GRAMMATICAL PHILOSOPHY IN CLASSIFYING FUNCTIONAL PARTS IN THE STRUCTURES AND COMPOSITIONS OF THE ARABIC LANGUAGE

Dr. Shaimaa Mohammed Tawfiq Mal Hussein[1]*, Makkah Al-Mukarramah[2]

[1]Assistant Professor in the Department of Language, Grammar and Morphology - College of Arabic Language-Umm Al-Qura University Saudi Arabia; [2]Makkah Al-Mukarramah-Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This research addresses the topic of (grammatical philosophy in classifying the functional parts in the structures and structures of the Arabic language), which is a linguistic, grammatical, and philosophical topic. It is based on what came from grammatical-philosophical studies on the functional characteristics of independent and non-independent linguistic parts, which are called tools or signs in The structures and structures of the Arabic language, and what is known as grammatical and syntactic signs and their letters in the words and structures of the Arabic language. What is known as the grammatical and syntactic signs and their letters in the words and structures of the Arabic language. One of the objectives of the research is to clarify the philosophical concept of functional parts in the Arabic language, analyze the various philosophical classifications of functional parts between tools and signs, and highlight the philosophical aspects affecting this classification. Which helps to know the worker and non-worker, and to know whether he is the worker or the effect of the worker. Explaining the types of signs in the Arabic language, in terms of their division into grammatical signs (parsing and syntactic signs), morphological signs (numerical, gender, and temporal), and verbal derivational signs (subjective, object, exaggeration, superlative, and simile). I followed the descriptive and analytical approach in dealing with the individuals of the phenomenon under study, and the comparative approach in comparing the doctrines of the Basra and Kufan grammarians regarding its essence. The study was divided into two sections, the first on the grammatical-philosophical concept of the essence of the sign, and the second on the grammatical-philosophical concept of the end of the tool. Then came the conclusion in the results of the study, which showed the role of grammatical philosophy and its differences in clarifying the nature of the functional parts, in the specialty of each of the tools and signs with meanings that distinguish them from others, and the participation of tools and signs in meanings that are granted by the unity of description (the scientific term), and the way out of this classification distinction. By applying the term (letters) to both types.

Keywords: Philosophy, Classification, Functionalism, Tools, Signs

Introduction

In the name of God, and may blessings and peace be upon the Messenger of God, his family, his companions, and those who follow him. And then.

Grammatical philosophy was manifested in what is known as the books of grammatical differences, the most famous of which are: Al-Insaf fi Masail al-Khilaf bayna al-Nahwiyyin al-Basriyyin wa al-Kufiyyin by Ibn al-Anbari, Al-Tabyeen an Madhahib al-Nahwiyyin al-Basriyyin wa al-Kufiyyin by Abu al-Baqa al-Akbari, and Ikhtilaf al-Nahwiyyin by Ahmad ibn Yahya Tha'lab, and many others (Al-Rafi'i, 2010).

The most prominent aspects of philosophy in grammatical issues - in its comprehensive meaning of grammatical, morphological, and lexical rules - were represented in the preference and justification of the rulings of the established grammatical rules. Here we say established; because the branching grammatical philosophy did not change the grammatical principles, but rather presented points of view in adopting them in a way that helps in visualizing the reasons for that adoption. We find this in the reasoning for which is the original: the noun or the verb; Whatever is said about the origin of them, the words are placed, and their inflections are heard, and it is only the theoretical justification for which of them is the origin and the theoretical preference based on what was mentioned from the aspects of that justification.

One of the grammatical issues that philosophy has delved into is the issue of classifying the functional parts in the single structures (words) and the compound structures (sentences).

I mean by the functional parts in the words what was an independent word, such as the vocative) ya(, and what was part of the word, such as the letters of the present tense, and I mean by the functional parts in the sentences what performed a function in complete sentences, such as the abrogating letters.

The place of grammatical philosophy in this study and its scope is the issue of classifying the functional parts in the Arabic language into tools and signs.

Arabic grammar is based on a philosophical theory known as the factor theory, which states that every object must have a factor that has worked on it to raise, lower, genitive, or jussive, and that raising is the science of agency, lowering is the science of objectivity, and genitive is the science of addition (Al-Malahi, 2016). Then, grammarians divided the word into three categories: noun, verb, and particle. They divided the noun in terms of definition and indefiniteness into indefinite and definite, and divided it in terms of rigidity and derivation into rigid and derived, and divided the verb according to its tense into: past, present, and imperative, and divided it according to its inflection into rigid and inflectional (Munawwar, 2020). They said in defining the noun that it is: what indicates an entity, and they said in defining the verb that it is what indicates an

event at a specific time, and they said in defining the letter that it is what does not have a meaning in itself independently but rather in something else, and they said that some letters work and are a tool, and that some letters come as a sign of Abdul Hamid 2009; Al-Faradhi, 2018).

Hence, this study came to clarify the grammatical philosophy in classifying linguistic parts (tools and signs) in Arabic structures, words and structures; by clarifying the differences and similarities between tools and signs in the Arabic language; by clarifying what distinguishes each of these two types from the other, what brings them together, and what unites them.

I made this study in two chapters, the first chapter in the grammatical philosophical concept of the nature of the sign, and I made it in four topics: The first topic in the concept of the sign in grammar, and in this topic came what indicates the conceptual similarity between tools and signs; This is in the coming of the sign in the meaning of evidence of the nature of the thing, and its characteristic that it is distinguished by.

I made the coming of the sign with this concept the content of the second topic: The origins of the nominal sign in ancient and modern grammatical philosophy. By its coming indicating that the word is a noun, and thus distinguishing it from the verb and the letter. Then I spoke about the grammatical-philosophical concept of the sign in its coming indicating the type of the noun in terms of masculinity, femininity and equality, and its coming indicating its number in terms of duality and plural: the sound masculine plural and the sound feminine plural, then indicating its ability.

Then came the third section on the origins of the actual sign in ancient and modern grammatical philosophy, with its coming to distinguish the verb from other words: the noun and the letter, then came the fourth section on: the origins of the nominal and actual sign in ancient and modern grammatical philosophy, explaining the ancient and modern philosophical grammatical concept of the sign, with its coming in the noun and the verb as synonymous with the affix, whether it is a single letter or compound letters, and whether it is a sign of inflection or construction, and whether it is active or not, and whether it is apparent or estimated.

