

The concept of snatching (Al-Salb) and its authenticity in Arabic

Ghanim Hani Gzaar al-Nasiry¹, Sabah 'Etiewi Aboud Al-Zubaidi²

Abstract: *The snatching (al-Salb) was mentioned frequently among the Arab linguists scholars in their manifestations, that its meaning by their concern is coercion and removal by hatred obligation, as Ibn Jenni (392 AH) held in its characteristics a door or a chapter for the snatching in which he explained that the snatching is the negation of the positive connotation of the verb or the guarantor noun of its meaning by increasing the structure of the word, as he gave it many examples, including the verb (A'jam) that indicates the presence and clarity, while we find its lexical material indicating to the vagueness, this indication was stolen by increasing the hamza on it, that when the snatching means the coercion and removing events _ as the events manifested by verbs or what like them _ the linguists have limited the indications of the snatching in them, However, we find other means of snatching that are not verbal, that they function as snatching from what it came with. Neither the grammarians nor the morphologists had mentioned them in their records or books, so this research which is entitled (The concept of snatching (al-Salb) and its authenticity in Arabic) came as an attempt to present the concept of the snatching of meaning and its implications with these multiple means.*

The Keywords: *snatching, removal, coercion, dismantling.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Words are placed in structures and contexts to be used in performing many various meanings, according to what the originator needed for the speech, also according to the conditions at the time of speaking, hence the language as a medium of various human needs; As these terms are charged with meanings that express the purposes that were intended by the speaker, as these diversified the methods that are related to these purposes, so the news and creation were of various types, meanwhile, the articles that carrying this are varied from names, verbs and letters. However, the full talk of the meanings that perform the purposes is subjected to considerations and criteria that make it varying in the degrees of acceptance, but rather it is subjected to inevitable conditions when performing the meaning, including that the speech is impossible because its contradiction in the meaning, so it does not make sense to say, for example: By God, if I had died, I would have complained you to the judge because this is impossible and does not make sense to say the truth, for example: Abu Zaid (means the father of Zaid) does not have a son. How is he a father without a son, how does he not have a son who is Abu Zaid? If the evidence is named him by the metonymy, it is true.

It is also impossible for you to say: My brother Muhammad does not have a brother, so how can he not have a brother as his brother Mohammed is the truth? If the other evidences are based on the denial of brotherhood, then the words will be correct and true, such as saying to your brother, battering and blaming you are not my brother.

It is also impossible for the speech to be general, so it does not make sense for its general, Sibawayh (180 AH) said: (if he said, "No one was like you or no one was addicted to a contradiction, because he knew that there was no Zaid or no one like him except from people)"².)

Center for Continuing Education - Al-Qasim Green University-Iraq¹
College of Education for Humanities - Babylon University -Iraq²
Corresponding author's e-mail: ghanimalnasriy@environ.uoqasim.edu.iq
²(Sibawayh Book: 1/55.

Likewise, do not say in the void exception: only Khaled attended and I honored only Muhammad; because that requires everyone on earth has attended, also that the honored one all people except Khalid, Al-Khudari (1287 AH) said: (Do not say: I hit except Zaid; ... for it is impossible for hitting all people other than him)¹ .⁽

If consort exists to determine the exclusion, the speech is correct, Al-Radhi (686 AH) said: (If you were told: You have not met the makers of the country? Then you say: I have met except someone)², then the meaning of the words does not mean that he met all the country's makers. Also, the benefit must be available in the telling, it is not reasonable to tell Muhammad about Muhammad, and she says: Muhammad is Muhammad and the house is the house.

If the consort exists, it will be correct, as that due to the difference between the two sides of the chain of transmission, you say: My generous brother is generous, the beautiful one is beautiful, but it can be true; because you want to demonstrate generosity and beauty, meriting and acknowledging him about it.

Also from that you do not say: the fire is hot and the snow is cold, because there is no use in speaking, Ibn Al-Sarraj (316 AH) said: If someone said: You say: God is our Lord and Muhammad is our Prophet, as this is a known truth with us and other muslims, but we say that in response to unbelievers and to those who do not say it, as if we had no contradiction to this statement, it would have been said only in glorification and praise and for seeking a reward for it ... The root of the speech is subjected to get benefit as if the doctrines widen in it, but if someone had said: Fire is hot and snow is cold, then this would be utterly useless)³.⁽

This is the origin of speech, which is subjected to get benefit whether it is negative or positive, interrogative or informative, as the purpose of the speech may be to snatch this meaning, our saying: There is no snatching of the meaning of going, then it does not attend the snatching of the meaning of attendance, also I do not know the snatching of the meaning of knowing and so on.

