

Derivation from Al-Naraqī in his book Anis Al-Mujtahidin

By

Zaman Kareem Mriyh

Department of Arabic Language, College of Education for Human Sciences, Wasit
University, Iraq

Email: zamankareemalshtay@gamil.com

Ahmed Jaafar Daoud

Department of Arabic Language, College of Education for Human Sciences, Wasit
University, Iraq

Email: aalzbedi@uowasit.edu.iq

Abstract

One of the language topics that fascinate fundamentalists is derivation. As it was noted in their disagreement that attaching the verb to the subject involves generating a name from this verb, because it affects our understanding of legal judgments and decisions? Was their quarrel literal or metaphorical? Sheikh Al-Naraqī stated: "The derivation of the derivative on a subject considering the past - that is, after its existence and its removal from it; Research" The fundamentalists have discussed whether the word "derivative" is apparent in the context of someone who is in possession of the principle or is apparent in the general case. We shall discuss Sheikh Al-Naraqī, one of the extremists, and his book's Anis Al-Mujtahidin.

Keywords: Significance, Position, Derivation, Greater Derivation, Least Derivation

Introduction

Derivative is a branch identical to the original in letter, etymology, and meaning; Because the derivative is a branch, it is necessary to verify the change of pronunciation between it and its origin; Subsidiarity and originality cannot be achieved without it. The change is either the addition of a letter or an action or both, or by decreasing one of the three, or by adding and decreasing together, or in only one, or by being one of them in the other, or by one of them in one of them, and the other in the other as well. The derivative's divisions become fifteen, four of which are unary, six are binary, four are triple, and one is a quatrain. These examples are apparent. Then the agreement taken in the definition refers to the agreement in the letters of the origins with the arrangement, from which the derivation comes out with the small derivation, that is, what is considered the agreement in the letters of the origins without the arrangement, towards: kunya and nakah. And in this way, the derivative with the greater derivation comes out of it, and this is what is considered the occasion in it without consent, towards: thlib and furrow, and in the two the occasion is considered in the sense without approval in it. The definition is still specific to what is known and considered by the people, which is the derivation by the minor derivation, in which the agreement in the letters is the originals with the meaning and arrangement, towards: multiply and multiply. Relying on the aforementioned definition, the modifier enters into the definition of the derivative. If we say Bstqqh, there is no problem. And if we did not say it, then the definition would not be a barrier, and that is why the definition was increased "with a change in the meaning", and at that time the modifier would come out, and with it the meme source would also come out. And it is possible to direct the term without the addition: that what is meant in the original is the infinitive, and then the term becomes continuous and reversed. Likewise, the derivative may be expelled, and this is considered the

existence of the meaning of the original in it so that it is included in its concept, and considering that the meaning is in it for correction so that the meaning in the same derivative is ambiguous considering the association of the meaning to it, such as the noun of the subject, the object, the suspicious adjective and others. It is possible not to be expelled, and this was considered in it the meaning of the original, in that it is more likely to be named among the names with this name, not since it is included in its concept, such as the bottle, the obstacles, Al-Debaran, and the like; So naming the bottle with the flask is considering the stability of the thing in it, but considering that in it is not in terms of its entry into its concept, but rather in terms of that it is likely to identify this name among all other names, so the consideration of that meaning in it is for clarification without correction. This teaches us that naming everything with the name of the continuous derivative, considering the existence of the principle of derivation, is by way of truth, and as for metaphor; Naming something other than the bottle, for example, with the bottle, considering the stability of the thing is a metaphor, not the truth.

The nature of derivation and its divisions

Derivation language: taking something from something... It came in Lisan al-Arab: "The derivation of a thing: its structure from the improvised, and the derivation of speech: taking it right and left, and the derivation of speech: taking it right and left, and the derivation of the letter from the letter: taking it from it" And idiomatically: taking one form of another with their agreement on the meaning and the original substance, and the form of its synthesis, to indicate by the second the meaning of the original with a useful addition, for which they differed by letter, composition or form The Messenger used the derivation in hadiths by saying: "God said: I am God, and I am the Most Merciful, I created the womb. Definitions of derivation varied and differed, so the definitions of a number of fundamentalists were different, their words differ and their meanings converge. And their contrast in the formula) which is according to Al-Suyuti meaning (to take one form from another, with their agreement in a meaning, an original substance and a syntax for it, to indicate by the second the meaning of the original, with a useful addition; for which they differed by letter, or form, as a hitter from "darab" and "beware" from caution" including the text of Imam Al-Zarkashi on the imams of the language, "The derivation is one of the most honorable and most accurate sciences of Arabic, and it is based on the science of morphology in knowing the original and the addition and the nouns and verbs, so he needs to know them in the derivation, and stop it in the grammar." Its letters are the origins and their meaning, and it is known from the fact that the derivative is a branch that it is necessary to verify what is in the pronunciation between it and its origin, since subordination and originality cannot be achieved without it. Thus, it has been proven that it is not devoid of four pillars, namely the derivative, the derivative, and the derivative from it. Their union in letters and meanings, and they share a word change, such as the derivation of a student from the request, or in a place of appreciation, a request from the request An example or two because he believes that it is easy to represent her, and that it is not within his competence, and he said at the end of his division, and the linguist must ask for examples of what he found of them. They are: "One: the increase in the movement, the second: the increase of the letter, the third: the increase of both together, the fourth: the decrease in the movement, the fifth: the decrease of the letter, the sixth: their decrease together, the seventh: the increase of the letter with the decrease in the movement, the eighth: the increase in the movement with the decrease of the letter, and the ninth: the increase and decrease of a letter and a letter in it. It also includes a movement and a letter, so these are the possible sections, and the linguist must ask for examples of what he finds. And the divisions of the derivative according to Sheikh Al-Naraki are fifteen, and counting the examples of them is apparent and we mention them according to the division of Sheikh with the representation of them.

