

LINGUISTIC CRITICISM IN ABD AL-QAHIR AL-JURJANI'S BOOK AL-MUQTASID: TOOLS AS A MODEL

A CRÍTICA LINGUÍSTICA NO LIVRO AL-MUQTASID, DE ABD AL-QAHIR AL-JURJANI: TOOLS COMO MODELO

Article received on: 1/7/2026

Article accepted on: 4/8/2026

Hiyam Khalil Ibrahim Hamad*

*Tikrit University (TU), College of Education for Girls, Department of Arabic Language, Tikrit, Iraq
hiyamkhalilabraham@gmail.com

Mona Adnan Ghani*

*Tikrit University (TU), College of Education for Girls, Department of Arabic Language, Tikrit, Iraq
slmansuha776@gmail.com

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

Abstract

This research aims to study the critical aspect of violating the rules of grammar and what the structures require according to one of the scholars of Islamic culture in all its known dimensions in his era, namely Imam Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani (d. 471 AH). The aim of studying this topic was twofold: One aspect relates to the field of criticism, a field that highlights the author's scholarly ability and intellectual contribution, and cultivates ideas, granting them perfection and development. The second aspect relates to the text upon which the study is based; the researcher who meticulously examines the books of Imam Abdul Qahir al-Jurjani will find knowledge exaggerated and a grammatical mind that absorbed the opinions of the grammarians who preceded him, subjecting most of their opinions to criticism, aided in all of that by a grammatical mindset whose source was familiarity with the principles of the grammatical industry, from hearing and analogy and others, as is clear during this research.

Keywords: Criticism. Linguistics. Abdul Qahir. Tools.

Resumo

Esta pesquisa tem como objetivo estudar o aspecto crítico da violação das regras gramaticais e o que as estruturas exigem, de acordo com um dos estudiosos da cultura islâmica em todas as suas dimensões conhecidas em sua época, a saber, o Imã Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani (m. 471 AH). O objetivo do estudo deste tema foi duplo: um aspecto diz respeito ao campo da crítica, um campo que destaca a capacidade acadêmica e a contribuição intelectual do autor, além de cultivar ideias, conferindo-lhes perfeição e desenvolvimento. O segundo aspecto diz respeito ao texto no qual o estudo se baseia; o pesquisador que examinar meticulosamente os livros do Imã Abdul Qahir al-Jurjani encontrará um conhecimento exaustivo e uma mente gramatical que absorveu as opiniões dos gramáticos que o precederam, submetendo a maioria de suas opiniões à crítica, auxiliado em tudo isso por uma mentalidade gramatical cuja fonte era a familiaridade com os princípios da ciência gramatical, a partir da audição, da analogia e de outros, como fica claro durante esta pesquisa.

Palavras-chave: Crítica. Linguística. Abdul Qahir. Ferramentas.

1 INTRODUCTION

Praise be to God who split the dawn by His power and clothed us in its light by His mercy. Peace and blessings be upon the one after whom there is no prophet,



Muhammad, and his good and pure family and his chosen companions and those who followed them in goodness until the Day of Judgment.

This study is based on addressing the phenomenon of linguistic criticism in Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani's book *Al-Muqtasid*, as criticism reflects a unique mentality and vast knowledge. Linguistic criticism is based on evaluating texts and sentences and searching in them for the origins of the rules of language and words, taking into account the correctness of the meaning, and preserving the aesthetics of the text in terms of its adherence to the rules of speech. We can say that it is related to the correctness and corruption of speech.

2 LINGUISTIC CRITICISM IN TOOLS

2.1 Or in the sense of the letter waw

The majority of grammarians believe that (or) differs from (and) in that they share the same grammatical case but not the same meaning; ((because if you say: Zayd or Amr stood up, the action is performed on one of them)))¹⁾, Its foundationNo subscription;However, other meanings may branch out from this original meaning. Extendfrom The evidence Different contexts, such as choice and permissibility in Demand, doubt, ambiguity, division, or Diversification, or other⁽²⁾In the ovenR,Among these sub-meanings that may indicate(Or) by way of context, leading to a meaning that is originally conveyed by other conjunctions (the conjunction "and"). Among the criticisms leveled against Al-Jurjani on this issue regarding the change in the meaning of (or) is what came in the poet's saying (3):

It was the same whether they let them graze or not.*****Or they let it graze.The plains became dusty

1-The close jinn in the letters of meaning, p. 227.

