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I. INTRODUCTION

Praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds, and prayers and peace be upon our master Muhammad and his family and companions. I chose the title of my research the semantical meaning of “This Is Not a Human” in Surat Joseph, and the readings in which it was received. So, I divided it into three topics:

- The first topic: Semantical Meaning of “This Is Not a Human”.
- The second topic: “The difference between “This is not” for denial and “not”, and what are the opinions of the grammarians about that.
- The third topic: Interpretations of the occurrence of the expression “Human”.
- Conclusion

II. SEMANTICAL MEANING OF “THIS IS NOT A HUMAN”

They negated humanity from him \(^1\), and they said, “this is not a human” because they did not see anyone in his beauty from any other human, so they said: If he were human, it would be like some of what we saw of human forms, but from what came from Yunus, he said: Ibn Zaidoun said:

They said: This is not a human and that is when the beauty is strange and exceedingly beautiful, and what is on him is the best forms of man and prove to him the kingship and the judgment is made, and that is because God Almighty focused on the nature because there is no better than the king, as He focused on it not to be worse. From Satan, and therefore he likens everything infinite in good and bad to them and was content to infer this belief, by the necessity that he claimed to be based on character, then he ruled that every focus in character is right, especially speaking in the nature of women who say, and this is not human.

They also proven to him the kingship when he is focused on the good character of the king, and if he is not seen, the Arab poets and modernists have said this. Some of the Arabs said:

You are not a human being, but an angel descending from the sky to shoot

Some of the scholars said:

These people, when they were met, they were good angels, and if they were killed, they were demons

Their purpose in this is to describe him as being in the highest ranks of goodness and perfection appropriate to their nature, and it is known from what has been established that the verse does not stand as evidence of the king is better than the sons of Adam, as Abu Ali al-Jabai and his followers thought, and he supported him with pride and no pride in him. With what he supported, and more than one went to the point that the purpose was to exonerate him, peace be upon him, from what he threw in the fullest way, and they opened that, God forbid.

On what is common in such.

In explaining the ease of use, if they wanted to absolve someone of evil, they began to absolve God Almighty of evil, then they absolved those who wanted to acquit him on the meaning that God Almighty is above not purifying...
him from what harms him, so it is more emphatic and eloquent. Yes, this use is apparent in the following, God willing, from His saying about the women: “Allah forbid! We know nothing indecent about him”.

III. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "THIS IS NOT" AND "NOT", AND WHAT ARE THE OPINIONS OF THE GRAMMARIANS REGARDING THEM

The difference between one dialect and another may extend to the Arabic language. The ancient dialects differed in the Arabic case of the second name after the negative “ma”, for the Hijaz dialect makes the second name after “ma”, which is its predicate, while the Tamim dialect uses this name raised. Sibawayh said: “This is the chapter on what has been done, which is not in some places in the language of the people of Hijaz, then it becomes an original, and that letter is "This is not". We say: What is your brother’s servant, he is not logical. And as for the Banu Tamim, they make it a stream, whether or not, which is the analogy because it is not a verb, and there is no manifestation in it. As for the people of Hijaz, they liken it to "not", if their meaning is the same.

Likewise, the Almighty’s saying, “This is not a human” in the language of the people of Hijaz, and Bani Tamim raised it, except for those who know how it is in the Qur’an.

And from what came in the explanation of the Mufassal, Ibn Yaish said that “This is Not” is a negative letter that enters into nouns and verbs, and its analogy is that it does nothing. For example, do you not do anything? If you say, did Zaid stand up and did Zaid stand tall, then he is entitled to the verb, the subject and the predicate, then his actions are not permissible in any of the nouns and verbs because they are not specific, so this is the analogy in “This is Not”. Because you say Zaid did not stand, as you say, Zaid is standing, so it has the name and the verb, except that the people of Hijaz familiarize it with “Not”, and this is because:

First, for its likeness to “not” in the negation and entering into the subject and the predicate, except that what goes too far in the resemblance to it is due to its specialization in the negation of the case. Therefore, it was included in it on the collective knowledge and denial, so they raise the name with it and imply it the predicate as it does B. outside.” The first language is more accurate, and the second is more eloquent. It is mentioned in the Qur’an that God Almighty says: “This is not a human”.

