Registered in Germany **Europa Revue Journal**
ISSN: 1862-6564 **Vol. 6 No. 6 (2026) Published June 25, 2026**

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE EXPLANATORY METHODS OF QASUM AL-KHWARIZMI AND UMAR AL-JANDI

Samariddin AHMEDOVA

Lecturer of the "Languages" department of Tashkent Islamic institute named after Imam Bukhari

*email:*samariddin2023@gmail.com

Abstract

This article presents a comparative analysis of the work "al-Iqlid" by Ahmad ibn Mahmud ibn Umar al-Jandi, one of the masterpieces of his time in Arabic linguistics, to Mahmud Zamakhshari's work "al-Mufassal", and the methodology of the at-Takhmir centuries by Qasim Ibn al-Husayn Ibn Ahmad al-Khwarizmi. Within the framework of the study, the methods of Umar al-Jandi and Qisim Al-Khwarizmiy in interpreting the "al-Mufassal" text in terms of the factor (influencer in the agreement) of Mubtada and Khabar, which are controversial topics among scholars in the field of Arabic grammar, are analyzed based on their unique scientific and methodological approach.

Key words

word, phrase, expression, definition, question, objection, answer, evidence, terminological definition, factor, origin, message, inseparability, grammatical effect.

In Arabic linguistics, the concept of *kalima (word)* is one of the most important theoretical issues of *nahw* (syntax), and scholars have proposed various approaches to defining its meaning and boundaries. For this reason, the explainers of "*Al-Mufassal"* also paid special attention to this matter. First of all, it is appropriate to present the definition of *kalima* given by Mahmud Zamakhshari himself. In discussing the themes of *kalima* and *kalam(sentence)* Mahmud Zamakhshari provides the following definition of *kalima*:

"الكلمة هي اللفظة الدالة على معنى مفرد بالوضع" "*Kalima* is a single word that denotes only one meaning in this terminological designation"[1].

[1] Al-Zamakhshari, Abu al-Qasim Mahmud ibn Umar. Al-Mufassal fi al-'ulum al-'arabiyya. Amman: Dar Ammar, 2004, p. 32.

Qasim al-Khwarazmi adopts a critical and analytical approach in explaining Zamakhshari's definition of *kalima*. He evaluates certain components of the definition given by the author of *"Al-Mufassal"* as redundant and seeks to make the definition more concise. This demonstrates his inclination toward logical minimalism. Specifically, he emphasizes that the inclusion of the phrase "بالوضع" (by terminological designation) in the definition of *kalima* is not necessary. He explains the reason as follows: "The author included the phrase "بالوضع" so that distorted utterances (words that lack meaning due to incorrect pronunciation) would not fall under the definition of *kalima*. However, such distorted utterances are already excluded from the definition by the condition "بالوضع" (denoting the meaning). Therefore, the inclusion of "اللفظة" in the definition is not essential". Because the letter *"ta"* functions as a personal-number suffix and is used to indicate singularity, while the notion of singularity is already expressed by the term "مفرد"[2]. In this way, Qasim al-Khwarazmi noted that Mahmud Zamakhshari employed two redundant words in the phrase he used to define *kalima*.

Based on the above analysis, the commentator believes that the most concise and logically perfect definition of the concept of "kalima" should be expressed as follows:

"لكلمة لفظ له دلالة مفردة"

"A word is a word with a single sign[3]." Because the redundant "in terms of" (terminological designation) and the concepts of unity in the word "اللفظة" have been removed from this definition, it fully meets the logical criteria of the theory of definition.

Al-Khwarizmi covers a wider semantic range in his interpretation of the relationship between word and meaning. He argues that the concept of "word" is not limited to pronounced units, but also includes units that exist theoretically. This approach is consistent with modern linguistic theories, which show the need to evaluate language units not only formally, but also functionally.

Qasim al-Khwarazmi interprets the concept of **"لفظ"** within a broad semantic scope. That is, *lafz (pronounced word)* is not limited only to an actually pronounced

[2] Qasim ibn Husayn al-Khwarazmi. At-Takhmir. Vol. 1. Beirut: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1990, p. 155.
[3] Qasim ibn Husayn al-Khwarazmi. At-Takhmir. Vol. 1. Beirut: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1990, p. 156.

unit, but also encompasses hypothetically (conceptually) pronounced units whose existence within the language system and grammatical function are taken into account. On this basis, even though the hidden subject (*fa'il*) in a verb is not explicitly pronounced, it is still evaluated as a *lafz* in a hypothetical sense[4].