2- See: Mughni al-Labib, pp. 88 and 89.

3- The verse is by Abu Dhu'ayb al-Hudhali, in *Lisan al-Arab*, entry (san), vol. 12/412, and *Diwan al-Hudhaliyyin*, vol. 1/107, and *Al-Muqtasid* 2/939.

4-*Al-Muqtasid* 2/940.

5- Explanation 285.

The evidence in it is: (or they release him) where the poet made (or) take the place of (and); because the word (is the same) is not suitable for one, as he said: ((Know that his saying: Zayd and Amr are the same, and Abdullah and Bishr are the same, is like your saying: Zayd and Amr are equal, and equality is the essence of agreement and participation, and the poet's saying: ... or they release him, is like your saying: Leaving the release or releasing is the same, and this is not correct; because if you say: Zayd or Amr came to me, the action was affirmed for one of them and (is the same) is not suitable for one, except that this poet made (or) take the place of (and)))(4), that is, the word (is the same) indicates that (or) is in the sense of (and) in this verse; because it is often associated with (and) for this reason the poet made (or) take the place of (and). Al-Jurjani transmitted what Abu Ali al-Farisi had said, that the "or" mentioned in the verse means "and," as Abu Ali said: "It is similar to saying: 'Sit with al-Hasan or Ibn Sirin'" (5); And that that (or) HaHere, meaning theAcourtyard,She says:sittingThis or that,You wantAresearch!This type is for you,This is like(Waw)From Wajh andMFAHe felt sorry for him from the face...last, AmI amhIn the position(The letter Waw)In terms of!thatCouncilsTheyall!AmmIt does not containAMaintenance,Also, if you say:sittingAl-Hasan and Ibn Sirin,It was so,As for its separation from the letter waw, it is that!ifsittingoneaAmong themAAnd did notHe sits with the otherIt was permissible!A,Even if I said:sittingAl-Hasan and Ibn Sirin,**did not**It is permissible, but Ysittingallone...From themSoThe permissibility of combiningAnd the letter wawcrownWith him,Since it contained the meaning of plurality, it was used in this context.(Waw)²⁾With this statement, Al-Jurjani provides us with a grammatical explanation.It fitsWith measurement and use.

The poet used (or) in the verse in the sense of (and), when there was no ambiguity in indicating participation in the gathering, even though the gathering in (or) was made permissible, and in (and) it was obligatory (2).

Ibn Jinni said, pointing to the context that justified this usage: ((This is when something resembles something else in a certain way, so its ruling is based on the ruling

1- Al-Muqtasid 2/940.

2- See: the same source2/940, and the effect of the speech of the Arabs on the grammatical direction of the tool, p. 124.

3- Characteristics 1/349.

of the first, and then it progresses from there to something else. For example, they say: "Sit with al-Hasan or Ibn Sirin," and if he had sat with both of them, he would have been correct and obedient. Contrary, even if (or) that What is its original purpose in relation to one of the two things?, and that That was not permissible in this context for any reason other than the same thing. (or) Rather, a contextual clue joined in terms of meaning to (or) That's because AN He knew that H. In He desired to sit with Al-Hasan because of the good fortune associated with such gatherings, and this situation was also present in the gatherings of Ibn Sirin. also... then that When he saw (or) In this instance, it has been treated like the conjunction "wa" (and), gradually moving from that to something else, so it has been treated like the conjunction "wa" in a place devoid of this contextual clue that justified its use. (or) Regarding the meaning of the conjunction "wa" (and), do you not see how he said: ... Or they let it graze there, and the plains became dusty. Whether or not, it is not used to Except with the letter waw (3) Because each of them implies two, as they indicate equality between the two things, and the intermediate meaning is one of the relative meanings in which it is only connected by the conjunction "and," so when "or" occurred after them, the context indicated

However, they are synonymous with the conjunction "wa" (and), and it indicates conjunction.³⁾ Thus, Ibn Jinni confirmed the view of the majority that (or) comes with the meaning of (and), and among those who followed this trend was Imam Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani, as we mentioned.

Al-Astarabadi followed them, confirming that the coming (or) Meaning (Waw) at Its use in the sense of permissibility that does not... N On the group, When he said: "When the use of (or) became frequent in permitting what means the permissibility of combining, it became permissible to use it in the sense of 'and'" (2).

