

Causal Relationships According to Jurisprudents and Rhetoricians

Bekhti Abdelkader¹, Ghalem Mohamed², Bouchena Omar³

^{1,2,3} Laboratory of Linguistic and Literary Practices in the Algerian Desert Regions and their Extensions on the African Coast, University of Tamanghasset (Algeria).

E-mail of Authors: ¹bekhti.abdelkader@univ-tam.dz, ²ghalem.mohamed@univ-tam.dz,
³bouchena.omar@univ-tam.dz

Received: 11/2024, Published: 12/2024

Abstract:

Words are vessels of meanings; they may overflow with literal meanings or with the meaning of the meaning. In the latter case, they expand into a vast space of connotations under various names and numerous terms, including the term "metaphor," which can be approached through language or intellect. If approached through language, it is called a linguistic metaphor, which is of two types: metaphor and metonymy. We have chosen the causal relationships from metonymy to explain their nature according to jurists and rhetoricians.

Keywords: words, causal relationships, jurists, rhetoricians, literal meanings, metaphorical meaning.

Introduction:

The studies of rhetoric are shared topics between scholars of jurisprudence and rhetoric alike. Although rhetoricians have pioneered the foundation and elaboration of these studies, jurists have followed in their footsteps. Some jurists have even expanded and participated in the most intricate and obscure discussions, expressing their opinions on the contentious issues that have arisen among them.

Perhaps the most important topic that rhetoric has focused on is the study of metaphor and its various relationships. This topic has garnered the attention of both scholars of Sharia and rhetoric due to the rulings it entails in matters of worship and creed, and the derivative issues that are the focus of disagreement between jurists and scholars. This has led them to become more rhetorically inclined than rhetoricians themselves; in order to understand the nuances of these issues and reach conclusions they deem closer to correctness.

Given the diverse and varied relationships of metaphor, we have chosen to focus in this research paper on causal relationships. We aim to study them from the perspectives of both rhetoricians and jurists, using a comparative approach that seeks to balance the views of both groups. The goal is to identify the similarities, differences, and overlaps inherent in this research.

Causal Relationships According to Jurists and Rhetoricians:

Metaphor belongs to all linguistic books before it belongs to rhetorical books. Jurists have drawn their study of metaphor from rhetoricians, as acknowledged by scholars in the science of jurisprudence.¹

Abdul-Qahir al-Jurjani was the first to distinguish between metonymy and metaphor.² "Later scholars attempted to define this relationship of association, which Abdul-Qahir did not try to specify in certain relationships. However, their attempts as a whole did not reach a solid truth that we can rely on; they were all incomplete."³

Abdul-Qahir's excuse for not specifying the relationship of association is that he was distinguishing types of metaphor based on the type of observation—the relationship—that is stronger in metaphor and weaker in metonymy.⁴

Al-Sakkaki's criterion for metonymy is: "It is the transference of a word from its original concept to another with the help of context, due to a relationship between them."⁵

Al-Khatib al-Qazwini defined it as: "It is what the relationship between what it is used for and what it is originally meant for is an association other than similarity, such as using 'hand' to mean 'blessing,' because it is usually issued by the hand and reaches the intended recipient."⁶

He then mentioned the condition for using 'hand' to mean 'blessing': "It is required that there be an indication of the giver, so it is not said: 'The hand expanded in the country,' or 'I acquired a hand,' as it is said: 'The blessing expanded in the country,' or 'I acquired a blessing.' Rather, it is said: 'His hand was generous to me,' and 'His hands were many to me...'"⁷

Sayyid Ahmad al-Hashimi defined it as: "It is a word used intentionally in a non-original meaning due to an association other than similarity, with a context indicating the non-original meaning."⁸

Using 'hand' to mean 'blessing' in metonymy requires that the hand be connected to something indicating its owner, such as the masculine pronoun in "His hand was generous to me," indicating his generosity, protection, and care. Sayyid Ahmad al-Hashimi adds the condition of a context preventing the original meaning, and his use of "intentionally" indicates avoiding mistakes and emphasizes the artistic purposes created by shifting the word from its original meaning to its metaphorical meaning.

The relationships of metonymy are not based on similarity and are multiple, unlike metaphor, which is based only on similarity. This division is specific to rhetoricians, while jurists have a different approach.