- First: Four of them are singular: an increase in the vowel - victory from victory - or an increase in the letter - a liar from the lie -, a decrease in the vowel - infinitive from the past verb hit -, a decrease in a letter - fear from the action of the command fear.
- Second: Six of them are binary, namely: their increase together - a multiplier - or their decrease together - sir from sir-, the increase and decrease of the letter - a Muslim plural premise -, the increase and decrease of the letter - a plant grown from the plant -, and the decrease of the movement with its increase - the verb rum Past from the source Rum - decreased movement m P increase the letter - knowing who knew.
- Third: And four of them are triple: Decrease of movement with increasing movement and letter - multiply from the source multiplication, decrease of movement and letter with increase of movement - counting from promise -, decrease of movement and letter together with increase of letter - Kal of Kalak
- Fourth: And one of them is a quadrilateral, which is: Decreased movement and letter together with increased movement and letter together - throw from throwing

Returning to Sheikh Al-Naraki's definition of the derivative, the word approval requires approval in the original letters with the order, so we have two types of derivation here:

1-Small derivation: It is the extraction of one formula from another, even metaphorically, provided that they agree, i.e. their appropriateness in the meaning, the form of the composition for it, and the original material, to indicate by the second the meaning of the original, with the presence, and their difference in the form in fact and appreciation, with a useful addition of letters and form i.e. "Agreement in the letters of the origins in no order, towards: kunya and naki "

2-Al-Istiqaq Al-Kabeer: The most famous of Ibn Jinni's fascination with him, he is an absolute name, and he defined it by saying: "It is that you take an original from the three foundations and make it and on its six variants one meaning on which the six structures are combined and what each one of them disposes of, even if something is separated from that." He replied with kindness of craftsmanship and interpretation of it" so it is "what is considered the occasion in it without agreement, like: thlib and furrow" and considering the occasion in both is a condition without the appropriateness in it, as Sheikh Al-Naraki says, the definition remains specific to what is famous among the people, except that it is the derivative By the minor derivation that included agreement in the letters of the origins with the meaning and order, such as: multiply and multiply.

Based on the foregoing definition of the derivative, the modulus entered into the definition. Al-Suyuti says: "It is from the practices of the Arabs to bring the verb in the past while it is present or future, or with the wording of the future while it is past; Towards "God's command has come" i.e. it will come.. and "And they followed what the devils recited in order to control the kingdom".

Solomon' i.e. what followed; And to bring the object of the subject to the 'secret katim' i.e. muffled;

Water effluent', meaning 'boiled' and 'Isha. Satisfied," meaning he is satisfied with it, and "a safe sanctuary," meaning it is safe in it His metaphor is running, and his metaphor is Qifer, which means deserted." An example of this is the poetic verses cited by Ibn Live in Adoul in the same chapter:

If you are gentle, O Hind, then gentleness is right, and if you are gentle, O Hind, then gentleness is the mother

You are divorced, and divorce is a determination three times, and whoever breaks it is the most obnoxious and darkest. There is no problem in saying it by derivation, and there is no objection to the definition if we do not say, this is what Sheikh Al-Naraqī said and he indicated in the margin with examples, of which (three and a triangle) are denoted by three three and they are three three, so the matter required an increase in the definition and it is “with the change of what is in The meaning” and with this addition came out the modifier, and the meiform infinitive as well, or directs the term in its definition without the addition, since the infinitive is what is intended in the original, and then the term becomes progressive and reflexive

What expels its derivation and what is not expelled

1-What excludes its derivation, so it is based on analogy: “He is the one who considers the existence of the meaning of the original in it insofar as it is included in its concept, and the consideration of that meaning in it is for correction, so that what is meant by the derivative is an ambiguous subject given that the meaning is ascribed to it.” The noun of the object, the suspicious adjective, the superlative verb, the adverbs of place and time, and the noun of the instrument. The reason for naming is because the principle of derivation is based on the truth.

2-What his derivation is not expelled, so he relies on hearing: “And he is the one in which he considered the meaning of the original, not in terms of being included in its concept, but in terms of being more likely to be named by this name among the names, so the consideration of that meaning in it is for clarification without exclamation.” It is derived from the stability of the thing in it, i.e. from the decision, the bar and the impediment, and the consideration of the name in it came because of the weighting of this name among the names, and not because it is included in its concept. The name in it is metaphorical, and its usefulness appears in rulings in endowments, faith, comments, and the like.