1- See: Al-Qara and Lexical analysis of words and styles, p. 197.

2- Al-Radi's commentary on Al-Kafiya 4/398.

3- Al-Muqtasid 2/945.

4- See: Al-Kitab 1/429, and Al-Usul fi Al-Nahw 2/55.

2.2 Preventing the use of (either) as a conjunction

One of the critical issues that Imam Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani spoke about is his refutation of some grammarians' counting of (either) as a conjunction, thus completing the number of conjunctions for them to ten. This is because he stopped at their saying: (He hit either Zaid or Amr), after he explained that the first (either) is not a conjunction because it came before the object of the verb, and what is the object of the verb is not conjoined to it. Just as you do not say: I hit Zaid, and you mean I hit Zaid, because it is impossible to conjoin the object of the verb to it, likewise you do not say: Either Zaid came to me, because if it were a conjunction it would not come between the verb and its subject, ((because the subject is like a part of the verb, and it is not correct to strip it of it, and whenever the verb's requirement of the noun is stronger, the conjunction is further away))(3).

He rejected the notion that the second "imma" (either/either) could also be a conjunction, a view held by some grammarians (4). He stated: "What has been mentioned, that you say: 'wa-imma 'Amran' (and either 'Amran), and you add 'wa-' (and) to it, if it were a conjunction, no other conjunction would be added to it. This is clarified by the fact that you do not say: 'I hit Zaydan wa-aw 'Amran' (I hit Zaydan and either 'Amran). If 'imma' were equivalent to 'aw' (or), it would be impossible to add 'wa-' just as 'aw' is impossible. This is the conclusive proof. Grammarians have continued to consider 'imma' a conjunction, and no one has verified this except Sheikh Abu Ali. This is why he said at the beginning of the chapter: 'There are nine conjunctions, and these...'"

They say: It is ten; because they counted it either in its entirety, and that is an obvious oversight.⁴⁾This is a statement that Abu Ali al-Farisi and Imam Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani held that the "waw" in his statement, "wa-imma 'Amran" (and either 'Amran), is the conjunction and not "imma" (either); this is because "waw" precedes it, and a conjunction cannot precede another conjunction. Al-Farisi says:(And it is not a

1-Al-Muqtasid 2/945.

2- Explanation 289.

3-Book 1/429.

4- The Fundamentals of Grammar 2/55.

5- Al-Muqtasid 2/945.

6- Explanation of Al-Mufassal by Ibn Ya'ish 5/24.

7- Al-Radi's explanation of Al-Kafiya 4/404.

conjunction); because Conjunctions are not without the element of You connect one word to another, or one phrase to another, and you say: I hit! or Either Zayd or Amr, you will find it devoid of these two categories., She says: "As for 'Amr,' the conjunction 'wa' is added to it, and two letters cannot be combined for a single meaning."⁽²⁾ While some grammarians have considered it a conjunction meaning "or" in examples such as: "I struck either Zayd or Amr," including Sibawayh, who said: And from it: I passed by a man who was bowing or prostrating, for it is like either or, except that "either" is brought to indicate that he means one of the two things.⁽³⁾ Ibn al-Sarraj supported this, saying: ((There are ten conjunctions that follow the nouns and verbs preceding them in their grammatical case... Fifth: Either, Or in doubt and certainty, it is like (or⁽⁴⁾ Imam Abdul Qahir objected to this opinion. He said: ((And they say: that there are ten, because they count them either in their total; and that is an obvious mistake))⁽⁵⁾.

As for Ibn Ya'ish, he adopted the view of those who say that it is not a conjunction, saying: The second cannot be the emotion because the conjunction "wa" precedes it, and a conjunction cannot precede something like that.^(e)⁽⁶⁾

Al-Astarabadi also stated: "The truth is that..." The letter "waw" is a conjunction. And (either) is useful for one of these things. Ein, unemotional⁽⁷⁾

Al-Muradi stated that there is no disagreement among grammarians regarding the first "either," but they differed regarding the second, with some considering it a conjunction and others rejecting it as such.

His opinion is that it is a conjunction like (or)⁽⁵⁾.

