

Original Research

Received 28 May 2026

Revised 22 June 2026

Accepted 17 July 2026

Natural Resources for Human Health 2026, Vol. 6(9s): 1400–1416

KEYWORDS:

adherence, disagreement, evidence (shāhid), inference

The Qur'anic Evidence: between School Disagreement and Grammatical Adherence

Alaa Hussein Hasab Al-Yassiri¹, Prof. Dr. Asaad Khalaf Al-Awadi²

¹ Dhi Qar Education Directorate, Ministry of Education, Iraq

² Department of Arabic Language, College of Education for Humanities, University of Dhi Qar, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Iraq

¹ hla04023@gmail.com

² Asaad.Khalaf.Alawadi@utq.edu.iq

ABSTRACT: Co The manifestations of reasoning within the Arabic grammatical system are diverse, and their forms are distributed according to the differing approaches adopted by grammarians. Some were agreed upon, and others were the subject of disagreement. In both cases, reasoning constitutes the foundation of grammatical argumentation, working toward establishing the rule and reinforcing the evidence for it. Within this framework, samā' (oral transmission/audition) was one of the fundamental principles of reasoning in Arabic, to which grammarians resorted when deducing rules and constructing arguments. They devoted great attention and careful study to it as a primary criterion in the search for these rules. From this arose the idea for the present research, which sheds light on the reality of poetic and Qur'anic evidence as it stands between two poles: grammatical disagreement on one hand, and grammarians' adherence to it on the other.

INTRODUCTION

Linguistically, al-samā' (audition) derives from the root ((sīn, mīm, and 'ayn — a single root, meaning the ear's perception of a thing))¹, from which comes the expression ((sami' abu sam'an, sim'an, samā'an, samā'atan, and samā' iyyatan. Al-Liḥyānī said: some hold that al-sam' is the verbal noun (maṣḍar), while al-sam' is also used as a plain noun))². The term itself carries several meanings: the ear, as in God's words, "God has sealed their hearts and their hearing" [al-Baqarah 2:7]; and the faculty of hearing — a power within the ear by which sounds are perceived — as in God's words, "...or gives ear while attentive" [Qāf 50:37]³. Accordingly, al-sam' may at times denote its instrument, the ear, as in the verse cited above, and at other times denote the act of hearing itself, as in God's words, "Indeed, from [its] hearing they are removed" [al-Shu'arā' 26:212]; it may also denote its outcome, namely comprehension, as in God's words, "They said, 'We hear and we disobey'" [al-Baqarah 2:93]⁴.

As a technical term, al-samā' is one of the foundational concepts of Arabic grammatical terminology, referring in this usage to that for which no comprehensive rule encompassing all its particulars has been formulated⁵. It has accordingly been described as ((whatever is established in the speech of one whose eloquence is trusted — encompassing the speech of God Almighty, namely the Noble Qur'an,

¹Mu'jam Maqāyīs al-Lughah, 3/102.

²Lisān al-'Arab, 8/162.

³See: Lisān al-'Arab, 8/162.

⁴See: al-Kulliyāt, 496.

⁵See: al-Ta'rifāt, 121.

*the speech of His Prophet, and the speech of the Arabs before, during, and after his mission, until the tongues became corrupted through the proliferation of non-native speakers in verse and prose, whether Muslim or non-Muslim; each of these three categories requires established authenticity))*⁶.

For Ibn al-Anbārī it is synonymous with naql (transmission): *((it is eloquent Arabic speech, conveyed through sound transmission, occurring not rarely but abundantly))*⁷.

What al-Suyūṭī terms samāʿ, Ibn al-Anbārī terms naql; Ibn al-Anbārī perhaps preferred "transmission" to indicate that the sources of grammar are of two kinds: *((transmitted sources and rational sources. The transmitted include the Noble Qur'an, the noble Prophetic ḥadīth, and what has been transmitted of Arab speech in poetry and prose, matters here depending on transmission without the intervention of reason; the rational include analogy (qiyās), presumption of continuity (istiṣḥāb al-ḥāl), and the like, which come about only through the exercise of reason))*⁸.

It is also necessary to note that the term *((samāʿ is applied to what a scholar transmits after having heard it himself; what he transmits from another scholar, an earlier generation of scholars, a linguistic compilation, or a work of grammar is not counted as samāʿ but as riwāyah (reported transmission). The criterion distinguishing the two is the number of intermediaries between the source of the linguistic material and the person studying it: where intermediaries exist — even scholarly ones — it is riwāyah, whereas if the student heard it himself, it is counted as samāʿ. Accordingly, samāʿ is the direct acquisition of linguistic material from its native speakers))*⁹.

In any case, samāʿ is a general category comprising three sources counted as definitive evidences within the grammatical domain: the Noble Qur'an, the noble Prophetic ḥadīth, and the speech of the Arabs, whether poetry or prose¹⁰.

Among grammarians, samāʿ is governed by two boundaries — temporal and spatial. Temporally, they accepted citation from the sayings of pre-Islamic Arabs and eloquent early Muslims up to the mid-second century AH, whether the speakers were urban or Bedouin. As for the Bedouin, scholars continued recording their speech until their linguistic instinct became corrupted in the fourth century AH, according to the prevailing view among early grammarians and linguists on the temporal limits of citation¹¹.

The temporal boundary thus regards the mid-second century as marking the end of citation from the eloquent speakers and poets of the cities, while for the Bedouin, the middle of the fourth century, or its final quarter, marks the last point at which their speech could be cited¹².

The spatial boundary rests on a tribe's proximity to, or distance from, non-Arabs (al-aʿājim): tribes far removed from contact with non-Arabs were relied upon as sources, so that scholars took language only from the tribes at the heart of the Arabian Peninsula, distant from the coasts and from mixing with non-Arabs¹³.

In defining this boundary, grammarians incline toward what al-Suyūṭī transmitted from Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī in his book al-Alfāz wa-l-Ḥurūf, relying on his statement that *((Quraysh were the most discerning of the Arabs in selecting the most eloquent expressions, the easiest upon the tongue in pronunciation, and the best in sound and in conveying inner meaning. It is from them that the Arabic language was transmitted; by them others were guided, and from them, among all Arab tribes, the Arabic tongue was principally taken — they together with Qays, Tamim, and Asad, from whom the greater part of the language was taken, and upon whom reliance was placed for rare vocabulary, inflection, and morphology; then Hudhayl, part of Kinānah, and part of al-Ṭāʾiyyīn — nothing being taken from the rest of their tribes))*¹⁴.

In sum, nothing was taken from city-dwellers, nor from desert-dwellers inhabiting the fringes of lands bordering other nations. Nothing was taken from Lakhm or Judhām, for they bordered the people of Egypt and the Copts; nor from Quḍāʿah, Ghassān, or Iyād, for they bordered the people of Syria, most of them Christians who recited their prayers in languages other than Arabic;

⁶al-Iqtirāḥ fī Uṣūl al-Naḥw, 39.

⁷al-Ighrāb fī Jadāl al-Iʿrāb, 81.

⁸Uṣūl al-Naḥw al-ʿArabī, Maḥmūd Naḥlah, 31.

⁹Uṣūl al-Tafkīr al-Naḥwī, 33.

¹⁰See: Uṣūl al-Naḥw al-ʿArabī, Maḥmūd Naḥlah, 33.

¹¹See: Marāḥil Taṭawwur al-Dars al-Naḥwī, ʿAbd Allāh al-Khathrān, 163–164.

¹²See: ibid., 164.

¹³See: ibid., 164–165.

¹⁴al-Iqtirāḥ fī Uṣūl al-Naḥw, 47.

nor from Taghlib and al-Namir, for they were in the Jazīrah bordering Greek-speaking peoples; nor from Bakr, for they bordered the Nabataeans and Persians; nor from 'Abd al-Qays, for they inhabited Baḥrayn amid contact with India and Abyssinia; nor from the Azd of 'Umān, owing to their contact with India and Persia; nor from the people of Yemen at all, owing to their contact with India and Abyssinia and the presence of Abyssinian births among them; nor from Banū Ḥanīfah and the inhabitants of al-Yamāmah, nor from Thaḳīf and the inhabitants of al-Ṭā'if, owing to their contact with foreign merchants residing among them; nor from the urban centers of the Ḥijāz, because those who transmitted the language, by the time they began recording Arab speech, had already mixed with other peoples and their tongues had become corrupted. Those who transmitted the Arabic language and recorded it in writing, making it into a science and a craft, were the people of Kūfah and Baṣrah alone among all Arab urban centers¹⁵.

Scholars divided what is transmitted by samā' into two categories: regular (muṭṭarid) and anomalous (shādhah). Grammarians classed as regular whatever remained consistent in inflection and other technical matters, and as anomalous whatever departed from the pattern of its class and stood apart from it¹⁶.