It is narrated on the authority of Al-Asma’i that he said what I heard that he said what I heard in something of the poetry of the Arabs, that is to say, the accusation of a report of what is likened to “Not” and what is this, and if it is likened to “Not” and does its work, it is weaker in action than it is because it is not a verb or a letter, and therefore it is weak if its story precedes its name or enters a letter The exception between the noun and the predicate nullifies its action, and what follows it is raised with the initiation and the predicate, towards your saying what Zaid is standing, and not acting in any case.

As for the similarity between not and what they are all about to negate what is in the case and if it is not specific to the subject or the predicate, then if you enter what is on the subject and the predicate, I resemble it from the point of view of the negation and from the point of view of entering into the subject and the predicate.

**Ibn Malik says about "This is not"

The usage of “not” is utilizing “This is not” without “that”

With the negation, and the arrangement of Zakan

As for “This is not” in the language of Bani Tamim, it does not do anything, and the language of the people of Hijaz does its actions as “doing” not because it is similar to it. To make the name nominative and the predicate accusative. Example: God Almighty said, “This is not a human”.

And from what was mentioned in the jurisprudence of language, Ibn Jinni says that the Tamimiyya “this is not” and its being stronger by analogy than the Hijazi are related to some of the Arabic differences between these two northern Arabic dialects, and they are significant differences. It is well known that grammarians divide the negative “this is not” into Hijazi and Tamimi.

The predicate in the Hijazi is is accusative, while it is in the nominative form in the Tammimiyyah version. Also, the Qur’an in saying “This is not a human” came, of course, in the dialect of the Hijaz. Solving this diacritical dispute is what revolved around the predicate of "Not", if it is combined with “except,” then Tamim raises this predicate as “Not” over “this is not” which negates where Quraysh make is accusative. In this they tell a story, we do not
know whether it is correct or fabricated, but it is in any case a clear picture of the scientific debate about linguistic dilemmas.

As for what was mentioned in the book “Al-Insaaf fi issues of disagreement” by Al-Anbari, issue No. 19, where he said: The Kufics held that “this is not” in the language of the people of Hijaz does not work in the report, and it is established by deleting the letter of reduction. They argued that they said: This is because the analogy in “this is not” is that it does not work at all. Because the letter is only a factor if it is specific as the letter of reduction when it is specific to the names it works in, but the people of the Hijaz did it because they likened it to "not" in terms of meaning, and it is almost weak, so it was not able to work in the story as "not" did, because there "not" is a verb, and "this is not" is a letter, and the letter is weaker than the verb, so it is invalid to be accusative with “this is not”.

Although, it must be accusative by deleting the letter of the lowering, because the original is “what is added to the standing.” When the letter of the lowering was omitted, it must be erected, because the adjectives are erected in the souls, and when they left, they left behind them. That is why the accusative is not permissible if the predicate is presented, like “This is not Zaid” or the exception letter is entered like “Zaid is not standing”, because it is not appropriate to enter the ba’a "الباء" with them. So it is not said that Zaid is standing, and only Zaid is standing.” This indicates what we have said earlier.

And the Basrians were of the view that it works in the predicate, and it is implied in it and they argued that they said: The evidence that “what” is the invocation of the predicate, and that what it resembles is not, so it is necessary that you do an action that is not, and an action that is not, and an action that is not nominative and accusative, and the similarity between it and not from two opinions, One: it enters into the subject and the predicate, just as it does not enter the subject and the predicate.

The second: It negates "this is not" in case of conjunctives, just as "not" does negate "this is not" in case of conjunctives.

