# The Problem of Objecting the Logical Grammatical Boundaries in Al-Kafya Book Through (Alfkuk Fi Shrh Alshkuk)

Suliman Mohamed Elmalki, Diaya Uddeen Deab Mohmoud Alzitawi, Zulkiflee Bin Haron

# The Problem of Objecting the Logical Grammatical Boundaries in Al-Kafya Book Through (Alfkuk Fi Shrh Alshkuk)

## Suliman Mohamed Elmalki
University Technology Malaysia Faculty of Islamic Civilization
Email: mesuliman@graduata.utm.my

## Diaya Uddeen Deab Mohmoud Alzitawi, Zulkiflee Bin Haron
University Technology Malaysia UTM
Email: diaya@utm.my, zulkiflee@utm.my

### Abstract
The phenomenon of objection to the logical grammatical boundaries is one of the issues that frequently occur in Arabic grammar books generally, and in Shorooh Al-Kafya Fil Nahw (Al-Kafya explanations of grammar) particularly. Although Ibn al-Hajib is one of the grammarians who paid special attention-fundamentally and critically- to logical grammatical boundaries, many of the boundaries he set faced logical objections, either them being not comprehensive, exhaustive or subject to addition or different vicious circles. Perhaps a single boundary faced many logical objections. The responses to these objections stem from a misunderstanding of the purpose of the setter of the boundary, or that the boundary is valid according to the approach of its setter. Here emerges the problems of these logical objections, this article attempts to analyse these logical objections to identify their weak points. That comes for two reasons in this work: Firstly, the difficulty of logical boundaries which depend on definition of things that depending on its intrinsic characteristics. Secondly, grammatical boundaries depend on the approach of its setter. The outcomes were reached through studying several forms of the objections to grammatical boundaries in the book (al-Kafiyah fi alnnhu) Jarbardi's answers are in his book (Shukuk 'alá alhajibiyh) And his explanation (Alfkuk fi shrh alshkuk)
**Keywords**: Aljarabrdi, Boundaries, Ibn Al-Hajib, Logic, Objection.

### Introduction
Logic and philosophy had an impact on grammar in several areas, including the area of grammatical boundaries. This influence was evident in Ali ibn 'Isá al-Rumani (died in 384 AH). The attitudes of grammarians varied towards the trend which was approved by Al-Rumani by his formulation of the grammatical boundaries according to the method of logicians, to the extent that Abu 'Ali al-Farisi, a contemporary of Al-Rumani, objected to this trend and said: "If the grammar is what Abu Al-Hasan Al-Rumani says, we have nothing of it, and if the grammar is what we say, he has nothing of it" (Al-Anbari, 1985, 234)

The reason for this objection is the difference in the purpose of the boundary between grammarians and philosophers. The grammarians see that the boundary identifies something and distinguishes it from anything else. Therefore, Al-Zajjaji (died 337 AH) said objected to the definition of the noun and identifies it as "The sound of a subject that is indicative, with an agreement, on a meaning that is not associated with a time... it is valid to the conditions and trends of the logicians because their purpose is not like ours, and their intention is not like ours, and it is not valid according to our conditions of the grammar" (AlZajjaji, 1986, 48)

Another group of grammarians believes in setting grammatical boundaries according to the method of logicians. Al-Al'ukbry says: "The purpose of the boundary is to distinguish the bounded from what other similar boundaries." The distinction of the boundary is achieved by mentioning its nature "because the real boundaries denote their nature" (Al-'Ukbari, 1995, 45) Ibn Yash (died in 553 AH) said: The boundary should include the closest genus and differentia (Al-Zarkashi, 2000, 204)

Ibn al-Hajib (died in 646 AH) was one of the grammarians who focused on logical grammatical boundaries, their roots, and criticism[1]. In his book Al-Kafya, he set boundaries for most grammatical terms. In spite of this, these boundaries faced many logical objections, either that the boundary is not sententious or because there is an addition and a circle. Aljarabrdi responded to these objections in his book Doubts About Al-Hajabiya.

It is important here to highlight an issue that was referred to by some grammarians and has a direct connection with the problem of logical boundaries that this article is trying to clarify, which is the difficulty of finding a real boundary. They attributed the reasons behind this to the difficulty of recognizing the nature and specifications as the reality is built according to its specifications. Ibn al-Hajib said: "it is the thing that tells about its total complex specifications. (al-Aṣfahani, 1986, 287), and Al-Ghazali (died in 505 AH) said: "perhaps something is difficult to understand through its specifications but can be recognized through its accidental characteristics which will consequently distinguish it" (Al-Ghazali, 1961, 267)

If this difficulty is in things perceived by the senses, then defining non-tangible things that have no external evidence is more difficult. Al-Ghazali said: "This difficulty is in most things. Most sensory perceptions are difficult to be defined.  If we want to recognize the smell of musk or the taste of honey, we would not be able to do so. If we are unable to identify the perceptions, we would find it more difficult to identify their realizations."[2] (Al-Ghazali, 1992, 1/21)

Because grammatical terms and the like have no sensory reality, their definitions vary from one scholar to another, according to the perceptions and approaches of their identifiers. The boundary of the term will be correct according to that approach.