Based on this interpretation, the scholar responds to the objection: "In the definition of *kalima*, the element **"لفظ"** is not necessary, because even the hidden subject in the verb is also called *kalima*. The reason is that when the verb is considered together with its subject (*fa'il*), the combination rises to the level of *kalam*, whereas *kalam* must be a complex unit composed of at least two *kalimas*. Therefore, if the hidden subject within the verb, though not an actual *lafz*, is nevertheless referred to as *kalima*, it becomes clear that the inclusion of **"لفظ"** *'* in the definition of *kalima* is not essential."

This approach fully corresponds to the fundamental principles of the issue known in *nahw* as "hypothetical elements". That is, the existence of linguistic units may be determined not by their actual pronunciation, but by theoretical grammatical necessity. From this perspective, recognizing the assumed subject of a verb as a *kalima* does not provide sufficient grounds for excluding the element *"lafz"* from the definition.

Qasim al-Khwarazmi cites the following verse of a poet as evidence that *lafz* should not be restricted only to actually pronounced units:

أسد علي و في الحروب نعامة فتخاء تنفر من صفير الصافر

This couplet serves as a clear proof in explaining the distinction between *tashbih* (simile) and *isti'ara* (metaphor), which is one of the important issues in the science of *balagha* (rhetoric). Through this example, the author reveals the impact of the assumed meaning on semantic status. From the perspective of *balagha*, if in a *tashbih* the *mushabbah* (the subject being compared) is intended, then the expression remains within the domain of reality. Because the elements of comparison exist in the mind, they do not reach the level of semantic transference. In the cited couplet, through the images of the "lion" and the "ostrich," two contrasting states are depicted: a person's

[4] Ibid.156.156-157.

claim to bravery and their practical cowardice. In this verse, although the image of the "lion" is used as a symbol of courage, since the *mushabbah* (the person being compared) is intended, it does not rise to the level of a complete metaphor (*isti'ara*). Similarly, the description "like an ostrich in battles," though possessing ironic force, is evaluated rhetorically within the scope of *tashbih* (simile). Thus, this example demonstrates the decisive role of the "mental" *lafz* in semantic and rhetorical judgment. It also clearly reveals the intrinsic connection between the sciences of *nahw* and *balagha*. Just as in *balagha* the assumed *lafz* is analyzed like an actual *lafz* in determining whether an expression belongs to the realm of reality or metaphor, in *nahw* the assumed (hypothetical) *lafz* is likewise analyzed as if it were a real *lafz* in grammatical analysis[5].

In his commentary methodology, Umar al-Jandi pays special attention to uncovering the internal logical structure of the text. He begins his commentary not by directly analyzing the content of the text, but by explaining why the author mentioned the issue precisely at that point and how it relates to the preceding and subsequent topics. This approach is well known in scholarly literature under the name *"bayān al-munāsaba wa-t-tartīb"* (بيان المناسبة والترتيب), that is, the method of explaining the connection and arrangement between themes.

Al-Jandi explains the reason why Zamakhshari presents the definition of *kalima* before the discussion of noun (*ism*), verb (*fi'l*), and particle (*harf*) as follows: "The concept of *kalima* serves as a general foundation for all categories of words; therefore, before moving on to the particular issues (noun, verb, and particle), it is in accordance with the requirements of scholarly order to first present the general concept (*kalima*)."[6]. In this way, the explainer reveals the logical coherence between the themes.

While explaining the definition of *kalima*, Al-Jandi considers all of its components (*lafz*, meaning, singularity, and designation) to be essential. He analyzes them based on the criteria of logic and determines the function of each part in a

[5] Qasim ibn Husayn al-Khwarazmi. At-Takhmir. Vol. 1. Beirut: Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1990, pp. 156–157.
[6] Ibid.156.

question-and-answer format. For instance, he states that the pronoun "هي" in the definition was included not to serve as an adjective (*na't*) for the second element of the sentence, but rather to distinguish it as the predicate (*khabar*).