After that, I moved to the second chapter entitled The philosophical grammatical concept of the nature of the tool, starting it in its first section entitled The concept of the tool in grammar by defining it to be clear to it, distinguishing it from the sign, even if it contains the commonality between it and the sign.

Then I talked in the second section entitled "The conceptual classification difference of the tool among ancient and modern grammarians" about the philosophical grammatical conceptual difference of the tool among some of the ancients (Sibawayh, Ibn Hisham and the moderns), between broad, narrow and medium. Then in the third section entitled "The conceptual classification difference among ancient grammarians in some letters", I discussed these differences in the sin, the sawf and the letters of the present tense; because of what they contain of indications of work and lack thereof; which makes it possible to enter into both types.

Then came the results explaining what I concluded in this study, from the points of commonality and differences in the philosophical grammatical classification concept between tools and signs in the Arabic language, and what unifies them.

In this study, I followed the descriptive approach in monitoring the individuals of the phenomenon under study and what was written about it, and the comparative historical approach in tracking what was mentioned from the grammatical philosophy in classifying the functional parts in the structures of Arabic, words and structures among the ancients and moderns; and the analytical approach in clarifying the differences and conceptual and functional participations between tools and signs in the Arabic language and their causes and results.

Then came the results that come in summary in the specialization of each of the signs and tools with meanings that distinguish them from the other in the philosophical grammatical concept, and if there is something that overlaps between them, it gives them the term commonality; which made the exit from this by applying "letters" to each of the tools and signs - except for the grammatical signs: the signs of inflection and indicative construction.

The importance of the topic of grammatical philosophy in classifying the functional parts in the structures and structures of the Arabic language lies in several matters:

1.   Clarifying the theoretical document on which the classification difference of the functional parts in Arabic grammar is based, represented by the factor theory.

2.   Clarifying the basic philosophical grammatical concepts; as the research contributes to clarifying the conceptual differences between "tools" and "signs"; which helps reduce the confusion that may arise among students of Arabic grammar.

3.   Enhancing the correct understanding of Arabic philosophical grammatical rules by achieving an accurate understanding of tools and signs in the circumstances that contribute to mastering parsing and construction, which leads to improving reading, comprehension and linguistic analysis skills.

4.   Enriching grammatical studies; with what the research adds in terms of a comparative philosophical grammatical vision that helps in developing grammatical studies and enhancing understanding of the differences between grammatical schools.

5.   Serving Arabic language education; as this topic is essential for teachers and learners; by clarifying grammatical rules in a precise systematic way that enhances the learning process.

6.   Proposing the unification of grammatical terms, as the research contributes to unifying the use of grammatical terms for tools and signs; which reduces the differences in interpretation between grammarians, and helps facilitate the study and teaching of the language.

7.   Showing the development of philosophical grammatical thought, as the research highlights the development of the philosophical grammatical view of tools and signs across different eras, which reflects progress in linguistic grammatical understanding.

This study aims to study the differences and contributions between tools and signs in the Arabic language to:

1.   Identify the essential philosophical grammatical differences between tools and signs, by clarifying the conceptual and functional differences between tools and signs in the Arabic language.

2.   Investigate the conceptual and functional similarities between tools and signs, by seeking to clarify the common aspects between tools and signs, which helps to understand the unity of the term and its connotations.

3.   Classify signs in grammatical philosophy into grammatical signs such as signs of inflection and construction. Morphological signs such as numerical, gender and time signs, and derivational signs such as the connotations of effectiveness, objectivity, exaggeration, preference and simile.

4.   Analyze the philosophical grammatical differences in the classification of some letters; by highlighting the differences in grammarians'

opinions in classifying some letters, between being tools or signs, and trying to explain these differences.

5.   Clarifying the impact of tools and signs in the construction of the Arabic sentence; by stating how tools and signs affect the structure of sentences, and highlighting their role in achieving meaning.

6.   Providing solutions to the philosophical grammatical terminological differences; as the study proposes to unify the terms between tools and signs through an in-depth comparative study.

7.   Facilitating linguistic education; by simplifying the concepts related to tools and signs for students and specialists.

In studying the subject of grammatical philosophy in classifying the functional parts in the structures and structures of the Arabic language, I have adopted the descriptive and analytical approach, and this is in describing the tools and signs in terms of definition, types and functions, and the analytical approach, in analyzing linguistic and grammatical texts to extract the differences and similarities between tools and signs, and the comparative approach in comparing the opinions of ancient and modern grammarians on the classification of tools and signs, and in comparing the grammatical and morphological functions of tools and signs. And the historical approach; by tracing the development of concepts related to tools and signs across different grammatical eras, studying how the view of tools and signs has developed in the Basra and Kufa grammatical schools.

The plan of this study is as follows

Introduction, a general introduction to the importance of grammatical philosophy in classifying the functional parts in the structures and compositions of the Arabic language in its contribution to the deep understanding and accurate perception of the rules of grammar and morphology, and the topics of parsing and construction.

The problem of the study

What is the grammatical philosophy in classifying the functional parts in the structures and structures of the Arabic language? And how does this philosophy work in analyzing the structures of linguistic texts.

The importance of the study: It contributes to clarifying the grammatical philosophical foundations for classifying the functional parts in a detailed manner for students of grammar and morphology and researchers.

Study sections

The first section: The philosophical grammatical concept of the nature of the sign.

I discussed the concept of the sign in grammar, the origins of the nominal sign in ancient and modern grammatical philosophy, the origins of the actual sign in ancient and modern grammatical philosophy, and the origins of the nominal and actual sign in ancient and modern grammatical philosophy.

The second section: The philosophical grammatical concept of the nature of the tool.

I discussed the concept of the tool in grammar, the conceptual classification difference of the tool among ancient grammarians, and the conceptual classification difference among ancient grammarians in some letters.

Research results

Clarifying the philosophical grammatical origins for understanding and classifying the functional parts in the structures and compositions of the Arabic language; which helps in a deep understanding of the grammatical and morphological rules, partial and comprehensive.