---

[1]As for the root, that is in his book *Almokhtasar*, there is a chapter in which he talked about the boundary, its types, conditions, form, and defects. As for criticism, his objection was to the boundaries set by Al-Zamakhshari in his book (Al-Mufassal), and as for their setting, they are the boundaries that he put in his book (Al-Kafya fin Grammar).

[2] This is the problem of grammatical boundaries, which is that they are boundaries for terms that do not have sensory realities, so we find a lot of objections to them, and the grammarians sensed this difference. Therefore, we find Al-Shalubin saying: "The boundary to the grammarians is the word, not the sententious, whatever it is and in any word."  Ibn Hisham said: "The boundaries of the grammarians and other scholars of Sharia are not real, with the intention of fully revealing the reality of the bounded, rather the purpose is to distinguish the thing so that it is known that it is the owner of this name."

The objections to the boundaries mentioned by Aljarabrdi in his book include those related to logical objections, which is the problem to which the title of this article refers. Other objections are related to grammatical issues in which there is no place for logic, and therefore they are not within the scope of this article.

The researcher adopts the inductive method to collect grammatical boundaries and their objections and then classify them according to the objection. The researcher also adopts the analytical method to achieve the objectives of this research. This article is divided into:

The introduction: It includes the linguistical and terminological definitions of the boundary, its conditions, and the defects of the logical boundaries, in addition to defining important terms that are directly related to the topic of the article.

Logical objections: objection to the boundary because it is not comprehensive or not sententious, or because it includes a circle, or because on of its parts is non-existent, or because it includes an addition in the boundaries. After that, the results are listed.


**Introducing the Boundary**

Linguistically, the boundary has two meanings: The first: the separation between two things so that one of them does not mix with the other or encroach on the other. The second: the end and final limit of everything. For example, the boundaries between two lands.

Ibn Fares (died in 395 AH) says: "boundary has two roots, the first one is the prevention and the second is the margin. The boundary is a barrier between two things. If someone is bounded, it means he is forbidden from doing something." Someone is limited if he is denied a livelihood. The doorman prevents people from entering. (Ibn Faris, 1979, 3)

Terminologically, some scholars divided the boundary into three types[3]: the verbal, the formal, and the real boundary:

**1. The Verbal Boundary**: It is the definition of the word with another word that is synonymous with it, such as defining the crocodile as an alligator. Ibn al-Hajib says: "The verbal boundary is an identifier that foretells about the thing with the synonym of the word. (Alsubky, 1999, 288)

**2. The Formal Boundary**: It is the recognition of genus, special and general properties. Special properties mean non-self attributes that are resulted from real humans. For example, the definition of the human being as the laughing animal, because the laughing of the human being results from the nature of the human characteristics, and it is specific to humans without other species of the animals. An example of the general properties is walk activity and the shadow of the human beings, which are also attributes resulting from their nature on the one hand, and are shared among humans and others (like animals) (al-'Uthaymin, 2011, 48)

The formal boundary is divided into complete description and incomplete description:

A- The complete description: it is composed of the close genus and the property, such as the definition of humans as animals.

The incomplete description: it is only in the property, or in the property and in the distant genus, such as defining a person through laughing (Al-Jurjani, 1984, 147)

**3. The Real Boundary**: it is defined by scholars, whether they jurists or grammarians, as what is required in the conception of the essence to distingui sh it from others (AlZajjaji, 1986, 46)

---

[3] . Some of them went to increase other types such as boundary by division, and boundary by example. The boundary by division is like the grammarians say in defining the word: a noun, a verb, and a letter, and the boundary by example is like defining a noun as: a man, a horse, and a wall. See: (al-'Uthaymīn, 2011, 1/288).

Al-Ghazali defined it as the utterance that indicates the essence of a thing, (Al-Ghazali, 1961, 255) and Al'ukbry (died in 616 AH) said: "it is the revealer of the reality of the boundary" (Al-'Ukbari, 1995, 1/71)

The boundary does not define the essence of the bounded unless it is comprehensive. Al-Fakihi (died in 972 AH) said: "one should know that in the tradition of grammarians and jurists, the boundary and the identifier are two names for the same thing" (Al-Fakihi, 1993, 19) Al-Alshlawbyn (died in 645 AH) said: "The boundary that the grammarians have is the comprehensive and sententious utterance, whatever it is, and in whatever pronunciation." (Al-Shalawbin, 1993, 229)

Some scholars expressly argue that regularity and reflection denote the sententious boundary, and that the boundary cannot be sententious unless it is reflective and regular. The meaning of regularity is that where there is boundary, there is bounded. The meaning of reflection is that if there is no boundary, there would be no bounded. If it is not regular, it would not be preventive, because it is more general than the boundary. If it is not reflective, it would not be comprehensive because it is more specific than the boundary (Al-Kaffawi, 1999, 612) If the boundary is sententious, it has to include all of the intrinsic of the bounded.[4]

Alrrdi (died in 686 AH) explains the meaning of regularity and reflection: "regularity is to add an utterance to the boundary, making it a subject phrase and making the bounded as its predicate. For example, A noun is what denotes a meaning in itself. Likewise, everything that denotes to a meaning in itself that is a noun. The same applies to the property, everything that includes the definite article is a noun.  What is meant by the reflection, according to grammarians, is to replace this with its opposite. Therefore, everything that does not denote a meaning in itself is not a noun. It is not correct to say in the property that everything that does not include the definite article is not a noun. (al-Radi, 1996, 1/43)

The real boundary is divided into two categories, complete boundary and incomplete boundary.