In the definition of *kalima*, the word "اللفظة" functions as the genus (general concept), encompassing both meaningless (*muhmal*) utterances and utterances that carry meaning. Therefore, in order to exclude meaningless utterances from the definition of *kalima*, the phrase "indicating meaning" was added. This is because meaningless (*muhmal*) utterances do not possess the status of *kalima*.

He raises the question: "What purpose is intended by the *tāʾ marbūṭa* (ـة) indicating singularity in the word "اللفظة" within the definition of *kalima*?" and answers as follows: "This letter expresses that *kalima* is a single utterance; therefore, through it, compound utterances that convey singular meaning are excluded from the definition of *kalima*". For example, expressions such as "بَرَقَ نَحْرُهُ" (literally meaning "His chest shines," which in the pre-Islamic era was used as a proper name for a person) are cited. Such expressions, however, do not fall within the scope of *kalima*. The reason is that the word "بَرَقَ" is itself a *kalima (word)*, and "نَحْرُهُ" is also a *kalima* before they are combined. Once they are joined together, however, both lose their previous individual meanings and shift to a new, singular meaning (functioning as a proper name for a person). Therefore, such expressions belong to the domain of *kalām* (sentence) and do not fall under the definition of *kalima*[7].

In the definition, the concept of "معنى" is general, as it includes utterances that express a single meaning as well as those that convey a complex meaning. Since in this context the intended focus is specifically on single meaning, the author restricts it with the qualification "مفرد"(single). This qualification serves not only to indicate the unity of the utterance but also to emphasize the integrity of the meaning. If one asks: "Since the "*tāʾ marbūṭa"* (ـة) in *"al-lafẓa"*already conveys singularity, is the specification *'mufrad'* (single) unnecessary?" the answer is that there are many utterances which are singular in form yet contain complex meanings. For example, the word "انصر"(help)

[7] Tojuddin Ahmad ibn Mahmud ibn Umar al-Jandi. Al-Iqlid fi sharh al-Mufassal. Riyadh: King Fahd National Library, 2002, p. 151.

appears to be a single word in form, but its content embodies command (*amr*), address (*khiṭāb*), and the meaning of the verb itself. Thus, although it is singular in terms of utterance, it expresses a complex structure in terms of meaning[8].

It is well known that for any sound or utterance to convey meaning, its connection to meaning must be established through *waḍʿ*- that is, by being assigned a specific meaning by the speakers of the language and becoming fixed on that basis. Otherwise, the connection to meaning would remain accidental or merely the product of rational inference. For example, if a person hears the utterance "ديز" from behind a wall, through rational reflection he understands that this sound belongs to the speech of a particular individual. In other words, here the sound indicates the existence of a specific person. However, this indication does not arise from linguistic *waḍʿ* (conventional assignment), but rather from the listener's rational perception and inference. Therefore, the qualification "بِالوَضْعِ" (by conventional designation) in the definition serves to exclude such utterances from the scope of *kalima*[9].

The definition of *kalima* does not include the verb (*fiʿl*), because from the perspective of *waḍʿ* (conventional designation) a verb indicates not just one meaning but two: the action (الحدث) and its relation to one of the tenses. In response to this objection, al-Khwarazmi explains: "This objection would only be valid if the action expressed by the verb and its relation to time were regarded as two separate phenomena". However, the verb (*fiʿl*) was established to express both meanings simultaneously. In conclusion, the fact that a verb indicates both the action (الحدث) and a specific time is similar to how the word " دار"((house) refers to a unified building complex composed of different parts. Just as the grammarians unanimously agreed that the word "دار" conveys a single, unified meaning, so too the meaning inherent in the verb is essentially one[10].

Unlike Qasim al-Khwarazmi, Umar al-Jandi agreed with Zamakhshari regarding the definition of *kalima*. However, both commentators elaborated on the definition

[8] Ibid.151
[9] Ibid. 152.
[10] Tojuddin Ahmad ibn Mahmud ibn Umar al-Jandi. Al-Iqlid fi sharh al-Mufassal. Riyadh: King Fahd National Library, 2002, p. 152.

found in "*Al-Mufassal*" in the widely used question and answer style of Arabic grammar, addressing possible objections to the definition and providing detailed explanations.

