

Conflicting Evidence in the Interpretation of Linguistic Directives - Analytical Descriptive Study

Abdulkareem Abdulqader Abdullah Okelan

Arabic Emirati Studies Department, Higher Colleges of Technology, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

Email address:

a_okelan@yahoo.co.uk

To cite this article:

Abdulkareem Abdulqader Abdullah Okelan. (2023). Conflicting Evidence in the Interpretation of Linguistic Directives - Analytical Descriptive Study. *Arabic Language, Literature & Culture*, 8(3), 36-42. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.allc.20230803.12>

Received: October 25, 2023; **Accepted:** November 15, 2023; **Published:** December 5, 2023

Abstract: The research is aimed to describe the phenomenon of conflicting linguistic evidence in the interpretation of directing linguistic issues and provide an explanation for the reasons for their existence in linguistic studies. The research has followed the descriptive analytical approach by looking at the books of linguists and how they employ the guides, and the description of the weighting mechanism between the conflicting evidence, and the analysis of those manifestations, to try to explain this phenomenon and reveal the factors affecting it this paper has come to several conclusions, the most important of which is that the conflict between linguistic evidence is the outcome of the difference in the exploration of the two dimensions of the original and classification of linguistic evidence. The linguistic evidence in which the conflict occurs can be limited to three sections, namely: evidence of linguistic origins, exploration of linguistic guidance, and evidence of linguistic provisions, and that any evidence is used as a restriction to adjust the provisions in matters. The research also found that the most prominent reasons for the existence of the phenomenon of conflicting linguistic evidence revolve around several factors, the most important of which are: The difference between theory and practice considering the incomplete induction on which the rules are based, the difference between dialects and its impact on employing conflicting linguistic evidence to explain these differences, in addition to the multiplicity of Quranic readings and their impact on employing conflicting linguistic evidence to explain these differences. In addition, linguistic dictionaries contributed to the emergence of contradictory evidence by combining the statements of different linguists in the same issue.

Keywords: Linguistic Evidence, Conflict of Evidence, Linguistic Guidance, Linguistic Origins, Linguistic Provisions

1. Introduction

The search in linguistic evidence is a key issue that reveals the documents adopted by linguists in launching their linguistic classifications and framing grammar, and thus reveals the way linguists think about language and their deep view of its components. This is the stage of drawing the features of grammar based on preserving the language from being hijacked by the movement of history and the changes that this movement makes in structures as it is in conflict between them. Another addition to the forms of linguistic reinforcement produced several features supporting the linguistic rule and linguistic evidence such as weighting between them, and acceptance of one of them and rejection of the other. The research in this topic follows the descriptive analytical approach in studying the phenomenon of conflicting evidence, by looking at linguists' books and how

they employ guides, describing the weighting mechanism between conflicting evidence, and analyzing those manifestations, to try to explain this phenomenon and reveal the factors affecting it. The paper proceeds from the basis that the origin of the evidence to be a way to narrow down the area of disagreement in linguistic guidance, but the tracking of the books of linguists shows that this was an element of disagreement in guidance, hence, the research was interested in revealing the areas of conflict of evidence and study its merits and impact in directing linguistic interpretations, up to their interpretation and determine the controls that govern their employment.

The idea of conflicting evidence is deeply rooted in linguistic discussions since the inception of linguistic traditions and has been a subject of recent studies. One such study titled: "Conflicting Evidence: Their Types and Faces of Preferability" (1961), focuses on the concept of evidence

confliction, specifically within the Islamic rules, examining conflicting evidence in legal Islamic judgments and the criteria for Preferring one over the other. Another study titled: "Contradiction of Causes in (Maani Al-Quran) for Al-Farra" (2015), which explores how (causes) contradict and align in Al-Farra's book "Ma'ani al-Qur'an".

While this study stands out from previous studies on the concept of confliction in that it does not delve into the causes examined in "Contradiction of Causes in (Maani Al-Quran) for Al-Farra" study, but rather into the evidence used by linguists in directing their interpretations of linguistic issues. The research highlights that the term (evidence) does not refer to those (causes); (causes) are subjects of disagreement without a firm criterion for their determination. This is in contrast to linguistic evidence, which is considered a means or tool among the instruments leading to linguistic confliction. Additionally, this study distinguishes itself from the "Conflicting Evidence: Their Types and Favoring Aspects" study by adopting a linguistic foundational approach in addressing the concept of contradiction, focusing on the contradiction of linguistic evidence and its impact on shaping linguistic rules.