A-  **The Complete Boundary**: it is composed of close genus and differentia, such as defining a human being as a speaking animal.

b- **The Incomplete Boundary**: it is what occurs in the close differentia alone, or in the close differentia and in the distant genus, such as defining a person as a speaking human being or a speaking body (Al-Jurjani, 1984, 112)

The difference between the boundary and the description is that the boundary is taken from the intrinsic nature of the thing that is a part of the essence of that thing.  As for the description, it is taken from the general and specific properties that are in the essence of a thing. Ibn al-Hajibsays: "The difference between a boundary and a property is that the boundary should be in all the parts of the bounded thing, but the property is in some specific parts" (Ibn al-Hajib, 2004, 31)For example, the grammarians have "the properties of the

---

[4] The five totalities are divided into two parts, subjective and accidental: the subjective "everyone who enters into the essence of a thing and its reality cannot imagine understanding the meaning without understanding it, and that is like the chromaticity of blackness and the physicality of horses and trees". (Al-Ghazālī, 1992, 1/42) divides the subjective to three types: genus, species, and differentia. The accidental, unlike the subjective, is what can be understood before the subjective is understood and is divided into: imperative and accidental. Ex: laughter, shadow. See: (Alsubky, 1999, 1/292)

noun"[5] which are signs of the noun, such as: inserting the definite article, which is one of the signs of the noun and it accompanies some nouns and does not accompany all nouns. Every word in which one of these signs is found is a noun, and the absence of this sign does not change this nominal character, and accordingly, the description is regular but not reflective. "This is contrary to the boundary, which is regular and reflective, and regularity entails preventive character. If the boundary is regular, it would be preventive, not allowing the insertion of the unbounded. The meaning of reflection is the combination. If the boundary is reflective, it would include all the parts of the bounded thing. (Al-Damamini, 2008, 1/94-95)

The method of setting a boundary is to begin with the close genus, then to mention the differentiae so that the boundary is distinguished from others. Ibn Ya'ish said: "The method of setting a boundary is to bring the close genus, then combine it with all the differentiae. The genus denotes the essence of the boundary in general, and what is close to it denotes the reality of the boundary because it includes more general properties. The differentia especially denotes the essence of the boundary." (Muhammad, 2001, 1/70)

This is the method of Ibn al-Hajib in setting and formulating the boundaries. In his definition of the subject, he said: "it is the part to which the verb is attributed, and it is the part that performs the action." The sentence "it is the part to which the verb is attributed" is a genus that includes the subject, the substitute for the doer, and the subject phrase, The sentence "it is the part" is a differentia by which the subject is distinguished. The sentence "to which the verb is attributed" is a second differentia for a substitute of the doer[6].

**The Conditions of the Real Boundary**

Based on the aforementioned information, the word boundary is used to refer to verbal, formal, and real boundaries. It is synonymous with the word identifier according to many scholars, Al-Fakihi said: "one shall know that the boundary and the definition in the tradition of grammarians and jurists are two names for one thing" (Al-Fakihi, 1993, 49) This is contrary to those who see that there is a difference between the two terms and see that the identifier is more general than the boundary. and that the rank of the identifier by description, whether complete or incomplete, is less than the rank of the identifier by the complete and incomplete boundary, because the description only presents the accidental characteristics of the identified, and is resorted to when it is difficult to set the boundary through the intrinsic properties (genus and differentia). Al 'Askari said: "the description is a feature that informs us where it is difficult to set a boundary" (Askari, 1997) The grammarians have set conditions for the real boundary that shall be met in the boundary in order to consider it a real boundary through which we can achieve a purpose of distinguishing the identified from others. The failure of any of these conditions results in a deficiency in the boundary.

One of the most important conditions of the boundary is to be sententious because the purpose of the boundary is to distinguish the bounded from others, and this purpose would not be achieved unless the boundary is sententious. In order for the boundary to be sententious, it shall include genus and differentia (Al-Hajib, 2004, 16), they are intrinsic properties that consist of the bounded. Therefore, it is necessary to mention all of its intrinsic

---

[5] Ibn al-Ḥājibsaid: "Among its characteristics is the entry of the lam, the preposition, the tanween, the attribution to it, and the addition (Ibn al-Hajib, 2010b)

[6] The objective that comes in the place of the subject is not a subject. this is the setter's approach, in contrast to the approaches of most of the critics and in contrast to al-Zamakhshari. See: (Al-Ansari, 1989, 294)

properties without shortness or lengthening. Al-Ghazali said: "This is not intended to prolong the boundary; it rather has to be brief. When the realization of the essence bounded occurs, the boundary ends, here is not necessary to mention the accidental and special properties, mentioning them, in fact, may weaken the boundary sometimes. If one of the differentiae is missing, then it is an incomplete boundary, but it does not equal the bounded in meaning, even if they are equal in general. Therefore, it is necessary to mention all the differentiae after mentioning the close genus. (Abd-al-Hamid, 2008, 25-26)

If the boundary includes the close genus, the differentiae, and all of its intrinsic properties, it would be equal to the bounded, and the boundary would be complete, "if some differentiae are missing, it would be an incomplete boundary, even if the distinction occurs" (Al-Ghazali, 1961, 256)