Recommendations

The study recommends shedding light on the philosophical grammatical methods for classifying the functional parts in the Arabic language, in an accurate manner that sometimes distinguishes between them and sometimes combines them; in a way that helps in knowing the reasons for this distinction or unification, and directing grammatical education in a way that enhances the students' understanding of these concepts.

References

The study references are represented in the mothers of grammatical works and old controversial grammatical works, and what was written on the subject of articles published in solid scientific journals. The first section: The grammatical and philosophical concept of the nature of the sign

The concept of the sign in grammar

The sign is the information (the feature), and it is what is used to reveal the

special meanings of something (Mustafa Al-Riyat, Abdul Qadir and others, 1972), such as the leading Alif and Taa that come at the end of the word and indicate its nominative and that it is a sound feminine plural (Ibn Aqil, 1980), such as: Taleba Talebaat. The sign in this definition is evidence of the essence of the thing and what distinguishes it from others, and thus includes tools, some pronouns, and some letters. If one of us defines the investigators of the book Al-Jinna Al-Dani fi Huruf Al-Ma'ani) for tools, that they are letters and what is similar to them from nouns, verbs, and circumstances (Al-Muradi (1991); then it includes most signs.

This agrees with what was stated by the author (Al-Hariri, 2005)

And the letter is what does not have a sign, so compare it to my saying that it is a sign i.e. what is not distinctive from others: the verb and the noun; since each of them has signs that distinguish it from others.

The sign is also applied to the single word with a lexical concordant meaning, and the organized sentence with a syntactic meaning in the written unit (Muhammad and Al-Fahl, 2014). However, what is enumerated in this study is its meaning and first use.

What is the nominal sign in ancient and modern grammatical philosophy?

A. The distinguishing feature of the noun and the indication of its essence (nominalism):

Ibn Malik (Ibn Al-Wardi, 2008 By the accusative, tanween, the vocative, the definite article, and the predicate of the noun, a distinction is obtained The signs that enter on nouns in particular (Bashd, 2014); their nature (nominal) is established (Ibn Al-Wardi, 2008)

1. Signs of accusative The accusative tools in the Arabic language have no place in parsing, but rather have a semantic meaning without them; as they drag the meaning of what comes before them (the agent) to what comes after them (the noun that they enter) (Zamzam, 2018), and they are active tools and bring the accusative mark. An example of this is the preposition (fi) in our saying: I put the book in the drawer, it dragged the meaning of placing found in the verb (wad'at) to the object, the word (the drawer).

2. The sign of notation The notation is a sign of inflection and evidence of empowerment and inflection, and it is an effect of the agent, an example of which is the notation in the word (men) in our saying I saw men, so the notation in it indicates that it is an inflected word not an infinitive, and that it is inflected and not prevented from inflection.

3. Signs of calling The tools of calling are signs of the nominal nature of the word that it enters into; because it does not decompose into other words (Al-Siyali, (2017), and it has semantic meanings with what it enters into, and some of it has a position in inflection. An example of which is the humma before the word (zaid) in our saying: Azid go to your house, indicating the proximity of the one calling, proximity really or morally. And (O) in our saying: O man, listen to my words. It is in the accusative case as a direct object of a verb whose meaning is: I call.

4. The sign of attribution to the word - attributing the predicate to the subject and the verb to the agent, so attribution to the word is a sign of the nominality of the word, and it is a syntactic meaning of syntax, an example of which is attributing going to the moving taa' that is the agent in our saying: I went.

5. The sign (al) in all its types (non-relative and interrogative, such as the horse from the non-rational, and the boy for the rational (Al-Azhari, 2000).

B Indicating its type

A.In the masculine: The absence of the sign of femininity in the word, whether it is the silent feminine taa or the shortened or extended feminine alif is a sign of the masculinity of the word, and this is like our saying: (ذهب) without the silent feminine taa; indicating the masculinity of the word, and that it is an event issued by a masculine, and like our saying: (أكبر) without the shortened alif at the end of the word; indicating the masculinity of the word, and that it is a description of a masculine (Saada, 2023, Mardasi, 2023).

B. In the feminine: The silent open feminine taa (the opposite of the connected), in such as: (ذهب) is a sign of the femininity of the word, and that it is an event issued by a feminine, and it is a sign that has no place in parsing.

C. In equality: The absence of the feminine marker from some adjectives that are in the form fa'il, such as: shaheed, and in the form fa'il, such as dhamer, and in the form mifa'al, such as mukthar, and in the form fa'ul, such as arous; is a sign of equality between the sexes and unity of origin (bu) Baqar, 2012). This is expressed by the zero morpheme (Abdel Dayem, 2007).

C-The number indicator

1. In the dual: (a) y: The alif and ya in the dual are not part of the

word in which they occur, such as al-waladaan and al-waladain, but rather they are a sign of inflection, meaning that they are an effect of the operator, just as they are a sign of duality (al-Azri, 2019), and they do not have meaning in themselves 9. Ibn Hisham, n.d.

2. In the sound masculine plural (w) y) the waw and ya are not part of the word in which they occur, such as al-qa'imun and al-qa'imin, but rather they are a sign of inflection; meaning that they are an effect of the operator, just as they are a sign of the plural of masculine (al-Azri, 2019), and they do not have meaning in themselves. (Ibn Aqil, 1980).

3. In the sound feminine plural (at), the alif and the ta are two additional letters to the root of the word that they enter into, such as the qa'imat; they are a sign of the femininity of the plural (Al-Ahmadi, (2017), so they are not part of the root of the word, nor are they a sign of inflection, nor do they have meaning in themselves (Ibn Aqil, 1980).

D. The evidence that the noun can be inflected with a fatha and its prevention from tanween is a sign of its prevention from inflection, and that it is in a position that is not possible (Ajeel, 2021), such as in the word (masajid), in: We prayed in many mosques.

The following are the actual signs in ancient and modern grammatical philosophy

What distinguishes it from others, and indicates its nature, Ibn Malik says:

"Bata fa'ala" and "atat" and "ya if'ali" and "nun aqbalna" are verbs that are revealed. (Ibn Aqil, 1980). The past tense of verbs with "ta" and "sm" with "nun" is the imperative verb if it is an imperative verb.