Discussion of regularity and anomaly falls into four categories¹⁷: (1) regular in both analogy and usage together — the ideal case, as in "qāma Zaydun wa-ḍarabtu 'Amran wa-marartu bi-Sa'īdin" ("Zayd stood, I struck 'Amr, and I passed by Sa'īd"); (2) regular in analogy but anomalous in usage, as with the past-tense forms of yadhar and yada', and the expression "makānun muqbilun" — this is what analogy dictates, though the more common form in samā' is otherwise, even though the analogical form is also attested; (3) regular in usage but anomalous in analogy, as in the expressions istahwadha, istanwaqa al-jamalu, istawṣabtu al-amra, and abā ya'bā, where analogy would call for internal vowel change (i'lāl) in the first three and a kasrah on the middle radical of the last; (4) anomalous in both analogy and usage together, as in "thawbun maṣūnun" ("a protected garment"), "farasun maqwūdun" ("a led horse"), and "rajulun ma'wūdun min maraḍihi" ("a man recovered from his illness").

From this standpoint, samā' represents the linguistic wellspring through which the grammatical rule may be reached. The effects of this linguistic principle are reflected throughout the grammatical study conducted by grammarians, for it was among the mechanisms upon which they relied in upholding and defending grammatical opinion. Indeed, it may be said that the phenomenon of adherence (tamassuk) centered, in many of its instances, on this very principle, prompting numerous grammarians — whether on the level of school, doctrine, or personal opinion — to cling tenaciously to a grammatical ruling and champion it on the strength of samā'. We find grammarians drawing on it at various levels, sometimes through Qur'anic evidence and at other times through poetic evidence.

It is well known to students of the field what a fundamental pillar the Qur'anic text constitutes for understanding and upholding numerous grammatical issues. The Qur'anic text serves as a foundation to which grammarians turn, relying on its evidence to justify various grammatical rulings in keeping with their grammatical inclinations. The Qur'anic witness (shāhid) has thus played a major role in the phenomenon of adherence and in shaping grammatical rulings.

Numerous grammatical issues present themselves in which disagreement arose among grammarians, with adherence grounded in samā' drawn from the wise verses of the Qur'an. Among these are the following:

THE ACCUSATIVE MARKING OF THE VERB CONJOINED TO THE CONDITIONAL BY (THUMMA)

The notion of the conditional (al-shart) springs from the principle of contingency and causation, being a construction that ties the existence of one thing to the existence of another. Al-Mubarrid skillfully summarized this concept: *((the meaning of the conditional is the occurrence of a thing because of the occurrence of another))*¹⁸. Ibn Ya'ish affirmed the dimension of cause and causation

¹⁵See: al-Iqtirāḥ fī Uṣūl al-Naḥw, 47–48.

¹⁶See: ibid., 49.

¹⁷See: al-Khaṣā'is, 1/98–99.

¹⁸al-Muqtaḍab, 2/46.

within it¹⁹, since linking a matter to a condition is nothing but suspending its entry into existence upon the entry of the other into existence²⁰.

Al-Fārisī pointed to the unique status of the conditional sentence among sentence types, placing it alongside the oath sentence and stating that *((its counterpart among sentences is the conditional in its correlative (mujāzāh) construction, in that although it is a sentence, it departs from the normal rulings governing sentences, since it conveys no complete meaning until the apodosis (jazā') is joined to it))*²¹. This is what led al-Fārisī to apply the term mujāzāh to this construction — a usage his student Ibn Jinnī followed, affirming that the protasis (shart) and apodosis (jazā') are not mere isolated words but two clauses, each requiring the other, just as the first part of a sentence requires its second part, as in "Zaydun akhūka" and "wa-qāma abūka" ("Zayd is your brother, and your father stood")²².

Thus it becomes clear that the construction of the protasis and apodosis, though originally two distinct clauses, are joined by the correlative particle so as to become a single, integrated unit²³.

The conditional sentence is a distinctive construction composed of three essential elements: the conditional particle, the protasis verb, and the apodosis. These elements are governed by precise rulings, the most important of which concerns the status of an imperfect verb occurring between the protasis and apodosis when conjoined by (fa) or (wāw). In this position, two grammatical possibilities are permitted: the jussive (jazm), by conjunction with the jussive protasis verb (whether its jussive marking is overt or implied), or the accusative (naṣb), through the obligatory implication of (an) after (fa) or (wāw)²⁴.

The nominative (raf') is impermissible here, since it is invalid to begin a new, independent clause before the arrival of the apodosis that alone completes the meaning²⁵. Sibawayhi upheld this ruling, transmitting al-Khalīl's view through examples such as "in ta' tinī fa-tuḥaddithanī uḥaddithka" ("if you come to me and speak with me, I will speak with you") or "wa-tuḥaddithanī uḥaddithka." Al-Khalīl held the jussive to be the more correct form, since the meaning of the verb does not depart from the jussive even under an accusative reading, and because unifying the governing element (al-'āmil) is preferable²⁶.

Although grammarians prefer the jussive for the harmony of the two forms and the unity of the governing element, the accusative has nevertheless been transmitted from the Arabs, as in the poet's verse²⁷:

"Whoever draws near to us and submits, we shelter him; he need fear no wrong so long as he abides, nor any injustice."

It may be observed that the accusative is more acceptable when the verb is medial (between the protasis and apodosis) than when it is final, since the conjunction here falls upon the protasis verb, which is not always necessarily realized — bringing it closer to contexts of interrogation, command, and prohibition²⁸.

Turning to the conjunctive particle (thumma), we find that the Kufans held to the permissibility of marking the verb it conjoins to the protasis verb in the accusative, just as is permitted with (wāw) and (fa). They would say "in ta' tinī thumma tuḥaddithanī ukrimka" ("if you come to me, then speak with me, I will honor you"), with tuḥaddithanī in the accusative²⁹. They grounded this in certain Qur'anic readings, such as the accusative reading in God's words, "And whoever leaves his home as an emigrant

¹⁹See: Sharḥ al-Mufaṣṣal, 5/111.

²⁰See: Sharḥ al-Mufaṣṣal, 5/105.

²¹al-Īdāh al-'Aḍudī, 263.

²²See: al-Khaṣā'is, 3/181.

²³See: Sharḥ al-Sirāfi, 3/283.

²⁴See: Sharḥ al-Taṣrīḥ, 2/409.

²⁵See: Sharḥ al-Taṣrīḥ, 2/409.

²⁶See: Kitāb Sibawayhi, 3/89.

²⁷See: Sharḥ al-Taṣrīḥ, 2/409.

²⁸See: al-Maqāṣid al-Shāfiyah, 6/158.

²⁹Sharḥ al-Tashīl, Ibn Mālik, 4/45.

to God and His Messenger and then death overtakes him..." [al-Nisā' 4:100]³⁰. The Basrans, however, did not adopt these readings as an established grammatical rule, owing to their rarity³¹, and the reading of the majority remained the jussive³².

In light of the foregoing evidence, the researcher adopts the Kufan opinion permitting the accusative marking of the imperfect verb conjoined by (thumma) to the protasis verb, based on the evidence they relied upon. This adoption is reinforced by the fact that the Basrans did not categorically reject this Qur'anic reading nor describe it as grammatically anomalous, treating it merely as a rare reading. While regarding it as rare accords with their methodology of building rules on the predominant pattern, this does not entail the invalidity of the Kufan opinion; rarity does not negate probative force, and it leaves room for adopting this grammatical wajh within argumentation.

THE ITEM CONJOINED TO A VOCATIVE BOUND NOUN DEFINED BY (AL-)

The question of the appositives (tawābi') of the vocative (munādā) is among the most intricate and contested issues in Arabic grammar, and it merits the careful attention it has received, given the ramified and branching nature of its rulings. The vocative in Arabic does not occur in a single form: it may at times be declinable and marked accusative, and at other times indeclinable, built upon the case-marker it would otherwise take in the accusative position. This variation in the status of the vocative casts its shadow over its appositive, especially since dependency in vocative appositives may follow more than one pattern — sometimes according to grammatical position (maḥall), sometimes according to the wording (lafz) itself. Since the appositives themselves are not of a single kind — varying among description (na't), corroboration (tawkīd), appositive of explanation ('aṭf al-bayān), coordinating conjunction ('aṭf al-nasaq), and substitution (badal) — this diversity in the appositive leads to differing rulings on its case ending. Grammarians accordingly held that when the conjoined appositive of a vocative is a singular, definite noun bound by (al-), two grammatical possibilities are permitted: the nominative, as an appositive to the wording of the built vocative, and the accusative, as an appositive to the grammatical position of the accusative vocative³³.

The nominative is the preference of al-Khalīl, Sībawayhi, and al-Māzinī. Sībawayhi transmitted al-Khalīl's explanation of this, noting that *((one who says 'yā Zaydu wa-l-Naḍru' with the accusative does so because this was one of the positions in which a thing is returned to its origin; but as for the Arabs, we have mostly observed them saying 'yā Zaydu wa-l-Naḍru' [nominative]. Al-A'raj recited: 'And We had certainly given David from Us bounty: O mountains, repeat [Our] praises with him, and the birds [as well]' [Saba' 34:10], with the nominative. And they say 'yā 'Amru wa-l-Ḥarithu,' and al-Khalīl — may God have mercy on him — said: this is what analogy requires, as though he said 'wa-yā Ḥarithu'))*³⁴.