Therefore, the research stated its goals to achieve several objectives, the most important of which are:

1. Characterization of the phenomenon of conflicting evidence in guiding linguistic interpretations.
2. Explain the phenomenon of conflicting evidence in directing linguistic interpretations.

2. Foreword

Arabic linguistic studies were based in their inception on several criteria in the linguistic base report, so they started from determining the linguistic levels from which the rules are derived within certain temporal and spatial limits. This launch was the foundation of the first origin in the linguistic base report, which is (hearing), which is based on the adoption of what the Arabs said from speech in the structure and composition.

In addition, (analogy) was the second asset in the rule report, based on (- السماع *hearing*) and its convergence between blocks and structures that are not audible and audible, through the extraction of the holistic causes between them in the linguistic ruling, and added a third asset is (consensus), which means: the consensus of grammarians on a particular provision or the consensus of the Arabs on a particular use, in the construction or installation [1], and what was devoid of one of those assets, they have entered it in the fourth asset is (- استصحاب الأصل *Istes-hab Al Assl*) – which means: (Extension of the Origin) – or the case [2], and is based on the adoption of what it is the word or composition in the case when there is no evidence of change.

Since those assets are based on the diligence of linguists in issuing provisions, factors emerged to help those assets in drawing the parameters of the interpretation of linguistic directives for buildings and structures, and those factors were (linguistic evidence), and this research is intended: (the mark

that disposes of linguistic guidance to what corresponds to the report of linguists for the base of construction or installation), and this evidence is not (- العلة *the cause*) that explains the reason for the ruling, but it is what the linguist relies on in the event that it is directed to interpret structural and compound relations are supportive. This evidence is part of the linguistic revision process or controls that support the rule. It could mean (evidence) in this concept (presumption), but the research is based on the choice of the term (evidence) for two reasons:

First: That linguists in their books used this word in the description of their linguistic guidance, including what was stated in (- لسان العرب *Lisan Al Arab*): "In their saying: (- قافية *rhyme*) evidence that it is not a letter, because (- القافية *rhyme*) feminine and (- الحرف *letter*) masculine" [3], shows how (Ibn Manzur) used the word (- دليل *evidence*) in the context of directing the interpretation of the meaning of (rhyme), is the last letter in the poetic verse or another Word? And the coming of feminine brings her closer to the feminization of (the word) in exchange for a reminder (the letter).

Second: It is that (the presumption) at the origin of the launch when linguistic guidance its goal is to resolve the matter and exclude the manifestations of disagreement in it, but (evidence) is suspected to be opposed by other evidence in the same matter, and this is commensurate with what is intended by this research in revealing the principle of conflicting evidence in directing linguistic issues.

3. The Concept of Conflicting Evidence

Talking about the concept of conflicting evidence in the interpretation of linguistic directives starts from two dimensions: the first: the fundamental dimension, in which this concept appears from the product of linguistic work practiced by linguists in order to primarise linguistic rules, as linguistic interpretations are an act outside the language because they are issued by the jurisprudence of linguists who used evidence to control the direction of their linguistic interpretations, and these evidences were assets on which to achieve that control. The second dimension: It is the classification dimension, in which the conflict is classified based on the type of evidence in which the conflict occurs, and the evidence for directing linguistic interpretations can be classified into three sections: First: evidence of linguistic fundamentals, which is the evidence used by linguists in laying the foundations of linguistic grammar, and on top of these assets hearing and analogy, in addition to consensus and the companionship of the extension of the origin. Second: evidences of linguistic guidance which are the linguistic signs on which linguists rely in allocating their interpretations, such as a guide (- الأصل اللغوي *linguistic origin*), a guide (- الترجيح *approximating*), and a guide (- العلامة اللغوية *linguistic sign*), and so on. Third: Evidence of linguistic rulings, which are the evidence that is based on linguistic rulings in the interpretation of linguistic issues, such as the reliance on (- الواجب *obligatory*), or (- القبيح *despised*), and the accompanying conflict that meets in linguistic matters.