Other than them, the letter "kahl" and "fi" is the present tense verb that follows "lam" and "kishm".

1. The silent feminine taa, the silent open taa in such as (تَبَذ) is a sign of feminization of the verb (Awad, 2015, and a sign of the verbality of the word, and it has no syntactic position and does not have a meaning in itself (Munawar, 2020).

2. The active taa, the moving taa in such as (تَبَرَض) is a sign of the verbality of the word, and it has a syntactic position, and its connection to the verb is a sign of its nominality by way of (attribution), so it is a definite noun (pronoun), and a sign of its nominality is attributing the verb to it (Abdul Rahman, 2023).

3. The nun of emphasis The nun of emphasis, in such as (التهبن) is a sign that distinguishes the verb from the noun, and it is a sign of the verb as an imperative verb; if it indicates with its connection to it the command and it does not have a syntactic position, and it has no meaning in itself.

4. **The yaa of the addressee:** The yaa of the addressee in such as (اذهبي) is a sign of the verbality of the word, this letter Ya has a grammatical position; it is in the place of the subject's nominative case and has no meaning in itself. Its connection to the verb is a sign of its nominative status by way of attribution; it is a definite noun (pronoun), and the sign of its nominative status is the attribution of the verb to it. These four signs come as synonyms for the affixed sign in the modern morphological lesson (Al-Sharqawi, 2020).

5. **Nawasib:** The tools of Nasb are active tools, and they have meanings in themselves: an, lan, ki, idhan, lam ta'leel, hatta, and they are signs of the verbal nature of the word they enter into (Al-Aqeel, 2022); they only enter into verbs; so we say: I want to go, I will not go, he came to us so that we can go, then we go, let us go, until we go. (Abu Hayyan, 1998).

6. **Jazm:** The tools of Jazm are active tools, and they have meanings in themselves: lam, lama, lam of command, la of prohibition. Signs of the verbal nature of the word they enter into; they only enter into verbs (Jabarti, 2022); We say: We did not go when we go to go do not go (Hassan, nd.)

The following are the nominal and verbal signs in ancient and modern grammatical philosophy:

Coming as a synonym for the literal affix in the noun and verb, in addition to the first four signs

1. The letters of the present tense: The group in the word) Anet, and they are the letters that come at the beginning of the present tense verb, we say: I go, we go, he goes, she goes, she goes, and they are signs according to the Basran grammarians (Ibn Aqil, 1980); as evidence of their being part of the word, and according to the Kufic grammarians they are tools that raise the present tense verb by themselves (Daif, 2008); on the claim of their increase, which is a rejected doctrine according to some grammarians; because if the letters of the present tense were tools that work to raise the present tense verb that they enter - as they say - then the present tense verb would not be made jussive by the tools of jussive. The present tense verb is not allowed to be

149

Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología del Ejercicio y el Deporte. Vol. 20, n° 2 (2025)

made nasb by the nasb tools, because the factors do not enter into the factors in the Arabic language (Al-Anbari, n.d.). They are signs that indicate absent signs, by estimation and concealment, which is what is expressed by the absent morpheme or the zero morpheme (Abdul-Dayem, 1422). In the words "aqum," "naqum," "taqwum," and "yaqūm," the subject is a hidden pronoun estimated as "I," "you," "he," or "we" (Ibn Aqil, 1980), which is the absent morpheme, or what is called the absent sign (Abdul-Dayem, 1422).

2. The presence of the "nūn" in the five present tense verbs is a sign of the i'rāb, i.e. an effect of the absence of the factor and its being free of the nasb and jazm in the example of our saying "the students memorize." The presence of the "nūn" in the present tense verb here is an effect of its absence and its being free of the nasb and jazm. The absence of the letter "nun" from the five verbs is a sign of the effect of an accusative or jussive factor (Abd al-Dayem, 1422), as in our saying: "lan yadhhabu" (they will not go), "wa in thahabu" (if you go), and "la thahabna" (the deaf, 2021). Or a sign of construction in the imperative verbs, such as our saying: "go". And there is a disagreement between the two schools (the Basran and Kufian schools on: Is i'rab a vowel or a letter? The Kufian school of thought: i'rab is a vowel and a letter (al-Suyuti, 1316), and the Basran school of thought: i'rab is a vowel, and everything else is based on it (al-Damamini, 1403), Ibn Ya'ish branched off from it, 1422). Some grammarians add sukun to the vowels and make it the origin "and i'rab with vowel and sukun is the origin, and the letter and deletion replace them" (al-Zajjaji, 1402). This is in addition to the comment (Hamasa, n.d.).

3. Attached pronouns are subject pronouns, such as the moving taa in (I hit), and accusative pronouns, such as the haa in (hit him), and genitive pronouns, such as the kaf in (ilayk), and the attribution to it and its genitive is a sign of its being a noun (Masrour, 2010).

4. Signs of inflection: Effects of factors on objects, such as the fatha on the boy) in our saying: Zaid hit the boy, and sometimes they are effects of the absence of other factors in the factors, and a sign that these factors and objects are variable and inflected, such as the damma on both (yadhhab) and (al-talib) in our saying: yadhhab al-talib (Ibn Jinni, n.d.); so their titles are linked to the action (Hamasah, n.d.).

5. Construction signs: They are not an effect of the factors in the transactions, but rather they are signs of the stability of the word sign, and that it is built on it in all its positions in the structure (Hamasa, n.d.), whether they are nouns, such as: مَاذح, or verbs, such as: بـهذ or letters such as نم (Nizal, 2010).

6. Common signs between the noun and the verb: raising and lowering, and others specific to the noun: the genitive. And others specific to the verb of the jussive. So the accusative, genitive, raising and jussive are signs specific to the declension. The declension is for the established nouns, the active participles, and the present tense verbs that begin with the four augmented letters: the hamza, the ta', the ya', and the nun (Sibawayh, 1988). As for the fat-ha, the kasra, the damma and the stop, they are signs of the construction (Sibawayh, 1988).