The resemblance between them from these two aspects is strengthened by the entry of the ba “الباء” into its narration just as it enters into a narration that is not. If it is proven that it is similar in none of these two ways, then it must follow its course. You should make the name accusative and the predicative nominative. As for the answer to the words of the Kufics: As for their saying, “The analogy requires that you do not act,” we said, “This was the analogy, except that he found between it and something not similar that necessitated doing its work, and it is the language of the Qur’an. God Almighty said: (This is not a human), also, God Almighty said: (They are not their mothers). Their saying: (The people of Hijaz did it because it was weak, so it was not possible for it to work in the predicate)

We said: This resemblance made it obligatory for her to do her job while it makes the name accusative and the predicate nominative.

However, we have acted according to this weakness, for it invalidates its work if its report precedes its name or if the exception letter is entered, or if it separates between it and what is done by saying that it is light, and if it were not for that weakness, it would have been necessary to work on all these topics.

As for their claim that the original is not added to a standing “we do not accept that the original is not, but it was entered for two reasons, one of them: that she inserted an affirmation of the negation, and the second: that in her report there would be something in relation to the blame in the report that, because she does not negate what she proves that, so she made the ba’ “الباء” in her report towards “what.” Zaid is based on Qaim to be opposite to Laam “اللاام” in the manner of “Zaid is based on Standing”.

And their saying, “When the letter of reduction was omitted, it must be plucked, because the attributes are erected in the souls, and when they left, they left behind them.” We said: This is corrupt, because the baa was in itself broken, not open, and there was no syntax in it, because the syntax does not fall on the letters of meaning, then if it was omitted the lowercase letter necessitates the accusative as they claimed. This would have been required in every place in which it is deleted, and there is no dispute that many nouns are inserted by lowering letters and do not become erect by deleting them, as you say: “God is sufficient as a witness, and God is sufficient as a helper" in nominative form.
If they omitted the letter of the lowering, they said, “It is sufficient for you, Zaid,” and no one came to me, with the nominative only. Likewise, all that came from this way, and if it was as they claimed, it would have to be erected, so when the consensus fell on the necessity of the nominative, it indicates the corruption of what they claim, and God knows best.

IV. ASPECTS OF THE READINGS OF THE OCCURRENCES OF THE WORD "HUMAN"

1. READING OF "THIS IS NOT A HUMAN"

It was mentioned in the dictionary of Quranic readings the aspects of reading, the reader and the source thus

Reading aspects: Human

Reciter Ibn Masoud

Reference

1. Al-Bahr Al-Moheet 5/304/
2. Al-Kashshaf 2/317/
3. Fakhr Al-Razi 18/129(22)

It came in al-Bahr al-Moheet, he said: Tamim’s language is nominative, Ibn Attia said, and he did not recite it, and al-Zamakhshari said, “Whoever recites on his slate from Banu Tamim, human being recited with nomination, which is the recitation of Ibn Masoud” In Al-Kashshaf the same speech was also mentioned and in the great interpretation of Al-Razi also the same speech was mentioned and it came in the interpretation of Ruh Al-Ma’ani by Al-Alusi, he said: The language of Bani Tamim is similar to that, and on this came his saying:

Gloriously sympathetic, I told him to join

He replied, killing a lover is not forbidden

In their language, Ibn Masoud, may God be pleased with him, recited it, and Ibn Atiyah claimed that no one read it here. Also, from what came in the interpretation of al-Tabari, it was mentioned that the people of Najd from their language raised it, saying, “This is not Omar and Qa’im”. Also, some say:

There is a difference between my intention and the intention of my father's children

All of them, this is not a difference

They wished me everlasting and painful death

And every boy meets with death

Al-Kisa’i said that it is the language of Tihama and Najd. Al-Fara’ claimed that the lifting is the stronger of the two ways: Abu Ishaq said: This is wrong, the Book of God Almighty and the language of the Messenger of God, may God bless him and his family and grant them peace, is stronger and more appropriate.

2. Reading “This is not a human"

Reading: “This is not a human”.

Reader: Hafsa.

Reference: Al-Jami’ by Al-Qurtubi 9/182.