Linguists have used other elements in directing their linguistic interpretations, such as referring to (*العلّة* *the cause*), but the difference between (*the cause*) and these evidences that (*the cause*) is based on diligence in the origin of its existence, which is suspected of difference in estimation. What a scientist sees as a rule in an evidence is different from what another scientist may conclude to see as a different rule of the same evidence. Moreover, the difference may be between different grammar schools, which is the most common, (*the causes*) have become the causes of grammatical schools and this is what is revealed by books of grammatical dispute, led by the book Fairness (*كتاب الإنصاف* - *Al Insaf*), rarely find in it the causes of a scholar compared to what we find of the causes of the Basrians or Kufic as a whole, and the evidence intended in this research, they are fixed on the origin of their significance and the stability of their association with the linguistic rule and the dispute does not occur only when there are two evidence in one issue, which is a disagreement in the interpretation of the impact of the existence of the two evidence and not in the reason for their existence;

Although relying on (evidence) in the interpretation of linguistic directives is the thought of avoiding disagreement, but this (evidence) may be the cause of the difference in that interpretation, when two or more guides meet in one issue and contradict in directing the interpretation, and this conflict may lead to permissibility in an issue, or expansion, or interpretation, and examples of such a conflict are what (Ibn Manzur) reported in (*Lisan Al-Arab*), as he says: Abu Ali said: "وقالوا: لا أباك عليّ فيه. تقديران مختلفان لمعنيين مختلفين، وذلك أن ثبات الألف في (أبا) من (لا أباك لك) دليل الإضافة، فهذا وجه، ووجه آخر أن ثبات (اللام) وعمل (لا) في هذا الاسم يوجب التثكير والفصل، ثبات (الألف) دليل الإضافة والتعريف، ووجود (اللام) دليل الفصل. There are two different estimates of two different meanings, and that the stability of the letter (ألف - *Alif*) in (أبا - *Abba*) of (لا أباك - *not your father*) is the evidence of addition, this is one face, and another aspect that the stability of (اللام - *lam*) and the work of (لا - *no*) in this name requires denial and separation, so the stability of (alif) is the evidence of addition and definition, and the presence of (lam) is the evidence of separation and denial, and these two as you see them conflicting" [4], and it appears that this conflict does not cancel the use or negation the phrase rather, it describes and interprets it, and research reveals its role in linguistic repetition.

Through the above, it appears that the concept of conflicting linguistic evidence in the interpretation of linguistic directives is the outcome of the difference in the use of the fundamental and classification dimensions of linguistic evidences. These two dimensions are the outcome of the diligence of linguists in determining linguistic rules theoretically and practically, and this difference in interpretations is other than the difference in the nature of the language practiced by speakers, the synthetic, phonetic or semantic difference in the reality of linguistic use is due to other origins related to social and geographical influences that caused the existence of linguistic difference such as the difference between the (Tamim) language and the (Hijaz) language, and this difference of use served as a document for linguists in determining their linguistic rules in a restrictive and expanded manner.

In addition to the above, the contradiction of evidence occurs when there is a linguistic provision related to two or more evidence, so this conflict is between two directions, either the two guides can be combined in directing the linguistic interpretation, and this happens when there is nothing in one of the two guides that calls for rejection, and then there is no conflict in this case, and the other direction is a conflict with which the two guides cannot be combined in the interpretation and this is the intended conflict of the difference in the interpretation of linguistic directives [5].

4. Manifestations of Conflicting of Evidence

The manifestations of inconsistency of evidence for directing linguistic interpretations can be described based on the classification of these guides, which was previously mentioned that it is divided into three sections, namely: evidence of linguistic origins, evidence of linguistic guidance, and evidence of linguistic provisions, and it should be noted that the classification of these guides has been based on what leads to these evidences, evidence of linguistic origins are linguistic assets, evidence of linguistic provisions are linguistic provisions, and guides of linguistic guidance are linguistic guidance, these guides have been used in the performance of the function of determining the rule. In addition to directing linguists' interpretations of linguistic issues, the occurrence of conflict is the result of differences in the interpretation of linguistic issues according to this evidence.

4.1. Conflicting Evidence of Linguistic Fundamentals

The evidence of linguistic fundamentals are those evidence used by linguists in the development of the foundations of linguistic rules, and on top of these fundamentals *hearing* and *analogy*, in addition to *consensus* and extension of the origin, and the conflict of evidence of linguistic fundamentals mainly from the violation of the rule stipulated between linguists, the conflict of these evidence is a conflict with the origin of the rule and in the mechanism of its use in the interpretation of linguistic directives.

The conflict between the evidence of the origins of the language was accompanied by a report of the methodology for dealing with this conflict, and therefore, linguists set the foundations for dealing with these evidence fundamentals when conflicting, so they decided to prioritise hearing over analogy when the conflict occurs [6], and prioritise hearing and analogy over the extension of the origin, which is the weakest evidence [7], and prioritise the consensus over the controversial [8], and other foundations of approximating, the matter when the conflict of evidence of linguistic fundamentals is based on the provision of the strongest evidence as decided by linguists, and may expand when Two hearings contradict or contradict two analogy, and then provide them what had other evidence to support it.