Among the conditions that shall be met in the boundary and their violation result in a violation of the boundary is a semantic condition that is related to the meaning, which is the need for the identifier to be clearer than the identified, so that it is not defined with something equal to it, such as defining the dual as "a number that is more than singular by one. Here the dual is defined through the singular, both are equal in the intellect in their (in)visibility." Likewise, it shall not be defined by what is more invisible, such as defining fire as a soul like the human one because the soul is more invisible than the fire to the intellect (Al-Asfahani, 1986, 1/80)

Likewise, defining a thing with what its mentality depends on, i.e., the definition through which the thing is defined is not recognized by the intellect. This is called the circle and it is one of the defects of the boundary. An example of this is the definition of the sun as a diurnal planet, and the realization of that diurnal thing depends on the realization of the sun (Alsubky, 1999, 1/295) Another example is the grammarians' definition of the inflected as "the end of which differs according to the different inflictions in pronunciation with a case or a letter or a place). Ibn al-Hajib said: "this boundary has been objected for defining a thing with what it is dependent on, and that is the difference of the case according to the difference of the inflection depends on the understanding that it is inflected. This definition is a circle." (Ibn al-Hajib, 2004, 82) Another defect is the addition in the boundary. The boundary shall not be prolonged, but the addition violates the boundary and results in a decrease in the bounded. This occurs when the addition is in the differentia or a special or general property. The addition of this type is in fact a restriction of the bounded, and this is what is meant by: "an addition in the boundary is a decrease in the bounded, and the decrease in it the boundary is an addition in the bounded" (al-Zarkashi, 2000, 4/151) As for the addition that is neither a differentiae nor accidental, it does not result in a decrease in the bounded, but rather it is a form of redundancy that should be avoided in the boundaries. This is what Ibn Rushd likened to the sixth finger on the hand, so it becomes ugly (Al-Duhayyan, 2013, 34)

Another condition is that the definition should not include vague or metaphorical words. Ibn ya'ish said: "The boundary that is required to prove the essence of something shall not include metaphors" (Ibn Ya'ish, 2001, 7/6). Alrrdi said: "It is not necessary to invent words in the boundaries. Rather, it is necessary to use the well-known and common ones because the boundary is for clarification" (Al-Radi, 1996, 1/22) Also, "strange, brutal, distant metaphorical, and common hesitant words," should be avoided (Al-Ghazali, 1992, 1/48)

## Objecting Ibn al-Hajib's boundaries in Al-Kafya and Aljarabrdi's Responses to these Objections

Ibn al-Hajibi's book Al-Kafya in Grammar includes many grammatical boundaries that occur according to the logical approach to formulating the boundaries. This approach defines things

based on the five universals that are a genus, differentia, species, property, and general accident.

Ibn al-Hajibis one of those concerned with setting and formulating boundaries for grammatical terms, he set boundaries for many grammatical doors, which are:

Word, speech, noun, the inflicted, inflection, the Indeclinable, and changeability.

**The Nominatives**, the subject, the substitute for the doer (if its object is not identified), the subject (topic), the predicate, the predicate of inna and its sisters, 'La' that denotes negation of the genus, and the noun (ma) and (la) that are similar to lais (not).

**The Accusatives**, the cognate accusative, the object, the accusative of vocation, contraction, alishtighal, the warning, the accusative of company, The Accusative of Purpose, adverb, The accusative of specification, The accusative of (dis)continuous exception, the predicate of kana and her sisters, the noun of that and her sisters, the noun of (Inna) and its sisters, accusative with (la), the predicate of (ma) and (la) that are similar to lais (not).

**The Genitives**, the genitive, moral and verbal additions.

**The Dependents**, and the adjective, and conjunction, and emphasis, and appositive, and the explanatory conjunction.

**The indeclinable**, the implied, the nominative, The demonstrative pronouns, the relative, the nouns of verbs, the nouns of sounds, and the compounds.

**The definite**, proper, indefinite, number nouns, masculine and feminine.

**The dual**, plural, masculine plural, feminine plural, broken plural.

**The infinitive**, the gerund, the past participle, the attributive adjectives, and comparatives.

**The verb**, the past tense, the present tense, the command, the verb with no identified subject, the transitive verb, the imperfective verbs, Inchoative verbs, the exclamation mark, and verbs of praise and blame.

**Letters** and prepositions.

Ibn al-Hajibwas very careful about the boundaries so that the boundary includes what it shall include and exclude what it shall exclude. In his view, the boundary shall distinguish the bounded. He said about his philosophy of the boundary: "The boundary shall be a compound of genus and differentia, the genus identifies the bounded, and the differentia separates it from others." (Ibn al-Hajib, 2004, 27)Among the manifestations of his concern for boundaries and his preoccupation with them is that he set boundaries for almost all grammatical doors in his book Al-Kafya, as it was presented.