Ibn al-Warrāq justified the choice of the nominative as the stronger position, noting that a noun bearing the definite article has the wording of a singular and is definite, so that its definiteness through the article resembles definiteness through (yā); hence it is obligatory to choose the form that resembles it, namely the nominative³⁵.

By contrast, a group of grammarians — led by Abū 'Amr, 'Īsā, Yūnus, and al-Jarmī — held to the accusative, arguing that a noun bearing (al-) is not directly attached to the vocative particle and therefore cannot be treated as if it had been. They cited as evidence the apparent sense of God's words, "And We had certainly given David from Us bounty: O mountains, repeat [Our] praises with him, and the birds" [Saba' 34:10], where the reciters — with the sole exception of al-A'raj — are unanimous on the accusative³⁶.

The proponents of the accusative argue that they return the noun bearing the definite article to its origin, just as they return it to its origin in the case of construct-annexation (idāfah) or nunation (tanwīn)³⁷.

³⁰al-Tadhkirah fī 'Ilm al-Naḥw, al-Kirmānī, 165.

³¹Sharḥ al-Tashīl, Ibn Mālik, 4/45.

³²al-Muḥtasab, 1/195–197.

³³See: Kitāb Sībawayhi, 2/187.

³⁴Kitāb Sībawayhi, 2/187.

³⁵See: 'Ilal al-Naḥw, Ibn al-Warrāq, 340–341.

³⁶See: Sharḥ al-Ashmūnī, 3/33.

³⁷See: al-Muqtaḍab, 4/213.

Nevertheless, Sībawayhi and those grammarians who followed him rejected the preference for the accusative in this matter. Al-Mubarrid articulated their counter-arguments, noting that they claimed this position (*does not bind us, since the definite article does not occur directly adjacent to the vocative particle; and when you mark it accusative, you likewise do not place it in that position — so we are equal in this respect. Rather, the [accusative] was permitted owing to its separation from the demonstrative particle, just as one says ‘kullu shatin wa-sakblatibā bi-dirham’ and ‘rubba rajulīn wa-akbihi,’ yet one does not say ‘kullu sakblatibā’ nor ‘rubba akbihi’ unless the indefinite noun precedes*)³⁸.

Accounts of al-Mubarrid's position vary, though his own stance tends toward distinction and differentiation. Ibn Mālik stated: (*al-Mubarrid distinguished between what the definite article affects, such as al-rajul (‘the man’), and what it does not affect, such as al-Ḥārith. He preferred the accusative over the nominative in cases like al-rajul, owing to its resemblance to a construct-annexed noun in being affected by what is attached to it, and preferred the nominative over the accusative in cases like al-Ḥārith, owing to its resemblance to an unmodified noun in not being so affected*)³⁹.

Abū Ḥayyān and al-Suyūṭī both stated explicitly that al-Mubarrid originally chose the accusative; al-Suyūṭī attributed to him the following detail: (*the preferred form is the accusative if the article (al-) denotes definiteness, since the noun then resembles a construct-annexed noun; and the nominative if the article does not denote definiteness but rather marks a descriptive nuance, as in al-Yasā’, since it then bears no such resemblance — this is al-Mubarrid's view*)⁴⁰.

Despite presenting both positions and elaborating on the matter, al-Mubarrid ultimately favored the accusative in keeping with the common reading, stating: (*both views are sound, but the accusative is, in my opinion, preferable according to the common reading*)⁴¹.

It is clear that grammarians relied on what Ibn al-Sarrāj reported regarding al-Mubarrid's preference: (*the accusative in your saying ‘yā Zaydu wa-l-rajul,’ and the nominative in al-Ḥārith when you say ‘yā Zaydu wa-l-Ḥārith,’ because in his view the definite article in al-Ḥārith was introduced for emphasis, whereas the definite article in al-rajul was introduced as a substitute for (yā)*)⁴².

In light of the foregoing, we support the school that adopted the nominative, since its arguments rest on a solid foundation — the linguistic origin — relying on returning the derivative to its essential base by tracing the form back to its linguistic root. This view gains further acceptance and strength from its reliance on al-A‘raj's reading, which renders it more consistent with a rigorous linguistic perspective.

THE OCCURRENCE OF THE EXPLANATORY PARTICLE (AN) AS AN EXPLANATION OF THE DIRECT OBJECT OF EXPLICIT SPEECH

Grammarians define the explanatory clause (al-jumla al-tafsīriyyah) as a supplementary clause whose task is to reveal the true meaning of, and clarify, the ambiguity preceding it⁴³.

Scholars' views have differed regarding the grammatical position (maḥall) of the explanatory clause. The well-known opinion adopted by Ibn Hishām and others is that it has no grammatical position⁴⁴. Ibn Hishām stated this explicitly, noting that al-Shalawbīn was the one who broke with the consensus, claiming that its position follows that of the clause it explains⁴⁵. Al-Suyūṭī held that its ruling is tied to what it explains: (*if the explained element has a grammatical position, so does it; otherwise, it does not*)⁴⁶.

The explanatory clause is introduced by one of two particles, called the “two particles of explanation” or “two particles of expression”: (ay) and (an)⁴⁷.

³⁸al-Muqtaḍab, 4/213.

³⁹Sharḥ al-Tashīl, 3/402–403.

⁴⁰Ham‘ al-Hawāmi‘, 3/234.

⁴¹al-Muqtaḍab, 4/213.

⁴²al-Uṣūl fī al-Naḥw, 1/336.

⁴³See: Mughnī al-Labīb, 521.

⁴⁴See: Mughnī al-Labīb, 521.

⁴⁵See: Mughnī al-Labīb, 526.

⁴⁶Ham‘ al-Hawāmi‘, 2/332.

⁴⁷See: al-Mufaṣṣal fī Ṣan‘at al-I‘rāb, 427.

Grammarians distinguish between these two particles in usage. Al-Raḍī clarifies that (ay) explains anything ambiguous, whether a single word, as in “ʿajāʾanī Zaydun ay ‘Abdu Allāh” (“Zayd came to me, namely ‘Abd Allāh”), or a full clause, as in “uriqa damuhu ay māta” (“his blood was spilled, that is, he died”). By contrast, (an) explains only an implied object referring to a word that conveys the meaning of speech without being explicit, as in God’s words, “And We called to him: ‘O Abraham” [al-Ṣāffāt 37:104], where the explanatory clause clarifies the implied object of the implied verb nādaynāhu (“We called to him”) — meaning “We called to him with something,” namely “Oh Abraham”⁴⁸.

The basic rule for the explanatory (an) is that it must be preceded by a clause implying the meaning of speech, and it is most often followed by a verb in the imperative form⁴⁹.

Disagreement intensifies over the occurrence of (an) explaining an overt direct object or explicit speech. (An) may explain an overt direct object, as in God’s words, “When We inspired to your mother what We inspired: [39] Cast him into the chest” [Tāhā 20:38–39], and God’s words, “I said not to them except what You commanded me — to worship God, my Lord and your Lord” [al-Mā’idah 5:117] — where it explains the pronoun (hā) in “bihi” (“by it”)⁵⁰.

Some scholars permitted the relative pronoun (mā) to be explained by (an), while others responded that (an) here may instead be a maṣḍar-forming particle, on the doctrine of those who permit the maṣḍar particle to precede a clause of request, or that it is a redundant particle, its insertion avoiding a preposition governing an overt verb directly⁵¹.

Al-Suhaylī offers a deeper account of the true nature of the explanatory (an): its function is not, together with what follows it, to be construed as a verbal noun (maṣḍar); rather, it shares with the maṣḍar-forming (an) the role of safeguarding and explaining condensed maṣḍars that carry the sense of statements and indications. Its scope is restricted: it explains only what is condensed among the five modes of expressing inner speech — utterance, writing, gesture, contractual reckoning (‘aqd), and erection [of the fingers in counting] (naṣb)⁵².

Al-Suhaylī holds that the explanatory (an) is itself identical with the maṣḍar-forming (an), since it explains speech that is originally a maṣḍar, with the additional nuance that it conveys the sense of command or prohibition — a nuance that removes neither the verb from being a verb, nor the particle from being maṣḍar-forming⁵³.

Opinions have differed on whether explicit speech (ṣarḥ al-qawl) may be explained by the explanatory (an). Some permitted this, citing God’s words, “I said not to them except what You commanded me — to worship God, my Lord and your Lord” [al-Mā’idah 5:117], treating it as explanatory of “mā amartanī bihi” (“what You commanded me”)⁵⁴.

A group of grammarians held that it might instead be maṣḍar-forming, redundant, or explanatory⁵⁵, al-Zajjāj holding that it may carry the meaning of the explanatory (ay), or occupy an accusative position as a substitute for (mā) — that is, ‘illā an u’budū Allāh’ (“except that you worship God”)⁵⁶.