This will be prioritizing hearing with an analogy, over

hearing that has nothing to support it [9], or offering more hearing than hearing less in the narrated language, and so on. This prioritising affects the determination of the linguistic rule and permissibility in use without canceling the use itself, and this is an indication that the goal of this guidance is to control the language and characterize its features.

One of the instances of conflict in the evidence of linguistic fundamentals in the morphological side, the Almighty says: (- استحوذ عليهم الشيطان / *Possessed by Satan*) - Al-Hashr 19, and the home of the witness (acquired) the analogy in this word to be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the explanation, to become (- استحوذ possessed), but it is audible words from the word of the Holy Qur'an. So, there was a conflict between analogy and hearing, but this conflict is governed by the methodology of combining the rule and deviating from it when it comes to the conflict of analogy and hearing.

Linguists acknowledge this use, but do not measure it, and the meaning of its approval is any acceptance of its use in its context only without becoming a general rule generalized to other contexts, and such an acknowledgment can have an estimated dimension that paves the way for the acceptance of this audio later, but it is conditional acceptance of its context and not by fabricating other contexts that insert this use. Within this framework we could understand other similar phrases such as: (- استنوق الجمال / *Istanwaqa Al jamal*), meaning: (He thought the male camel was a female camel) It may seem that there is no collector between them (استنوق / *Istahwatha, Istanwaqa*) except this image, but there is another collector, which is its competence in a special context, this phrase conducts the course of the proverb that does not change, as is the case with the context of the previous Qur'anic verse, which is the divine word does not change [10].

One of the pieces of evidence of this contradiction in the grammatical aspect is the saying of (Tarfa) in his famous commentary [11]:

وَأَنْ أَشْهَدَ اللَّذَاتِ، هَلْ أَنْتَ مُخْلِجِي؟ أَلَا أَيُّهَا النَّاتِي أَحْضُرُ الْوَعَى

O' You, who is blaming me for taking risks and indulging in pleasure, are you my immortal?

The key point here in the poetic verse is (أحضر / *Ahduru*), and it was narrated by the key point (أحضر / *Ahdura*), and the difference here is between two transmissions or two hearers, and the Kufics have adopted the narration of the key point that the verb (bring) is present tense with (أَنْ *Ann* [That]) is omitted without compensation, and the Basrians [12] have disagreed with them based on the fact that the work of (أَنْ *Ann* [That]) the implicit according to the measurement must have compensation [13].

It appears from this conflict between the two transfers that there is a difference in use and this means that such use may be contained in the languages of some Arabs on this difference, and therefore; the linguists interested in it as a borrowed from the Arabs. Their position on the difference is due to their approach to the determination of those provisions and measurements, and the fundamentals on which they are based, has been proven when the strict Basrians in hearing was required in the narration of the audible of the integrity of his

language as for the narrator, the truthfulness and authenticity [14], then they did not count the poetic line if the narrator was not known or was not narrated on by a trusted known Arab. So, they restricted some narrated speech by analogy. On the other hand, Kofics, relaxed their rules to include more hearing with less restrictions. So, they accepted all irregulars and mispronunciation, they took on corrupted pronunciation from rurals and Bedouins [15].

4.2. Conflict of Language Evidence Manuals

This conflict is included in the evidence relied upon by linguists to decide the provisions in the structural relations or linguistic compounds, and it results in a decision to direct those relationships according to grammatical or morphological perceptions, and examples of this type of conflict are their saying:

(- أَقَامَ أَخوكَ Is your brother standing?) In this example, the guidance of linguists differed in the judgment (- قَامَ Standing), is a (Subject) or (Predicate)? and they based their decision on one evidence which is what can be called (evidence of the origin), the basic rule in the initial word to be (Subject). This evidence is adopted as (Standing) is an (Predicate) because it is a description, and the basis of the description to be considered as a (Predicate). As a result of this conflict, a fundamental rule has emerged named (Annulation of Evidences), which means erasing evidence in both directions, it is not right to prefer between the two [16].

Another trend of conflict appears in (Approximating), an example of this type of conflict is what was stated in the guidance of the Almighty: (- أَنْتُمْ تَخْلُقُونَهُ / *Do you create it*) - [Al Waqiaa 59], the pronoun (أَنْتُمْ *you*) has two sides: the first is that it is a *Subject*, and the Predicate is the sentence: (- تَخْلُقُونَهُ / *you create it*), and the second: that it is the *Subject* of a deleted verb interpreted by the verb mentioned (you create it), and it was said in the reason for deleted verb that it is achieved "from tampering with the presence of the interpreter, and then replaced the connected pronoun in the verb with a separate pronoun" [17], and the conflict here is represented in the weighting guide.