7. The signs of inflection are apparent, estimated, deleted, and absent (Al-Saeedi, 2021), and vowels and letters (Al-Bar, 2021), and they are summarized in fifteen signs (Al-Sabban, nd.), which are inflection (Al-Radhi, 1975).

The second section: The philosophical grammatical concept of the nature of the tool

The concept of the tool in grammar

The tool is the word used to connect speech, or to indicate a meaning in other words, such as "al" which comes for definition in the noun, or reception in the verb (the mediator), and such as the tools of the accusative, as well as the letter corresponding to the noun and verb.

The conceptual classification difference of the tool among ancient grammarians:

First: According to Sibawayh

The term tool was used by Sibawayh for letters, and this is consistent with its lexical meaning, which is the tool used. The tool often appears in grammar to mean the word, whether it was a noun, verb, or letter (Al-Nahhas, 1399), and the word is a tool for linguistic expression.

This means that Sibawayh used the term "tool" for what performed a moral function in general, whether it performed the meaning in itself, the noun and verb, or in other words, the letter, and whether it was an agent or not.

Second: According to Ibn Hisham

As for Ibn Hisham, the tool for him is what conveys a general functional meaning, and was an agent of the verb in its accusative; so he did not mention the word tool except for:

A. The exceptions; because they are either verbs (laysa la yakun),

or nouns (ghair) and (sawa), or they differ in their verbality ('ada), (khala), (khala), (hasha), or they are letters (illa), and they differ in their nature; some grammarians have gone to the view that they are the ones that themselves make the noun that comes after them accusative (Ibn Hisham, 1404); which elevates this word to the level of performance and direct action, and gives it the description of a tool, and some grammarians have gone to the view that they are a letter that carries the meaning of exception, and they are not the ones that make the noun that comes after them accusative.

B. The letter of address (ya); because when he came to the statement about the accusative of the called, mentioning several opinions, he mentioned in one of them: that the agent is the letter of address by way of substitution for the verb, and its replacement, and the called is similar to the object, then when he came to mention the other statement, which is that the agent is the letter itself, he said: that it is the tool of address. And in it is a subtle distinction, and in places other than those two, he used to say with the letters to get out of the circle of disagreement.

For this consideration, Ibn Hisham avoided saying with the tool in the accusatives and the jussives to say with the letters; and likewise what included the meaning of the letters from the names and circumstances Ibn Hisham, 1404); Because the tool, according to him, is what establishes by itself what comes after it of the names in particular

Third: According to the authors of the books of the letters of meanings and those who followed them from the modernists:

On the approach of Al-Muradi in his book (Al-Jinn Al-Dani fi Huruf Al-Ma'ani) and those with him who wrote about the letters of meanings, such as Al-Rummani in his book (Ma'ani Al-Huruf), and Al-Zajjaji in his book (Huruf Al-Ma'ani), and Al-Harawi in His book (Al-Azhiyya) in the science of letters), modern linguists such as Abdul-Hayy Kamal in his book Letters of Meanings, and Mustafa Al-Nahhas in his book (Studies in Grammatical Tools) went on to say that all of these words are tools; that is because the tool, according to them, is what indicates a general functional meaning: negation, confirmation, question, command, prohibition, presentation, incitement, wish, hope, question, call, conditional prohibition, possible condition, oath, lamentation, distress, exclamation (Hassan, 1973).

Thus, the tools of meaning are those that enter into sentences, to indicate a meaning that was not in the sentence before the tool entered it, such as the tools of negation, confirmation, and question.

As for the linking tools, they are those that link between individual words within the sentence, such as: conjunctions, and prepositions, accompaniment, exception, explanation, and source, etc. (Al-Nahhas, 1399).

The conceptual classification difference among ancient grammarians in some Letters

First: The grammarians differed in the nature of the letters of relief (seen and sawaf) that enter the present tense verb: Some Arabic grammarians considered the seen and sawaf that enter the present tense verb as tools; this is because the seen and sawaf, when entering the present tense verb, prevented other factors from entering it (Al-Mubarrad, n.d.), and it is known that factors in Arabic do not enter factors, so it is as if they are the ones that made it nominative, in addition to the fact that the present tense verb is parsed according to its origin; due to the occurrence of syntactic meanings on it Ibn Hisham, nd. So the seen and sawaf, by their indication of the future, are from these meanings, so when it is connected to them, it is stripped of what it makes accusative and jussive, not stripped of what Ibn Hisham makes nominative, n.d., even though the seen has become part of it.

In the school of Kufi grammarians, headed by Al-Kisa'i, in contrast to the school of Basra grammar (Sibawayh) The letter "lam" in the negative present tense verb (ma) kan li-yaf'al is the one that raises the verb by itself, and the letter "sin" in the positive present tense verb (sayyaf'al) is the one that raises the verb by itself. Based on this, Al-Kisa'i concluded that the letters of the present tense (a), n, y, t, are the ones that raise the present tense verb by themselves.

Sibawayh's words compare the affirmative phrase "kana syaf a'al" with the negative phrase "ma kan liyaf'al", in that the first must be negated by the second, because what is with it must be negated by a non-working letter with a non-working letter, according to his doctrine that the present tense verb "liyaf'al" is not accusative by the lam attached to it, but rather by an implied "an", so the implied is: because he does. The present tense verb (sīfa`al) is not raised by the connected sin, but rather because it is free of the factors of nasb and jazm (Sībawayh, d. (t.); the factor of raising in the present tense verb is the absence of the factors of nasb and jazm; according to his school of thought, there are no factors of raising.

Second: The difference of grammarians in the nature of the letters of the present tense

Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología del Ejercicio y el Deporte. Vol. 20, nº 2 (2025)

150

Al-Kisa'i, the founder of the Kufi grammatical school, believed that the present tense verb was only parsed by the letters of the present tense, collected in the word (ānit), but this school of thought is weak; because if the letters of the present tense were the ones that work the raising in the present tense verb, then the jazm and naḥsib would not be allowed to enter it; since in the Arabic language, a factor does not enter upon a factor.