The meaning of snatching is not to empty this word from its meaning, then it remains empty without meaning. Rather, this meaning is taken away to remain loaded with another meaning other than the snatching meaning, if not then is was against it.

The linguists have presented the snatching and its meaning, as this was limited to the morphological side, that they said that the most famous articles in it is the " Hamza of snatching" and the formula (fa'ala), like: peeling something if it removes its peel, ticking the camel removes its ticks, or sickening if it removes its ills.

However, we found that snatching was much more than that, as it came in many ways that were littered with linguists, so this research is an attempt to present the snatching of meaning by these multiple means.

II. CONCEPT OF SNATCHING (AL-SALB):

Snatching in language means coercion and removal by coercion and subjugation. Ragheb Al-Isfahani (d. 502 AH) said: "(Snatching took away something from others over oppression. The Almighty said: {And if the fly snatches away a thing from them, they will have no power to release it from the fly} [Hajj: 73])⁴, as snatches means: disposed, as the language glossaries does not depart from this concept, as the snatching is the snatched man and the female camel so as is the woman, whom her son was snatched, it is said about the bark of the trees from which it was snatched, the snatching is also what one of the two centuries of war takes from its place, from what it is and with it of clothing, weapons and animals, because it was taken by force and strength, that the snatching man is the one who was snatched his mind, and the camel was snatched if it rushed in its path even as if it came out of its skin, also the woman snatching as she is snatched if she was dressed in mourning clothes, as if she were stripped of her joy through force and coercion)⁵.⁽

What appears to the linguists is that the order of affirmative is before snatching, for affirmative is a source and snatching is a branch thereof, so snatching as mentioned above is the removal of the event, and the deeds and the like are events, so the basis for the verbs is to prove the events and not as removing them, Ibn Jenni said: (Know that every verb or noun is taken from the verb, or it has the meaning of the verb, if it is put this in their words to prove its meaning and do not snatch them)⁶.⁽

¹Hashya: Al-Khudari: 1/466.

²Shah al-Radhi on Kafya: 2/101.

³Fundamentals in syntax: 1/72 - 73..

⁴(Vocabulary in Qur'an: 419 (snatched)..

⁵(See: Arbitrator and the Greatest Circumference 8/504 (snatched), Lisan Al-Arab 1/472 (snatched), and the surrounding dictionary 97 (snatched).

⁶Properties: 3/77.

So (stood) to prove the (standing) and (sat) to prove the sitting and (set out) to prove the (setting), as well as the starting and standing and the starting as they infer that the increase which is attached to the original to remove its meaning and snatching it, so if you want to negate something from them for example, the negative you have to attach to it and the letter of negation: he didn't do, he will not do, he does not, and he does not do.... for the negated is the snatching happened by increasing the article of negation on it, as what the increase has become as a branch and what is just one of it became a source, Al-Suyuti (911 AH) said: (The affirmative is the root of others i.e negations, prohibitions, interrogations, etc.. We say, for example: Zaid stood up, then we say in the negation: Zaid did not stand, as in the interrogation: did Zaid stand up ?, in the prohibition: do not stand up and in the imperative: Stand up, as you see the affirmation composed from a datum and a datum to it, and others need to be indicative in the forming on that other, that whenever it is a branch, it needs to be indicated by it, just as the identification needs a sign from (Al: which it means in English "the") and the like; because it is the Indeterminate branch)¹⁴, because these increases are brought to the original to be snatch away from it its significance or change it, so the increaser becomes a branch, that the masculine have an root and feminization is a branch of it; because it has an increase in the masculine - the original - and the present tense is its present state and reception and the increase over it is its disposal for reception or for going forward, as the source is an root because it is an event that does not increase in it as is the verb that contains the event and time, that the burners enter the nominal sentences, and this is an root , that they make them as a branch, so the snatching often takes place with an emergency increase in construction, which removes the evidence that was originally proven for it, however, this increase was more appropriate in indicating to the snatching before that the it means an accident to prove the original that is affirmative and positive, so when the snatching was an urgent, plus, happening in the original, it was related to everything has the increase; as the increase in an accident is an accident of the indication, can't you see that feminization is an emergency on the original that is masculinization, so it needed an extra sign to indicate it, such as (taa: ت) a talha and the alif (a: ا) in Boshra and Hassanaa, like is the definition, as it is an extra emergency to Indeterminate , therefore, it needs to an increase in the pronunciation indicated to it as (Laam ل) of the definition in (gholaam) and (jariyaa), as we may find some verbs on the contrary on that which are indicating that the event went without an increase in its construction like: the drink ran out, the water receded, his trade was lost, his work is invalidated and his livelihood is gone, the truth is that these verbs are to prove its events originally, meaning his trade was lost is the stability of his loss of it, the drink is run out, is the stability of the running the drink out and the invalidity of the work, so when they are negated, this event is taken away(snatched) from it, so what he didn't lost his trade means, the snatching of losing from it, as well as the other verbs.