Accordingly, al-Khalīl, Ibn al-Sarrāj, al-Zajjāj, and others held to the permissibility of explaining, by (an), the direct object of explicit speech, expressing this position through God’s words, “And the eminent among them went forth [saying], ‘Continue, and be steadfast” — literally “walk” — [Ṣād 38:6], its underlying sense being ‘some of them saying to others: walk on’⁵⁷.

⁴⁸See: Sharḥ al-Raḍī ‘alā al-Kāfiyah, 4/468–469.

⁴⁹See: Sharḥ al-Mufaṣṣal, 5/83–84.

⁵⁰See: Sharḥ al-Raḍī ‘alā al-Kāfiyah, 4/469.

⁵¹See: ibid., 4/469.

⁵²See: Natā’ij al-Fikr fī al-Naḥw, 98.

⁵³See: Natā’ij al-Fikr fī al-Naḥw, 99.

⁵⁴See: Sharḥ al-Muqaddimah al-Kāfiyah, 3/995.

⁵⁵See: Kitāb Sibawayhi, 3/162.

⁵⁶See: Ma’ānī al-Qur’ān, al-Zajjāj, 2/223.

⁵⁷See: Sharḥ al-Raḍī ‘alā al-Kāfiyah, 4/470.

It was answered that (an) is redundant here, or that the implied explicit speech is treated like a verb construed with speech, or that the verb *inṭalaqa* (“they set off”) itself contains the sense of speech, being an instance of mutual negotiation (*tafāwuḍ*)⁵⁸.

Some grammarians insist that the clause preceding the explanatory (an) must be a complete statement requiring nothing beyond what follows (an) except its explanation. An example of completeness is God's words, “And We called to him: ‘O Abraham’” [al-Ṣāffāt 37:104], where “*nādaynāhu*” (“We called to him”) is a complete statement and the call is itself speech, so (an) here carries the sense of (ay). An example of incompleteness is God's words, “And the last of their call will be, ‘Praise to God, Lord of the worlds’” [Yūnus 10:10], where (an) here is not explanatory but rather forms, together with its noun and predicate, the predicate of the preceding subject (‘the last of their call’); had one stopped at ‘the last of their call,’ the statement would not have been complete⁵⁹.

The disagreement may ultimately be reduced to a single hypothesis: that the so-called explanatory (an), in a direct object bearing the sense of speech, may be either redundant or treated as *maṣḍar*-forming — an approach that would unify the grammatical rulings across most examples, even though this runs counter to the principle that redundancy should not be posited except where necessary. The disagreement persists between holding to the originality of the explanatory (an), subsuming it under the *maṣḍar*-forming (an), or considering it redundant in a direct object bearing the sense of speech — approaches that all seek to account for the grammatical variation found in the structure of the Arabic sentence.

THE OCCURRENCE OF THE PAST-TENSE VERB AS A CIRCUMSTANTIAL CLAUSE (ḥāl)

The occurrence of the past-tense verb functioning as a circumstantial qualifier (*ḥāl*) is among the intricate grammatical issues that sparked wide disagreement among grammatical schools, specifically between the Basrans and the Kufans. This disagreement stems from differing views on the true nature of the *ḥāl* and the temporal sense it carries.

The majority of grammarians, particularly the Basrans, agreed that the *ḥāl* is so named (*because the active participle within it can refer only to what one is presently engaged in, whether for a long or short duration; it cannot refer to what is past and concluded, nor to what has not yet occurred*)⁶⁰.

The *ḥāl*, as they define it, is the state or attribute accompanying the agent or the direct object at the very time of the action⁶¹.

It follows from this that the active participle is intended to denote the present state, unlike the past-tense verb, which does not denote present time; for this reason the past-tense verb was not permitted to function as a *ḥāl*⁶².

On the strength of this precise temporal criterion, the Basrans disallowed the occurrence of the past-tense verb as a *ḥāl*, justifying this on two main grounds⁶³: first, the past-tense verb does not denote the present, since the past denotes conclusion, and what denotes conclusion cannot take the place of what denotes presence; second, what may properly function as a *ḥāl* is what may be qualified by the time adverbs “now” or “at this hour,” such as the imperfect verb, as in “*marartu bi-Zaydin yaḍribu*” (“I passed by Zayd, [as he was] striking”) — which does not hold true of the bare past-tense verb.

By contrast, the Kufans and al-Akhfash permitted the past-tense verb to occur as a *ḥāl*, citing both *samāʿ* and analogy. As for *samāʿ*, it includes God's words, “Except those who join a people between yourselves and whom is a treaty, or those who come to you, their hearts strained at [the prospect of] fighting you or fighting their own people...” [al-Nisāʾ 4:90], and the verse of Abū Ṣakhr al-Hudhalī:⁶⁴

“Indeed a shudder overtakes me at your remembrance, just as the sparrow trembles when soaked by the rain.”

⁵⁸See: *Sharḥ al-Raḍī ʿalā al-Kāfiyah*, 4/470.

⁵⁹See: *Sharḥ al-Raḍī ʿalā al-Kāfiyah*, 4/470.

⁶⁰*Sharḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*, 2/4.

⁶¹See: *Sharḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*, 2/4.

⁶²See: *al-Inṣāf fī Masāʾil al-Khilāf*, 1/208.

⁶³See: *ibid.*, 1/205–206.

⁶⁴*ibid.*, 1/205.

As for analogy, they reasoned that the occurrence of a past-tense verb as a ḥāl is analogous to its occurrence as a descriptive qualifier of an indefinite noun: whatever may be a descriptive qualifier of an indefinite noun, as in “marartu bi-rajulin qā’idin” and “ghulāmin qā’imin” (“I passed by a sitting man” and “a standing boy”), may likewise be a ḥāl of a definite noun, as in “marartu bi-l-rajuli qā’idan” and “bi-l-ghulāmi qā’iman.” Since the past-tense verb may be a descriptive qualifier of an indefinite noun, as in “marartu bi-rajulin qā’ada” and “ghulāmin qāma,” it should likewise be permitted to occur as a ḥāl of a definite noun, as in “marartu bi-l-rajuli qā’ada” and “bi-l-ghulāmi qāma.” They add that the past tense may sometimes stand in the place of the imperfect, as in God’s words to Jesus: “O Jesus, Son of Mary, remember My favor upon you and upon your mother when I supported you with the Holy Spirit and you spoke to the people in the cradle and in maturity...” [al-Mā’idah 5:110] — meaning “when you speak” — and by virtue of this substitution, the past tense was permitted to occupy the position of the ḥāl⁶⁵.

Despite the underlying restriction among the Basrans, they nonetheless agreed on the permissibility of the past-tense verb occurring as a ḥāl under two conditions, intended to bring the sense of the past closer to that of the present state: first, that it be accompanied by (qad), whether overt or implied — since (qad) brings the past tense closer to the present, so that one says ‘qad qāma al-āna, aw al-sā’ah’ (‘he has [just] stood now, or this very hour’), thereby becoming adjacent to the present and taking on its ruling; second, that it be a descriptive qualifier of an omitted described noun, subsequently standing in the place of the ḥāl⁶⁶.

The Basrans (with the exception of al-Akhfash) therefore held that (qad) — overt or implied — is obligatory with the affirmed past-tense verb occurring as a ḥāl, while the Kufans and al-Akhfash held to its obligation only when the past tense is linked by (wāw), permitting its presence or omission in other forms. They cited as evidence God’s words, “Except those who join a people between yourselves and whom is a treaty, or those who come to you, their hearts strained...” [al-Nisā’ 4:90], God’s words, “And they came to their father at night, weeping” [Yūsuf 12:16], and God’s words, “Those who said about their brothers while sitting [at home]...” [Āl ‘Imrān 3:168]⁶⁷.

Al-Zamakhsharī, Ibn al-Ḥājjib, and Ibn Ya’ish agree with the Basran doctrine on the necessity of (qad), al-Zamakhsharī affirming in his exegesis of God’s words, “How can you disbelieve in God when you were lifeless and He brought you to life; then He will cause you to die, then He will bring you [back] to life, and then to Him you will be returned” [al-Baqarah 2:28], that the (wāw) denotes the ḥāl, and that the past tense is valid as a ḥāl only with the implication of (qad)⁶⁸, a position Ibn al-Ḥājjib endorsed regarding the necessity of overt or implied (qad)⁶⁹, while Ibn Ya’ish explained that (qad) brings the past closer to the present, thereby permitting it to occur as a ḥāl in its company⁷⁰.

Al-Farrā’, though a Kufan, nonetheless acknowledged the implied attachment of (qad), explaining God’s words “How can you disbelieve in God when you were lifeless...” [al-Baqarah 2:28] as follows: *((the meaning — God knows best — is ‘wa-qad kuntum’ (‘and you had been’); and were it not for the implication of (qad), the like of this construction would not be permissible in speech))*⁷¹, which places him in agreement with the Basran doctrine on the necessity of (qad).