According to Al-Kisa'i's school of thought, the letters of the present tense are tools, and according to the Basrans' school of thought, they are signs; because they do not work according to them, in addition to coming as part of the word (Al-Anbari, 2003). This show As a result, Al-Suyuti followed the Kufian school of thought in introducing the sin, sawf, and the letters of the present tense in the tools when enumerating them.

Research results

From the above, we conclude the following

First, about the nature of signs in Arabic grammatical philosophy

1. The sign in the Arabic language may be one of the functions of inflection; by indicating the change that occurs to the word without transferring it from its verbal section (noun), verb, or letter, and this change occurs in the Arabic word in what is known as morphological genders, which are: Type: the type of the word in terms of nominal, verbal, and literal, number: singular, dual, plural, gender, masculine, feminine, and an example of a word changing its type: its transfer from the source to the active participle, or the passive participle, or the exaggerated form, for example: ضرب ضرب مَرِبو, بورِ. An example of a word changing in number is its transition from singular to dual, or plural in its various types: sound masculine plural, sound feminine plural, broken plural, example: student, two students, students, female students, students. An example of a word changing in terms of person: its transition from masculine to feminine, example: striker, striker; so the sign in some of these types of change indicates a meaning, and in some of them it is an effect of the factor.

2. The sign in the Arabic language may be in the absence of a distinguishing sign for the word from others, as in letters that do not have a meaning in themselves but in others, and they transfer the meaning and function of what precedes them to what comes after them, such as prepositions that were named this because they drag the meaning of what precedes them to what comes after them.

3. The sign in the Arabic language can be a single letter, such as the silent feminine taa, in the example: qara'a, and the sign can also be a compound letter, such as (ka'ayn) in the saying of the Almighty: (and how many a village). The sign can be a vowel of inflection or construction; In parsing, it is said: The sign of its nominative is the damma, the sign of its accusative is the fatha, the sign of its genitive is the kasra, the sign of its jussive is the sukoon. And in construction, it is said: built on the damma, built on the fatha, built on the kasra, built on the sukoon.

4. Changing or maintaining the sign in the Arabic language is evidence of the type of word, whether it is inflected or uninflected. The sign of an inflected word changes with a change in its position and the factors affecting it, such as the word (student); we say: The student came, raising the word student, and I saw the student, in the accusative case, and: I passed the student, in the genitive case, student. As for the uninflected word, it is maintained on one sign in all its grammatical positions, such as the word (Sibawayh); we say: Sibawayh came (subject) and I saw Sibawayh (object), and I passed Sibawayh (noun inflected with the preposition ba), in the construction of the word on the kasra in all its grammatical positions.

5. The sign in Arabic derivatives indicates other signs, some of which are qualitative, and some of which are structural, such as the word (the patient) which has the sign (al) indicating the definition of the word, and its entry on the active participle indicates that it is a relative; So (the patient ones mean those who are patient, and the waw in the word (the patient ones) is a sign that the word is inflected and raised, and that it is a sound masculine plural, and the nun in it is a sign that the word is not added to what comes after it.

6. The signs in the Arabic language come as independent words, such as the tools of nasb: an, lan, ki, and they have no place in parsing, or as part of a non-independent word, and they have no parsing, as in the letters of the present tense: (a, n, y, t), or part of the word and has syntactic inflection, as in the attached pronouns, such as the moving taa in (قَرآت) and the closed haa in (قنه). This is based on the morphological unit).

7. The sign in the Arabic language is not originally in the structure of the word to which it is attached, and by entering into words it works to construct their meaning, such as the dual alif entering the word (الطالبان) as a sign of its nominative case (syllable inflection) and that the word is dual (number inflection).

8. The sign in the Arabic language may be the effect of the grammatical factor in terms of its syntactic movement, such as the kasra in the word (الطالب), in our saying: I passed by the student, or the sign may be the structural indication, such as the sukoon in the word (من), or the stability of the syntactic letter, such as the nun in the word (يذوذُن), in our saying: الآلا نولمُ هَذَ بيَتْمُهُ. In Arabic, both "seen", "sawf", and "al" are considered synonymous signs for the affix (Abdul-Baqi, 2021), although "al" is a tool (Nasr, 2008).

9. The presence of the sign in the Arabic language is sometimes necessary and sometimes not necessary, such as: the feminine taa' that is necessary for the verb when the subject is a real feminine, so we say "ja'at Hind" and it is not necessary for the verb if the subject is a metaphorical feminine that comes after the verb, such as: "tamsah nar" or "yamsah nar".

10. The deletion of the letters of inflection in the Arabic language changes the meaning, such as: the alif of the dual, the waw of the group, and the yaa in the plural of correction for the masculine and the dual. As for the signs of inflection: the vowels and what is equivalent to them, such as the nun in the five verbs, the meaning is not changed by deleting them.

11. The presence of the sign in the noun or in the verb in the Arabic language is an indication of its branching from the root, considering that the branch is what indicates the root and an increase, such as the presence of The alif in (striker) is evidence of the subsidiary of the active participle from the root (source) (striker).

12. In the Arabic language, the diacritical mark is unified in the noun in the accusative and genitive cases with the fatha, and preventing it from tanween is a sign of preventing it from being declined, such as (mosques) in our saying: We passed by many mosques.

13. The mark in the Arabic language comes explicitly as in the proper nouns, such as the damma on (Zayd), and it also comes estimated, as in the defective and maqsurah nouns, such as the damma on (Musa) and (Qadi).

14. The mark in the Arabic language comes verbally, and it also comes semantically, such as preventing the noun from being declined as a sign of its inability to fit into its category. 16 - The mark in the Arabic language can be a cause, as in the diacritical marks, and it can also be a reason, as in the scientific description that causes the noun to be prevented from being declined; so its sign is that it is inability.

Secondly, about the nature of tools in Arabic grammatical philosophy

1. The working tools in the Arabic language are not part of the word, even if they can be cast with it in a source, such as (an), and as for the non-working, such as (al), it comes as part of the word.

2. (al) in the Arabic language is considered a tool; because of its many important meanings that come upon it, such as covenant, gender, perfection, truth, presence, dominance, hint of the attribute, the necessary redundant, the redundant for necessity, a substitute for the pronoun, a substitute for the hamza, emphasis and the relative that means which.