This is what we can say is the dominant and not for at all; As not all that is negated which is placed as a snatching for the event, nor is every annuller snatching the indication of the annulled, but the sentences are said on their denominators, their occasions and their contexts that determine their indications. Our saying: If only the infertile gives birth, for example, it does not mean that the original in it: the infertile gives birth, also our saying, if only the dead would return, it does not mean that the originally in which the dead person returns, so is our saying: the rock is not a speaker, in which a speaker is not the original in which the rock speaks; Therefore, the sentences are said to be composed of their chains authorities and their faults, according to the clues and levels, also are not based on their division into assets and branches.

Since it was(this meaning of the snatching is for the verb)²⁴ , for the linguists, we do not find some verbs indicating the snatching in itself without increase to it which is indicating on it, Ibn Jani mentioned a number of examples, but he insists that snatching is an accident by means of the increase, so he began to interpret it with a high sense this increase in the verb in an exaggerated interpretation, in which even the most distant verbs from what was subjected to it from the event. He said, about the verb (Sahar) for example: It is that if it stripped divest from the increase in letters, as it was not stripped from the increase in what is the attached with the letter, which is within its vowels...., as in (sahar)is alif (ا), yah(ي) as if it is (saheer) , as it is not stripped from the increase that was a present tense to the letter that is to say the vowel¹³.

I do not know how this was justified for him to turn from (Sahr) into (Saheer), as if the verbs were voluntary between his hands that connotes what he wants of connotations and construction, as this is what he ended up with

¹⁴Likes and isotopes: 1/211 .

²⁴Properties: 3/85.

¹³Properties: 3/85.

as a result of his insistence that the snatching is an increase happening to the original and is positive, whereas snatching has an excessive meaning, it must be matched by happened increase in the verb, as if this increase is made up of letters denoting the snatching, like the meanings of the happened with letters that denote them, such as the feminization of the maculation which is requiring an extra sign in the pronunciation that is indicating it, like it, the definition of the needing negation that need to a sign which is an increase in the pronunciation like the article of definition (the) and others, but when he found stripped verbs from the increase and the indication of the snatching in them is clear towards: the dust disappears the eight envelopes ,as he went to the indication in it of the situation as we see that Zaid and the Bakkar are known as the situation with not of the definition (laam), as well as these verbs, but rather he went to more than that, as he sees (that this meaning which was found in the verbs is more than the meaning of affirmative by snatching it, as if it was marketed on what came from the names as a guarantor of the meaning of the letter as the names used by it ... the interrogation is an happening in it according to what the names have been given for the benefit of its meanings)¹.(

There is no doubt that Ibn Jenni has greatly interpreted his interpretations as what he envisions to denote the snatching, otherwise what is inhibiting that these and other verbs are placed on snatching, testifying for this that we have found many verbs are indicating their placement of snatching happens from them, for example, the verb (ghasaba which means in English wring) means taking with coercion and it means (extort) taking someone else's money injustice and aggression, also (rape)forcing woman or girl to have sexual intercourse²(, the verb (despite) means humiliation from his hatred and forced him to make him bear what he cannot abstain from³(, (remove the thing: pull it from its place, like removing the bow from his liver, also from it removing love and enmity from the heart, removing someone something i.e snatching, The Almighty said: { removing the domination from whomever as He wills} [Aal Imran: 26], and He said: "Plucking out the people" [Al-Qamar: 20], it was said that people took off from their places due to the intensity of its blowing, and it was said: Their lives are stripped from their bodies)⁴.(

From that the verb (killing); As the root of the killing is the removal of the soul from the body like death, the verb (Ghaala) means destroyed, destroyed and murdered him and took him from where he did not know, which means that It is to deceive a person so that he comes to a place where the one who kills him has hid for him⁵(, and (defeat) the meaning of beating, I beat him by mastering and defeating, it is said I have conquer him⁶(and other verbs that were included in the lexicon of the language.

The means of the Indicative snatching.

Whereas the snatching means the removal of events and their coercion, and - events which are minimized by verbs or the like - the linguists limit the increases that indicate the snatching with them, as they can be summarized as follows:

1- Hamzah: It is quaint that the most extra hamzah does is affirmation and positive, like: I honored him and did good for him and I gave him and saved him, on the contrary, it comes to snatch the event and remove or stripping it, like: I will complain him if he removes his complaint, I have a problem with the book if I removed its problem, and I sickened him if I remove his illness.