Derivatives and their time significance

The scholars unanimously agreed to call the derivative on the subject as the future is definitely metaphorical, i.e. before it is characterized by it, such as when it is characterized by the principle, and its dead example for those who did not die and will die, and to release and use it as the case is a reality of accord, i.e. to describe it with the principle, such as the strike to direct beating, and the dispute occurred between them by launching the derivative on The subject in terms of the past, i.e. its characterization after the derivation has passed, is it a fact, or a metaphor? Like the one who hits the one who is still beaten? The people were divided into three sects.

1. The first school of thought held that it is absolutely true, and it is the doctrine of those whom Sheikh Al-Naraki calls his companions, Abu Ali Al-Jaba’i, the Mu’tazilah, and Ibn Sina.
2. The second madhhab held that it is absolutely permissible, and it is the madhhab of the Ash’aris, including al-Razi, and al-Baydawi chose it, al-Razi said.
3. The doctrine that says, judging in it is according to its survival, that is, if it is from what can be preserved, then it is metaphor, and the opposite of it is real, and its example is speech, and it is only completed by the sum of its letters and procedures, and there is

no doubt that you abstain, and every part that came cannot be sustained in a time, and it is not possible Comparing it with the future or the past, and vice versa, that is, if possible, it is a metaphor for multiplication and its like.

4. The fourth doctrine, which says to stop, and was followed by Al-Amidi, and Ibn Al-Hajeb.

The Sheikh touched on the most important rulings around which there was disagreement among scholars regarding the survival of the derivative adjective after the derivation has ceased. Imam Al-Razi went not to stipulate it by saying: “They differed that the derivation aspect remains a condition for the validity of the derivative’s name? The closest is that it is not a condition.” he emphasized in another place, that it becomes a metaphor after the demise of the derivative adjective, so he said: “As for the derivative, as long as the metaphor does not refer to the derivative from it, it does not refer to the derivative, which has no meaning except that it is something that happened to him the derivative of.” In their view, that he continued in possession until the time of release, as the hitter, or what could have continued, such as speech and news. That is, the place of the cell As for if the place did not have an existential description that contradicts or contradicts the first meaning, such as standing and sitting, and the combination of white and black, and with flying, metaphorically agreed, came in the preamble: Or a murderer, or a speaker, if he is condemned, as God Almighty says {And the adulteress and the adulterer, flog} {And the thief and the female thief, cut off...} And {So fight the polytheists...} and the like it is absolutely true, whether it is for the situation or not. This was a reason for some of them to say that the derivative may be true of the Self who is actually possessed of the event, and the same is the Self that was characterized by confusion and then the confusion has disappeared from it in the present time, as stated in the two honorable verses (They said that the two honorable verses do not indicate a more general temporal significance than the elapsed time and the time of flagrante delicto. Rather, they indicate that the theft and adultery occurred as a means to elicit and perpetuate the ruling. There is an opinion that says that it is true when the derivative is released considering the past, provided that the character of the subject with the principle is a majority, that is, when the non-characteristic of the subject with the principle is diminished if compared to the character, and the subject is not exposed or willing to the principle, and the derivative is equal in that it is condemned or Judgment by it, and whether the opposite occurs or not, especially since they use derivatives to refer to the aforementioned meaning from the presence of a presumption, such as the tailor, the writer, the reader, the teacher and the learner, even if the object is characterized by an existential opposite, such as sleep and the like, and saying that what was mentioned of the words and the like are all laid down for the faculties of these verbs. That is, the words, which are not acceptable to sound nature in most examples, and it does not correspond to what is in the books of the language for the meaning of its principles And quoting from Abi Ali and Al-Ramani, the commentator Al-Radi says: “The noun of the participle with the Lam is a verb in the form of the noun.” He said: “Ibn Al-Dahan also transmitted that from Sibawayh, and Sibawayh did not state this, but rather said: Al-Darib Zayda means hit”. The one who said that it is not stipulated was also inferred by what the people of the language said that the noun of the subject if it is carried on the past does not do the action of the verb, so it is not correct to say: “Multiplier Zaid yesterday,” as if it was an estimate of the future. The noun of the subject, because of the past participle of the verb In response to their inference, the truth is not necessary to call the subject’s name on it, and accordingly they said: The noun of the subject makes the action of the verb if it is estimated by the future, so it was said that the noun of the subject will be added tomorrow, and it is not true by agreement Our Sheikh summed up the dispute between them by saying: “A group mentioned that the subject of the dispute is as long as there is no existential description that contradicts the first, such as releasing the batterer to the one from whom the

beating has ended without continuity. A description that contradicts multiplication. And with flying - like shooting white at someone who has lost its whiteness and is now black - it is permissible by agreement. And in the words of some of our companions, the dispute regarding the derivation was decided by, as we say: Zaid is a batterer, or a speaker and the like, but if it is adjudged against, such as the Almighty's saying: {the adulterer and the adulterer} and {the thief and the thief} and {kill the evildoers without the word. {Others said that the conflict is in the derivation that means occurrence, such as the hitter and its like, without the one in the sense of stability, such as the believer and the unbeliever, and the sweet and sour. And some of the later said: The aforementioned absolute is true if the specificity of the essence with the principle is a majority so that the lack of character is diminished in the aspect of character, whether the derivative is judged by it or by it, and whether the opposite occurs or not, such as the writer, the tailor, the reader, the teacher and the learner and the like, and the right is the first doctrine. ; Because the batterer - for example, is - was put in the language for the one to whom the beating was proven, and this concept is comprehensive for the direct beating, and for the one who was struck and the beating was removed from him, so taking out one of the two individuals from it is a control.