Ibn Mālik strongly criticized the claim of the necessity of implying (qad) held by the Basrans and their followers, affirming that the original rule is that no implication should be posited, and that the presence of (qad) adds no new meaning to the sense of circumstantiality already understood from context. He held that the need for such an implication arises only when the omitted element denotes a meaning that cannot otherwise be grasped — which, he argued, does not apply here. He cited as evidence

⁶⁵ibid., 1/206.

⁶⁶ibid., 1/206.

⁶⁷See: Sharḥ al-Ashmūnī, 2/41.

⁶⁸See: al-Kashshāf, 1/121.

⁶⁹See: al-Kāfiyah fī ‘Ilm al-Naḥw, 24.

⁷⁰See: Sharḥ al-Mufaṣṣal, 2/27.

⁷¹Ma’ānī al-Qur’ān, al-Farrā’, 1/24.

that a verb negated by (lam), despite carrying past meaning, may occur as a ḥāl without any implied (qad); had (qad) been necessary, this occurrence would not have been permitted⁷².

It follows from this that Ibn Mālik leans toward permitting the occurrence of the past tense as a ḥāl without necessarily implying (qad), relying instead on the strength of context in conveying circumstantiality.

In light of the foregoing, the researcher agrees with Ibn Mālik's position as the preferable one, holding that context is the stronger factor in clarifying linguistic structure and in determining the grammatical function most consistent with the intended meaning in general.

THE PERMISSIBILITY OF ANNEXING THE TEMPORAL (IDHĀ) TO A NOMINAL CLAUSE

It is well established in the rules of Arabic that the word (idhā) oscillates between two basic functions: first, as a particle denoting sudden occurrence (al-mufāja'ah); second, as a noun, a temporal adverb (ẓarf) carrying the sense of a conditional⁷³. In this latter sense it is defined as a non-jussive-inducing temporal adverb, permanently built, most often carrying the sense of a condition, and specifically denoting future time, though it may occasionally denote the past, while retaining its sense of futurity even when the verb of its protasis or apodosis is in the past tense⁷⁴.

The temporal (idhā) must be annexed to a clause following it, though grammarians have disagreed over the type of this clause⁷⁵. Sibawayhi and those who followed him held that (idhā) may be annexed only to a verb, whether overt or implied⁷⁶, since (idhā) carries the sense of a conditional, and a condition is suited only to a verbal clause, the verb being, as a legal matter, capable of contingency and causation — this being the original principle governing such particles⁷⁷.

Ibn al-Anbārī explains this position on the grounds that the conditional particle requires a verb, and since the verb is necessarily implied, this precludes the following noun from being marked nominative as a subject of predication (mubtada'), since predication entails freedom from both overt and implied governing elements⁷⁸.

The Kufans and al-Akhfash opposed this view, holding to the permissibility of annexing (idhā) to nominal clauses, citing as evidence the apparent sense of God's words, "When the sky is split [apart]" [al-Inshiqāq 84:1], and "When the sun is wrapped up [in darkness]" [al-Takwīr 81:1], holding that the noun following (idhā) may be a subject of predication whose predicate is the following verb, the nominal clause thus occupying a genitive position through annexation⁷⁹.

Ibn 'Aqīl summarizes the position, stating: *((idhā must be annexed to a verbal clause and cannot be annexed to a nominal clause, contrary to al-Akhfash and the Kufans; so one does not say 'aji'uka idhā Zaydun qa'imun' [with a nominal clause]. As for 'aji'uka idhā Zaydun qāma,' Zayd here is marked nominative by an omitted verb, not by predication — this is the doctrine of Sibawayhi, opposed by al-Akhfash, who permitted it to be a subject of predication whose predicate is the following verb))*⁸⁰.

Al-Sīrāfi offers a more precise analysis of the disagreement, claiming that the dispute between Sibawayhi and al-Akhfash does not concern the underlying possibility of a subject of predication occurring after (idhā), but rather the nature of that subject's predicate: Sibawayhi requires the predicate to be a verb, while al-Akhfash permits it to be a noun.⁸¹

⁷²See: Sharḥ al-Tashīl, 2/372–373.

⁷³See: Raṣf al-Mabānī, 149–150.

⁷⁴See: al-Janā al-Dānī, 367.

⁷⁵See: ibid., 367.

⁷⁶See: ibid., 368.

⁷⁷See: Sharḥ Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik, al-Ḥāzīmī, 21/73.

⁷⁸See: al-Inṣāf fī Masā'il al-Khilāf, 2/507.

⁷⁹See: Sharḥ al-Ashmūnī, 2/152.

⁸⁰Sharḥ Ibn 'Aqīl, 3/61.

⁸¹See: Sharḥ Kitāb Sibawayhi (al-Sīrāfi), 1/428–430.

THE PERMISSIBILITY OF (idh) OCCURRING IN THE NOMINATIVE POSITION

The question of whether the temporal (idh) may occur in the nominative position was a subject of longstanding disagreement among earlier grammarians. The majority held that (idh) is a temporal word necessarily marked accusative as an adverb of time, annexed to the clause following it (whether overt or implied), and that it cannot be inflected to function as an agent or a subject of predication. Nevertheless, they noted that (idh) may depart from its adverbial status when annexed to a noun of time, as in “yawma’idhin” (“on that day”) and “hīna’idhin” (“at that time”), and as in God’s words, “after He had guided us” [Āl ‘Imrān 3:8], where it occurs in the genitive through annexation⁸².

The leading grammarians defined (idh) as an adverb for past time⁸³, a position Sībawayhi affirmed, holding that *((idh denotes what is past of time, and is an adverb functioning like ma’a (‘with’))*⁸⁴, likening it to (ma’a) in its adverbial function.

Al-Mubarrid, who likewise affirmed its construction as denoting past time⁸⁵, noted that it and similar adverbs *((are annexed to a verb and its agent, and to a subject of predication and its predicate... as in your saying, ‘ji’tuka idh qāma Zaydun’ and ‘ji’tuka idh Zaydun fī al-dār’))*⁸⁶.

On this basis, the majority rejected the occurrence of (idh) in any function other than as an adverb or an annexed genitive; in verses that suggest it functions as a direct object, they offered alternative interpretations. In God’s words “And remember when you were few” [al-A’rāf 7:86], (idh) is taken as an adverb for an omitted direct object, the underlying sense being ‘remember God’s favor upon you when you were few’; in God’s words “when she withdrew” [Maryam 19:16], it is taken as an adverb annexed to an omitted direct object, the underlying sense being ‘remember.’ This interpretation is supported by God’s words, “And remember the favor of God upon you when you were enemies” [Āl ‘Imrān 3:103], where the direct object (‘the favor of God’) appears explicitly, with (idh) then functioning as an adverb governed by ‘favor’⁸⁷.

Al-Akhfash and al-Zajjāj held to the permissibility of (idh) occurring directly as a direct object, citing as evidence God’s words, “And remember when you were few” [al-A’rāf 7:86]⁸⁸. Al-Zajjāj’s position is evident in his exegesis of God’s words, “And [recall] when We saved you from the people of Pharaoh, who afflicted you with the worst torment, slaughtering your sons and letting your women live; and in that was a great trial from your Lord” [al-Baqarah 2:49], where he stated explicitly that *((the position of idh is accusative, as though he said: ‘and remember when We saved you from the people of Pharaoh’))*⁸⁹.

Abū Ḥayyān sided with the majority, stressing that treating (idh) as a direct object is impermissible, since nothing resembling ‘aḥbabbu idh qadima Zaydun’ has been transmitted in sound Arab speech; he held that the more straightforward interpretation of the Qur’anic verses is that (idh) is marked accusative as an adverb, governed by an omitted verb whose sense is ‘remember your condition, your affair, or your matter,’ and that this interpretation is preferable to establishing a comprehensive rule on the basis of mere possibility⁹⁰.

Al-Zamakhsharī departed with an opinion contrary and unique to the position settled upon by other grammarians, holding to the permissibility of (idh) occurring in the nominative position as a subject of predication. This view appears in his exegesis of God’s words, “God had certainly conferred favor upon the believers when He sent among them a messenger from themselves” [Āl ‘Imrān 3:164], where he presented two possibilities: *((either the intended sense is ‘God’s favor upon the believers was through him, or through His sending [the messenger] when He sent him among them,’ with omission occurring once the sense is established; or idh occupies the*

⁸²See: Sharḥ al-Tashīl, Ibn Mālik, 2/206.

⁸³See: Zīnat al-‘Arā’is, 15.

⁸⁴Kitāb Sībawayhi, 4/229.

⁸⁵See: al-Muqtaḍab, 2/54.

⁸⁶al-Muqtaḍab, 4/347.

⁸⁷See: Muḡhnī al-Labīb, 112.

⁸⁸See: al-Janā al-Dānī, 187–188.