2- The formula (fa'ala): This formula comes with several meanings, including removal, which is snatching, like: I specked the eye, if I stripped off its eye sore, and I would tick the camel and whipped it if I removed its skin with picking skin off⁷(, from what is said Almighty God: {that, when terror is removed from their hearts} [Saba: 23], i.e., He removed their fear⁸.(

3-The formula (Tafa'ala): like abstaining, shunning, spend the night in prayer, al-Ragheb said: (Nursing is the practice of the patient and his achievement is the removal of illnesses from the patient, such as specking in removing the fine dust from the eyes)⁹.(

4 - The formula of (al-taf'ala): like: the (al-tawdya), which is a stick that is put on the back of the camel to prevent milk, which it is to remove not to prove it)¹⁰.(

¹(ibid. 84-83

²(See: fine tuning of the language 62/8 (usurpation)..

³(See: the Arab tongue 12/245 (though).

⁴(Vocabulary in the strange Qur'an 798 (stripped) .

⁵(See: Arab Tongue 11/509 (gal).

⁶(See: Vocabulary in the strange Qur'an 611 (Ghalb) .

⁷(See: The secret of making syntax: 1/50-51.

⁸(See: Al-Jami 'for Ahkam al-Qur'an 14/298, the surrounding sea 8/545, and Al-Durr Al-Masoun 9/180

⁹(Vocabulary in the strange Qur'an: 765 (sickness)..

¹⁰(Properties: 3/83.

5- Formula (mufa'al): likes a padded man, for the belly shirt, from the verb (belly), as if he were snatched of the abdomen)¹⁴.

This is what the linguists' books mentioned about the snatching, but we can find other manifestations of snatching by nonverbal means that do the snatching function of what they are entering into. Neither the grammarians nor the morphologists mentioned in their records, among these aspects are the following:

1) The definition's snatching: the definition snatches by the following means:

A-The yah of the genealogy: the lineage yah(ي) snatches the definition of what you interfere with, and makes it an Indeterminate , so we say in Baghdad: Baghdadi and in Kufa: Kufi; that is why the Indeterminate describes it as: this is a Baghdadi man and that is a Kufi man, Sibawayh said: (know that if you add a man to a man then you make him from the family of that man, that you added the addition yah). If you add him to a country, you make him from its people, that yah is added. Also, if you add all other names to the country, or to a neighborhood or tribe)², that Sibawayh did not declare about this snatching, but his saying (I made him from the family of that man or his family) means that he enters into the general of the one who entered the name attributed and becomes a member of them. It has come in the book(Tawtheeh al-Maqasid): if they refer to his lineage with something, they would increase yah the term of the lineage ... vowelizing with (i) before it, as you say in the lineage to Zaid: Zaidi)³.

B - Perhaps(رب): It is an Indeterminate article, as if you enter it into definite that has taken away its definition and made it Indeterminate (because the(رب)is one of the characteristics of Indeterminate)⁴. So he added more to our saying: perhaps Zaid whom I met, it became the basing on Indeterminate, as well as if its income is a pronoun, Sibawayh said in their saying: Perhaps a man and his brother: (His saying and his brother are in a position of Indeterminate, because the meaning is only him and his brother, so if it was said: is this adding to definite or Indeterminate? Then you will say to definite, but it conducted the course of Indeterminate , just as your ideals are added to definite while it is describing the Indeterminate and its places are located, don't you see that you say: perhaps likes you)⁵.

C- (Al): (Al) of definition is snatched (Amsa: yesterday) if it entered with it, as (amsa)is definite as because (yesterday: the day before your day)⁶, that if you entered (أل :the) with it, it will become in the sense of long time not the day before your day), Al-Suyuti said about it (If you want to define it with (Al), it will be Indeterminate)⁷.

D- Dualism and plural snatch the definite of its definition, then it will be under the rule of indeterminate. So, Zaid, Amr and Bakr are proper nouns of the situation, so it is described as definite, as you say: Zaid the poet and Bakkar the brave, do not enter it (the) with them, so we do not say: AlBakr, AlZaid and AlOmar, but if they were two or they made plural the entrance of (أل) with them is permitted, then we can say: al-Zaids, Al-Bakkar and Al-Omars that it was true that we can describe it as Indeterminate , we say: Two brave Zaids were attended because the definition of these proper nouns is snatched and become as a base of Indeterminate s

E - The call: One of the identifiers of the name is the call, If the defined noun was called, the call would snatch its definition, then it definition becomes known to the call article: O Zaid, because the noun does not include two definitions, Abu al-Barakat al-Anbari (577 AH) said: ((The definition of the property is removed from it and the definition of the call and intent happened in it, so no two definitions are combined)⁸.