Another controversial issue in the field of grammar among scholars is the issue of the factor (influencer in agreement) of the initial (owner) and the message (participle). Three different views have been presented by scholars on this issue. According to the scholars of Basra, the factor in the initial and message is the originality, that is, the absence of verbal factors[11]. According to Sibawayh, the factor of origin is the origin, and the factor of message is the origin[12]. The scholars of Kufa said that the factor of the origin is the message, and the factor of the message is the origin[13].

Mahmud Zamakhshari's agreement with the Basra scholars on this issue can be clearly seen from his following statements: "Mubtada and khabar are two nouns that are free from verbal factors and are formed to be connected to each other through nisbat (the connection between the possessor and the participle). For example: like the sentence "زيد منتلق" (Zayd set out) [14]. The purpose of separating them from verbal factors here is to make them free from verbal factors (which affect the change of the agreement of the possessive and the participle) such as "كان وإن وحسبت وأخواتها" and their like. Because if these factors enter the initial and the subject, the initial and the subject will be under the influence of these factors, and as a result, the agreement of the initial and the subject will change not due to a spiritual factor, but due to these verbal factors"[15].

The absence of factors in order to connect the subject and the message through the relation is the reason why they are in the state of raf' (head agreement). Because the relation is a meaning that encompasses both of them at the same time in a single way. It cannot be realized without two sides, that is, the side to which the relation is directed and the side to which the relation is directed. A similar situation exists in the letter

[11] Nur al-Din ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jami. Al-Fawāʾid al-Ḍiyāʾiyyah. Istanbul: Author, 2015. p. 155.
[12] Abu Bishr ʿAmr ibn ʿUthman ibn Qanbar (Sibawayh). Al-Kitāb. Cairo, 1988. 126-127 p.
[13]Abu al-Barakot ibn al-Anbariy. Al-Insof. –'Qohira: Maktabatul al-Xonaji, 2009. p. 40.
[14] Abu al-Qasim Mahmud ibn ʿUmar al-Zamakhshari. Al-Mufaṣṣal fī al-ʿUlūm al-ʿArabiyyah (The Detailed Treatise on Arabic Sciences). Amman: Dar Ammar, 2004. p. 32.
[15] Ibid.156.

"كأنَّ" "ka anna". Since the meaning of analogy requires the side to be likened and the side to which it is likened, the letter "كأنَّ" applies to both elements. The similarity of the subject and the message to the foil is similar to the subject in that the subject is the main part of the comparison (the main part of the comparison), and the message is similar to the second part of the sentence[16].

Qasim al-Khwarizmi cited the full text of the Mufassal and mentioned two critical additions to Zamakhshari's opinion on the beginning and the message.

The first aspect is his statement that “The absence of factors for the origin and the message to be related to each other through nisbat is the reason for their occurrence in the state of raf’ (head agreement).” The meaning of this statement is that when a relational relationship occurs between two nouns and no other verbal factors enter them, this situation shows that they have the right to be differentiated. However, this situation does not strictly determine that they will occur in the raf’ Arabic case.

The second aspect: if their occurrence in the raf’ (head conjunction) is determined only by the fact that they are free from verbal factors in order to connect with each other through the relation, then what is the need to bring something similar to foil in both the initial and the message? This could only be interpreted as “Their e’rab is not a specific e’rab, but a general state of e’rab.” However, the author’s text does not support such an interpretation.

The second aspect: if their occurrence in the raf’ (head conjunction) is determined only by the fact that they are free from verbal factors in order to connect with each other through the relation, then what is the need to bring something similar to foil in both the initial and the message? This could only be interpreted as “Their e’rab is not a specific e’rab, but a general state of e’rab.” However, the author’s text does not support such an interpretation. That is, when an isnadi relationship occurs between the initial and the subject, a new predicative (definite) meaning is formed. The verb is a means of expressing this meaning grammatically. The reason why the initial and the subject appear with the raf' verb is explained by their similarity to other units in the raf' position. The initial is similar to the foil, because it is also a musnad ilayh (possessor),

[16] Sadr al-Afāḍil al-Qasim ibn al-Husayn al-Khwarizmi. Al-Takhmīr. Beirut: Dar al-ʿArab al-Islami, 1990. p. 255.

therefore it appears in the main clause. The subject is compared to the verb muzaariy (a verb that expresses the meanings of the present and future tenses) in terms of predicativity (definite). It informs about the subject and creates a judgment. The verb muzaariy also expresses a judgment and has the property of being related to time. Based on this similarity, the fact that the initial and the subject are free from factors in the word ensures that they appear in the raf' verb[17].