3. The tools attached to the noun in the Arabic language are either:

A - To lower it to the status of a part or not, if it lowers it to the status of a part it does not work, otherwise it has the right to work; because what is attached to something and is not like a part of it usually affects it, and if it works, its origin is to work the genitive; Because its function is specific to the noun, and the tools do not work in the accusative and nominative except because it resembles what they work, such as (in) and its sisters that work in the accusative in the noun and the nominative in the predicate because they resemble verbs in their meanings.

4. The tools specific to the verb in the Arabic language are either lowered from it to the position of a part or not, if they are lowered from it to the position of a part they do not work like the letters of relief that are a sign of its type (present tense verb), and if they are not lowered from it to the position of a part then it is right for them to work, and if they work then their origin is to work the jussive; because the jussive in the verb is similar to the genitive in the noun.

5. The tool in the Arabic language may mean the pronoun that has a place in parsing, as in the saying of Ibn Malik: And if you attribute to a tool a ruling then judge or parse and make it a noun.

6. It is possible in the Arabic language to count both the seen and the saw as tools considering them to be working, and their function in preventing others from working; this is because preventing from working is a type of work.

7. The tool in the Arabic language comes estimated, working or not working, and it also comes apparent.

8. In the Arabic language, the tools specific to the verb do not work in

Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología del Ejercicio y el Deporte. Vol. 20, nº 2 (2025)

151

the accusative case except because they resemble the tools that work in the accusative case in nouns, such as: (an) the verbal noun that makes the verb accusative, similar to it, which makes the noun accusative (in and its sisters), and if it were not for this similarity, it would be right to be in the jussive case.

9. The common tools in the Arabic language do not work in the accusative case because they are not specific to something, such as: the interrogative hamza that comes before the verb; so we say: Is Zaid going? And before the noun; so we say: Is Zaid going? Third: About the commonalities between the tools and signs in Arabic grammatical philosophy:

10. The tools are active and non-active, the active ones are like the tools of the accusative case, and the non-active ones are like (al), while the sign is not active at all.

11. The sign has a semantic function, while the tool's function is either purely semantic or grammatical semantic, like the tools of the jussive case.

12. The sign has no meaning when it is singular, while the tool, some of them have meaning when it is singular, such as (lan), and some of them do not have meaning when it is singular; it has no meaning except when it is attached, such as (al) and the ba of attachment. Don't you see that if you say the boy, they understand from attaching (al) to the noun, the definition, and if you say (al) singular, no meaning is understood from it? If it is paired with the noun, it indicates definition, and likewise the ba of the genitive does not indicate attachment except if it is added to the noun.

13. The tool may come as an extra without meaning, such as the ba in the agent of kafa, in our saying: sufficed by Zaid, and the sign does not come as an extra meaning.

14. Considering the morphological unit, the tool is a word or part of a word, while the sign is not a word.

15. It is possible to apply a tool to every sign as it indicates something, and it is possible to apply a sign to every tool as it indicates the essence of the thing. 7- It is possible to differentiate between tools and signs in terms of what pertains to each of them, in terms of work or lack thereof, and in terms of whether it is a trace of the worker or he is the worker.

References

1. Munawar, Ahmed. (2020). Word and Sentence in the Arabic Language JURNAL SHAUT (8). DOI: 10.24252/saa.v8i2.17958. 2550-0317 ALARABIYAH

2. Abdul Hamid, Muhammad Muhyi al-Din. (2009) Explanation of Qatr al-Nada and Bal al-Sada by Ibn Hisham (no date). Dar al-Tala'i'

3. Al-Farizi, Muhammad. (2018) Explanation of Imam al-Farizi on Alfiyyah Ibn Malik (1st ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.

4. Mustafa, Ibrahim al-Zayat, Ahmad Abdul Qadir, Hamid (1972). Al-Mu'jam al-Wasit (2nd ed.). The Islamic Library.

5. Ibn Aqil, Abdullah (1980). Explanation of Ibn Aqil on Alfiyyah Ibn Malik (2nd ed.). Dar Misr for Printing.

6. Al-Muradi, Al-Hassan. (1991). Al-Jana Al-Dani fi Huruf Al-Ma'ani. Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyyah. Al-Hariri, Al-Qasim. (2005). Melhat Al-I'rab. Dar Al-Salam.

7. Ali Muhammad I., & Al-Fahl. M. (2018). Linguistic signs and cultural references in the novels of Al-Tayeb Salih "A research paper in cultural criticism Journal of Education College Wasit." University, 1(17), 36-71. https://doi.org/10.31185/eduj.Vol1.Iss17.303

8. Ibn Al-Wardi, Omar. (2008). Explanation of Ibn Malik's Alfiyyah. Al-Rushd Library.

9. Ali Karim Nashed. 2014. Signs of the noun in the Arabic language Journal of the College of Education for Girls, Vol. 25, Iss. 3, pp. 815-825 https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-410357

10. Zamzam Khadija Subhi. (2018). Displacement in prepositions: An applied study on the Quranic text. Journal of the College of Dar Al-Ulum, No. 111, 311-365 Retrieved from: http://search.mandumah.com/Record/974180

11. Al-Siyali, Muhammad bin Najm bin Awad (2017) Signs of the noun. Journal of the College of Dar Al-Ulum, No. 99. 81-124 http://search.mandumah.com/Record/825525

12. Al-Azhari, Khalid (2000). The statement of the content of clarification in grammar. Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyyah Saada B., & Mardasi J. (2023) Arabic morphology between the phenomenon and the method: A reading of the thought of Dr. Muhammad Abdul Aziz Abdul Dayem through his book The Linguistic Theory in the Arab Heritage. Qiraat Magazine, .210-220, (15) 1 http://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/235039), number(1), journal pages(210-220).