2) Snatching the likeness of verbal (the variable of the Invariable) from its means are:

A diminution: one of the articles of snatching in Arabic is diminution; It snatches the nouns that are prohibited from variation, which made them similar to the verb, conjugates and modulates ,towards: Auhaimurun(red) and Ausaimun(duff); Because the diminution is one of the signs that the noun is stable in its property noun, don't you see that the agent noun if it is shortened, it will be away from the similarity, then its work has weakened, Sibawayh said: (Know that you do not belittle the noun if it is like a verb, don't you see that it is ugly)⁹, they also responded to Al-Kisaei (189 AH) his works is that the agent noun is minimized in towards: I think I am traveling which is firmly

¹⁴(See: ibid. 3/83.

²(Sibawayh Book: 3/335.

³Clarification of intents: 3/1443.

⁴Sharah al-Radhi ealaa al-Kafia:3/257.

⁵Sibawayh Book: 2 / 54-55.

⁶ibid: 3/479.

⁷Grammatics: 48 .

⁸Arab Secrets: 174.

⁹Sibawayh Book: 3/480.

established as its object, but rather it is an adverb of place ; because (the adverb is worked from it the verb's spirit other than the object)¹.(

B- The Modulation: One of the signs of snatching is the entry of the modulation of undetermined on a section of the proper nouns to shift from definition to undetermined (towards I saw Ismail(with modulation) and the meaning I saw some body was named Ismail, other than your saying: I saw Ismail(without modulation), it means a known person, like; I passed Khalid(without) and other Kalid(with)² , so the modulation has snatched from them the definition as they became indeterminate.

C- The (t)Suffix for the Ultimate plurals, it is to ultimate plural to the individual like:(Saiarifat) and (Saiqilat) the plural of the (sairaf) and (saiqal) for their joining with voluntarily and hate, so by this, the plural becomes conjugated after it was prohibited from variation

D – The addition and Alif and Laam: The conjugation of the none conjugated by addition also the entry of Alif and (Lamam) of definition, so you say I passed you Ahmed and by Ahmad; this is because they are snatching from it of the similarity of the verb; As they are two of the signs of the noun, so this name is reduced with the vowel (i)³(

3) The snatching by disposition:

The term is placed in a specific position, which is related to relationships with other terms in the structure, If its position is changed, the indication changes with it by snatching an element of it , so our saying: Zaid attended is not like attendance of Zaid, that's due to the different positions of Zaid the structure, as the Indeterminate adjective for example which after its noun in the position but if it came at first it will be an adverb, towards: In the house a man is standing and A standing man is in the house that the describing is snatched⁴.(From this we also say: what a man is Zaid, it is permissible in (Zaid) to primitive and conductive. If the position was changed as we say: Zaid is what a man, it will be not permissible because it was snatched by telling, from it also the meeting of the condition and the oath , then the answer will be to the owner of the preceded position, but the late one answering is snatched for the indication of first on it, Al-Radhi said: (If the oath takes precedence over the words of the condition, considering, the oath must be first; to strengthen the oath to the precedence which it is its root, while the weakening of the condition is being in the middle.....and if the condition precedes the oath , it must be considered, to strengthen it by the priority while being originally stronger than the oath)⁵.(

4) The snatching by construction:

You may have two or more words that become a single word that has a base other than its original base, so (إِ) is a noun and if it is combined with (م) becomes a letter which is elided two verbs, as the construction has snatched from it the noun's characteristic and changed it as a letter, as (هَلْ) is a letter of interrogation which is entering on the verbal nominal sentences, If it is combined with (لَا), the interrogation will be snatched and turned into an article of stimulation, and negating (لَا) if it is combined with the hamza before it, it became a letter of caution, as the negation was snatched from it, then it would have new conditions that it did not have before, as it enters on (م) that it does not enter (لَا), also (لَا) is a letter of denial to denial which if it combined with (ي) it will become a letter of denial to presence that the second denial was snatched, (كَلَيْتَ) is a combination of two letters, the similarity letter (ك) and (ي) which is added to it the letter (س) and became as one word, that this combination had a meaning from nothing.⁶.(As the construction may snatch the firmness of the nominals, so that it will be as a prohibited of conjugation (from where the combination was a branch on one and second to it, because the simple one is before the combined)⁷, which also snatching the property, from this their saying: the hands of Sheba went, which is a striking example of dispersal in countries, who is Shebaa Bin Yashjub (So it removed with the structure meaning of the noun property and became one noun)⁸.(

5) The snatching by the letters

Some of the letters, if you enter the construction, it snatched something from its meaning, as may (قَدْ) if it enters the phrase (may God have mercy on him), it will snatch the construction and make it as a news, as well as our saying: May God reward you with good, that (قَدْ) is snatched the construction which was in it before the entrance of (قَدْ), as

¹Mughni al-Labib: 568.

