



TALWEEH
ACADEMY

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

الحمد لله رب العالمين ، والصلاة والسلام على أشرف الأنبياء والمرسلين ،

وعلى آله وأصحابه أجمعين



TALWEEH
ACADEMY

Course: Mutammimah al-Ājurrūmiyyah

Author: al-Ḥaṭṭāb al-Ruʿaynī

Instructor: Mohammad Daud Khurshid

Lesson 3: The Definition of Kalam

Further Inquiries: Info@talweehacademy.com

www.talweehacademy.com



Lesson 3

Overview:

In this video we discuss kalām since i’rāb only exists in tarkīb, unlike single words such as Zaid, which require no grammatical role until placed in a sentence like Zaid fī al-dār.

A proper definition must be jāmi’ (inclusive) of all its instances and māni’ (exclusive) of anything outside it. With that principle, the grammarians defined kalām as:

الكلام هو اللفظ المركب المفيد بالوضع

Kalām is an utterance that is structured, meaningful, and based on Arabic convention.

Each part of this definition excludes what is not true kalām:

- لفظ: any sound from the mouth, including everything in kalām.
- مركب: a compound, excluding single words or simple sound.



- مفيد: a complete meaning (فائدة يحسن السكوت عليها) a benefit upon which silence is appropriate
- بالوضع: by Arabic coinage, excluding non-Arabic words and foreign structures. Scholars debated whether qaṣd (intent) is required; Ibn Mālik considered it necessary, while Abū Ḥayyān rejected that condition.

Kalām is precisely defined as structured, meaningful, intentional Arabic utterance that carries i'rāb, comprehensive of all valid instances and restrictive against everything else.

Summary:

Kalām and that from which it is composed

As we mentioned before, i'rāb only exists in tarkīb, which is why the author starts with kalām. The word Zaid alone will not have i'rāb because there's no need for it. The word Zaid is not playing a role. However, in a sentence like زيد في الدار, we now need i'rāb. So the author mentioned the definition of kalām first, like Ibn Mālik in the Alfīyah. And then, since kalām is made up of kalimah, he defines



kalimah as well. Other scholars, like Ibn al-Ḥāḥib, Ibn Hishām, etc., say that since kalām is made up of kalimah and can't exist without it, we should define kalimah first.

Definition of Kalām

الكلام هو اللفظ المركب المفيد بالوضع

There are two types of definitions:

1. The linguistic definition. If someone gave a sign or expressed something hidden in their heart to their audience through sign language or any other form of communication, this would be considered kalām according to the dictionaries. القول وما كان مكتفيا بنفس. The wāw is in the meaning of أو. Any expression of yours and any expression that shows something within your heart. It can be sign language or a hand movement. A stop sign is considered kalām.
2. The definition, according to the grammarians, is very specific. They're thinking from an i'rāb perspective. If you raise your hand to say salam,



there's no i'rāb there. So to the grammarians, that's not kalām. Here, the author is referring to the definition according to the grammarians because this is a Naḥw book. In his Alfīyyah, Ibn Mālīk says كَلَامُنَا لَفْظٌ مُفِيدٌ , our kalām, i.e. the kalām of the grammarians.

هو اللفظ المركب المفيد بالوضع

It is that utterance, which is a compound structure, which gives benefit through its coinage.

إعراب:

الكلام: مبتدأ مرفوع وعلامة رفعه الضمة الظاهرة في آخره

هو: ضمير فصل على الأصح لا محل له من الإعراب

This is the pronoun that can come between the muḥtada and khabr.

اللفظ: خبر المبتدأ مرفوع وعلامة رفعه الضمة الظاهرة في آخره



المركب: نعت اللفظ ونعت المرفوع مرفوع، وعلامة رفعه الضمة الظاهرة في آخره

المفيد: نعت المركب ونعت المرفوع مرفوع، وعلامة رفعه الضمة الظاهرة في آخره

بالوضع: الباء حرف جر والوضع مجرور بالباء، وعلامة جره الكسرة الظاهرة في آخره، والجار والمجرور متعلق بالمفيد،

Damīr al-faṣl

Do we say اللفظ is the khabr and the هو is damīr al-faṣl? Or هو is the second muḩtada, and اللفظ is its khabr. In the second case, the entire sentence from هو to the end would be in the state of raf' and the khabr of the muḩtada.