If the condition for the survival of the derived adjective in the absolute was inferred by the detractors, the naming of the informant and the speaker would not be true unanimously. For the preceding letters with the last in origin, and the essence in it is not realized by one letter or at the same time, and there is no doubt in the absence of him being a true speaker before the existence of speech. Saying that it is a truth in the first place, and it is something that the mind does not care about, so what is true at the time that he is not a speaker, then he is inseparable from the negation of the truth This is verified in speech. The conditionals inferred for the survival of the adjective derived from it: that - hitter - after the end of the beating, then it is correct to say that he is not a hitter, which requires the sincerity of the saying that he is not a hitter, then when he is certified by that, it is invalid to be said about him as a hitter, because in our saying: (hitter) His objection - in the custom - is not a strike, so the answer to the one who said: (He is a batterer) when wanting to deny him, and invalidate the saying: He is not a batterer, it is the opposite of the first, that is why they used it in the refutation, and they are also subject to two contradictory concepts, and when one of them is true, the other must not be believed (, and it is answered by saying: They are two absolute propositions - he is a hitter or he is not a hitter- because the time of judgment in them is not unified, because the time of negation and proof may not be united, so they do not contradict each other. And the Sheikh's answer to the foregoing: "And the truth: that what is considered in the characterization of a subject with the principle at once is that it is said in the custom: that it is characterized by it, and this is verified as long as the subject is direct to the action by the customary directness, that is, as long as there is no separation between the parts of the verb so that the custom says: It is gone. direct "Those who said that absolute does not entail truth was inferred: that if it were not true in it, the believer would not believe the heedless and the sleeper that he is a believer, because Faith is achieved by good deed or ratification, and for what meaning is taken, the state of sleep is not achieved. Complete, and one of them is that it is said: Zaid is a hitter yesterday - so the hitter is called the one from whom the beating has passed, and they say that the origin in the absolute is true and we answer them with the same as Sheikh Al-Naraqī answered that the use is more general than the past and the case, as it is more general in the future, so it must be A fact at once, as it is permitted by agreement. They argued that if the batterer was actually shooting at the one from whom the beating has ended, it would not be correct to say - Zaid is not a batterer now - even though he is truthful by agreement.

And the answer to him: saying that he is not a strike now is more special than saying he is not a strike at all, and that his absence is more general than the negation of absolute multiplication, and since it is accepted that the most general in terms of existence is more special in terms of non-existence, and the truth of the general does not require the sincerity of the particular. The multiplier, i.e., the one who got the multiplication, expresses a universal essence with many particles according to the times in the present and the past, the agent and the machines, and therefore saying that he is not a multiplier now, is a negation of a certain part of those particles, i.e. the multiplication that is happening now, as for their saying: he is not a multiplier at all. , it is like a complete negation of all other particulars, and as we said earlier that partial negation does not necessitate negation of the whole. If it is said, “He is not a batterer now,” it requires the absolute, i.e., it is not a general strike, with the restriction of their union being a subject, and its evidence is that the general absolute is more general than every actual case, and the rule states that the truth of the particular necessitates the sincerity of the general definitely.

He was in agreement with the answer of our Sheikh Al-Naraqī when he answered by saying: “And the answer is: that in “now” there is no circumstance for negation, so that what is meant is that it is true in me. Synthesis, so what is meant is that he believes that he is not a hitter with a multiplication present in the instant, and that does not contradict our saying: It is true on the spot that he is a hitter at all. And he mentioned to him: that our saying: “Zayd is not a speculator now” is temporary, and it is required for the general absolute, provided that their subject is united. Because the absolute is more general. Actual cases, and the sincerity of the particular requires the sincerity of the general, and it contradicts our saying: Zayd is a hitter in absolute terms, and I answer: by preventing the incompatibility between the two absolutes differing in qualitatively. But he retraces the foregoing, indicating that the saying in his view is that it is forbidden to temporality, but it is also absolute - Zaid is not a multiplication now - because “because” is not a time to rob the absolute multiplication, but rather the predicate of the predicate, i.e. the lost multiplication, which is the specific multiplication conditional to occur now, and we mean that it is not a multiplication. Existing now or in the case, the saying with an estimate “Zayd is not a multiplier by the so-and-so” multiplication, and requires in temporality that the time in it is a time of negation, but if it is an absolute - not a multiplier at all - it suffices to indicate the proof of the inconsistency between it and the compelling absolute, and there is no need in the matter to be fractious. Requirement statement. The Sheikh believes that their assumption of the two estimates is invalid, because we have previously confirmed that there is no contradiction between the two divorcees, i.e. between them and the first divorced woman. But he confirms that this answer is incorrect because of the falsity between the two absolute truths in terms of definition and quality. Imam Al-Amīdī said: Infidels, because of the previous disbelief, and the one standing while sitting, and the one sitting standing, because of what was found of him sitting and standing before, and it is not permissible according to the consensus of Muslims and people of the tongue”.