⁸⁹Ma’ānī al-Qur’ān wa-l-rābuh, 1/130.

⁹⁰See: al-Tadhyīl wa-l-Takmīl, 7/292–293.

nominate position, as does idbā in your saying ‘akḥṭabu mā yakūnu al-amīru idbā kāna qā’iman’ (‘the commander is at his most eloquent when standing’))⁹¹.

THE PERMISSIBILITY OF LINKAGE BY (AL-) IN PLACE OF THE PRONOUN

Arabic style is distinguished by an inherent characteristic: the strength of the tightly governed relationship among its clauses — a relationship governed by the authority of cohesion (taḍāmm) and mutual reinforcement among its parts. This cohesion is a prominent hallmark of linguistic coherence, precisely delimiting the boundaries of meaning and removing all ambiguity or obscurity from it. Every clause, whatever its type, must therefore contain something linking it to what precedes and what follows it, in addition to the internal links binding its essential components together

⁹², for *((there is no order or arrangement among words until some are linked to others and built upon others, this being made contingent upon that))⁹³.*

On this linguistic basis emerged the concept of linkage (al-rābiṭ), defined as *((a verbal indication of the connection between two correlated elements; it is understood that linkage should occur between the relative pronoun and its relative clause, between the subject of predication and its predicate, between the circumstantial qualifier (ḥāl) and its referent, between the qualified noun and its descriptive qualifier, between the oath and its response, and between the protasis and its apodosis))⁹⁴.*

Speech does not become meaningful unless its parts are joined together, for at the very heart of the concept of “sentence” lies the tight interlinking of its elements. For this reason certain early scholars preferred the term ta’līf (“composition,” from a root meaning familiarity and harmony) over tarkīb (“structure”), owing to the former’s connotation of familiarity, proportion, and harmony among words⁹⁵.

The earliest grammarians, such as al-Khalīl and Sībawayhi, did not refer to the concept of linkage by its current terminology as a verbal device achieving textual cohesion, yet they addressed its substance precisely under other headings, grasping its function through such concepts as implicit reference (iḍmār) and antecedent (‘ā’id), suspension (ta’līq), and referral (ihālāh), among other terms closely related to linkage. The term “al-rābiṭ” perhaps first appeared with Ibn al-Sarrāj in al-Uṣūl fī al-Naḥw⁹⁶.

The linking device in Arabic linguistic structure is marked by a multiplicity of types and a divergence of directions. Grammarians have affirmed that the pronoun is the essential linking device, indeed the very origin of every linking device — hence its broad and extensive use, spanning the assimilated adjective (al-ṣifāh al-mushabbahah), corroboration, substitution, adverbs, and prepositional phrases, and appearing frequently in declarative and circumstantial clauses and in descriptive clauses⁹⁷. *((Grammarians have regarded other linking devices as substitutes for the pronoun, on the premise that the pronoun is the origin of linkage — meaning by “origin” that it is the most common in usage, not that it is a root from which other forms branch))⁹⁸.*

On this basis, the question of whether the definite article (al-) may substitute for the pronoun in linkage constitutes a fundamental point of disagreement between the two grammatical schools. The Kufans held to the permissibility of linkage by (al-), citing as evidence God’s words, “But as for he who transgressed [37] and preferred the life of the world [38], then indeed, Hellfire — that is the refuge” [al-Nāzi‘āt 79:37–39], holding that (al-) in “al-ma’wā” (“the refuge”) is the linking device that has taken the place of the pronoun, the underlying form being “ma’wāhu” (“his refuge”)⁹⁹.

The Basrans did not accept this, regarding the interchange between a noun and a particle as objectionable; they therefore posit an implied pronoun in such examples. Their position stems from the fact that an overt noun denotes a specific meaning in

⁹¹al-Kashshāf, 1/436.

⁹²See: al-Rābiṭ wa-Atharuh fī al-Tarākīb fī al-‘Arabiyyah, 136.

⁹³Dalā’il al-I’jāz, 1/55.

⁹⁴al-Lughah al-‘Arabiyyah Ma’nāhā wa-Mabnāhā, 213.

⁹⁵See: Binā’ al-Jumlah al-‘Arabiyyah, Muḥammad Ḥamāsah, 87.

⁹⁶See: al-Uṣūl fī al-Naḥw, 1/42.

⁹⁷See: al-Rābiṭ wa-Atharuh fī al-Tarākīb fī al-‘Arabiyyah, 136.

⁹⁸Binā’ al-Jumlah al-‘Arabiyyah, Muḥammad Ḥamāsah, 110.

⁹⁹See: al-Rābiṭ wa-Atharuh fī al-Tarākīb fī al-‘Arabiyyah, 136.

itself, unlike a relative noun such as (alladhī), which denotes no specific meaning except through the relative clause that clarifies it; and if the overt noun does not resemble it in meaning, it cannot properly take its place¹⁰⁰.

The Kufans' position shows that they took the Qur'anic evidence as a foundation upon which to base and reinforce their grammatical ruling — that is, they found in the Qur'anic text something enabling them to hold firmly to the ruling and defend it, so that their grammatical ruling emerged from their adherence to Qur'anic evidence, an adherence absent in the Basran position, since they did not permit the matter based on their own particular grammatical outlook.

THE PERMISSIBILITY OF DETACHING THE CORROBORATIVE (KULL) FROM ANNEXATION IN WORDING

Construct-annexation (al-iḍāfah) is among the common linguistic features of nouns; the majority of nouns, such as ghulām ('boy/servant') and thawb ('garment'), accept annexation. By contrast, certain nouns are barred from annexation, such as pronouns, demonstrative nouns, relative nouns, conditional particles, and interrogative particles (with the exception of ayy), the reason for this prohibition being their resemblance to particles, and particles do not undergo annexation — hence these nouns were built (mabniyy) and given the ruling of particles. As for the permissibility of annexing the relative, interrogative, and conditional (ayy), this stems from its weaker resemblance to a particle, given its acute need for a following singular noun that clarifies its meaning and to which it is annexed¹⁰¹.

Among nouns requiring annexation to a singular noun, some may be detached from annexation in wording alone, such as (kull), on condition that it not function as a descriptive qualifier or as corroboration; others require annexation absolutely¹⁰².

The word (kull) is employed to denote comprehensiveness and totality, its semantic contexts varying to include: comprehensiveness of the individual members of an indefinite noun, as in God's words, "Every soul will taste death" [Āl 'Imrān 3:185]; comprehensiveness of the individual members of a collective definite noun, as in God's words, "and all of them are coming to Him on the Day of Resurrection" [Maryam 19:95]; and comprehensiveness of the parts of a single definite noun, as in "kullu Zaydin ḥasanun" ("all of Zayd is fine")¹⁰³.

It may be observed that annexation to an indefinite noun conveys the general sense of individual members, as in "akaltu kulla ragħīfin li-Zaydin" ("I ate every loaf belonging to Zayd"), while annexation to an indefinite noun that is itself annexed to a definite noun shifts the meaning to comprehensiveness of the parts of a single item, as in the same example when reinterpreted. This distinction clarifies why the word 'qalb' ('heart') must remain unannexed in the reading of all but Abū 'Amr and Ibn Dhakwān of God's words, "Thus does God seal over every heart [belonging to] an arrogant tyrant" [Ghāfir 40:35], on the implied construction 'kull ba'ḍ qalb' ('every part of a heart'), so as to realize both the comprehensiveness of individual hearts and the comprehensiveness of their parts¹⁰⁴.

The word (kull) occurs in its linguistic contexts in three forms, depending on its relationship to what precedes it¹⁰⁵: first, as a descriptive qualifier (na' t) — occurring as a description of either an indefinite or definite noun and denoting the perfection of the described noun, in which case it must be annexed to an overt noun matching it in both wording and meaning, as in 'aṭ'amnā shātan kulla shātin' ('we fed a sheep, a whole sheep'); second, as corroboration (tawkīd) — occurring to corroborate a definite noun or a bounded indefinite noun and denoting comprehensiveness, in which case it must be annexed to a pronoun referring back to the corroborated noun, as in God's words, "so the angels prostrated, all of them together" [al-Ḥijr 15:30]; third, as a non-appositive element, following the governing case-assigning elements, occurring either annexed to an overt noun, as in God's words, "Every soul, for what it has earned, is held in pledge" [al-Muddaththir 74:38], or unannexed, as in God's words, "And for each We presented examples [to warn them]" [al-Furqān 25:39].

¹⁰⁰See: al-Rābiṭ wa-Atharuh fī al-Tarākīb fī al-'Arabiyyah, 136.

¹⁰¹See: Sharḥ al-Taṣrīḥ, 1/692.

¹⁰²See: ibid., 1/692.

¹⁰³See: Muḡhnī al-Labīb, 255–256.

¹⁰⁴See: ibid., 255–256.

¹⁰⁵See: ibid., 256–257.