The evidence for the effectiveness of the sentence is the presence of the interrogative in the first and the interrogative is already prioritises verb over noun and the evidence for the nominal sentence is conjunction of the sentence that follows namely: (- أَمْ نَحْنُ الْخَالِقُونَ / *Or are we the creators*), hence, the statement of the actual sentence makes it contrary, which is the nominal sentence, and saying the nominal sentence makes it suitable for the sentence that it was attached to, and thus the actual evidence contradicts with the nominal evidence.

Furthermore, because access to the nominal evidence and the actual evidence resulted from the search for the weighting of the type of sentence; The contradiction here is a conflict in (Approximating), and therefore it is indicated in the judgment in this matter that the two statements are permissible, because the weighting between them conflicts, according to the rule that says: if the two approximates conflict, they will fall [18].

In addition to the previous two types, a third type of conflict emerges with its consequences, which is a conflict between a

linguistic sign and a linguistic connotation, it is from this: the conflict in saying the type of word (ضربة - *a blow*) morphologically in the phrase (ابتهجبت بضربتك العدو الغادر - rejoiced in your blow, the treacherous enemy), so it was differed in (blow) as source or the name of once as a blow?. The evidence that it is (the name of once of the time) ended with an extra ('taa' - تاء زائدة) which is a linguistic sign, and the evidence of its source is its original indication of the abstract event, and here, this conflict between the evidence of the name of the time and the evidence of the source is the reason why linguists report conditions for the work of the source, among which was (not to be send with an extra ('taa' - تاء زائدة). [19]

4.3. Conflicting Evidence of Linguistic Provisions

These provisions represent a systematic position of the language based on two directions: an internal trend of the language represented in the amount of prevalence in the reality of use consecutive or few, and the other direction is an external trend issued by linguists and their work in deciding the appropriateness of linguistic use and the launch of the description that expresses the extent of their acceptance or rejection of this use [20], has made Al-Suyuti in the origins of these provisions in six categories: obligatory, forbidden, good, despised, other than the former, and permissible [21]. Although it is believed that these provisions have been brought to adjudicate the issues, but they were not without contradiction, these provisions themselves were a source of conflict when directed linguistic interpretations based on them, and the research in such a conflict reveals the methodology followed by linguists in directing such conflict and its impact on the determination of linguistic issues.

One of the pieces of evidence that illustrates the contradiction between the (*despised*) in use, is the saying of Kuthayir Azza [22]:

يلوح كأنه خال لمية موحشا طلل

Mayya has deserted ruins looming like sword cases

And the key point of the poetic line (موحشا - *despised*) as saying that this word in the position of the case (*despised*) because it is a case of denial, and the origin in the owner of the case to be knowledge, and to say that it is in the position of the adjective (ugly) also because it advanced on the inhibited, and it is noted through this guidance that the rule of ugly conflict with the two directives, both directives ruled (*despised*), and in such a case the linguists prioritise (*the least despised*), so the guidance came in the expression of (*deserted*) as an adjective case, because this saying is *less despised* than saying the adjective which is not mentioned in the used by Arabs [23].

5. Interpretation of the Phenomenon of Conflicting Evidence

The research into the causes of the phenomenon of conflicting evidence calls for standing at its material, these evidences in themselves are disputed and not unanimous, the fundamentals by which we know the total evidences of

grammar are disputed in number. If Ibn al-Anbari has stipulated this evidence as evidence of grammar considered, and Ibn Jinni – a precedent it – has stipulated another evidence is the consensus of the scholars of Basra and Kufa, along with hearing and analogy [24], addressing how to use this evidence will inevitably lead to disagreement in how this is used, as well as the rest of the evidence referred to in this research as evidence of judgments and guides of linguistic guidance.

On the other hand, the difference between theory and practice seems to be one of the factors for the emergence of this phenomenon, in light of the incomplete extrapolation on which linguistic rules are based, dealing with verbal material as a means of detecting the systems that govern it and using it in linguistic refinement is different from dealing with it as a means of linguistic communication; is a remarkable achievement, but the material on which they based these rules is not the whole language;

In addition to the reasons for the existence of the phenomenon of conflict between linguistic evidence that difference between dialects, in the manner of the difference in the work of (Ma - *Ma*) similar to (Laisa - لايسا) between the Hijazis and Tamimis, the reality of use in the two dialects of (what) shows the difference in its work, and what was from linguists only to look for guidance explains this conflict in use, was the conflict in the evidence on which they relied, their interpretation of its work when the Hijazis is likened to (not) in the lifting and monument as it is in its likeness in the negative, As for their explanation of its neglect when the Tamimiyyin is likened to (Hal - هل) and (bal - بل) non-specialized letters [25], and as it is apparent that (Ma - *Ma*) in fact negated, but the difference in the impact of its use in two languages prompted linguists to explain this difference with contradictory evidence in itself, but explain the conflict in use; It is one of the effects of the conflicting evidence that linguists glimpsed and came up with these issues this graduation that completes their work in the language refinement [26].