What also shows his concern with boundaries that he set is his review of them, and his correction of some of them, such as what he did in his boundary to the explanatory conjunction, where he bounded it by saying: a dependent that is clearer than what independent, and when this boundary was responded to, by the likes of (I passed by this man), Ibn al-Hajib said: "This was in the first copy. The contemporary one is more appropriate to be read, which is: "A dependent without an adjective clarifying the independent." He was asked: What is the respond to the first? He said: "I passed by this man", because it is not an explanatory conjunction, but rather an adjective for the grammarians, so we adjusted to these two so that this and its likes would not show up" (Ibn al-Hajib, 1989, 2/528)

What indicates his attention to the boundaries is also his criticism of the grammatical boundaries in Alzzmkhshari's book Al-Mufassal, and this includes his objection to Alzzmkhshari in his boundary of the inflicted noun (the end of which differs according to the different cases) because he "bounded a thing with what its reality depends on, and that its end differs due to the different cases after understanding it as being inflicted. Therefore, if the difference of its end depends on knowing that it is inflicted, and that its being inflicted depends on knowing

the difference of its end, then its definition is a circle." (Ibn al-Hajib, 2004, 82) He believed that it is better to say that "It has a relative structure that does not resemble the original one." (Ibn al-Hajib, 2004, 83)

Despite Ibn Al-Hajib's attention to grammatical boundaries in his book Al-Kafya, many of them were criticized and objected by grammarians who were also concerned with Al-Kafya.

These objections are considered defects of the logical boundaries. Aljarabrdi collected these objections in his book Doubts About Al-Hajabiya and tried to respond to these objections. The number of the objections mentioned by Aljarabrdi in the book reached thirty-five boundaries. As these boundaries take after the style of logical boundaries, Aljarabrdi's responses were characterized by the same thing.

We can categorize these objections to the boundaries of Ibn al-Hajib in Al-Kafya based on the defects of the boundaries, which is that the boundary is not sententious, or the boundary includes an addition or the circle, or that one of the parts of the boundary is nonexistent.

**First: The grammarians' objection to Ibn al-Hajib that the boundary is not sententious**

The objection to the boundaries of Ibn al-Hajib that they are not sententious is one of the most recurring objections to the boundaries of Ibn al-Hajib. Aljarabrdi responded to many of them in his book Doubts About Al-Hajabiya, and his opinion was in support and in agreement with the opinion of Ibn al-Hajib.

An example of this is the objection to Ibn al-Hajib's definition of (the word), as Ibn al-Hajib definition of the "word", Ibn al-Hajib defined it as "an utterance used for a singular meaning." The word "utterance" is a genus that includes the word and other neglected utterances. The phrase "used for" differentia for the neglected utterance. For example, (Dayz) is not a word for grammarians. The word "singular" is a second differentia that brings the words, such as (Zayd stood).

This boundary was objected for not being inclusive and sententious, that is because he restricted the boundary to the word "singular." Thus, he excluded the verb that denotes the event and the specific time, and the subject, well as compound nouns such as "sah" because it means: "keep silent".

Aljarabrdi responded to this objection by clarifying the meaning of Ibn al-Hajib in the word "singular" that was mentioned in the boundary, and that what is meant by it is "what its part is not denoted by a part of the utterance". For example, the word "Daraba" is composed of (ad), (ra), and (ba), which are parts that constitute the word and are not indicative of a signified part. This means that this restriction (singular), the compound is supportive. Ibn al-Hajib said: "(Singular) is preventive. For example, "Zaid stood" is an utterance that is created for meaning, but it is a compound, and it is the attribution of standing up to Zaid. Without this, the utterances would have entered the boundary of the word, as they appear to be two different realities" (Ibn al-Hajib, 1997, 1/215)

In the same way, Aljarabrdi responded to those who objected to Ibn al- Hajib's boundary of the object being "the one on whom the action of the subject falls" The objector to this boundary said that the boundary does not prevent the entry of what is not in it, because the definition is true for the subject (the cone broke) and (the rope was cut) and the like, although it is not an object that is broken and cut, which refers to the action that the subject performed. When the action is performed, it is believed that it is the one on whom the action was performed. He said that the performance has to be relevant to the object, which is not achieved because it is not relevant to the performed action. The interpretation of performance with the relevance that caused Aljarabrdi's objection to this boundary is what

Ibn al-Hajib states in his explanation, saying: "its relevance to what it cannot be comprehended without" (Ibn al-Hajib, 1997, 1/405)

Ibn al-Hajib united the inflicted by saying: "It is the compound that does not resemble the original that is not inflicted."[7] So, "compound" is an adjective for described noun that is deleted. It is omitted to be denoted to. "Noun" is a genus that includes the inflicted. "Compound" is a differentia by which a noun that is not a compound is identified, such as (Zayd, Amr, A, and B) as well as other nouns if they are not compounded. This is because the reason for the infliction is the syntax, it is meant to clarify the meanings obtained from the compound utterances.