Al-Kafrāwī, in his commentary on Al-Ājurrūmiyyah, says that the correct opinion is the first. That we have the muḩtada, the damīr al-faṣl and the khabr. Let's look at the i'rāb of damīr al-faṣl. There are two general opinions:

1. It's a ḩarf. And ḩurūf don't have i'rāb. Hence our saying لا محل له من الإعراب.
2. If we say it's an ism, there are three opinions:
 - 2.1. لا محل له من الإعراب, just like an ism al-fi'l which can govern but doesn't receive i'rāb. It's still an ism.



- 2.2. له محل بحسب ما قبله. It follows the i'rāb of the word before.
- 2.3. له محل بحسب ما بعده. It follows the i'rāb of the word after.

The first two opinions are simple. In the sentence Zaidun huwa al-qāim, if we were to apply either opinion one or opinion 2.1, it's simple: لا محل له من الإعراب. If we were to apply Opinion 2.2, then هو في محل رفع because what is before it is Zaid, which is marfū' because it's the muḩtada. If we take opinion 2.3, then huwa is fī maḩalli raf' because the word after it is al-qāim, which is khabr marfū'. So, according to both opinions 2.2 and 2.3 in this sentence, هو في محل رفع. Another structure is كان زيد هو القائم. Again, according to opinions 1 and 2.1, لا محل له من الإعراب. But according to opinion 2.2, we look at what's before the pronoun, which is the ism of kāna, Zaid. It's in raf'. According to opinion 2.3, huwa would be in naṣab. Because the word after it, al-qāim, is in naṣab because it's the khabr of kāna. In the example إن زيدا هو القائم. According to opinion 2.2 هو في محل نصب because before it is Zaid, which is the ism of inna. According to opinion 2.3, it's fī maḩalli raf' because it's followed by the khabr of inna, which is in raf'.

The Science of Definitions



Every definition needs two things. It needs to be jāmi' and māni'. If you're defining a reality, jāmi' means the definition should be such that all individuals of that reality are found within your definition. Māni' means that everything that is not in the reality you're defining is excluded from the definition. To do this, we first bring a genus (genus), which encompasses everything. A broad word that encompasses everything. Then we bring what we call a faṣl. We bring a factor specific to what we are defining. It will do two things for us. Firstly, it'll place all the individuals we are defining under our definition because it's specific to them, and secondly, it will exclude all the individuals that are external to our reality.

Lafz

فَالْفِظُ صَوْتُ مُعْتَمِدٌ عَلَى مَخْرَجٍ مُحَقِّقٍ أَوْ مُقَدَّرٍ

Lafz is any voice that originates from a makhraj which is either muḥaqqaq or muqaddar. A makhraj muḥaqqaq is wherein your voice will end at a certain place. For example, if you say ad. Your voice ends at the makhraj of dāl. Or at. Your voice ends at the makhraj. You can't prolong it. The breath might continue, but the voice will end. And in these makhārij, you're putting parts of your mouth together to make a sound. A makhraj muqaddar is where you're using the openness of the mouth. For example, if you say ā. You're pronouncing the



makhraj of alif, and you're not putting any parts of your mouth together to achieve this makhraj. It's the emptiness that allows you to pronounce that letter. When you say ooo. You're pronouncing a wāw maddah, and your voice isn't ending at a point. Likewise, in ī, the yā maddah. The makhraj of yā wāw alif is muqaddar. And all the other letters have a makhraj muḥaqqaq. So lafẓ is any sound that leaves the mouth. This is our jins. This includes everything, kalām and other sounds that are not kalām.

Now we add a faṣl. It's murakkab (a compound structure). Now we've removed singular words from our definition. The following are all lafẓ: Zaid, ā, ba, Zaid is standing, etc. However, Zaid, and the sound aa or ba can't be al-lafẓ al-murakkab.

Ifādah

Al-mufid, it gives a benefit. Here this refers to فائدةٌ يحسنُ السُّكُوتُ عليها. A benefit upon which silence is appropriate. If you say Zaid is standing, there's no further question. This is a complete sentence in and of itself. But if you say Zaid's book, which is murakkab, we no longer have that benefit. You're still waiting for something (predication). What about Zaid's book? Likewise, this clause excludes a murakkab mazjī—for example, New Brunswick. The words new and Brunswick were added together. Despite this being murakkab, it's not giving a benefit.