Quranic readings may have a role in the existence of a conflict between linguistic evidence, when the reading of what a linguistic rule and the result of another reading another rule, and examples of this read the reading of the Almighty: (ولبنوا) And they stayed in their cave three hundred years) – [Al-Kahf, 25], by adding (مائة - *hundred*) to the countable (سنتين - *years*), which is the reading of (Hamza) and (Al-Kisa'i) and (behind the tenth) [27] and this reading is unlike the reading of the rest of the readers Btanween (ثلاث مئة - *three hundred*) and different to what was decided in the use of (مائة - *hundred*) added to the singular without the plural, and linguists directed this reading to decide its existence first, in addition to directing its existence in relation to the established rules, and the point of separation is the presence of Tanween or not, the presence of Tanween denies the addition and the presence of (مائة - *hundred*) negates the addition to the combination, the reading that proved Tanween did not occur in which there was a conflict with the existence of (سنتين - *years*) plural, while the reading that omitted Tanween evidence of the addition, which is the home of the conflict with the presence

of the added after (Note that Sibawayh has pointed out in this verse that this reading came on the original, which is that (مئة - hundred) origin to be added to the plural and not vice versa [28]; because it carries the meaning of plural; there for, Al-Kisa'i said: "The Arabs say: "I stayed with him for a hundred years and a hundred years" [29].

In addition, linguistic dictionaries that were based on the collection of language [30] contributed to highlighting the contradiction between the evidence in directing linguistic interpretations of linguistic words, including the statements of linguists and their interpretations of linguistic issues, including what was stated in the dictionary of Lisan al-Arab in the words of the Almighty: (وَبَلَّغَ نِعْمَةً تَعْلَمُهَا عَلَىٰ أَنْ عَبَّدَتْ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ) - *And that is a blessing granted to me to worship the children of Israel*) – [Al-Shu'ara, 22], as the dictionary quoted the saying of Al-Akhfash in his interpretation of this verse [31] from his book (The Meanings of the Qur'an), as Al-Akhfash says: "He said: (وَبَلَّغَ نِعْمَةً تَعْلَمُهَا عَلَىٰ -) *And that is a blessing granted to me*) and this is said interrogative as if he said: (أَوْ -) *Or that is a blessing that you wish*) and then interpreted and said: (أَنْ عَبَّدَتْ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ -) *that I worshiped the children of Israel*) and made it instead of grace" [32]; Based on the context or meaning guide [33], but the dictionary quoted another statement that contradicts that meaning based on the context guide as well, but did not accept that interpretation, hence it is clear that the emergence of the conflict occurred through the dictionary's collection of scattered sayings on the same issue.

The following question can be asked: Can the phenomenon of conflicting linguistic evidence seem to be an inevitable natural phenomenon in linguistic studies? To answer this question, it should be noted that the conflict in its basis is a conflict in the interpretation of linguistic directives and not a conflict in the language itself, the native speakers of the language have been established in their minds language systems and spoke according to those systems, and therefore they do not pronounce according to what contradicts with what was done in their minds, but the listener will pay attention if the speaker does not pay attention to that conflict and describes it as a melody or weakness in use, but what linguists have done is to describe these systems and extract them. And framing it, what fell on their ears and put its fundamental, and what appeared to them of the contradiction between these evidences contributed in one way or another to the determination of rules subordinate to the original rules. [34]

6. Conclusion

After the presentation on the conflict of evidence and its impact on directing linguistic interpretations, the research came out with the following results:

1. The concept of conflicting linguistic evidence in the interpretation of linguistic directives is related to two basic dimensions that had an impact on the possibility of conflict, the first: the fundamental dimension, which is based on the development of the origins of linguistic

rules, and the second: the classification dimension, which distinguishes linguistic evidence in terms of the direction of employment, and these two dimensions are the outcome of the diligence of linguists in determining linguistic rules theoretically and practically, and thus the conflict between linguistic evidence is the outcome of the difference in the employment of the two dimensions of fundamentals and classification of linguistic evidence within linguists.