The text of what our Sheikh said about the foregoing was: “It is not hidden that this answer is incorrect, in order to verify the falsity between the two different divorcees, how they are known, for it is said in response to those who said “Zayd is standing”: “He is not standing.” And customary falsity necessitates linguistic inconsistency, although the validity of the statement is Negation is one of the properties of metaphor, so it negates the truth. The truth in the answer is to say: The truth of the absolute negation is forbidden language, rather it is the essence of the dispute as you know, so it is not permissible in language to say: “Zayd is not a batterer.” Yes, it is reasonable to do so, based on the fact that the validity of the present negation of multiplication requires reason for the validity of the negation of multiplication in the

sentence. The validity of what the Sheikh took with examples of them is inferred - man is not an animal - the sentence is not permissible from a linguistic point of view, but it is reasonably permissible according to the assessment that an animal like the Sahel is denied, but this permissibility of robbery does not contradict the affirmation of the truth, which is the affirmation of the animal in the human being, because he is one of the members of his concept. And it is validated by the permissibility of depriving him of his intellect in general, and the pleasure lies in building the truth on language, not on reason, and they argued that it is not permissible to name the infidel on the believer after his conversion to Islam. Being dry black it is wet green

The sheikh answers the reasons for the ban, saying:

I respond to the first that the prohibition is legal, and about his two brothers: the reason for the prohibition in them is customary, and it is mentioned that the language does not reject the aforementioned absolute, so it is permissible linguistically, although it is excluded according to reason. If he singles out the case, if it does not occur in the case, whether it is against or against - as some have mentioned - then this evidence is rejected; Because not being absolute in the aforementioned matters would then be unanimous. For the contrary, it is outside the case, but the aforementioned agreement has not been proven, but its opposite is established. The truth in the answer is what was mentioned first. If you know this, you will know the reality of the situation in the other schools of thought, the aforementioned specifics, and the face of their corruption

Among the branching jurisprudential issues mentioned by scholars on this are:

1. If someone trusts something about a resident of a specific place, and the sheikh says about it, the right of some of the residents to go out does not invalidate, even if it is for a long period.
2. Dislike of purification with sun-heated water after it has cooled.
3. Hating the juvenile under the trees that bore fruit in the past and were not actually fruitful.

and after p Satisfying the evidence of all the schools of thought shows us that the most correct in the matter is an opinion that the adjective does not require the survival of the adjective in reality, i.e. the deniers are the condition for the survival of the adjective derived from it on the release of the name of the derivative. Or the case - as for the one from whom the beating will occur in the future, it does not require the sincerity that the beating took place from him, and on this it is not necessary that the one who truly believes that he struck what was found from the beating, should be true to the one who will get the beating, and it did not happen.

Derivative concept

Each of the derivatives denotes a subject and a specific description, so white denotes a thing with whiteness whose beginning is white. It was not made for privacy and it is not a part of what was put for it, so if the white had its connotation that it is a body, we would not be permitted to say - the white is a body - and it is similar to the saying - the white is the body - which is a waste, just as carrying the body on it was useless despite its benefit. The Sheikh concludes with a hadith on the etymology that the benefit appears in the rulings in the commentaries, oaths and the like, especially if your statement included a word derived from the words of the Lawgiver devoid of a presumption indicating self-determination. At the end of this, our words in this topic come to the importance of this phenomenon due to what it has contributed in giving flexibility to the linguistic connotations, whether for the Arabic lexicon

or the Qur'anic lexicon, and negating the monotony about it by enriching it with renewed words. Or openness and expansion, especially in keeping pace with what the necessity and need dictates to the text, and within the word, in order to reach its desired understanding. From many sides, they all contribute to the central connotation and the general axis of the term throughout the study and research. While alerting us to the error of some researchers in the unhurried judgment on some words and saying that they are among the verbal common to the diversity of their connotations and the difference in their meanings through their apparent observations, without paying attention to the variation and agreement in the infinitive, even if we look through a quick look at the origin of what the word was derived from It reveals to us that the plurality of meaning is in fact attributed to the plurality of the origin from which that utterance descended according to the language controls and its reality. We do not neglect the rule that says (the participation in the formula and the original together, not in the formula alone, and neglecting and ignoring the original) () After presenting the evidence of all schools of thought, it becomes clear to us that the most correct in the matter is the evidence of the nafoon, the requirement that the adjective derived from it remain on.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we can summarize the most important of this research in the following points :Definitions of derivation varied and differed, so there were several definitions for the fundamentalists, their words differ and their meanings converge. Among his definitions are:

1. Al-Rumani (d. 384 AH) defined it as (deducting a branch from an original whose expenses revolve around the original)
2. Al-Sharif Al-Jurjani defined him by saying (to remove one word from another, provided that they match the meaning and structure, and differ from them in the form)
3. According to Al-Suyuti, meaning (to take one form from another, with their agreement in meaning, an original substance and a syntax for it, to indicate by the second the meaning of the original, with a useful addition; for which they differed by letter, or form, as a hitter from a hit, and a warning from a caution)
4. Imam al-Zarkashi stated on the authority of the language imams, "The derivation is one of the most honorable and most accurate sciences of Arabic, and it is based on the science of morphology in knowing the original and the addition, nouns and verbs, for its clarity needs to be known in derivation, and it depends on it in grammar".
5. We find from it "The derivative is a branch that agrees with the original in its letters of the origins and its meaning, and it is known from the fact that the derivative is a branch that it is necessary to verify what is in the pronunciation between it and its origin, since subordination and originality cannot be achieved without it".
6. Sheikh Al-Taraqī touched on the most important rulings around which there was disagreement among scholars regarding the survival of the derivative adjective after the derivation is removed. on condition."
7. The divisions of the derivative according to Sheikh Al-Naraqī are fifteen divisions, and counting the examples of them is apparent and we mention them according to the Sheikh's division, with representations of them.

References

The Holy Quran.

Ibn al-Hajib Othman bin Omar (deceased: 646) (d.t), ultimate access and hope in the science of origins and argumentation - Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.

- Ibn Jinni, Abu Al-Fath Othman. (D. 392 AH). Characteristics, investigation: Muhammad Ali Al-Najjar, Cairo, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Masry.
- Ibn Katheer Al-Dimashqi, Abu Al-Fida Ismail Bin Omar Bin Katheer Al-Qurashi Al-Basri (deceased: 774 AH) (1987), The Beginning and the End, Dar Al-Fikr, 15 vol.
- Ibn Manzur, Muhammad bin Makram. (1990 AD). Lisan Al Arab, Beirut, Dar Sader, first edition.
- Ibn Yaish, Mowaffaq Al-Din. (D.T). Explanation of the detailed, Beirut, the world of books.
- Abu Sakeen, Abdul Hamid (1399 AH) Derivation and its impact on linguistic growth, Typical Arts Library (no place of publication), 1st ed.
- Al-Asnawi, Abd al-Rahim bin al-Hassan (died: 772) (1987), the introduction to graduating the branches on the principles, investigation: Muhammad Hassan Hito, Beirut, Al-Resala Foundation.
- Al-Asnawi, Abdul Rahim. (1999 AD). The End of the Sol in Explanation of the Method of Access to the Science of Fundamentals, Investigation: Shaaban Muhammad Ismail, Beirut, Dar Ibn Hazm, first edition.
- Al-Isfahani, Muhammad Taqi Bin Abd Al-Rahim (died: 1248) (1420), Guidance of the Guides in Explaining the Origins of the Religion, The Global International Teachers' Association in Qom, Islamic Nashar Institute, Qom.
- Al-Afghani Saeed, The Origins of Grammar, The Islamic Library.
- Al-Amidi, Ali bin Muhammad Abu Al-Hassan. (died: 631) (2003 AD). Accuracy in the origins of judgments, commented on: Sheikh Abdul Razzaq Afifi, Riyadh, Dar Al-Sumaimi, first edition.
- Al-Irawani, Sheikh Baqir, Kefayat al-Usul in its Second Style, Foundation for the Revival of Shiite Heritage, 5 vol. dat.
- Researches in the science of origins, research reports of Mr. Muhammad Baqir al-Sadr, Mr. Mahmoud al-Hashimi al-Shahroudi.
- 15The Sahih Mosque, which is Sunan al-Tirmidhi by Abu Issa Muhammad bin Surah, Chapter No. 9 - Righteousness and the Connection.
- Al-Jurjani, Ali bin Muhammad Al-Sharif (died: 814 AH) (2003 AD), definitions, Arab Heritage Revival House, Beirut - 1st Edition.
- Al-Jiani, Ibn Malik Al-Tai Al-Andalusi (died: 672 AH), Sharh Al-Kafia, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut.
- Al-Hadithi, Khadija Abdul-Razzaq Abani Al-Sarf, 1st Edition - Baghdad - 1965 AD.
- Al-Hilli, the scholar Al-Hasan bin Yusuf, (deceased: 726) (1425-1429), the end of access to the science of origins, achieved by Sheikh Ibrahim Al-Bahadri, 1, 5 volumes, Imam Al-Sadiq Foundation.
- Khan, Muhammad Siddiq (1296 A.H.), Al-Faqqa' in the science of derivation, Stretching Al-Jawa'ib.
- Al-Khurasani, Sheikh Muhammad Kazim, Kifaya Al-Osoul, founder of Aal al-Bayt, peace be upon them, for the revival of heritage.
- Khomeini, Sayyid Mustafa (died: 1398 AH) (1407), edited in the Origins, Edited and Corrected by Sayyid Muhammad al-Sajjadi, 1st Edition, Institution of Printing and Publishing, Qom.
- Al-Razi, Fakhruddin. (1998 AD). The crop in the principles of jurisprudence, study and investigation: Taha Jaber Fayyad Al-Alwani, Damascus, Al-Risala Foundation, third edition.
- A treatise on the derivative, Sheikh Mirra Abu Al-Qasim Al-Kalantar Al-Nouri, returns to the legal rulings arising from the issues.