Ibn Hisham held that the second was a substitute for the first, as he said: ((There is no disagreement that either the first is not passion; Because of its interference between the agent and the agent in the like: Either Zayd stood up^أ And either Amr, And between one of my two workers worker And its other function is in about: I saw either Zayd! A Or age! A, And between the original and its substitute, for example His saying, may He be exalted: □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ [Maryam: 75] So What comes after the first is a substitute for what came before it.⁽²⁾

1- See: Al-Jani Al-Dani fi Huruf Al-Ma'ani 530.

2- Mughni al-Labib, p. 85.

3- Explanation of Qatr al-Nada 1/308.

4- See: Sharh al-Mufassal by Ibn Ya'ish 5/25, and al-Khilaf al-Nahwi fi al-Muqtasid p. 414.

5- Al-Muqtasid 2/841.

Anda description Ibn Hisham said Imam Abdul Qahir al-Jurjani in that (Either) it is not an emotion That it is (the truth) He said: ((My silence on the matter included (Either) that it A Without emotion, and that is the truth., And h He said, "A thousand A Rasi, And Al-Jar said C that Y: several A In conjunctions, She apparent))⁽³⁾.

It seems that the second "either" is not a conjunction, as it is like the first in meaning and literalness. The conjunction in his statement: "either Omar" is the "and" not "either"; ((because conjunctions do not enter into one another))(4). Based on this, the conjunctions according to Imam Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani are not ten, but nine.

2.3 It is permissible to use the conjunction (until)

Imam Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani held that "hatta" can function as a conjunction and is similar to the preposition "hatta" in that it indicates the end of a limit, as in: "I struck the people, even Zayd," "I passed by the people, even Zayd," and "The people came to me, even Zayd." He further explained that its inclusion of the meaning of limitation is supported by the fact that the meaning remains correct even if it were in the genitive case; the ruling only changes with conjunction, as it follows the second word with the first, like the conjunction "wa" (5). This is one of the points of contention among grammarians.

They were of two different schools of thought:

The first view: Sibawayh held that it is permissible for it to be a conjunction, and he confirmed this by saying: ((Until the river flows R The conjunction "wa" and "thumma" are not equivalent to "amma".; Because it is based on the preceding statement and is not started by saying, "I saw the people, including Abdullah," and then stopping. Its meaning is simply that you saw Abdullah with the people, just as you saw the people and Abdullah with them.))⁽⁶⁾ And on this doctrine are Ibn al-Sarraj, Abu Ali al-Farisi and Imam Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani (2).

Imam al-Jurjani stipulated that for the conjunction "hatta" (حتى) to function, what follows it must be of the same kind as what precedes it, as in: "I struck the people, even

1-Book 1/96.

2- See: Al-Usul fi al-Nahw 1/427, Al-Idah p. 227, and Al-Muqtasid 2/841.

3- See: Irtishaaf Al-Darb 4/1998.

4-Al-Muqtasid 2/956 and 957.

Zayd." He rejected using it to connect something of a different kind, such as: "I struck the people, even a donkey." The conjoined element must be part of what it is conjoined to (3). He said: "Hatta differs from other conjunctions in that what follows it must be of the same kind as what precedes it. Therefore, it is not permissible to say: 'I struck the people, even a donkey,' as you would say: 'I struck the people and a donkey,' or 'then a donkey.' This is because 'hatta' implies the meaning of limit, and it cannot be devoid of this meaning in conjunction either. Its purpose is to indicate that what follows it is also the end of the action, and that it is not excluded from the group previously mentioned. If you say: 'The people came to me, even a donkey,' you have mentioned something that is not included in the group of people, since the word 'people' does not apply to a donkey, nor does it include it as it includes Zayd. So you say: 'I struck the people, even Zayd,' so that it is known that..." It is included in the beating that occurred to the people and did not leave them, and the donkey is known to have left the people and it is not suspected that it entered them in any way (4). The meaning of Al-Jurjani's words is that the conjunction with (until) on something that is not of its kind is considered a departure from usage, because the conjoined is not of the same kind as that to which it is conjoined, and he expressed this by using one of his critical rulings, which is (it is not permissible).

Al-Jurjani's statement is similar to what Ibn Aqil said: ((It is required! In the conjunction B-(until) To be some! The first of what precedes it and its limit in increase or decrease, such as: He died ♦ the people! Even the prophets, And presented ♦ Pilgrims! Even pedestrians!))⁽⁷⁾. If the conjunction comes from a different category **The conjoined** Therefore, it embodies error and deviation from the norm (2).