On this basis, grammarians' views diverged regarding the ruling on (kull) when detached from annexation in wording. Sībawayhi and the majority held it to remain definite, so that a following ḥāl is permissible, as in 'marartu bi-kullin sājidān' ('I passed by all, prostrating'). Al-Fārisī held it to become indefinite, his argument resting on its current state, since the mere intention of annexation does not suffice for definiteness. This disagreement becomes apparent when the omitted annexed-to noun is definite; where it is indefinite, there is no disagreement over its indefiniteness¹⁰⁶.

Al-Farrā' and al-Zamakhsharī departed from the well-known doctrine, permitting the corroborative (kull) to be detached from annexation in wording — a grammatical ruling Ibn Hishām described as the product of adherence to Qur'anic evidence. He reported that al-Farrā' and al-Zamakhsharī permitted this verbal detachment on the strength of a certain reading of God's words, "Those who were arrogant will say, 'Indeed, all [of us] are in it [together]'" [Ghāfir 40:48], with (kull) in the accusative, their analysis being that (kull) is marked accusative as corroboration of the noun of (inna), with the nunation in (kull) serving as a substitute for the omitted annexed-to noun, the underlying form being 'innā kullunā' or 'kullunā fihā'¹⁰⁷.

The writings of al-Farrā' and al-Zamakhsharī demonstrate this adherence to a grammatical ruling stemming from their own conceptual outlook, in which they employed the Qur'anic evidence as a pillar supporting and reinforcing this theoretical position. Al-Farrā', in his exegesis of God's words, "Indeed, all [of us] are in it [together]" [Ghāfir 40:48], stated: *((‘kull’ is marked nominative by [its relation to] ‘fihā,’ and I do not treat it as a descriptive qualifier of ‘innā’; had I marked it accusative on that basis, I would make ‘innā fihā’ the predicate. Similarly, ‘Say: indeed the matter, all of it, belongs to God’ [Al ‘Imrān 3:154] — one may mark ‘kullahu lillāh’ nominative or accusative on this same analysis))*¹⁰⁸.

Al-Zamakhsharī, for his part, stated: *((it is read ‘kullan,’ as corroboration of the noun of inna, which is definite, the nunation substituting for the omitted annexed-to noun, meaning ‘innā kullunā,’ or ‘kullunā fihā’))*¹⁰⁹.

These two explicit statements confirm the adherence of al-Farrā' and al-Zamakhsharī to a grammatical ruling stemming from their own conceptual outlook, with samā' — represented by the Qur'anic evidence — serving as their foundation for this adherence. Ibn Mālik noted that al-Farrā' and al-Zamakhsharī adopted the ruling of permissibility, explaining that permitting the verbal detachment of (kull) is in fact impermissible, on the grounds that *((expressions of corroboration are of two kinds: one explicitly annexed to a pronoun referring to the corroborated element — namely nafs ('self'), 'ayn ('very self'), kull, jamī', and 'ammah — and another whose annexation to the pronoun of the corroborated element is merely intended though unexpressed — namely ajma' and its sister forms))*¹¹⁰. Ibn Mālik concluded that singling out (kull) as permitting both usages (explicit annexation, and intended annexation together with verbal detachment) — when it is agreed that no word besides (kull) among the explicitly-annexed corroboratives is used with merely intended annexation, nor with verbal detachment — leads to charging it with having no counterpart in either category, which necessitates avoiding this analysis¹¹¹. Ibn Mālik holds that the more acceptable analysis of (kullan) in the reading in question is as a ḥāl, marked accusative, referring to the implicit nominative pronoun contained within the adverb (fihā), which serves as its governing element — this being an instance of the ḥāl preceding its governing element¹¹². Al-Zamakhsharī objected to this analysis of a preceding ḥāl, ruling out the adverb (fihā) as capable of governing in this position, contrary to its governing capacity when it precedes¹¹³. Ibn Hishām saw weakness in the ḥāl analysis on two counts: first, the precedence of the ḥāl over its governing adverb; second, the requirement that (kull) be detached from annexation both verbally and notionally in order to become indefinite — a condition not easily met here. He therefore held the best analysis to be treating (kullan) as a substitute (badal) for the noun of (inna), noting that substituting an overt noun for the pronoun of a person present is permissible in this context when it serves to convey comprehensiveness, as in 'qumtum thalāthatukum' ('the three of you stood')¹¹⁴. He likewise

¹⁰⁶See: Sharḥ al-Taṣṭīḥ, 1/692.

¹⁰⁷See: Mughnī al-Labīb, 257.

¹⁰⁸Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān, al-Farrā', 3/10.

¹⁰⁹al-Kashshāf, 4/171.

¹¹⁰Sharḥ al-Tashīl, Ibn Mālik, 3/292.

¹¹¹See: ibid., 3/292.

¹¹²See: ibid., 3/293.

¹¹³See: al-Kashshāf, 4/171.

¹¹⁴See: Mughnī al-Labīb, 257.

rejected omitting the pronoun in reliance on the mere intention of annexation, contrary to al-Farrā' and al-Zamakhsharī, and dismissed the anomalous reading as a valid grammatical proof¹¹⁵.

REFERENCES

- [1] Uṣūl al-Tafkīr al-Naḥwī: 'Alī Abū al-Makārim, Dār Gharīb li-l-Ṭibā'ah wa-l-Nashr wa-l-Tawzī', Cairo, 1st ed. (2006).
- [2] Uṣūl al-Naḥw al-'Arabī: Maḥmūd Aḥmad Naḥlah, Dār al-'Ulūm al-'Arabiyyah li-l-Ṭibā'ah wa-l-Nashr, Beirut, 1st ed. (1407 AH / 1987).
- [3] al-Uṣūl fī al-Naḥw: Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Sarī ibn Sahl al-Naḥwī, known as Ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 316 AH), ed. 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatī, Mu'assasat al-Risālah, Beirut, n.d.
- [4] al-Ighrāb fī Jadal al-I'rāb wa-Luma' al-Adillah fī Uṣūl al-Naḥw: Abū al-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān Kamāl al-Dīn ibn Muḥammad al-Anbārī (d. 577 AH), ed. Sa'īd al-Afghānī, Dār al-Fikr.
- [5] al-Iqtirāḥ fī Uṣūl al-Naḥw wa-Jadaliḥ: 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911 AH), ed. Dr. Maḥmūd Fajjāl, Dār al-Qalam, Damascus, 1st ed. (1409 AH / 1989).
- [6] al-Inṣāf fī Masā'il al-Khilāf bayn al-Naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn wa-l-Kūfiyyīn: Kamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Sa'īd al-Anbārī al-Naḥwī (d. 577 AH), al-Maktabah al-'Aṣriyyah, 1st ed. (1424 AH / 2003).
- [7] al-Īdāḥ al-'Aḍudī: Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī (d. 377 AH), ed. Ḥasan Shādhilī Farhūd, University of Riyadh, 1st ed. (1289 AH / 1969).
- [8] Binā' al-Jumlaḥ al-'Arabiyyah: Muḥammad Ḥamāsah 'Abd al-Laṭīf, Dār Gharīb li-l-Ṭibā'ah wa-l-Nashr wa-l-Tawzī', Cairo (2003).
- [9] al-Tadhkirah fī 'Ilm al-Naḥw: Muḥammad Karīm al-Kirmānī, n.p., n.d.
- [10] al-Tadhyīl wa-l-Takmil fī Sharḥ Kitāb al-Tashīl: Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī (d. 745 AH), ed. Dr. Ḥasan Hindāwī, Dār al-Qalam, Damascus, 1st ed. (1418 AH / 1997).
- [11] al-Janā al-Dānī fī Ḥurūf al-Ma'ānī: Abū Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn Ḥusayn ibn Qāsim al-Murādī al-Miṣrī al-Mālikī (d. 749 AH), ed. Fakhr al-Dīn Qabāwah and Muḥammad Nadīm Fāḍil, Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, Beirut, 1st ed. (1413 AH / 1992).
- [12] al-Khaṣā'iṣ: Abū al-Faṭḥ 'Uthmān ibn Jinnī (d. 392 AH), al-Hay'ah al-Miṣriyyah al-'Āmmah li-l-Kitāb, 4th ed.
- [13] Dalā'il al-I'jāz fī 'Ilm al-Ma'ānī: Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Qāhir ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Jurjānī (d. 471 AH), ed. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Hindāwī, Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, Beirut, 1st ed. (1422 AH / 2001).
- [14] al-Rābiṭ wa-Atharuh fī al-Tarākīb fī al-'Arabiyyah: Ḥamzah 'Abd Allāh al-Nashratī, Islamic University of Madinah (1405 AH / 1985).
- [15] Raṣf al-Mabānī fī Sharḥ Ḥurūf al-Ma'ānī: al-Imām Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Nūr al-Mālaqī (d. 702 AH), ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad al-Kharrāṭ, Dār al-Qalam, Damascus, 3rd ed. (1423 AH / 2002).
- [16] Zīnat al-'Arā'is min al-Ṭuraf wa-l-Nafā'is fī Takhrīj al-Furū' al-Fiqhiyyah 'alā al-Qawā'id al-Naḥwiyyah: Yūsuf ibn Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī al-Ṣāliḥī, Jamāl al-Dīn, Ibn al-Mibrad al-Ḥanbalī (d. 909 AH), n.p., n.d.
- [17] Sharḥ Ibn 'Aqīl 'alā Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik: 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-'Uqaylī al-Hamdānī al-Miṣrī, known as Ibn 'Aqīl (d. 769 AH), ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, Dār al-Turāth, Cairo, 20th ed. (1400 AH / 1980).