Ibn al-Hajib was objected in that the boundary is not sententious because of the exclusion of what it is part of it. For example, "Zaid", in "the boy of Zaid" is inflicted and goes outside of the boundary. This objection is caused by the dispute over the issue of singular nouns before they are composed by a predicative structure, are they inflicted or not? The approach of Ibn al-Hajib is that they are indeclinable. Ibn al-Hajib said: "That is because inflection is not appropriate until after syntax, because its placement is to clarify the meanings that occur in it by syntax. If words were uttered before syntax, it would not be infliction" (Al-Ansari, 1989, 1/78)

The boundary is correct in this regard. Aljarabrdi said: "The boundary is comprehensive and the exclusion of (Zaid) in (the boy of Zaid) is not rejected, because it is not inflicted" (al-Hajib, 1980, 128)

Ibn al-Hajib defined the antecedent noun, he said: "it is every noun followed by a verb that is antecedent by its pronoun or related utterances, if it is imposed on the noun, it would make the case accusative" (Aljarabrdi, P 10). This was objected because the boundary does not prevent the entry of what is not in it. He said: "every noun" and "Zaid" in "Zaid, I hit him" is a noun after a verb, this verb operates over its pronoun. Aljarabrdi responded that what he meant by "every noun" is every object, he said the general and he meant the specific. The specific case here entails the deletion of the verb from the object, hence there was no contradiction here in the three forms, because Zaid is not an object in any of them. (Aljarabrdi, n.d. 47)

**Second: The Objection to the Existence of the Circle in the Boundary**
Ibn al-Hajib's definition of the circle was presented as the boundary of a thing and that is dependent on its reality, when he objected Ibn Alzzmkhshari's definition of the inflicted as: "The end of which differs according to the different cases of the utterance, either with a marker or a letter or a place". Knowing such a difference depends on knowing the inflicted, if the inflicted is recognized with a different case and knowing the inflicted would be dependent

---

[7] The reason for this is that this boundary is more important than the grammarians' boundary for it as "the boundary whose end of differs according to the difference of the case" because the difference of its end is a branch of knowing that it is inflicted, so the grammarians' definition is a circle, because the end of it does not differ until it is known that it is inflicted, and it is not inflicted until the end of it differs. Also, this definition is based on the definition of grammarians, which is that this contains a warning about the reason and the obstacle. As for the reason, Compound is the reason for the syntax, and the obstacle is our saying: It does not resemble the original indeclinable, as a precaution against your saying: These came to me, for the structure is present, except that it is indeclinable because it resembles the syntax of the original. See: (Ibn al-Hajib, 1989, 2/519)

on knowing the difference, then every bounded will be associated with its boundary and this would be a circle (Al-Radi, 1996, 1/55). This objection faced Ibn al-Hajib in the grammatical boundaries, and Aljarabrdi attempted to respond to these objections in his book.

Ibn al-Hajib defined the nominatives as "whatever includes the knowledge of the subjectivity." This boundary was objected to in that it leads to a circle because it is "the definition of the thing by itself, and its invalidity is clear because the subjectivity is about the nominatives, it is made to be an identifier to what it is part of, which leads to a circle." Aljarabrdi responded to this objection: "We do not accept the definition of the nominative through itself because what is bounded by its parts needs to be defined, and it is forbidden, but it is possible that the total is unknown and some of its parts are known, so the total needs to be defined."

Ibn al-Hajib also defined the names of the number as "what was established for the quantity of the units of things). This was objected to and accused of corruption in the boundary, "because it leads to a circle, the knowledge of the number depends on the knowledge of its parts, of which are the units, which is one of its members and depends on knowing what it is a member in." He responded that the circle is not necessary because the units are previously known or recognized by an official definition that the number was not a part of, so its knowledge does not depend on knowing the number.

**Third: The Objection to the Existence of an Addition in the Boundary**
One of the objections to the boundaries of Ibn al-Hajib in his book Al-Kafya is that the boundary includes an addition. As mentioned before, if the addition is not in the genus, differentia, and property, it would not result in a decrease in the boundary. This addition is considered a filler and repetition of no benefit.

Ibn al-Hajib defined the word as "an utterance that is set for a singular meaning." (Ibn al-Hajib, 2010, 11) This was objected in that the boundary includes an addition in putting "singular" after the word "set,", the word "set" causes a problem here because the utterance, unlike the word, could not be set. When he added the word "singular" at the end of the boundary, he mentioned that it is a useless addition, "and that "set" is a sufficient alternative of it since the utterance is not set in terms of speech." Aljarabrdi responded to this objection by rejecting the claim of addition in this boundary. This is because the author intended by "set" that its parts are set and formulated, and there is no dispute that the parts of the compound are set, and at that time it is believed that the boundary is made with this consideration, and thus it does not go out of the boundary.

Ibn al-Hajib defined the subject as: "the thing to which the verb, or what is similar, is attributed, and it is mentioned before the verb as it is its performer" (Ibn al-Hajib, 2010, 14) This boundary was objected in that it includes an addition in "mentioned before." Ibn Falah al-Yamani said: "there is no need for this addition because it entails the obligation of preceding the verb, which is understood from the context. If he said "it is an obligation", it would be concluded that it is an obligation because the attribution indicates that it has to be before the verb but does not indicate that it is obligatory (Muhammad, 2001, 236)

Aljarabrdi responded that the attribution of the verb and its likes is understood from the context and that the obligation is not necessary but forbidden here. Someone may delusionally think that the attribution of the verb to the subject pronoun in "Zaid stood" that the verb is attributed to topic subject as it is the one concerned with the hidden pronoun, so the boundary prevents this illusion (Aljarabrdi, n.d. 24)

This addition, according to the objection of the objectors, does not lead to the corruption of the boundary. It is only useless because it does not indicate the obligation to delay the subject, since its purpose is known from the word "attributed" at the beginning of the definition.