- Al-Zarkashi, Muhammad. (1992 AD). *Al-Bahr Al-Mohit fi Usul Al-Fiqh*, edited by: Sheikh Abdul Qader Abdullah Al-Ani, and reviewed by: Omar Suleiman Al-Ashqar, Kuwait: Ministry of Endowments and Islamic Affairs.
- Zuhair, Muhammad Abu Al-Nour, *The Fundamentals of Jurisprudence*, Al-Azhar Heritage Library.
- Al-Subki, Ali bin Abdul Kafi. (d. 756) (2004 AD). *Al-Ibhaj fi Sharh Al-Minhaj*, Explanation of the Curriculum of Access to the Science of Fundamentals by Al-Badawi, Investigated by: Ahmed Jamal Al-Zamzami, and Nour Al-Din Abdul-Jabbar Saghiri, Dubai, Research House for Islamic Studies and Heritage Revival, first edition.
- Sibawayh, Amr bin Othman bin Qanbar. (D. 180 AH) (1991). *The book, investigation: Abdel Salam Haroun*, Beirut, Dar Al-Jeel, first edition.
- Al-Suyuti, Jalal al-Din Abd al-Rahman (deceased: 991) (1993), *Al-Durr Al-Manthur fi Al-Tafsir Al-Mathur*, 10 volumes, Beirut, Dar Al-Fikr.
- Al-Suyuti, Jalal Al-Din Abdul Rahman (died: 991), *Al-Mizhar fi Science Language*, explained, corrected and edited, his title is Muhammad Ahmed Gad Al-Mawla Bey - Muhammad Abu Al-Fadl Ibrahim - Ali Muhammad Al-Bajawi, 3rd Edition, Dar Al-Turath Library - Cairo.
- The second martyr, Zain al-Din bin Ali (died: 965) (1416), paving the way for fundamentalist and Arabic rules to unpack the legal rules, investigation and publication: Islamic Information Office, Khorasan, 1st Edition.
- Al-Shawkani, Muhammad bin Ali (deceased: 1250) (d. T), *guiding stallions to achieving the truth from the science of origins*, investigation: Ahmed Ezzo Inaya, 2nd edition: two parts in one volume, Beirut, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi.
- Sheikh Muhammad Al Radi (died: 1400 AH) (1426 AH - 2005 AD). *Beginning of access in explaining the adequacy of the assets*, correction: Muhammad Abdul Hakim al-Mousawi al-Bakaa, 2nd ed., Zohour Press.
- Al-Tayyar, Dr. Musaed bin Suleiman bin Nasser (2001), *Linguistic Interpretation of the Holy Qur'an*, the origin of a PhD thesis, Dar Ibn al-Jawzi, Dammam, 1st ed.
- Al-Iraqi, Sheikh Aqa Zia (D.T), *The End of Ideas in the Investigation of Words*, Islamic Publication Institution of the Teachers Group, Qom.
- Al-Fadil Al-Tuni, Abdullah bin Muhammad Al-Bashrawi (died: 1071) (1415 AH), *The Compendium in the Fundamentals of Fiqh*, investigated by: Sayyid Muhammad Husayn Al-Radawi, 2nd Edition, Qom, Islamic Thought Academy.
- Al-Quraishi, Aziz Salim, *Semantic Research in the Systems of Al-Durar in Matching Verses and Suras by Al-Baq'a'i (885)*, PhD thesis submitted to the Council of the College of Education at Al-Mustansiriya University, 2004 AD.
- Al-Thanawy, Haji Khalifa, *Scouts I Conventions of Arts*, Offset, Qassem Al-Rajab Library.
- For Al-Zajjaj, Abu Ishaq Al-Nahwi Al-Baghdadi (deceased: 311), *the meanings of the Qur'an, its parsing, explanation and verification by Dr. Abdel Jalil Abdo Shalaby*: Dar Al Maaref - Cairo, i 1, 1978.
- Journal of the Royal Arabic Language Academy, Al-Amiriya, Cairo, 1936.
- Mustafa Jawad (1971), *The Borders in Grammar, Among the Letters on Grammar and Language, and Sukuni and Looking at Definitions*, Tunisian House.
- Al-Naraqi, Muhammad Mahdi, *Anis Al-Mujtahidin in the Science of Usul*, investigation: Center for Islamic Science and Culture - Center for the Revival of Islamic Heritage, part 2.

Margins

- Lisan al-Arab, Ibn Manzur 10:181.