²Meaning of grammar: 3/304.

³See: Sharh Ibn Aqeel: 3/321.

⁴Properties: 3/78..

⁵Sharah al-Ridhi ealaa al-Kafia: 5/458 ..

⁶See: likes and isotopes 1 / 104-105..

⁷Detailed explanation: 1/183 .

⁸ibid: 3/161.

the two letters of reception (س) and (سوف) snatch from the present tense and they get it rid it to reception. The extra baa (ب) in our saying: What your brother who (بالذي) attended with dereliction, snatching the description in who (الذي) became as a conductive, as well as it was fit to be the Hijazi (ما) and (dereliction) its conductive, and the extra (من) snatches the unit and stipulates the negation of genus in our saying: There is no man has attended, which is also snatching the present and stipulates the distinction in our saying: what a knight he is, as an enough man he is; because (من) is statement and discrimination (a remover of the thumb of what preceded it by clarifying its genus)¹.

6) The snatching by designation (naming).

There are words in Arabic that have the priority in speech, such as interrogative articles, articles of condition, etc., so if they are named with them, they are stripped from their meaning and intended to be pronounced and the most important provisions snatched of it, which is the priority, in this case it is the same as the noun which is similar to it in the status of construction and takes its rule, it came in "al-Muqtathab" that: (if you name it "إن" ... or "عل" or any other letter ... I would analyze it and change it because it is like the nouns, that is towards your saying: "This is (إن)," as well as (عل) and what was like it .. the counterpart of what I told you in the letter if it was singular, he said)²:

I wondered my poem as where the wondering from me, that wonder as if means exhausted³.

Ibn al-Sarraj said: (If you were named as "كم" how many or "من" who, so you say: This is how many has come)⁴ (Ibn Jenny said after he mentioned the words of Humaid bin Thur al-Hilali)⁵.

And Asmaa'u of what Asmaa'u in night is come to me and my companions with any and wherever.

(So he strip any "أي" from the interrogation and prevent it from being conjugated, because of the definition and feminization. That is because he placed it as a proper noun on the side that it is placed. As for his saying: wherever (وأيضا" it is also so)⁶.

as for the naming that stripped these words from its meanings and snatched its priority, that the examples these are mentioned above would not have been validated, and this is very clear.

7) The snatching by disputation

The grammarians prohibit the entry of two agents to one agent, because each one of them requests an agentive⁷. Therefore, their opinions has abounded in the meeting of the two articles of eliding (إنْ ولم) such as: I lost, if you did not (إنْ لم) say the truth, between those who see that the work is to the condition and who sees that the work is to the work verb to (لم)⁸.

What seems to me is that the conflict in this between these two letters, that the work is for the condition, in addition that (لم) is snatched with eliding for the following items:

A- (إنْ) has the priority to (لم) then it is strengthened in the first line, don't you see that progress is the one that strengthens the condition or oath when they meet, so the answer is for the prior one from them.

B-(إنْ) is eliding two verbs, while (لم) elides one verb, as the one which is eliding two verbs is stronger than the one which elides one verb .

C- (لم) would give up from its verb as a part from the whole; Therefore, there is not separation between them with a comma, while separating between (إنْ) and its elided by a comma, because it does not lowering the position of the part of the whole of its worked, so it is stronger than (لم).

D- (إنْ) is wider than (لم); As it enters with the past and the present tense, while (لم) is specializing in the present tense only.

E- (إنْ) is confirming the present and past tends to receive reception, while the (لم) is converting the present in to the past tense, so the one which confirms two verbs is stronger than the one which confirm one verb.

F-(إنْ) is confirming the present and past tends to receive reception, even if the (لم) was entered on it, similarly that (لم) is snatched, because it confirms the present tense to go-ahead and here it is not strong .

¹Hasyia on Sabban: 2/288.

²The house is from al-Khaffif, which is by Abu Zabid in the Book of Sibawayh 3/261, and has no proportion in the fundamentals in grammar 3/327.

³Al-Muqtadb: 4/32.

⁴Assets in syntax: 2/108.

⁵The House of the Long, Diwan: 7.

⁶Properties: 2/182..

⁷See: fairness in dispute matters: 1/85 (question: 13)

⁸See: The surrounding sea: 1/248 and the proof in the science of the Qur'an: 4/137.

From all of this it seems likely to me that the conditional (لَنْ) is the one which is working in the eliding, while (لَمْ) the eliding has been snatched of it because of the entrance (لَنْ) on it which has nothing left but the negation, so there is no conflict in this construction.