**Objection to the Limit that one of its Parts is Nonexistent**
Ibn al-Hajib defined the noun as "whatever indicates a meaning in itself that is not associated with one of the three tenses." (Ibn al-Hajib, 2010, 11) He was objected here in "not associated" because one of the parts of the boundary is nonexistent, and it is not permissible for the boundary to be composed from nonexistence. The reason for that is that the boundary is composed of intrinsic things that are included in the essence of the bounded thing. Abu hyyan said: "The nonexistent is not in included in the boundary because the boundary is composed of the essence that it is based on, and this essence is not composed of nonexistence." (Al-Andalusi, 1998, 1/59) Al'ukbry says: "The real boundary is not a negation, because it is all about what it shows about the reality of the bounded but the negation does not indicate the reality of the bounded." (Al-'Ukbari, 1995, 1/71)Aljarabrdi responded that this definition is not a boundary, but rather a description, and it is permissible for the description to be composed of nonexistence, since it is possible that the essence of a thing is nonexistent. (Aljarabrdi, n.d. 7)

**Results**
We can - through the issues that were presented and the logical objections to them, and Aljarabrdi's answers to them - identify the problems facing the sharp one - who set the limit - as well as the problems facing the objector, and they can be traced back to:
The reason of problem of objection is the logical boundary itself because what is meant by the logical boundary is the distinction of the bounded by its essence, as stated by the scholars of this field. Therefore, they pointed out the difficulty of this type of boundary. Consider what Al-Ghazalisaid:  A thing that it is difficult to identify all of its intrinsic characteristics, or it is difficult to find an expression for it," and also: "The difficult boundary is the real one and it is the only revealer of the essence of the thing" (Al-Ghazali, 1992, 45) Therefore, there are many grammarians who only stipulated that the boundary shall distinguish the bounded from others. Al-Alshlawbin said: "The boundary, according to the grammarians, is the sententious (comprehensive and preventive), whatever it is, and in any word. The grammarians would not surrender to the objections, rather they tolerate more than this in regard to their boundaries, so they bound a thing by most of its essence." (Al-Shalawbin, 1993,1/229-230)
Therefore, there is no logical boundary that has not faced an objection, rather you may find many objections to a single boundary, there are plenty of examples in Al-Kafya of Ibn al-Hajib there are many examples of that. What indicates the difficulty of this type of boundary that was referred to by al-Ghazaliis the involvement of the objector in what he objected. Ibn al-Hajib defined the indeclinable as: what fits the original indeclinable." He justified it as "I did not say that its boundary does not differ at the end of it, like all grammarians, because knowing the absence of difference is the recognition of the essence of the indeclinable. So, it is not correct to make the recognition of the essence of the indeclinable as a branch on the recognition of the absence of difference, it leads to a circle." Alrrdi objected to Ibn al-Hajib's boundary that "this boundary is only valid for someone who knows what the indeclinable is all about, and does not know the indeclinable noun. If he did not know it, it would have been a definition of the indeclinable through the indeclinable, because the indeclinable is mentioned in the word in indeclinable" (al-Radi, 1996, 2/398)

This may be the reason that many grammarians state that what is required of grammatical boundaries is only to distinguish the bounded and that this is the evidence of the real boundaries. Additionally Also, Alshlawbin mentioned about this concept.

Ibn Hisham said: "The boundaries of grammarians and other Sharia scholars are not real that are intended to fully reveal the essence of the bounded, rather, the purpose of it is to distinguish a thing, so that it is known that it is the owner of this name" (al-Suyuṭi, 2007, 1/57)

The other problem with logical grammatical boundaries is that they do not have tangible realities that distinguish them independently of their setter, but their meanings are different according to what their setter wanted. Ibn al-Hajib said: "one shall know that the grammatical boundaries are singular utterances with regard to syntax and its negation, and they are compounded (not singular) with regard to the syntax. They are distinguished by what the setter made indicative of them, and they have no intrinsic realities that distinguish them by considering their meanings except what I mentioned from the different meanings considering the setter"[8] (Al-Hajib, 1980, 123)

This text from Ibn al-Hajib is very important to clarify the confusion that occurs in the many objections to the logical grammatical boundaries. It is necessary to refer to the intent and approach of the setter of the logical boundary because the setter shall have a conception of the issue before setting the boundary, and based on this conception, he sets a sententious boundary.

Aljarabrdi rejected many objections and corrected the boundaries of Ibn al-Hajib based on Ibn al-Hajib's approach on the issue, especially what he stipulated in his book of Al-Kafya. Aljarabrdi's aforementioned response to those who objected to Ibn al-Hajib's boundary of the infliction "the compounded that did not resemble the original indeclinable." The objector said: "(the boy of Zaid) is inflicted and goes out of the boundary." Aljarabrdi responded: "It shall not be rejected because it is not inflicted." Aljarabrdi states that this boundary is valid according to the approach of Ibn al-Hajib on the issue.

## Acknowledgement

## References
Askari, A. H. (1997). *Alfurwq Al-Lughawiyah.* Edited by Mohamed Ibrahim Selim. Dar Al-Alam for Publishing.

Al-Anbari, A. Al-R. M. (1985). *Nuzhat Al-Alibba' Fi Ṭabaqat Al-Udaba.* Editing and investigation: Ibrahim Al-Samarrai. Maktabat al-Manar.