2. The research classified linguistic evidence in which the conflict occurs into three sections, namely: evidence of linguistic fundamentals, evidence of linguistic guidance, and evidence of linguistic rulings, and that any evidence used as a restriction to adjust the provisions in matters of grammar, morphology, lexicon and semantics can fall under one of these three sections, and these sections are not reasons for linguistic provisions, but they are restrictions or clues or signs that require a linguistic provision, and the conflict in these evidences lies in the combination of two or more evidence with the difference in the requirements of the Guide and its consequent provisions.
3. The conflict of evidence involves in many linguistic issues, it is present in the interpretation of grammatical structures, vocabulary, morphology, and semantic issues, and all these manifestations outside the origin of the language, and are only the product of the difference in the views of linguists on those issues, and what can be observed of differences in Arabic dialects is only the product of the impact of the factors of the social environment that produced a linguistic trend prevailing in a particular environment, and that the collection of language has contributed to the provision of linguistic manifestations seem contradictory in use, which led linguists to try to provide an explanation for these contradictions.
4. The research found that the awareness of linguists of the possibility of conflict between linguistic evidences has prompted them to provide linguistic requirements for the implementation of some linguistic tools or the launch of grammatical, morphological or semantic provisions, as if this serves as preventive measures that can contribute.

ORCID

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6624-8904>

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Ibn Jinni, Abu al-Fath 'Uthman (1952). "Al-Khasais". Investigated by Muhammad 'Ali al-Najjar, Al-Maktaba Al-Ilmiyya, (1/190).