8) The snatching by the negation Hamza

The Hamza of negation snatches the negation as well as snatches the affirmative; Al-Radhi said: "Hamza of negation has entered into the negation and benefited the affirmative."¹⁴, also Ibn Jani said: ((And among that is the obligatory term, if the hamzah of the is attached to it, it turns into negative, as if it attached the negative, then the negative turned into affirmative, as in the saying of God Almighty: {did you say to the people}) [Al-Ma'idah: 116], i.e you didn't say to them, as for its entering into the negation, in His Almighty saying: {Am I not your Lord} [Al-A'raf: 172] – i.e I AM, and Jarir's saying¹⁵:

Aren't you the best of those who ride rims, i.e, you are, but the negation was so; because the one who negates something, but his purpose is to refer it to its opposite and against it, therefore it is impossible for him to make an affirmative by negation or negation affirmatively)¹⁶.

III. CONCLUSION:

After it is explaining to us the concept of the snatching and its means, I can summarize what I have reached by the following:

_The root of snatching in the language is the stripping of something and removing it with coercion and strength, as for linguistic use, it is snatching the meaning from the verbs or the like, that the removal is common between them.

_The linguists saw snatching is forming with increase, because it means that it happened on the affirmative, that it is appropriate for the increase.

_There are verbs that indicate the snatching in themselves without increasing it.

_The ancients had specialized the snatching with a set of formulas, but there are means of snatching that were scattered in their manifestations: snatching of the definition, perhaps (رَبِّ), al, the dualism (التثنية), plural and the call, as well as spending what is not conjugate through diminution, modulation, attached (ت) for the formula of the ultimate plural, snatching by displacement, snatching by composition, snatching by letters, dispossession by conflict, etc.

REFERENCES

1 The Holy Quran. Printed books:

- 2 A footnote to al-Khudari on the explanation of Ibn Aqil on the millennium of Ibn Malik: Muhammad bin Mustafa bin Hassan al-Khudhari al-Shafi'i (d. 1287 AH), explained and commented on by Turki Farhan al-Mustafa, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Alami, Fourth Edition, Beirut 1432 AH - 2011 CE.
- 3 A footnote to the Sabban on Sharh al-Ashmoni on the millennium of Ibn Malik: Muhammad ibn Ali al-Sabban (d. 1206 AH), Arab Books Revival House, Issa al-Babi al-Halabi.
- 4 Asrar Al-Arabia: Abu Al-Barakat Kamal Al-Din Bin Al-Anbari (d. 577 AH), investigation by Dr. Fakhr Saleh Qaddara Dar Al-Jabal - Beirut 1415 AH-1995 AD.
- 5 Characteristics: Abu al-Fath Othman bin Jani (392 AH), investigation by Muhammad Ali al-Najjar, House of Cultural Affairs, fourth edition, Baghdad 1990.
- 6 Clarification of intents and paths by explaining the millennium of Ibn Malik: Abu Muhammad Badr al-Din Hassan bin Qasim bin Abdullah bin Ali al-Muradi al-Maliki (d. 749 AH), investigation by Abdul Rahman Ali Suleiman, professor of linguistics at Al-Azhar University, Dar al-Fikr al-Arabi, first edition 1428 AH - 2008 CE.
- 7 Diwan Hamid bin Thur al-Hilali: The investigation of Abdel Aziz al-Maimani, the National House for Printing and Publishing, Cairo 1384 AH - 1965 CE.
- 8 Diwan Jarir, explained by Muhammad bin Habib: an investigation by Dr. Numan Muhammad Amin, ed Third, Dar Al-Maaref (DT).

¹⁴Sharah al-Radhi ealaa al-Kafia: 4/348 .

¹⁵Sadar Bayt Min Alwafiri, Waeajzih: Wa'andaa Alealamin Butun Rahi. Dayawanuh:85.

¹⁶(Properties: 3/272.