Al-Shatibi stipulated that for conjunction with "hatta" to be valid, what follows it must be part of what precedes it. If what follows it is not part of what precedes it, then conjunction with it is not permissible. So you do not say: I was amazed by the girl, even

1-Ibn Aqil's explanation 3/229.

2- See: The example that violates the rule in Al-Muqtasid, p. 176.

3- See: Al-Maqasid Al-Shafiya 5/95.

4-See: Al-Faradi's commentary on Al-Alfiyya 3/245.

5- See: Al-Jani Al-Dani 1/551, Mughni Al-Labib p. 173, and Al-Khilaf Al-Nahwi fi Al-Muqtasid p. 407, and

Grammatical criticism in Al-Ashmuni's explanation of the explanation, p. 138.

6- See: The grammatical disagreement in Al-Muqtasid, p. 407.

by her son, but rather you say: I was amazed by the girl, even by her hair (3). Al-Farabi also stated this (4).

The second school of thought: The Kufans held that (hatta) is not a conjunction and what follows it is based on the omission of a governing factor. If what follows it is in the genitive case, it is in the genitive case with the implied preposition (ila). If it is in the nominative case, it is in the nominative case by virtue of being the subject and its predicate is omitted. If it is in the accusative case, it is in the accusative case by the omission of a governing factor that puts the accusative noun in the accusative case. The evidence for this is what some grammarians mentioned, that conjunction with hatta is rare according to the Kufan school of thought, and they completely deny it and interpret things like: (The people came even your father, and I saw them even your father, and I passed by them even your father) as meaning that hatta in these constructions is the subject of beginning and that what follows it is based on the omission of a governing factor (5).

Based on what has been mentioned, conjunction with “hatta” is permissible according to the school of Sibawayh and those who followed him among the grammarians, such as Imam Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani, on the condition that what comes after it is of the same kind as what comes before it. As for what the Kufans brought, it needs to be considered, because they mentioned that what comes after it is based on the assumption of a factor, but the absence of assumption is the original and preferable to assumption, and grammarians do not resort to it except when necessary (6).

2.4 It is not permissible to raise the noun after the two interrogative particles (هل and the hamza)

Among the critical issues discussed by Imam Abdul Qahir al-Jurjani is the impermissibility of interpreting interrogative particles as referring to a noun if they can be interpreted as referring to a verb, such as in the phrase: "Did you hit Zayd?" He said: "If the interrogative particle includes a verb, the standard rule is that it should follow the interrogative particles, not the noun, even when a verb is present. You say: 'Did you hit Zayd?' and use the accusative case. You are not obligated to say: 'Did you hit Zayd?' and use the nominative case as the subject of a sentence, because you are able to imply the verb and say: 'Did you hit Zayd?' and use the hamza as the verb. The same applies to 'hal'.

You say: 'Is Zayd your brother?' and use the nominative case after it for the sentence consisting of the subject and predicate. But if you say: 'Did you hit Zayd?' you are not permitted to use the nominative case for Zayd and say: 'Did you hit Zayd?' Rather, the accusative case is obligatory, implying the verb to follow the interrogative particle and the verb it contains. The difference between 'hal' and the hamza is that it is permissible to say: 'Did you hit Zayd?', although this is considered awkward." So the noun begins with the ability to do the action, and this is not permissible in "hal" (هل), but it is permissible to begin with the hamza (ء) because it is the mother of the chapter and the most variable of its letters, so it is permissible in it what is not permissible in others.⁸⁾.

Before Al-Jurjani, Sibawayh had already condemned the use of the interrogative particle (هل) before a noun when a verb is present, except in cases of poetic necessity. He said: If you ask: Did you see Zayd?? Did Zaid go?? ugliness It was only permissible in poetry.; Because when a noun and a verb are combined, they are treated according to the original form. If a poet is compelled to use a different form, he may place the noun first, and it is in the accusative case, as in "you were doing that" using "qad" and similar words.(2)

