the grammarians view it as weak, and some of them see it as being specific by necessity. This actually happened - according to their thinking - before he told them that their brother stole now. He also said: (It is, to me, predicated on the aforementioned interpretation, and it is not correct for it to be on others, because the condition takes precedence over the penalty and the impossibility of the future prior to the past in the outside or in the mind) (Ibn Malik 1990/4/93)

### **His Reply to Abi Hayyan**

On the issue of separating the conscience after it is only, as in the saying of Al-Farazdaq (Al-Farazdaq, 1404 AH, 153) [Al-Taweel]:

**I am the protector, the protector, ...but rather who defends for them me.**

Al-Jurjani said: (And it is not permissible to attribute it to necessity... because it is not necessary to that in terms of defending and defending one in weight) (Abd al-Qaher al-Jurjani, 1992 AD, 342)

That is, the separation of the conscience is permissible in the choice, except that Sibawayh made the separation of the conscience in it a matter of necessity (Sibawayh 2015 2/362-363).

In contrast, Ibn Malik said: (The conscience must be separated if it is limited to only...) (Ibn Malik 1990, 147/1)

He cited the House of Al-Farazdaq, and Abu Hayyan replied to him and said: (What the compiler went to regarding defining the separation of the conscience after that is an outrageous mistake and ignorance in the language of the Arabs. The Almighty said: "I only complain of my grief and my sorrow to Allah" (Yusuf: 86).

And he said: "I am only admonishing you with one." (Saba:46)... If it had been as he claimed, the definition of the separation of the conscience would have been: He only complains about my grief and my grief to Allah I, but rather He admonishes you with one thing. (The tongue of Ibn Malik recites: I only complain of my grief and sorrow to Allah, and the words of Ibn Malik are correct. It is not alone with it). (Abu Hayyan Al-Andalusi 2013, 2/221)

So he made it clear that it was not an opinion that Ibn Malik singularly used, rather he said something else, then he mentioned other aspects to refute the words of Abu Hayyan. He said: (And the realization of this is that Ibn Malik built his words on two principles: one of them: that it is only for restriction, and it is what most people have. The second: that it is limited to it It is the last in wording and this is what the rhetoricians unanimously agreed upon and upon it most of the uses. The fact that the restricted is only another in its entirety if it is intended to be limited, then he pointed out the accuracy of Ibn Malik's expression in his phrase when he said: (The pronoun must be separated if it is limited to only) (Ibn Malik, 1990, 147/1) and this means that it is not necessarily but It is intended to always limit the pronoun. Al-Subki said: (And it appeared that the truth is with Ibn Malik. Look at Ibn Malik's saying: The pronoun must be separated if it is limited to rather, because if you meditate on it, you cannot say, contrary to what he said to Sibawayh, he did not say: It must be separated yet, rather, rather. He said: The limitation of Panama) (Al-Subki, 79f/79).

Then Al-Subki discussed Abu Hayyan's inference about the verses, and said: (The verses mentioned by the sheikh are not reciprocated to Ibn Malik, because each of them did not intend to limit the subject, but rather the latter), meaning that what is meant in the verses is to limit the complaint and broadcast it in the direction that is only for Allah, and to limit Preach that one.

Al-Tahir Ibn Ashour said: (In a sentence, I only complain of my suffering and my grief to Allah, and it is useful to limit his complaint to being attached to the name of Allah, i.e., he complains to Allah, not to himself, in order to renew the sadness. 44). Likewise in the second verse, he said: "Therefore, I have brought the formula of limitation, but rather, that is, I am not admonishing you except with one word in order to simplify the debate and to establish the summary of the arguments" (Muhammad bin Taher bin Ashour 1984 AD, 22/231).

### **Reply to Al-Jarjani**

Among the issues in which al-Subki responded to Abd al-Qaher al-Jarjani is the issue of (every) if it was before the denial or entered the denial space, would it still benefit inclusion, or if it entered into its space, it was to negate the inclusion, not to negate each individual. (Arus Alafrah: 51f/51) The origin of the issue is what Sibawayh mentioned in the house of Abi Najm Al-Ajli (Abu Jamal Al-Ajli 1427 AH, 256):

#### **The mother of the cucumber has become claiming ... I have all my sins that I did not make**

By raising (all) he said: (It is not good in speech to make the verb denote the noun and not mention the first participle sign until it comes out of the word actions in the first, and if the noun is built on it and preoccupies it with other than the first until he refrains from being working in it, but it may be permissible in Poetry while it is weak in speech) (Sibawayh 2015, 85/1).

Then he mentioned the verse raised (everything I did not make) and said: (This is weak and is in his position other than poetry, because the accusative does not break the verse and does not disturb it by leaving the display of distraction, as if he said: All is not made) (Sibawayh 2015, 85/1).