Umar al-Jandi also begins this discussion by criticizing the author of al-Mufassal's definition of the initial and the message. He believes that it is methodologically unjustified to combine the initial and the message within a single definition, based on their belonging to the category of "noun".

1. After all, from the point of view of grammatical status and syntactic function, these two elements have a different essence, and combining them under a single definition contradicts the logical criteria of the theory of definition. The scientific requirement of a definition is that it should clearly and specifically express the essence of the concept being described[18]. However, the difference between the initial and the news is reflected in their functional-semantic role in the structure of the sentence: the initial is the subject of the isnad (owner-section relationship), and the news is the subject (section).

2. Therefore, uniting them solely on the basis of their belonging to the category of "noun" means limiting oneself to defining them by common gender, which ignores the fasl (distinct feature). As a result, the definition falls to the level of a description (general description) rather than a hadd (perfect definition).

Umar al-Jandi explains this approach through a logical analogy: for example, describing a human and a horse as a "moving body" (الإنسان والفرس جسم متحرك), although their common sign expresses corporeality and mobility, cannot reveal the specific essence of each. Similarly, grouping the initial and the message under a single

[17] Ibid.156. 257 p.
[18] Roziyuddin Muhammad ibn al-Hasan al-Astarobodiy. Sharhu Kafiyatu ibn Hojib. –Bayrut, Dor kutubil ilmiya.1971:p. 196.

definition based on the fact that they belong only to the noun category does not sufficiently illuminate their specific syntactic-functional nature[19].

If it is argued that the reason for combining the beginning and the message under one definition is that they both have the property of being free from factors, Umar al-Jandi would respond as follows: “If the author’s intention was indeed to define them on the basis of this common characteristic, the structure of the definition should also fully and clearly reflect this commonality. For, according to the theory of definition, if two concepts are combined on the basis of a common genus or common quality, this genus or quality must be explicitly stated as the central component of the definition. From this point of view, it would be more logical for the author to express the beginning and the news as “المبتدأ و الخبر هما الأسمان المجردان للإنداد” (The beginning and the news are the names that are devoid of verbal factors for the possessive relationship) not only because they belong to the “name” category, but also as “ المرفوعان بالإبتداء هما الأسمان المجردان للإنداد” (The two names that are in a shelf state due to the beginning (beginning/factorless) are the two names that are devoid of verbal factors for the isnad, that is, as two names that are devoid of the factor for the isnad relationship). Because if a person and a horse are defined as moving objects, then both a person and a horse are included in the scope of this definition. After all, both are moving objects. If the goal is to define them precisely on the basis of their common aspect, that is, the quality of being an animal, then this commonality must be clearly indicated in the definition. Otherwise, the given definition will only express their common aspect, not their specific distinguishing features[20].

After stating his views, Umar al-Jandi explains the author's inclusion of the initial and the message under a single definition as follows: if the author had not defined each of the initial and the message separately, a serious objection to the definition would have arisen through an example such as "أقائم الزيدان" (Are the two Zayds standing upright?). The essence of the issue is that the scholars of nahw distinguish the initial as the musnad ilayh (the element on which the sentence is imposed) and the message as

[19] Taj al-Din Ahmad ibn Mahmud ibn ʿUmar al-Jandi. Al-Iqlīd. Riyadh: King Fahd National Library, 2002. p. 303.
[20] Ibid. p. 156.303.

the musnad (the element imposing the sentence). This distinction seems logically correct and consistent in the structure of a normal sentence. After stating his views, Umar al-Jandi explains the author's inclusion of the initial and the message under a single definition as follows: if the author had not defined each of the initial and the message separately, a serious objection to the definition would have arisen through an example such as "أقائم الزيدان" (Are the two Zayds standing upright?). The essence of the issue is that the scholars of nahw distinguish the initial as the musnad ilayh (the element on which the sentence is imposed) and the message as the musnad (the element imposing the sentence). This distinction seems logically correct and consistent in the structure of a normal sentence. This situation also creates a result that contradicts the definition. Therefore, the author's bringing them under a single definition is a scientific and methodological approach aimed at eliminating contradictions that arise due to exceptional circumstances and maintaining consistency in the definition[21].