Ibn Ya'ish explained Sibawayh's use of "hal" without the hamza after he had stated that Interrogation The action requires No name... As for the author's representation, he said: (Did Zaid stand up?) So he did not use the hamza as an example, saying: (Is it more? He did) This is because Sibawayh differentiates between the hamza and (Do) So, if you say to him: (Zayd stood up) Is it permissible for a noun to be raised by beginning a sentence? This is a good permissibility.. And if you say: (Did Zaid stand up?) The verb is omitted necessarily, and the noun following it is only raised by an implied verb acting as the subject; raising it by way of beginning is considered incorrect.. The name cannot be placed before the verb here except in poetry, hence the example given. (Do) Without the hamza(3)

Ibn Ya'ish said: Know that questioning implies and requires action.. This is because the question is in reality... n What is about the act?; Because you are only asking about what you doubt and whose work you are ignorant of.. And doubt if What happened

1-Al-Muqtasid 1/78 and 88.

2- The Book 1/99.

3-Explanation of Al-Mufassal by Ibn Ya'ish 1/216 and 217.

in the action, but the noun is known to you., And if the interrogative particle is "in"MMThe verb, not the noun, was the one that was chosen to be followed by the verb for which it was intended.⁽⁹⁾.

Al-Astarabadi increasedThe interrogative particle has two letters: one of them is deeply rooted in it.The second is an intruder, so the originalThe hamza, it is added toThe sentenceThe verb form is:(Hit♦Zaid?)And onThe sentenceNominal form, for example:(I increase* existing?)And onThe sentenceThe nominal predicateHa verbal sentenceabout:(Zaid went out?)fatherhorses inhDo); becauseIts origin is to mean(may)Necessary for the action,So,EnterThe sentenceActualFor example: (Did Zaid go out?)And onThe sentenceNominal form, for example:(Is Zaid standing?)Because of the similarity of the hamza, and as for the nominal which is the predicateHere is a sentenceactual,about:(Did Zaid go out?? Do not enter upon herExcept on the tribeHLikewise, it is considered ugly to include it in a verbal sentence that is separated from the verb by a noun.about:(Did Zaid hit him??.andonA noun in the accusative case, governed by a verb.Estimated towards:(Is Zaid!I hit him?)And here, the installation is the lesser of two evils.⁽²⁾.

Abu al-Fida followed them in(The Notebook on the Art of Grammar and Morphology(F), where he said: ((It is permissible to use the hamza without hal, so it is permissible: a-zayd qāmIt is not permissible to ask: Did Zayd stand up?,Except in exceptional cases⁽³⁾.

Abu Hayyan al-Andalusi attributed the view of permissibility to al-Kisa'i, as he commented on al-Kisa'i's words:Al-Kisa'i permitted interrogative particles other than the hamza to follow the beginning of a sentence, such as: *toDid you achieve your goal? And who among God's servants is being struck? It is not permissible for a noun to follow a verb except in poetry; this is Sibawayh's view.,Al-Kisa'i permitted it to follow the noun, even if a verb is present, such as: Is it?

Zayd struck, and according to his school of thought, it is permissible to begin or continue the action.))⁽⁴⁾.

1-The detailed explanation by Ibn Ya'ish 1/216.

2-See:Al-Radi's explanation of Al-Kafiya 1/459.

3-Al-Kunnash fi Fannay al-Nahw wa al-Sarf 2/116.

4-A4/2166.

The prevailing opinion among the majority of grammarians is that the interrogative particle (هل) cannot be followed by it.

It is a noun raised as a subject, but it is in the accusative case because of an implied verb, and it is a verbal sentence.

2.5 Metaphors using (if)

Imam Abdul Qahir al-Jurjani criticized the Kufan grammarians' view on the permissibility of using the jussive mood with "idha" (if), and considered its use in poetry to be for poetic necessity, saying: "As for 'idha,' it is not used in the jussive mood except in poetic necessity, such as in the verse of the book:

Khindif raises me up, and God raises me up.*****A fire that, if their flames die down, will ignite again.⁽¹⁰⁾

The preferred view is not to use it in the jussive mood (2); because the Kufan grammarians permitted using it in the jussive mood absolutely (3), while Sibawayh reported that al-Khalil considered it reprehensible to use (idha) in the jussive mood, even if it resembled the jussive particles in some aspects. Its conditions, ((This shows that if you come at a specific time; don't you see that if you said: I will come to you when the unripe dates have turned red, It would have been fine, but if you had said, "I will come to you when the unripe dates turn red," it would have been ugly., For ever is ambiguous, as are the particles of consequence., And if it does indeed happen, then the verb in "if" is equivalent to "while," as if you said: "The time when you come to me, I will come to you." And it has They used it in poetry out of necessity, likening it to "inna" (إِنَّ), since they saw it as referring to the future, and that it does not...!dShe has an answer.⁽⁴⁾ Imam Al-Jurjani preferred not to be certain about it, and to be certain about it in the necessity of poetry according to the school of Al-Khalil and his Basran companions when he mentioned their arguments on which he relied, as he said: ((What made them reluctant to