That is, if the whole of the nominative and its accusation are not deciphered by weight, this indicates that it is permissible in ordinary speech, except that Sibawayh count it as weak, because the nominative (all) and attributing the mention of his pronoun in the verb (make) makes the verb empty from its action and does not work in anything, and the sentence of the predicate is devoid of the pronoun belonging to the subject Al-Sirafi said: (I mean, if you say: Zaid was struck, it is ugly, and despite his ugliness, it is permissible in speech. He raised it, so it was known that it is permissible in anything other than poetry (Abu Saeed Al-Sirafi 2008, 280/1).

Neither Sibawayh nor the Seraph were aware of the rhetorical aspect that made Abu Najm Al-Ajli leave the strong aspect and use the weak aspect, despite his ability to put “the whole” and that does not affect his weight. Al-Jurjani said: “And if you meditate, you will find that he did not commit it and did not impose himself on him except for a need for him to do so. The meaning and it requires that it came from the wolf that some of it claimed) (Abd al-Qaher al-Jurjani 1992 AD, 278). Then he made it clear that (every) if it was in the context of denial, it did not benefit the generality, but rather the denial of the generality, whether it was the practice of the verb or was a confirmation of its done, he said: (It is obligatory if you say, not all people came to me or not all people came to me, that some of them have come to you (Abdul Qaher Al-Jarjani 1992, 280). Then he stipulated the rule of each if it was an affirmation, so he said: (Here is a principle, which is that it is part of the rule of denial if it enters into a speech and then there is a restriction in that speech in one way that it is directed to that restriction and that it falls to him in particular... Emphasis is a form of restriction) (Abd al-Qaher al-Jurjani 1992 AD, 279-280).

**Sheikh Al-Subki, has an opinion on the matter, and he put it in several ways:**

**The first:** After agreeing with Al-Jurjani that the Alrafa'a benefits the general and comprehensive, he sees that the accusative also restricts it, but with an estimate of a verb that indicates that, and this is what he transmitted from his father, he said: (If it is accusative to work, so is it - that is, in the immersion of individuals - the father said: Because you built the speech on everything And I decided to deny it, because - I did not - I did it in the sense that you left it as if you said, I left everything I did not do) (Al-Subki, 51v / 52 and)

**The second:** Carrying the speech according to what Sibawayh estimated in the words of the previous one (as if he said: it is all unformulated) (Sibawayh 2015, 85/1). Al-Subki said: (And it requires that there is no difference between the nominative and the accusative in the estimation: all of it is not formulated, and it is necessary that the accusative also benefits the generality of the negative) (Al-Subki: 51v/52f)

**The third:** that he mentioned texts to Al-Jurjani that contradict his opinion. He said: If I say: What do you do in the manner of: And Allah does not like every proud arrogant (Luqman: 18).

And similar to it from the Almighty's saying: “Allah does not like everyone treacherous and ungrateful”. (Al-Hajj: 380) (Al-Subki, 1/52).

In these verses and others the entry of (every) into the space of prohibition, (forbidding is like negation) (Al-Subki, 1/52).

Al-Subki said: (I said, Salab from the total is more general than robbery from every individual, as evidence from outside may indicate the generality of robbery, unlike Abd al-Qaher) (Al-Subki, 52 and/52). Al-Taftazani held the statement of the total denial if it entered into the denial space on the majority, not that it is a general ruling. He said: (And the Sheikh - i.e. Al-Jurjani - said: If we meditate, we will find that each is included in the context of the negation, which is only appropriate where it is intended that some were and some were not. (Luqman: 18). And Allah does not love every sinful infidel (Al-Baqarah: 276), And do not obey every deficient swearer (Al-Qalam: 10). The truth is that this ruling is more than one, not total) (Sa'ad Al-Din Al-Taftazani 2007, 279).)

### **Reply to Al-Tanukhi**

In the course of talking about emphasizing the sentence and the stations of the discourse, Al-Tanuki said: (If they mean merely the report, they come with the actual sentence. And Al-Subki said: (His saying: If they just want to tell, then come to the actual sentence, there is consideration, because the actual is meant to renew, and to specify the time, not just the news) (Al-Subki, 25v, 26f). And it is what Al-Jurjani referred to in the chapter on saying about differences in the report, he said: (The subject of the noun is that the meaning of the thing is proven by it without requiring the renewal of something after something. I said Zaidha is the one who sets off, for she claimed that the starting part falls from it in a fragmented part, and I made him practice it and give it to him) and it is fair for Al-Subki to do justice to those who respond to him, and that is because he apologized to Al-Tanukhi by saying: Al-Subki, 25/26).