Most jurists have been keen to mention the relationships, and the difference in the relationships of metaphor has no effect in the science of jurisprudence,⁹ except for what al-Subki mentioned: if a metaphor has two or more relationships and it is possible to use it for each, then according to the jurists, the strongest relationship is considered partiality, where the whole is used to mean a part. They also prioritize final causality over other causes such as material, formal, and efficient causes, and causality over effect.¹⁰

The difference in relationships among rhetoricians has a significant impact on distinguishing types of metaphor from each other into metonymy and metaphor in the same sense, meaning that one is synonymous with the other based on the mere transfer that occurs between the literal and metaphorical meanings.¹¹

In this article, we will limit our discussion to the causal relationships according to jurists and rhetoricians, which are: causality, causation, and mechanism:

1- Causality (Using the Cause to Refer to the Effect):

"It is the state of something being a cause and having an effect on something else".¹²

It means: "Expressing the cause by referring to the effect, where the literal meaning of the word mentioned in the phrase is a cause for its figurative meaning".¹³

Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani explains this relationship by saying: "We grazed the rain, meaning the plants for which the rain is a cause".¹⁴

Al-Khatib Al-Qazwini says: "Among them is naming the effect by the name of the cause, as in their saying: 'We grazed the rain,' meaning the plants for which the rain is a cause".¹⁵

It appears that the relationship in the example "We grazed the rain" is derived from the word "rain" being a cause for the plants.

Thus, "rain" is a metonymy with a causal relationship, because the literal meaning of rain is a cause for its figurative meaning, which is the plants.

The context is "grazed," because we do not literally graze the rain.

Al-Khatib Al-Qazwini mentioned Quranic examples, some of which fall under what is called "mushakala," including the verse: "And the retribution for an evil act is an evil one like it" (Quran 42:40).¹⁶

He explains this verse: "The term 'evil' is used metaphorically for retribution because it is caused by it. It is said that if it is expressed as something that causes sadness, it is not a metaphor because retribution is truly saddening like the crime".¹⁷

It appears from Al-Qazwini's phrase that he weakens this opinion, as he mentions it by saying: "It is said." This Quranic example is studied by others under the relationship labeled "naming something by its opposite," where the literal meaning of the word mentioned in the phrase is the opposite of its figurative meaning. To clarify this, we present some scholars' statements:

Al-Alawi says: "The seventh is naming something by its opposite, as in the verse: 'And the retribution for an evil act is an evil one like it' (Quran 42:40)...¹⁸ If it is permissible to use a single word for two opposites in their language, such as using 'hanif' for both crooked and straight, and 'sudfa' for both light and darkness, then it is permissible to use 'evil' for its retribution as it is used for itself. It can be said that this is a type of metaphorical analogy, because the retribution for an evil act resembles it in being evil, in relation to the one who receives that retribution."¹⁹ He benefits from others like Al-Razi who says:

"The fourth is naming something by its opposite, as in the verse: 'And the retribution for an evil act is an evil one like it' (Quran 42:40)...²⁰ This can be considered a type of metaphorical analogy, because the retribution for an evil act resembles it in being evil, in relation to the one who receives that retribution".²¹

Al-Isfahani explains: "... The point of this statement is that the act which is the retribution for the evil act is not evil, but rather good, because it is just and fair. The first act is evil because it is unjust and oppressive. Naming the act which is the retribution for the first act as 'evil' is due to the opposition between evil and good. It can also be considered a metaphorical analogy because the retribution resembles the first act in being evil, in relation to the one who receives that retribution".²²

Al-Asnawi says about the metaphorical nature of this aspect: "... It can be considered a metaphorical analogy as mentioned in 'Al-Mahsool',²³ because similarity is a condition. It can also be considered literal because it harms the perpetrator. The better example is using 'mufaza' for a deadly desert".²⁴

By examining these statements, we find agreement in their content. The most prominent aspect is using a single word for two opposites, as in using 'evil' for both its retribution and itself. The retribution for an evil act is good because it is just and fair, while the evil act itself is unjust and oppressive. However, the opposition between the evil act and its retribution justifies using the same term for both.

The metaphor here is based on similarity (analogy), which is a condition between the first act (evil) and the second act (its retribution), because the retribution for the evil act harms and angers the wrongdoer, thus it is called 'evil.' Using the term 'evil' for the retribution is considered from a linguistic perspective, not a legal one, because from a legal perspective, it is good. From a linguistic perspective, it can be considered a literal truth because the retribution harms the wrongdoer. Therefore, Al-Asnawi preferred it and favored the example of using 'mufaza' for a deadly desert, driven by optimism. Thus, Al-Asnawi combined the rational methodology of jurisprudence and the rhetorical methodology, while Al-Alawi, being a rhetorician, took a jurisprudential approach, demonstrating the naming of something by its opposite based on the usage in the Arabic language, such as using 'hanif' for both crooked and straight, and 'sudfa' for both light and darkness.

It appears that the relationship of opposition exemplified by the verse: "And the retribution for an evil act is an evil one like it" (Quran 42:40)²⁵ is a form of "mushakala" as indicated by Al-Badakhshi in his statement: "The more apparent view is that it is a form of 'mushakala,' which is expressing something with the word of another due to their association, as in the saying: 'Cook for me a robe and a shirt,' meaning 'sew,' because the mention of cooking preceded it."²⁶

The causal relationship is subdivided among the jurists, as evidenced by Al-Razi's statement: "One of them is using the cause to refer to the effect, and there are four causes: 'the material,' 'the form,' 'the agent,' and 'the purpose.' Examples include:

- Naming something by its material: "The valley flowed."
- Naming something by its form: Calling 'the hand' 'power'.²⁷
- Naming something by its agent: Literally or figuratively, calling 'rain' 'the sky.'
- Naming something by its purpose: Calling 'grapes' 'wine,' and 'marriage contract' 'marriage'.²⁸

This is also indicated by Al-Baydawi in his examples.