1-The verse is by al-Farazdaq in the book 3/62, and the commentary on the book by al-Sirafi 3/255, and the helper in facilitating the benefits

3/154, and the introduction to the rules by explaining the facilitation of benefits 4/1936.

2- Al-Muqtasid 2/1117.

3- See: Al-Jani Al-Dani, p. 368.

4- See: The Book 3/60 and 61.

5- Al-Muqtasid 2/1117.

use it in the reward is that they placed it on what is appropriate for urging, and removes the ambiguity that is required by (that). Do you not see that you say: I will come to you when the unripe dates turn red, as if you said: I will come to you at the time when the unripe dates turn red. If you said: I will come to you if the unripe dates turn red, it would not be correct, because the redness of the unripe dates is a reason for coming))(5).

Among those who permit the use of the definite article "if" in cases of poetic necessity is al-Qazzaz al-Qayrawani, who mentioned

What is permissible for the poet ((Reward with-(if),And thatIf it is not in the future, if someone says: If you honor me, I will honor you, then the honoring is known, but it has not yet occurred. And the Almighty says: $\text{أَفَّ} \square \square \square$ [The Split: 1]and $\text{أَفَّ} \text{ل} \text{م} \text{خ}$ [The cracking:1],A known time that has not yet occurred, and the particle of conditionality is only used when the action following it is uncertain whether it will occur or not. If the poet is compelled to use it, he may use "if" as a conditional particle because it resembles conditional particles in that it refers the past to the future.))(11).

However, Ibn Malik, in his commentary on Al-Tashil, believes that using the jussive form in poetry is not obligatory, as he stated:((and thatIt is not permissible toHe asserts it in poetry;becauseIt contains what is in it, that is, linking one sentence to another.,and thatThat wasn't necessary for her.!a)(2).

Some scholars have permitted the jussive mood after "idha" in poetry and prose. In prose, the verb is jussive after "idha" because it is based on the principle of "mata" (when).The decisive one, that is, the decisiveness is borrowed by way of what is required (3).

Abu al-Fida said: "The jussive form of 'idha' is irregular." (4) Ibn Hisham followed him in al-Mughni, saying: "And 'idha' does not function in the jussive form except in cases of necessity." (5)

After presenting the statements of scholars, I noticed the multiplicity of opinions regarding the use of the accusative case with "if" (idha). Some of them permitted the

¹¹ - What is permissible for the poet in cases of necessity p. 343.

2-Explanation of Al-Tashil 2/211.

3- See: Amali Ibn Al-Hajib 1/188, and Tamhid Al-Qawa'id bi Sharh Tashil Al-Fawa'id 9/4358. The phenomenon of borrowing In Arabic grammar 58/242.

4- Al-Kunnash 2/24.

5- Mughni al-Labib, p. 128.

accusative case absolutely, some permitted it only in cases of poetic necessity, and some preferred not to use it in the accusative case, such as Imam Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani. This is evidence of the flexibility of the grammatical lesson in guiding the poetic evidence.

3 CONCLUSION

- 1- The critical terms used by Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani were numerous. Some of them indicated acceptance and approval of the opinion mentioned in the matter, and some of them indicated rejection and weakening. This multiplicity of terms and expressions reveals a unique critical mind.
- 2- Imam Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani did not follow a single approach in his criticism of opinions.
- 3- He was of the Basri school of thought, and this is evident in his preference for their statements in more than one place.
- 4- Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani's linguistic criticism was not limited to interpreting the issues of grammatical craftsmanship, but went beyond to interpreting the meaning of the grammatical structure according to the intended meaning, and what results from the corruption of the structure and the confusion of the meaning.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, A. M. *The phenomenon of borrowing in Arabic grammar. Journal of the Islamic University in Madinah.*
- Al-Astarabadi, R. al-D. *Al-Radi's Commentary on Al-Kafiya.* Corrected edition with comments and annotations by Yusuf Hassan Omar. Garyounis University, 1978.
- Al-Farisi, A. A. *Al-Idah Al-Adudi.* Investigated by Hassan Shazly Farhoud. 1st ed. Riyadh University, 1969.
- Al-Farqi, M. *Imam al-Faradi's commentary on Ibn Malik's Alfyya.* Edited by Abu al-Kumayt and Muhammad Mustafa al-Khatib. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 2018.
- Al-Jurjani, A. al-Q. *Al-Muqtasid fi Sharh al-Idah.* Edited by Kazim Bahr al-Marjan. Amman: Dar al-Rashid for Publishing, 1982.