- [2] Ibn Al-Anbari. "Al-Ighurab fi Jadal al-I'raab" Wa'-Luma Al-Adilla fi Usul al-Nahw, (p. 141).
- [3] Ibn Manzur Muhammad Ibn Makram. (1994)." Lisan Al-Arab". Dar Sadir. Beirut, (15/195).
- [4] Ibn Manzur Muhammad Ibn Makram. (1994)." Lisan al-Arab". Dar Sadir. Beirut, (14/11).
- [5] See: Fundamentals of Grammar (1). Al-Madinah International University. Al-Madinah International University Curricula. (p.53). See: Bilal Sami Al-Fuqaha'. (2014). The Linguistic Proof Between Acceptance and Response in Ibn Hisham Al-Ansari's book: Moghni Al-Labib, unpublished doctoral thesis, Mu'tah University, Jordan, (pp. 50-53).
- [6] See: Ibn Jinni, Abu al-Fath 'Uthman (1952). "Al-Khasais". edited by Muhammad Ali al-Najjar, Al-Maktaba Al-Ilmiyya, (1/119).
- [7] Al-Suyuti, Abd al-Rahman Ibn Abi Bakr (1989). Al-Iqtirah Fi Usul Al-Nahw Wa Jadalih Investigated by Mahmoud Fajal, Dar Al-Qalam, Damascus, (p. 356).
- [8] Al-Suyuti, Abd Al-Rahman Ibn Abi Bakr (1989)." Al-Iqtirah Fi Usul Al-Nahw Wa Jadalih". Investigated by Mahmoud Fajjal. Dar al-Qalam. Damascus (p. 160).
- [9] Al-Astrabadi, Muhammad Ibn Al-Hasan (1975). "Sharh Shafiyat Ibn Al-Hajib". Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya. Beirut, Lebanon. (1/254).
- [10] See: Al-Mubarrid, Mohamed Ibn Yazid, Al-Muqtadab. Investigated by Mohamed 'Abd Al-Khaliq 'Athimah, 'Alam Al-Kutub. Beirut. (2/98).
- [11] "The poetic verse is on Al bahr Attaweel". Diwan Tarfa Ibn Al-Abd (2002). Mahdi Mohamed Nasir Al-Din. Dar al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya. Beirut. Lebanon, (p. 25).
- [12] See: Abu al-Barakat Al-Anbari, 'Abd Al-Rahman Ibn Mohamed (2003). "Al-Insaaf Fi Masail Al-Khilaf Bayna AL-Nahwiyin Al-Basiriyyin Wa Al-Kufiyyin". Investigated by Mohamed Muhyi Al-Din 'Abd Al-Hamid, Al-Maktaba Al-Asriya. (2/456).
- [13] See: Al-Suyuti, Abd Al-Rahman Ibn Abi Bakr (1989)." Al-Iqtirah Fi Usul Al-Nahw Wa Jadalih". Investigated by Mahmoud Fajjal. Dar al-Qalam. Damascus, (pp. 385-386).
- [14] Al-Afghani, Saeed bin Mohamed bin Ahmed. "Min Tarikh Al-Nahw". Al-Falah Library. (p. 65).
- [15] Al-Afghani, Saeed bin Mohamed bin Ahmed. "Min Tarikh Al-Nahw". Al-Falah Library. (p. 71).
- [16] See: Al-Azhari, Khalid bin Abdullah (2000). "Sharh Al-Ta'sirh 'Ala Al-Tawdhiih". Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya. Beirut. Lebanon, (12/195). And See farther reading: Georgios Babinotis. Towards a Linguistic Theory of Specification Based on a Verb Grammar. International Journal of Language and Linguistics. Vol. 10, No. 3, 2022, pp. 176-180. doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20221003.11.
- [17] Al-Azhari, Khalid bin Abdullah (2000). "Sharh Al-Ta'sirh 'Ala Al-Tawdhiih". Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya. Beirut. Lebanon, (1/396).
- [18] See: Al-Azhari, Khalid bin Abdullah (2000). "Sharh Al-Ta'sirh 'Ala Al-Tawdhiih". Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya. Beirut. Lebanon, (1/396).
- [19] See: Hasan, Abbas. "Al-Nahw Al-Wafi". Dar Al-Maarif, (3/215).
- [20] See: Okelan, Abdul Kareem. (2018). "The Obligatory Provisions in the Nominatives: a study in the Grammatical thinking among Arab". Dar Jalees Al-Zaman for Publishing and Distribution. Amman. Jordan. pp. (17-19).
- [21] See: Al-Suyuti, Abd Al-Rahman Ibn Abi Bakr (1989)." Al-Iqtirah Fi Usul Al-Nahw Wa Jadalih". Investigated by Mahmoud Fajjal. Dar al-Qalam. Damascus, (p. 47).
- [22] The poetic verse is on Al bahr Attaweel. Diwan Kuthayir Azza. (1971). Compiled and explained by Ihsan Abbas. Dar Al-Thaqafa, Beirut, Lebanon, (p. 506).
- [23] See: Usul Al-Nahw (2). Al-Madinah International University, Al-Madinah International University Curricula. (p. 283).
- [24] Al-Suyuti, Abd Al-Rahman Ibn Abi Bakr (1989)." Al-Iqtirah Fi Usul Al-Nahw Wa Jadalih". Investigated by Mahmoud Fajjal. Dar al-Qalam. Damascus. (p. 63. p 163).
- [25] Ibn Jinni, Abu Al-Fath Uthman. "Al-Luma' fi Al-Arabiyya". Investigated by Fa'iz Faris. Dar Al-Kutub Al-Thaqafiyya. Kuwait. (p. 40).
- [26] See: Ibn Al-Sarraj, Abu Bakr Mohamed Ibn Al-Sirri. "Al-Usul Fi Al-Nahw". Investigated by Abdul Hussein Al-Fatli, Dar Al-Risalah. Beirut. Lebanon. (1/92).
- [27] See: Muhaisin, Mohamed Mohamed, (1984). "Al-Qira'at Wa Atharuha Fi 'Ulum Al-Arabiyya" Maktabat Al-Kulliyat Al-Azhariyah. Cairo. (2/34).
- [28] See: Makram Abd Al-Aal Salim. (1978). "Athar Al-Qira'at Al-Qur'aniyya Fi Al-Dirasat Al-Nahwiyya" Mu'assasat Ali Jarrah Al-Sabah. Kuwait. (p 87).
- [29] Ibn Zanjala, Abd Al-Rahman Ibn Mohamed "Hujjat Al-Qira'at". Investigated by Saeed Al-Afghani. Dar Al-Risalah. (P 414).
- [30] See: Ahmed Omar Mukhtar, (2003). "Al-Baith Al-Lughawi 'Ind Al-Arab". Alam Al-Kutub, (p 79).
- [31] Ibn Manzur, Mohamed Ibn Makram, (1994). "Lisan Al-Arab". Dar Sadir. Beirut. (3/272).
- [32] Al-Akhfash Al-Awsat, Abu Al-Hasan Al-Mujashie. (1990). "Ma'ani Al-Qur'an". Investigated by Huda Mahmoud Qara'a, Maktabat Al-Khaanji, Cairo, (2/461).
- [33] See: Ibn Manzur, Mohamed Ibn Makram. (1994). "Lisan Al-Arab," Dar Sadir. Beirut. (3/272).
- [34] See for farther reading: Delmadji Abdelkader. Phonological Manifestations Resulting of the Phenomenon of Waqf in the Recitation of the Qur'an. Arabic Language, Literature & Culture. Vol. 7, No. 3, 2022, (pp. 11-15). doi: 10.11648/j.allc.20220703.11.