Then he folded his objection to al-Tanukhi's earlier words, saying: (And if his saying: The nominative sentence is for emphasis, there is consideration, for the noun, even if it indicates stability and stability, indicates the stability of its source from which it was derived. As confirmed by it) (Al-Subki, 25/26).

What I see is that the actual or nominal sentence is not used. For the sake of mere news or for the sake of confirmation. Rather, the criterion has its significance. If I want the indication of renewal and continuity, they come with the actual sentence, and if I want the indication of confirmation without renewal or the occurrence, they come with the nominal sentence as indicated by this Al-Jurjani in his aforementioned text, and the confirmation comes in both sentences with an affirmation other than The attribution and the ratio such as the affirmation of the actual by the oath, may and others, and the confirmation of the nominative with that, the lam, the oath, and others.

### **Conclusion**

After the argument of Sheikh Al-Subki's edits, deductions, and responses has been presented, it should be noted that despite his imam and extensive knowledge and his mastery of this knowledge, he is not disdainful of returning credit to his family and is not arrogant towards the people of knowledge. He was preceded by scholars, and if in some cases his deduction precedes his discovery, one of the scholars would have preceded him, so he is from this recital after earlier and discovered because he deduced it with his thought, and if someone

else preceded it to him, but he does not depend on that and returns it to the one who deduced it before him, and this is from his humility and fairness.

## References

- The Holy Quran
- 1. Al-Aqsa Alkareb, Muhammad Bin Muhammad Al-Tanoukhi, Al-Saada Press, 1st Edition, 1327.
- 2. AlBurhan Fi Olum al Qur'an, Al-Zarkashi, edited by: Muhammad Abu Al-Fadl Ibrahim, House of Revival of Arabic Books, Issa Al-Babi Al-Halabi, Edition 1, 1957.
- 3. Altahrer waltanweer, Muhammad Taher Bin Ashour, Tunisian House, Tunis, 1984.
- 4. Altatheel wal Takmeel Explanation of the Book of Tas'heel Abu Hayyan Al-Andalusi, ed. Hassan Hindawi, Dar Al-Qalam, Damascus, 1st edition, 2013.
- 5. Al Talkes fi oloum Al Balakah, Jalal Al-Din Al-Qazwini, edited by: Abdul Hamid Al-Hindawi, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, 1st edition, 1997 AD.
- 6. Dalael Al Eja'az, Abdul Qaher Al-Jarjani, edited by: Abi Fahr Mahmoud Muhammad Shaker, 3rd edition, 1992 AD.
- 7. Diwan Abi Najm Al-Ajli Al-Fadl bin Qudamah (dead, 120 AH) compiled, explained and verified by: Dr. Muhammad Adib Abdul Wahed Jamran, d., 1427 AH - 2006 AD.
- 8. Diwan Al-Farazdaq, Dar Beirut, 1404 A.H. - 1984 A.D
- 9. Sharah Tashel Al Fawad, Ibn Malik, ed.: Dr. Abdul Rahman Al-Sayed and Dr. Muhammad Badawi Al-Mukhton, Dar Hajar for Printing and Publishing, 1st edition, 1990 AD.
- 10. Sharah Kitab al Sibawayh, Abu Saeed Al Serafi, edited by: Ahmed Hassan Mahdali, Ali Sayed Ali, Dar Al Kutub Al-Ilmiyya Beirut, Edition 1, 2008.
- 11. Shuahid al altudih wal tasheh lmushklat al jama'a al saheh, Ibn Malik, ed.: Dr. Taha Mohsen, Ibn Taymiyyah Library, I 1, 1405 A.H
- 12. Suryasa, I. W., Rodríguez-Gámez, M., & Koldoris, T. (2022). Post-pandemic health and its sustainability: Educational situation. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(1), i-v. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6n1.5949>
- 13. Sahih al-Bukhari, Imam Muhammad bin Ismail al-Bukhari, Translated by: Muhammad Zuhair Nasir, Dar Touq al-Najat, 1st edition 1422 AH.
- 14. Al-Kitab, Sibawayh, edited by: Dr. Muhammad Kazem al-Bakka, Dar Sadiq, Iraq, Babylon, 1st edition, 2015.
- 15. Maktut Arus Alafrah.
- 16. Al Muqtab, Al Mubarrad, edited by: Muhammad Abdul-Khaleq Azimah, Alam Al-Kutub, Beirut, 1431 AH.
- 17. Sulam Al Osul Ltabakat al Fuhood, Mustafa bin Abdullah al-Qustantini al-Othmani, known as "Katib Chalabi" and "Haji Khalifa" (died 1067 AH) edited by: Mahmoud Abdul Qadir Al-Arnaout, Ircica Library, Istanbul - Turkey, 2010 AD.