The author of "AL-Mufassal" said that the fact that the origin and the message are free from verbal factors for isnad is the reason for their coming together in the first place (the cause of raf'). Here, the cause of raf' refers to the factor that performs the action of raf', not the cause of raf'. Because the cause of raf is something other than its factor. The cause of raf is the similarity of the origin and the message to foil, and its factor is their being free from verbal factors for isnad. However, their being free from verbal factors for isnad is not a verbal factor (in the form of words), but a spiritual state that is not directly expressed in language, but is understood through meaning. The commentator responded to the objection that the meaning of being free from verbal factors is nothing other than the absence of verbal factors, so the absence of verbal factors itself becomes a factor: "The meaning intended by being free from verbal factors is that the originator is the element on which the ruling is imposed for the message, and the message is the element that imposes the ruling. This definition was narrated from Sheikh Abu Ali, and it is considered a existential attribute, that is, not a state of non-existence. Even more clearly, the meaning intended by the words of the scholars of grammar: "to abstract the name from factors so that it can be attributed to

[21] Ibid. p. 304-305.

it" does not refer to a human (non-existent) state, but refers to presenting the name without a factor. Presenting the name without a factor is undoubtedly a existential state[22]".

Some representatives of the Kufa school of grammar put forward a unique theoretical approach to the issue of the Arabic of the initial and the message. According to their view, both the initial and the message are mutually supportive of each other. That is, each of the initial and the message affects the occurrence of the other in the state of support as a grammatical factor[23].

Kufa nahw scholars base this view on the syntactical interdependence of the predicate and the message. They argue that the predicate and the message form an inseparable unity, since one of them cannot form a sentence that expresses a complete meaning without the other. For example, in the combination "زيد أخوك" (Zayd is your brother), each word is not considered as an independent sentence in isolation, but only as a result of their mutual isnodic connection does a complete sentence structure arise [24].

Therefore, Kufa scholars of nahw explain the grammatical relationship between the subject and the message through the principles of "عدم الانفكاك" (mutual inseparability) and "الاقتضاء المتعادل" (mutual necessity). In their view, it is precisely because of this mutual necessity that they consider the subject and the message as factors acting on each other.

This view was based on the analogy of the Kufa scholars with the interaction between "أَيًّا" and "تدعوا" in the verse of the Holy Quran: ﴿ أَيًّا مَا تَدْعُوا ﴾. According to them, in this example, there is also a grammatical interaction between "أَيًّا" and "تدعوا" and this situation serves as an analogy to prove the theory that the origin and the message can interact[25].

Umar al-Jandi criticized these views of the representatives of the Kufa school of grammar, emphasizing that their idea that "the beginning supports the message, and the

[22] Ibid. p. 306.
[23] Shayx ustoz Mavlono Rashid Ahmad. Ma'arif al-Kafiya va 'Avarif al-Jomiy. –Hindiston, Al-Madrasa al-Arabiyya Qosim al-Ulum nashriyoti, 2004, p. 403.
[24] Taj al-Din Ahmad ibn Mahmud ibn ʿUmar al-Jandi. Al-Iqlīd. Riyadh: King Fahd National Library, 2002. 308 p.
[25] ʿAbduh al-Rajihi. Lessons on the Grammatical Schools. Beirut: Dar al-Nahda al-ʿArabiyyah, 1980. 403 p.

message supports the beginning" contradicts the important principles of the factor theory developed in the science of grammar. He noted that according to the theory of grammar, the factor is always determined before the final product. If the beginning is accepted as the factor of the message and the message as the beginning, then the result follows that the message must precede the beginning, and the beginning must precede the message. This is logically impossible.

Umar al-Jandi's second objection is related to another rule accepted in grammar. According to it, if a word already contains a factor, another factor cannot enter and act on it. Because in grammatical theory, it is not permissible for two factors to be combined on one factor. This rule is also confirmed by practical examples. For example, in the sentence "كان زيد قاما", the subject is present due to the verb "kana", while the sentence also contains "Zayd", which acts as the initial. Similarly, in the sentence "إن زيدا قاما", the noun is present due to the influence of "inna", although the subject is also present, it cannot affect the noun in terms of Arabic[26].