It came in al-Jami’ by al-Qurtubi, I said: In the Qur’an of Hafsah, may God be pleased with her, “What is this good news?” mentioned by al-Garnawi. Al-Qushayri Abu Nasr said: The women mentioned that the “image” of Yusuf is better than the image of humans, rather he is in the image of a king. Also, the people of custom may say about the ugly as if he is a devil, and about the good as if he is an angel, meaning he has not seen the like of him because people do not see the angels. It is based on a belief that the image of the king is better, or on the news of his purity of morals and his distance from accusations.
2- Reading “This is not a human”

Reading: “This is not a human”.

Readers: Abu Omar, Abdul Warith, Al-Hassan Abu Al-Huwairith Al-Hanafi


It came in the dictation of the Akbari “What is this human being?” It is read by making the ba’a ”الباء” accusative: meaning a human being, rather he is a king, and it is read with a genitive ba’a ”الباء”: that is, this did not happen at a price, and it may be a source in the object of the object: i.e., with a purchase, and on this it was read with the genitive ”لام” ”اللام” in a king.

And what was mentioned in Al-Bahr Al-Mohet he said: Al-Hasan and Abu Al-Huwayrith Al-Hanafi read: “What is this glad tidings?” The owner of the allelements said. It may mean that it means a sale or a purchase, i.e., this is not something that is bought and sold, and it may be that it is not at a price, as if he said, “It is more expensive than any of these things being done to him.” A source that established the maqam of the effect, and Abd al-Warith followed them on the authority of Abu Amr on that and added to them except for a king by genitive ”لام” ”اللام”.

What came in the explanation of Al-Tusi, he said, while he was reading, “this is not purchased”.

Which means, “it is not owned”.

And what was mentioned in al-Tabari, he said, on the authority of Abu al-Huwairith al-Hanafi: that he recited: “This is not owned”, i.e., what is this with a purchase = by this he means that they denied that someone like him was enslaved to be bought and sold.

Al-Qurtubi said: It was narrated on the authority of al-Hasan: “This is good news” with the genitive of the ba’ and the shin, i.e., what this is a bought slave, i.e., what should be sold like this, so he put the infinitive in the place of the participle.

It came in al-Kashshaf and said: This is not owned or purchased, i.e., what is read by an owned slave.

And it came in the spirit of the meanings of Al-Losi, he said: And he recited Al-Hasan. And Abu al-Huwairith al-Hanafi - what is this good news of the neighbor’s ba’a, and breaking the shin on the fact that buying - as the author of the regulations said - is a source that has been established in the place of the prey, i.e. “what is this good news” that is, he is not one who buys in the sense that he is too dear to do that and this reading was narrated by Abd al-Warith on the authority of my father Amr too. However, he narrated from him that despite that he broke the lam from a king and said: To achieve the proportionality between them in the interpretation of that, i.e., what this is about a mean-buying slave, and according to the two estimates, it is not said: This recitation is contrary to the requirement of the place, yes, it is contrary to the drawing of the Qur’an because it was not written in Ya’a ”الياء” within the sentence.

V. CONCLUSION

Different Versions of the expression “This Is Not a Human”

1. “A Human” accusative ending: in which the Noble Qur’an was mentioned and with this recitation he recited the common people of the cities and its meaning, i.e., what is a slave owned by humans and that they expelled humanity from him due to the strangeness of his beauty and the distance of his goodness. It is the reading of the people of Hijaz and it is the correct reading, and all the books of interpretation

2. “Human” Nominative ending: that is, what is in a slave owned by humans, and it is the reading of Bani Tamim, and Ibn Atiya claimed that no one read it.” All the books of interpretations mentioned it.

3. “To any human” with genitive ending: Al-Qushayri said, and the women mentioned that “the image” of Yusuf is better than his human image, rather he is in the image of a king.
4. “Owned”: that is, it is not owned, and it is gay (42), i.e. what is owned by a slave is that it is in violation of the requirements of the station and that it is in contradiction to the drawing of the Qur’an because then it is written in it and they denied that the like of it is unlikely to be bought and sold.

1. “Not Purchased”: It was narrated on the authority of Al-Hasan that he recited “What is this Bsharay” that is, he is not a slave and he is gay, and this reading was mentioned by Al-Tabarsi in Majma’-Al-Bayan.
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