- Al-Misri al-Maliki, A. M. B. al-D. H. ibn Q. ibn A. ibn A. ibn A. al-Muradi. *The Fruitful Harvest in the Letters of Meanings*. Edited by Fakhr al-Din Qabawa and Muhammad Nadim Fadil. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 1992.
- Al-Qayrawani, M. ibn J. al-Q. A. A. al-T. *What is permissible for the poet in cases of necessity*. Edited by Ramadan Abd al-Tawwab and Salah al-Din al-Hadi. Kuwait: Dar al-`Uruba, under the supervision of Dar al-Fusha, Cairo.
- Al-Shahri, A. M. A. *Grammatical disagreement in Al-Muqtasid*. Umm Al-Qura University, College of Arabic Language. Dar Kunooz Al-Ma'rifah Al-Ilmiyah, 2022.
- Al-Sirafi, H. ibn A. A. ibn M. *To explain book Sibawayh*. Investigated by Ahmed Hassan Mahdali. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 2008.
- Al-Zamakhshari, A. al-Q. M. ibn A. ibn A. *The Detailed Treatise on the Art of Parsing*. Edited by Ali Bou Melhem. Beirut: Al-Hilal Library, 1993.
- Athir al-Din al-Andalusi, A. H. M. ibn Y. ibn A. ibn Y. ibn H. *The Sip of the Arabic Language from the Tongue of the Arabs*. Edited and studied by Rajab Uthman Muhammad; reviewed by Ramadan Abd al-Tawwab. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanji, 1998.
- Bakr Abdullah Khurshid. *The impact of Arabic speech on the grammatical direction of the particle: A study in books on general meaning particles*. Amman: Ghayda Publishing and Distribution House, 2013.
- Ibn Aqil, A. ibn A. al-R. al-A. al-H. al-M. *Ibn Aqil's Commentary on Ibn Malik's Alfiyya*. Edited by Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abd al-Hamid. Cairo: Dar al-Turath; Dar Misr for Printing, 1980.
- Ibn Hisham, A. bin Y. bin A. bin A. bin Y. *Explanation of Qatr al-Nada wa Ball al-Sada*. Edited by Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abdul Hamid. Cairo, 11th ed., 1383 AH.
- Ibn Hisham, A. bin Y. bin A. bin A. bin Y. *Mughni al-Labib 'an Kutub al-A'arib*. Edited by Mazen al-Mubarak and Muhammad Ali Hamdallah. Damascus: Dar al-Fikr, 6th ed., 1985.
- Ibn Jinni, A. al-F. U. ibn J. al-M. *Characteristics*. Cairo: The Egyptian General Book Organization.
- Ibn Ya'ish. *Al-Zamakhshari's detailed explanation*. Introduction by Emile Badi' Ya'qub. Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, 2001.
- Muhammad, known as Nazir al-Jaysh. *Introduction to the Rules with an Explanation of Facilitating Benefits*. Studied and verified by Ali Muhammad Fakhr et al. Cairo: Dar al-Salam for Printing, Publishing, Distribution and Translation, 2007.
- Sibawayh, A. ibn U. ibn Q. al-Harithi. *The book*. Edited by Abd al-Salam Muhammad Harun. Cairo: Al-Khanji Library, 1988.

The Hudhayl Poets. *Diwan of the Hudhayl Poets*. Arranged and commented by Muhammad Mahmoud Al-Shanqiti. Cairo: The National House for Printing and Publishing, 1965.

Youssef, H. M. S. *Grammatical criticism in the explanation of the explanation by Al-Ashmuni*. Supervised by Muhammad Yahya Salem. Iraqi University, College of Arts, 2025.