Likewise, it excludes a murakkab isnādī that's an 'alam. Imagine someone was named: "Muḥammad is standing". And you say Muḥammad is standing. But what about Muḥammad is standing? The entire structure is now a name. Muḥammad is standing has become a name. It used to be a murakkab with an isnād, but now it's just a name. You need to add information. This also excludes ما رُكِبَ تركيباً إسنادياً. For example, we have the sentence: ضربت زيدا، لكن لم يفد معني يحسن السكوت عليه. If you hit Zaid. There is an isnād, but we're still waiting. If you hit Zaid, then what? This does not give full benefit. This is a jumlah but not kalām because it's not beneficial. The difference between jumlah and kalām is that a jumlah only needs tarkīb and isnād. But kalām also needs ifādah. So when a ḥarf al-sharṭ enters upon ḍarabta Zaidan, it's no longer kalām. The entire structure إن ضربت زيدا يغضب، If you hit Zaid, he will become angry is kalām because tarkīb, isnād and ifādah are found. Al-Kāfiyah jī mentions in his sharḥ on Qawā'id Al-I'rāb that the sentences that are becoming part of bigger sentences are not kalām. For example, ḥāl, khabr, ṣilah and ṣifah. They all need to have a ḍamīr 'āid. None of them alone is kalām because they don't give a full benefit. For example جاء الذي يدرس. The person who studies came. The هو in يدرس is referring back to الذي. The entire thing is kalām. If we take يدرس alone, it's not kalām. We don't know who's studying or what the هو is referring to.



Wad'

Wad' here refers to wad' al-'arabī. Because the نحاة are explaining كلام in the Arabic language, by adding this, we excluded the wad' of other languages. wad' (coinage) is when you take a word and make it refer to a reality. For example, there's a child, and you take the word Zaid and make it a label for him. wad' occurs within single words. And there's a type of coinage that occurs in sentences. Any word in any language is wad'. That word has been made a label for that reality. The Arabs have also coined certain structures. And if these structures are not followed, it's not kalām. For example, if you have a fi'l, you need a fā'il. In their commentaries on mutammimah Al-Ahdal and Al-Fākihī mention that wad' here means qaṣd, which means that the speaker intends to convey a meaning. Ibn Mālik also takes this opinion in some of his books. For example, someone's asleep, and they say اضرب زيدا. Ibn Mālik and Ibn 'Uṣfūr do not consider this to be kalām because he didn't mean to say this. It's not kalām because there's no qaṣd. However, Abū Ḥayyān in Al-Tabdīl wa Al-Takkīl, his commentary on Ibn Malik's Tashīl Al-Fawā'id, says that Ibn Mālik made a mistake. He says the Nuḥāh are understanding kalām from the perspective of i'rāb. And in اضرب زيدا, there is a structure and i'rāb. And therefore, this should be a Kalam according to the grammarians. That's why he says, لَا يُشْتَرَطُ فِي الْإِفَادَةِ قَصْدُ الْمُتَكَلِّمِ إِلَيْهَا. For إفادة, it is not a condition that the speaker intends the benefit. Rather, وَإِنَّمَا يُشْتَرَطُ فِيهَا أَنْ تَكُونَ, عَلَى هَيْئَةِ التَّرْكِيبِ الْمَوْضُوعِ فِي لِسَانِ الْعَرَبِ. The only condition is that it's in line with the structures the Arabs have put forth as sentences. وَكَثِيرٌ مِنَ النَّحْوِيِّينَ لَمْ يَعْتَبِرُوا فِي حَدِّ



الكَلَامِ سِوَى التَّرْكِيْبِ الْإِسْنَادِي فَقَطْ وَلَمْ يَشْتَرُطُوا الْإِفَادَةَ وَلَا الْقَصْدَ. Many of the grammarians don't consider this to be a condition of kalām.

Ibn Malik also says that it needs to give a new benefit. If you're saying something obvious, you're not giving any benefit. For example, الأرض تحتنا The Earth is under us. But we're looking from the perspective of i'rāb. It doesn't matter what the person said. أبو حيان says this is another mistake, and he quotes a contemporary of his saying that according to Ibn Malik's opinion, if you say جاء زيد, it's kalām. Then you say it 5 minutes later. It's not kalām now. As we mentioned, the majority disagree with this.