13. Boubaker, Omar. (2012). The phenomenon of gender (masculinity and femininity) A linguistic approach. Al-Athar, No. 13, 21 http://search.mandumah.com/Record/4567479 -

14. Abdel-Dayem, Mohamed Abdel-Aziz. (2007). The feature of femininity in Arabic, the absence of the mark in attributes. Journal of the Faculty of Dar Al-Ulum, No. 41, pp. 151-207 http://search.mandumah.com/Record/145511

15. Al-Azri, Issa. (2019. The significance of affixes in the Arabic language The Arabic Language The Supreme Council for the Arabic Language, Issue 43, 75-106. 10.33705/0114-000-043-003. http://search.mandumah.com/Record/957300

16. Abdul Hamid, Muhammad. (2009) Explanation of Qatar Al-Nada and Bal Al-Sada by Ibn Hisham Al-Ansari.

17. Al-Ahmadi, Wiam Musaed (2017). Affixes and their effect on the syntactic and semantic structure of the verb. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Vol. 1, Issue 6, 26-35 http://search.mandumah.com/Record/858063 110.26389/AJSRP.W250817

18. Ajeel, Maryam Ali. 2021. The Undeclinable According to Abdul Rahman Al-Suhaili (d. 581). Journal of The Iraqi University, Vol. 29, No. 52, Vol. 2, pp. 387-398 https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-1371582

19. Bani, Nidal. (2015). A Study of the Phenomenon of Masculinity and Femininity in Semitic and European Languages and How to Benefit from It in Teaching Languages Journal of the Faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University, No. 162, 673-688. jsrep.journals.ekb.eg

20. Abdul Rahman, Baha El-Din (2023). Signs of the noun, verb and letter, a semiotic approach. Al-Aloka Network - Writer's Section. Date added 5/28/2023. P. 17.

21. Al-Sharqawi, Mustafa. (2020). Sections of the word and signs of the noun, verb and letter. Al-Aloka Literary and Linguistic Network. Date added 12/15/2020.

22. Al-Aqil, Munira. (2022 The nasb of the present tense verb in Surat Al-Ma'idah "An analytical study". The Arab Journal Madad (6(17) 1198-2022.2146.doi:10.21608/mdad .

23. Al-Andalusi, Abu Hayyan. (1998). Irtishaf Al-Darb min Lisan Al-Arab. Al-Khanji Library.

24. Jabarti, Osama. (2022) Jazm of the present tense verb between the ancients and the moderns, presentation and study. Faculty of Arabic Language in Girga. (26)3 doi: 2-2428383 10.21608/bfag.2022.167676.1183

25. Hassan, Abbas. (n.d.). Al-Nahw Al-Wafi. Dar Al-Maaref.

26. Daif, Shawqi. (2008). Grammar Schools (11th ed.). Dar Al-Maaref.

27. Al-Anbari, Abdul Rahman. (2003). Equity in the issues of disagreement between Basran and Kufi grammarians. Modern Library.

28. Al-Dabar, Abdul Mawla. (2021). Deleting the Noon of the Five Verbs in the Nominative Case. Journal of Human Sciences. http://dspace.elmergib.edu.ly/xmlui/handle/123456789/1326

29. Al-Suyuti, Jalal Al-Din. (1316). Similarities and Analogies in Grammar. Printing Press of the Council of the Department of Encyclopedias.

30. Al-Damamini, Muhammad. (1983). Commentary on Al-Fara'id on Facilitating Benefits. n.d.

31. Ibn Ya'ish, Muwaffaq Al-Din. (2002). Explanation of Al-Mufassal. Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyyah.

32. Al-Zajjaji, Abu Al-Qasim. (1982). Al-Idah fi Ilal Al-Nahw. Dar Al-Nafayes.

33. Hamasa, Muhammad. (n.d.). The diacritical mark in the sentence between the old and the modern. Dar Ghareeb.

34. Masrour, Muhammad. (2010). Connected pronouns in the Arabic language: Are they elements that match nouns or alternatives to them? Journal of King Saud University (Languages and Translation) - Saudi Arabia: Vol. 22: No. 2.https://yarab.yabesh.ir/yarab/handle/yad/209282

35. Ibn Jinni, Othman. (n.d.). Characteristics. Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi.

36. Nazzal, Nibal Nabil Salim. 2010. Phonetic interpretations of noun construction marks in the Arabic language. Al-Manara for Research and Studies, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 9-32. https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-327239

37. Sibawayh, Othman. (n.d.). The Book. Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyyah

38. Al-Saeedi, Ahmed Khadir Abbas Al-Ali. 2012. The female scholar's partner and its impact on directing the meaning in the interpretation of Al-Bahr Al-Muhit. Al-Ameed, Vol. 2012, Issue (s1), pp. 261-310. https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-673584

39. Al-Bar, Ibtihal Muhammad, & Al-Ghamdi, Hind Ali Muhammad. (2021). The female scholar of grammar between the ancients and the moderns: A study in the styles of (calling, exclamation, praise and blame, enticement and warning). Journal of the College of Dar Al-Ulum, 38(136,)277-320. doi: 10.21608/mkda.2021.224833

40. Al-Sabban, Muhammad. (1997). Al-Sabban's commentary on Al-Ashmouni's explanation of Ibn Malik's Alfiyyah. Dar Ihya Al-Kutub Al-Arabiyyah.

41. Al-Radi, Muhammad. (1975). Al-Radhi's Explanation of Al-Kafiya by Al-Ban Al-Hajeb. University of Qar Yunis.

42. Al-Nahhas, Mustafa, and Ashour, Al-Munsif. (1983). Studies in grammatical tools. Annals of Tunisian University, 22, 219-222. http://search.mandumah.com/Record/127891

43. Ibn Hisham, Abdullah. (n.d.). The clearest paths to Ibn Malik's Alfiyyah. The Modern Library.

44. Hassan, Tamam. (1973). The meaning and structure of the Arabic language. The Egyptian General Book Authority.

45. Abdul-Baqi. (2021). Abbas, Prefixes and Suffixes in Arabic. Journal of Linguistic Issues. Vol. 2. No. 3. 129-146. https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/207269

46. Nasr, Jamal. (2008). Seen and Sof between origin and meaning: A study and application on what came in the Holy Quran. The Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Arts. 28.131-199.

47. Al-Rafi'i, Abu Elias. (2010). Books written on grammatical disagreement. The Scientific Council, Al-Alukah Magazine. Majles.alukah.net/show