¹¹⁵See: Sharḥ al-Ashmūnī, 2/337.

- [18] Sharḥ al-Ashmūnī ‘alā Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik: ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā Abū al-Ḥasan Nūr al-Dīn al-Ashmūnī al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 900 AH), Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, Beirut, 1st ed. (1419 AH / 1998).
- [19] Sharḥ al-Tashīl: Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Mālik al-Ṭā‘ī al-Jayyānī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Jamāl al-Dīn, known as Ibn Mālik (d. 672 AH), ed. Dr. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sayyid and Dr. Muḥammad Badawī al-Makhtūn, Hajr Publishing, 1st ed. (1410 AH / 1990).
- [20] Sharḥ al-Taṣrīḥ ‘alā al-Tawḍīḥ, or al-Taṣrīḥ bi-Maḍmūn al-Tawḍīḥ fī al-Naḥw: Khālid ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr al-Jurjāwī al-Azharī Zayn al-Dīn al-Miṣrī, known as al-Waqqād (d. 905 AH), Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, Beirut, 1st ed. (1421 AH / 2000).
- [21] Sharḥ Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik: Abū ‘Abd Allāh Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar ibn Musā‘id al-Ḥāzimī, n.p., n.d.
- [22] Sharḥ al-Mufaṣṣal: Ya‘īsh ibn ‘Alī ibn Ya‘īsh Ibn Abī al-Sarāyā Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī Abū al-Baqā’ Muwaffaq al-Dīn al-Asadī al-Mawṣilī, known as Ibn Ya‘īsh (d. 643 AH), Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, Beirut, 1st ed. (1422 AH / 2001).
- [23] Sharḥ al-Muqaddimah al-Kāfiyah fī ‘Ilm al-I‘rāb: Jamāl al-Dīn Abū ‘Amr ‘Uthmān Ibn al-Ḥājib al-Naḥwī (d. 646 AH), ed. Jamāl ‘Abd al-‘Āṭī Mukhaymir Aḥmad, Maktabat Nizār Muṣṭafā al-Bāz, Riyadh, 1st ed. (1418 AH / 1997).
- [24] Sharḥ Kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥājib: Raḍī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Astarābādī (d. 686 AH), Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, Beirut, 1st ed. (1419 AH / 1998).
- [25] Sharḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi: Abū Sa‘īd al-Sīrāfi, al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Marzubān (d. 368 AH), ed. Aḥmad Ḥasan Mahdalī and ‘Alī Sayyid ‘Alī, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, Beirut, 1st ed. (2008).
- [26] ‘Ilal al-Naḥw: Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās, known as Ibn al-Warrāq (d. 381 AH), ed. Muḥammad Jāsīm Muḥammad al-Darwīsh, Maktabat al-Rushd, Riyadh, 1st ed. (1420 AH / 1999).
- [27] al-Kāfiyah fī ‘Ilm al-Naḥw: Ibn al-Ḥājib, Jamāl al-Dīn ibn ‘Umar ibn Abī Bakr al-Miṣrī al-Isnawī al-Mālikī (d. 646 AH), ed. Dr. Ṣāliḥ ‘Abd al-‘Azīm al-Shā‘ir, Maktabat al-Ādāb, Cairo, 1st ed. (2010).
- [28] Kitāb al-Ta‘rīfāt: ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Zayn al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816 AH), Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, Beirut, 1st ed. (1403 AH / 1983).
- [29] Kitāb Sībawayhi: ‘Amr ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Qanbar al-Ḥārithī, Abū Bishr, known as Sībawayhi (d. 180 AH), ed. ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, Maktabat al-Khānjī, Cairo, 3rd ed. (1408 AH / 1988).
- [30] al-Kashshāf ‘an Ḥaqā’iq Ghawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl wa-‘Uyūn al-Aqāwīl fī Wujūh al-Ta’wīl: Maḥmūd ibn ‘Umar ibn Aḥmad al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538 AH), Dār al-Rayyān li-l-Turāth, Cairo; Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, Beirut (1362 AH / 1947).
- [31] al-Kullīyyāt, Mu‘jam fī al-Muṣṭalahāt wa-l-Furūq al-Lughawīyah: Abū al-Baqā’ Ayyūb ibn Mūsā al-Ḥusaynī al-Qirīmī al-Kafawī al-Ḥanafī (d. 1094 AH), ed. ‘Adnān Darwīsh and Muḥammad al-Miṣrī, Mu‘assasat al-Risālah, Beirut.
- [32] Lisān al-‘Arab: Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn Mukarram ibn ‘Alī Jamāl al-Dīn Ibn Manẓūr al-Anṣārī (d. 711 AH), Dār Ṣādir, Beirut, 3rd ed. (1414 AH).
- [33] al-Lughah al-‘Arabiyyah Ma‘nāhā wa-Mabnāhā: Tammām Ḥassān, Dār al-Thaqāfah, Casablanca (1994).
- [34] Marāḥil Taṭawwur al-Dars al-Naḥwī: ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ḥamad al-Khathrān, Dār al-Ma‘rifah al-Jāmi‘iyyah (1993).
- [35] Ma‘ānī al-Qur‘ān wa-l-I‘rābuh: Ibrāhīm ibn al-Sarī ibn Sahl, Abū Ishāq al-Zajjāj (d. 311 AH), ed. ‘Abd al-Jalīl ‘Abduh Shalabī, ‘Ālam al-Kutub, Beirut, 1st ed. (1408 AH / 1988).
- [36] Ma‘ānī al-Qur‘ān: Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā ibn Ziyād ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Manẓūr al-Daylamī, known as al-Farrā’ (d. 207 AH), ed. Aḥmad Yūsuf al-Najāti, Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Najjār, and ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Ismā‘īl al-Shalabī, al-Dār al-Miṣriyyah li-l-Ta’līf wa-l-Tarjamah, Egypt, 1st ed.

- [37] Mu‘jam Maqāyīs al-Lughah: Abū al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad ibn Fāris ibn Zakariyyā (d. 395 AH), ed. ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī & Sons, Egypt, 2nd ed. (1392 AH / 1972).
- [38] Mughnī al-Labīb ‘an Kutub al-A‘arīb: ‘Abd Allāh ibn Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Yūsuf, Abū Muḥammad Jamāl al-Dīn, known as Ibn Hishām (d. 761 AH), ed. Māzin al-Mubārak and Muḥammad ‘Alī Ḥamd Allāh, Dār al-Fikr, Damascus, 6th ed. (1985).
- [39] al-Mufaṣṣal fī Ṣan‘at al-I‘rāb: Abū al-Qāsim Maḥmūd ibn ‘Amr ibn Aḥmad al-Zamakhsharī, Jār Allāh (d. 538 AH), ed. Dr. ‘Alī Bū Mulḥim, Maktabat al-Hilāl, Lebanon.
- [40] al-Maqāṣid al-Shāfiyah fī Sharḥ al-Khulāṣah al-Kāfiyah (Sharḥ Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik): Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Mūsā al-Shāṭibī (d. 790 AH), Institute for Scientific Research and Revival of Islamic Heritage, Umm al-Qurā University, Mecca, 1st ed. (1428 AH / 2007).
- [41] Hamdulay N. A., (2026). Prompt Engineering as Rhetorical Practice: Redefining Literacy in AI-Mediated Education. International Journal of Education, Society and Policy, 1(1), 50-59. <https://ijesp.org/index.php/ijesp/article/view/18>
- [42] al-Muqtaḍab: Abū al-‘Abbās Muḥammad ibn Yazīd ibn ‘Abd al-Akbar, al-Thumālī al-Azdī, known as al-Mubarrid (d. 285 AH), ed. Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Khāliq ‘Uḍaymah, ‘Ālam al-Kutub, Beirut, n.d.
- [43] Natā’ij al-Fikr fī al-Naḥw: Abū al-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Suhaylī (d. 581 AH), Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, Beirut, 1st ed. (1412 AH / 1992).
- [44] Usiere A. U., Akpan B. (2026). Digital communication, social media animations and the transformation of film industries: Views from Africa. International Journal of Education, Society and Policy, 1(1), 24–39. <https://ijesp.org/index.php/ijesp/article/view/8>
- [45] Ham‘ al-Hawāmi‘ fī Sharḥ Jam‘ al-Jawāmi‘: ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911 AH), ed. ‘Abd al-Ḥamid Hindāwī, al-Maktabah al-Tawqīfiyyah, Egypt.