- See: The meanings of the Qur'an, its parsing, by Al-Zajjaj 1:38, and the derivation and its impact on linguistic growth, Abdul Hamid Abu Sakeen: 15.
- The Sahih Mosque, which is Sunan al-Tirmidhi by Abu Issa Muhammad bin Surah, Chapter No. 9 - The Righteousness and As-Silah: 315.
- The limits in the transformation: 139, and the semantic research looks at the systems of Al-Durar in the proportion of verses and surahs: 19, Aziz Salim Al-Quraishi.
- Tariffs, Al-Jurjani: 29.
- Al-Mizhar, Al-Suyuti 1:346.
- See: Al-Bahr Al-Moheet, Al-Zarkashi 2:71.
- Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqhi 1:77.
- See: Journal of the Royal Academy of the Arabic Language, 2:197-198, Origins of Grammar, Saeed Al-Afghani: 142.
- Al-Majsoul, Al-Razi 1:238.
- See: Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqhi 1:77-78.
- See: Al-Ibhaj, Al-Subki 3:575-580.
- See: Al-Mizhar, Al-Suyuti 1:348-349, Al-Alam Al-Khafaq, Muhammad Siddiq Khan: 17-18, and Abniya Al-Sarf, Khadija Abdul Razzaq Al-Hadithi: 253.
- See: Al-Mizhar in Language Sciences, 346.
- Anis for the Mujtahids, Al-Naraqhi 1:78.
- Characteristics, Ibn Jinni 1:346.
- Anis Al-Mujtahideen, the same source.
- Al-Mizhar: Al-Suyuti, 1:335.
- Al-Kitab, Sibawayh 1:336, 337, 4:43.
- See: Sharh al-Mofasal, Ibn Yaish 3:49.
- See: Anis Al-Mujtahideen, same source, same page.
- Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqhi 1:78.
- Same source, same page.
- Art conventions index, Al-Thanawy 1:845.
- See: Al-Ibhaj, Al-Subki 1:228-229, Nihat Al-Soul, Al-Assani 1:224-225, Al-Bahr Al-Moheet, Al-Zarkashi 2:338, Irshad Al-Fahl, Al-Shawkani 1:120-121.
- See: Preface to the rules, the second martyr: 84, rule 19.
- See: The Beginning and the End, Ibn Kathir al-Dimashqi 11:125.
- See: Al-Majsoul, Al-Razi 1:240.
- See: Same source, same page.
- See: The Beginning and the End, Ibn Kathir 13:309. See: Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqhi 2: 79-80.
- See: Al-Muntaha, narrated by Ibn Al-Hajeb: 25
- See: Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqhi 1:79.
- See: Rulings on the principles of jurisprudence, Al-Amadi 1:86.
- See: End of Soul, Al-Assani 2:82.
- Al-Majsul, Al-Razi 1:239-240.
- Same source, same page.
- See: Al-Tamheed, Al-Assani: 154.
- Same source, same page.
- See: Hedayat al-Murshideen fi Sharh Usul al-Din, al-Isfahani 1:373, Bidayat al-Wasl fi Sharh Kifaya al-Usul, Sheikh Muhammad Al-Radi 1:236, edits in al-Usool, Sayyid Mustafa al-Khomeini 1:198-199.
- See: Kifayat Al-Usool, Al-Khurasani: 50 and Nihat Al-Afkar, Aqa Dia Al-Iraqi 1:139, Kifayat Al-Usool in its second style, Al-Irwani 1:352.
- See: Al-Wafidah, Al-Fadil Al-Tuni: 63-64.

- Explanation of the sufficient, Al-Jiani 2:201.
- See: Al-Majsoul, Al-Razi 1:242, Al-Hakam, Al-Amidi 1:57.
- See: Al-Ahkam, ibid. 1:5.
- Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqī
- See: Al-Ahkam, Al-Lamdi 1:57, End of Sol, Al-Assani 1:231.
- See: Al-Ahkam, same source 1:58, End of Sol, same source 1:231.
- See: Al-Majsoul, Al-Razi 1:240, Al-Ahkam, Ibid. 1:56, End of Soul, Ibid. 1:227, guidance. Stallions, Al-Shawkani 1:121.
- See: Al-Majsoul, Al-Razi 1:242, Nihat Al-Soul, the same source 1:228, Irshad Al-Fahl, the same source 1:121, Usul Al-Fiqh by Abu Al-Nur Zuhair 2:21-22.
- Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqī 1:80.
- See: End of Reach, Al-Allama Al-Hilli, 1:195-196.
- See: Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqī 1:81.
- See: Al-Majsoul, Al-Razi 1:242, Al-Ahkam for Al-Amidi 1:57, Nihat Al-Sol, Al-Assani 1:230-231.
- See: Researches in the Science of Fundamentals, Research Reports of Sayyid Muhammad Baqir al-Sadr, Sayyed Mahmoud al-Hashimi al-Shahroudi: 374, Hedayat al-Murshideen fi Sharh Usul al-Din 1:362.
- See: Al-Ahkam, Al-Amadi 1:49.
- Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqī 1:81.
- See: The End of Soul, Al-Asnawi 2:73-90.
- Rulings, by Al-Amidi 1:58.
- Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqī 1:82.
- See: Al-Ahkam, Al-Amadi said: 1:89.
- See: A Risala fi Al-Mashtaq, Sheikh Mirra Abu Al-Qasim Al-Kalantar Al-Nouri, referring to the legal rulings arising from the issues: 197-200.
- See: Al-Ahkam, Al-Amidi 1:57.
- See: Anis Al-Mujtahidin, Al-Naraqī 1:83-84.
- See the linguistic explanation: 498