Al-Andalusi, A. (1998). *Alttadhyil Walttakmil Fi Sharh Kitab Al-Tas'hil.* Edited by Hassan Hindawi. Dar al-Qalam.

Al-Anṣari, A. M. (1989). *Sharh Najm Al-Din Alqammuly 'alá Al-Kafiyah.* Jami'at Umm al-Qurá.

al-Aṣfahani, M. ibn 'Abd-al-R. (1986). *Bayan Al-Mukhtaṣar Sharh Mukhtaṣar Ibn Al-Hajib.*

---

[8] Therefore, some researchers argue for the division of the real definition into a nominal definition and an objective definition. The nominal definition "what its existence in the same matter is not a violation, that is, it is a definition of a nominal essence, that is, an entity according to the mind, and it has no evidence in reality, as it is imagined in the minds, and does not exist in reality," such as the definitions in the various sciences of the principles of jurisprudence, theology, grammar, and the hadith term (Al-Duhayyan, 2013, 19)

Edited by Muhammad Mazhar Baqa. Dar al-madani.

Al-Damamini, B. Al-D. (2008). *Al-Manhaj Al-Ṣafi Fi Sharh Al-Wafi Lile.* Editing and investigation: Fakher Jabr Matar. Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah.

Al-Duhayyan,  S. ibn 'Ali. (2013). Al-I'tirad Al-Manṭiqi 'alá Al-Hadd Al-Nahwi. *Majallat Jami'at Umm Al-Qurá Li-'Ulum Al-Lughat Wa-Al-Adab*, 7, 13–62.

Al-Ghazali, A., Hamid, M. I. M. (1961). *Mi'yar Al-'Ilm Fi Fann Al-Manṭiq.* Edited by Suleiman Donia. Dar al-Ma'arif.

Al-Ghazali, A., Hamid, M. ibn M. (1992). *Al-Mustaṣfá Fi 'ilm Al-Uṣul*. Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah.

Al-'Ukbari,  li-A. al-B. A., ibn al-Husayn. (1995). *Al-Lubab Fi 'Ilal Al-Bina' Wa-Al-I'rab.* Edited by Abdul Ilah, Damascus. Dar al-Fikr.

Al-'Uthaymin, M. ibn Ṣalih. (2011). *Al-Sharh Al-Kabir Li-Mukhtaṣar Al-Uṣul Min 'ilm Al-Uṣul. Edited* by Mahmoud bin Mohammed Miniawy. al-Maktabah al-shamilah.

Al-Jurjani, 'Ali ibn Muhammad ibn 'Ali. (1984). *Alt'ryfat.* Edited by Ibrahim Labyari. Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi.

Al-Kaffawi, A. al-B. A. ibn M. (1999). *Kitab Al-Kulliyat*. Mu'assasat al-Risalah.

Al-Radi, M. ibn al-Hasan. (1996). *Sharh Al-Radi 'alá Al-Kafiyah.* Edited by Youssef Hassan Omar. Manshurat Jami'at Qaryunis.

Al-Shalawbin, A., 'Umar, A. ibn M. (1993). *Sharh Almuqddmh Aljzulih Al-Kabir.* Editing and investigation: Turki Al-Otaibi. Maktabat al-Rushd.

Al-Zarkashi, M. ibn B. (2000). *Al-Bahr Al-Muhiṭ Fi Uṣul Al-Fiqh.* Edited by Mohamed Mohamed Tamer. Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah.

Aljarabrdi, A. bin H. (n.d.). *Alfkuk fi shrh alshkuk* (manuscript).

AlZajjaji, A. al-Q. (1986). *Al-Idah Fi 'illi Alnnahw.* Editing and investigation: Mazen Al Mubarak (5th ed.). Dar al-Nafa'is.

Ibn al-Hajib, A. 'Amr 'Uthman. (1980). *Al-Kafiyah, Sharh Al-Wafiyah Nazmu.* Editing: Al'lyly, Musá bnnay 'Alwan. Maṭba'at al-Adab fi al-Najaf al-Ashraf.

Ibn al-Hajib, A. 'A.'U. (1997). *Sharh Al-Muqaddimah Al-Kafiyah Fi 'ilm Al-I'rab.le.* Editing and investigation: Jamal Abdel Atti Mukhaimer. Maktabat Nizar Muṣṭafá al-Baz.

Ibn al-Hajib, A. 'A. 'U. (2004). *Al-Idah Fi Sharh Al-Mufaṣṣal.* Editing and investigation: Ibrahim Muhammad. Dar Sa'd al-Din.

Ibn al-Hajib, A. 'A. 'U. (2010a). *Al-Kafiyah Fi 'ilm Al-Nahw.* Maktabat al-Adab.

Ibn al-Hajib, A. 'A. 'U. (2010b). *Al-Kafiyah Fi 'ilm Al-Nahw*. Editing and investigation: Ṣalih 'bdal'zym al-sha'ir. Maktabat al-Adab.

Muhammad, N. ibn. (2001). *'Sharh Al-Kafiyah Fi Al-Nahw Li-Ibn Falah Al-Yamani.* Jami'at Umm al-Qurá.

Wqaf,'Abd-al-H. (2008). *Al-Hudud Fi Al-Dars Al-Nahwi Al-Hadith*. Jami'at Tishrin.