The words "أيّ" and "تدعوا" in the verse cited by the scholars of the Kufa school of grammar to prove their point of view are both grammatically recognized as a cognate factor, that is, an element that exerts a grammatical influence. However, when it comes to the issue of the initial and the message, both of them are considered units belonging to the noun category without any disagreement. As is known, according to the grammatical rule, the main rule in a noun is that it should not be an independent factor (a factor of influence). That is, a noun is usually known under the influence of another factor, but it is not grammatically accepted that it itself acts as a factor[27].

Thus, through these arguments, Umar al-Jandi showed that the Kufic view that the origin and the message are in a causal relationship is not justified from the point of view of grammatical theory.

The study allows us to compare the diversity of principles and views in the methodological approaches of two major figures in Arabic linguistics, Qasim al-Khwarizmi and Umar al-Jandi. Based on the analysis of Mahmud al-Zamakhshari's

[26] Taj al-Din Ahmad ibn Mahmud ibn ʿUmar al-Jandi. Al-Iqlīd. Riyadh: King Fahd National Library, 2002. 307-305 p.
[27] Ibid.156.308 p.

work "al-Mufassal", both scholars studied the science of grammar not as a mere set of rules, but as a system with a deep logical-philosophical basis.

One of the main conceptual contradictions in the framework of the study is the question of whether the definition given to the concept of "word" and its components are considered necessary or, conversely, logical reduction (compactness). Al-Jandi appears as a consistent defender of the classical theory of definition, considering each limiting element (word, meaning, individuality, emphasis) used by Zamakhshari as necessary, emphasizing that each of them plays an important role in distinguishing the word from other units. On the contrary, Qasim al-Khwarizmi criticizes the criterion of redundancy in the theory of definition and puts forward the principle of conciseness and logical economy (minimalism). His approach is aimed at not burdening the terminology with unnecessary elements, but at leaving the most fundamental signs that reveal the essence.

The second major debate is the issue of the origin and the origin of the message and the factors influencing them. In this topic, al-Jandi consistently defends the idea of the “spiritual factor” (primitiveness) of the Basra school of grammar with the help of logical comparisons and sharply rejects the theory of mutual inference (al-iqtiza al-mutabadal) of the Kufa school. Al-Khwarizmi, on the other hand, exposes some of the speculative approaches in Zamakhshari’s account on this issue and seeks to clarify the essence of the issue from the point of view of syntactic-functional relationships. This scientific debate shows that there was a unique diversity of views and a high academic culture in the linguistics of the medieval Islamic East.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad Hasan Ahmad Nasr. *The Noun Section in al-Mufaṣṣal (Based on the Commentary of Imam Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ibn Ḥajjāj al-Sanangānī): Doctoral Dissertation in Arabic Language*. Saudi Arabia: Umm al-Qurā University, 1998. 1338 p.

2. ʿAbduh al-Rājiḥī. *Lessons on the Grammatical Schools*. Beirut: Dār al-Nahḍah al-ʿArabiyyah, 1980. 403 p.

3. Abū Bishr ʿAmr ibn ʿUthmān ibn Qanbar (Sībawayh). *Al-Kitāb*. Cairo, 1988. 441 p.

4. Abū al-Qāsim Maḥmūd ibn ʿUmar al-Zamakhsharī. *Al-Mufaṣṣal fī al-ʿUlūm al-ʿArabiyyah*. Amman: Dār ʿAmmār, 2004. 565 p.

5. Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad. *Maʿārif al-Kāfiyah: ʿAwārif al-Jāmī*. India: al-Madrasah al-ʿArabiyyah Qāsim al-ʿUlūm. 458 p.

6. Tāj al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd ibn ʿUmar al-Jandī. *Al-Iqlīd fī Sharḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*. Riyadh: King Fahd National Library, 2002. 550 p.

7. Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Jāmī. *Al-Fawāʾid al-Ḍiyāʾiyyah*. Istanbul: Author, 2015. 607 p.

8. Ṣadr al-Afāḍil al-Qāsim ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Khwārizmī. *Al-Takhmīr*. Vol. 1. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1990. 528 p.