- 9 Equity in matters of disagreement between the visual grammarians and the Kufic: Abu al-Barakat Abd al-Rahman al-Anbari (d. 577 AH), investigation by Muhammad Mohiuddin Abd al-Hamid, Fourth Edition, Al-Saada Press, Egypt 1380 AH - 1961 CE.
- 10 Explanation of Al-Radhi on Adequacy: Radhi al-Din Muhammad ibn al-Hasan al-Astrabadi (d. 686 AH), Corrected and Commented by Yusef Hassan Omar, second edition, Al-Sadiq Establishment for Printing and Publishing (Dr. T).
- 11 Explanation of Ibn Aqeel on Al-Fiya Ibn Malik: Ibn Aqeel Abdullah bin Abd al-Rahman al-Aqili al-Hamdani al-Masri (d. 769 AH), investigation by Muhammad Muhi al-Din Abd al-Hamid, Dar al-Turath - Cairo, Dar Misr for Printing, twentieth edition 1400 AH - 1980 AD.
- 12 Explanation of the joint: Ali bin Yaish Ibn Abi al-Saraya Muhammad bin Ali, Abu al-Waqqa, Muwaffaq al-Din al-Asadi al-Musli, known as Ibn Ya`ish and Ibn al-San`a (d. 643 AH), presented to him by Dr. Emil Badi` Ya`qub, Dar al-Kutub al-Alami, Beirut - Lebanon, first edition, 1422 AH - 2001 AD
- 13 Meanings of grammar: Dr. Fadel Saleh Al-Samarrai, Higher Education Press, Mosul, 1989.
- 14 Refining the language: Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn al-Azhari al-Hirawi, Abu Mansur (d. 370 AH), investigation by Muhammad Awad Marib, Arab Heritage Revival House - Beirut, first edition 2001.
- 15 Shada Al-Arf in the Art of Drainage: Ahmed bin Muhammad Al-Hamlawi (D.1351 AH), by: Nasrallah Abdul Rahman Nasrallah, Al-Rushd Library, Riyadh.
- 16 Sibawayh Book: Abu Bishr Amr bin Othman Sibawayh (d. 180 AH), investigation by Abd al-Salam Muhammad Harun, second edition, Al-Khanji Library in Cairo and Dar Al-Rifai in Riyadh 1402 AH - 1982 AD.
- 17 Similarities and isotopes in grammar: Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH), investigation by Dr. Abdel-Salem Salem Makram, Al-Risala Foundation, first edition 1406 AH-1985 AD.
- 18 The Arbitrator and the Great Perimeter: Abu al-Hasan Ali bin Ismail bin Sayyidah al-Mursi (d. 458 AH), investigation by Abd al-Hamid Hindawi, Scientific Books House - Beirut, first edition, 1421 AH - 2000 CE.
- 19 The Compendium of the Rulings of the Qur'an: Muhammad Ibn Ahmad al-Qurtubi (d. 671 AH), edited by Dr. Abdullah bin Abd al-Muhsin al-Turki, first edition, Al-Risala Foundation, Beirut, Lebanon 1427AH-2006 AD
- 20 The grammatical puzzles, which is the book called (the model in the puzzles): Abd al-Rahman bin Abi Bakr, Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH), Al-Azhar Library for Heritage 1422 AH - 2003 CE.
- 21 The Office of Many Azza: Collected and explained by Dr. Ihsan Abbas, Dar al-Thaqafa, Beirut - Lebanon, 1971.
- 22 The preserved role in the science of the codified book: Ahmed bin Youssef known as Al-Samy Al-Halabi (d. 756 AH), investigation by Dr. Ahmed Muhammad Al-Kharrat, Dar Al-Qalam - Damascus, (d. T).
- 23 The proof in the science of the Qur'an: Badr al-Din al-Zarkashi (d. 794 AH), investigation by Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, first edition, the House for the Revival of Arabic Books, Cairo 1376 AH -1975 CE.
- 24 The secret of making syntax: Abu al-Fath Uthman ibn Jani al-Mawsili (d. 392 AH), Dar al-Kutub al-Alamiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, first edition 1421AH-2000AD
- 25 The surrounding dictionary: Majd Al-Din Abu Taher Muhammad Bin Yaqoub Al-Firozabad (d. 817 AH). Verification of the Heritage Investigation Office at the Al-Resala Foundation, under the supervision of Muhammad Naim Al-Arqsousi, Al-Resala Foundation for Printing, Publishing and Distribution, Beirut - Lebanon, eighth edition 1426AH-2005AD.
- 26 The Tongue of the Arabs: Jamal al-Din Muhammad bin Makram bin Manzur (d. 711 AH), Dar Sader, Beirut, 1374 AH - 1955 CE.
- 27 The Fundamentals in grammar: Abu Bakr bin al-Sarraj (d. 316 AH), d. Abdul Hussein al-Fatli, Salman Al-Adhami Press, Baghdad 1393 AH-1973 AD.
- 28 /Mughni al-Labib, on the books of Arabism: Ibn Hisham al-Ansari (d. 671 AH), investigated by Mazin Al-Mubarak and Muhammad Ali Hamad Allah
- 29 /The surrounding sea: Abu Hayyan Al-Andalusi (d. 745 AH), investigated by Sidqi Muhammad Jameel, Dar Al-Fikr, Beirut 1420 AH.