Al-Isfahani elaborated on Al-Razi's statement about the causes through the example "the house is a structure,²⁹" which has four causes:

1. **Material Cause:** The means of construction and its primary materials, such as clay and bricks, which are essential earthy materials for building walls, and wood and reeds, which are essential plant materials for making the roof.
2. **Formal Cause:** The shape of the house, its specific design represented in the architecture of the rooms and balconies, and everything that falls under this design, distinguishing it from other buildings like mosques and baths.
3. **Efficient Cause:** Building the house requires a skilled craftsman, known as the builder.
4. **Final Cause:** This is a fundamental condition in every work, which is the intended goal, the benefit, and the material advantage that houses provide, such as protecting humans from harsh natural elements like heat and cold.

Explanation of the four causes:

1. **Material Cause:** Al-Isfahani says: "An example of naming something by its material: 'The valley flowed,' because the water is the flowing substance, but it must flow in its proper place, so the valley is the material for the flowing water. This can also be considered a different type, which is metonymy by omission."³⁰

Al-Amidi says: "By the connection between the literal and the figurative, we mean that the place of the figurative expression is similar to the place of the literal expression... as in their saying: 'The river flowed.'"³¹

Ibn Al-Hajib agreed with this relationship and exemplified it with their saying: "The gutter flowed."³²

From their context, it is understood that these examples are a form of metonymy with an adjacent relationship, but rhetoricians consider it a logical metonymy with a locative or spatial relationship, meaning making the place the agent of the flow due to its similarity to the real agent because it is the place of the action.

Al-Asnawi exemplified this cause with the same example, "The valley flowed," but he considered it a case of naming the state by the place, or a metonymy by omission, estimating the water of the valley.³³

2. **Formal Cause:** Al-Isfahani explained Al-Razi's statement about this cause: "An example of naming something by its form: calling 'the hand' 'power.' The explanation of this type of metonymy is that each organ has a specific form, by which the required action from that organ is completed. For example, the eye has a specific form; if its natural form is diminished or increased, or generally changed, the required action from the eye will change, either by impairment or nullification. That form completes the ability of that organ to perform its required function. Thus, expressing 'the hand' as 'power' metaphorically is expressing the formal cause by its effect."³⁴

This is also what Al-Asnawi mentioned in explaining Al-Baydawi's statement, exemplified by the verse: "The hand of Allah is over their hands" (Quran 48:10).³⁵

An example of the formal cause mentioned by Al-Isfahani is "the eye," and by Al-Asnawi is "the hand," because all organs have a specific form and structure suitable for their natural function. If they deviate from this form, they cannot perform their function, or cannot perform it perfectly if altered. For instance, the hand has a specific form and shape, including the hollow of the palm, the small size of its bones, and the spacing between its fingers, enabling it to grasp objects firmly.

This example was critiqued by Al-Isfahani and Al-Asnawi, who corrected it by saying: "The correct example is naming power as a hand,"³⁶ and Al-Isfahani justified this by saying: "Because power is not the same as the form of the hand, but power is inherent to the form of the hand."³⁷

3. **The Third Cause: Naming by the Agent:** This includes naming "rain as the sky," or saying "the clouds descended," where the clouds are the rain, and the sky is a figurative agent for the rain, while the real agent is God.³⁸

4. **The Fourth Cause: Naming by the Purpose:** This is evident from Al-Isfahani's explanation of Al-Razi's statement: "The author, may God have mercy on him, said: An example of naming something by its purpose is calling grapes 'wine,' and a contract 'marriage,' because the intended purpose of grapes for many people is wine, and the intended purpose of the contract is marriage in the sense of intercourse. This does not negate that procreation and lineage are intended from the contract, as this purpose is only fulfilled through intercourse."³⁹

Al-Amidi says: "By the connection between the literal and the figurative, we mean that the place of the figurative expression is similar to the place of the literal expression... because it usually leads to it, like calling juice 'wine.'"⁴⁰

It appears that Al-Amidi uniquely exemplifies this relationship by saying "calling juice 'wine'," while the common example among others like Al-Razi and Al-Isfahani is "calling grapes 'wine,'" derived from the verse: "Indeed, I see myself pressing wine" (Quran 12:36),⁴¹ meaning grapes that turn into wine. Al-Amidi extended the example from grapes to juice, because grape juice does not become wine immediately upon pressing but requires fermentation, which takes time. This is a metonymy with a relationship of considering what will be.

The examples given by jurists for the formal, agent, and purpose causes are considered metonymy by rhetoricians.

5. **Causation (Using the Effect to Refer to the Cause):** "It is the state of something being an effect and influenced by something else,"⁴² or "expressing the effect by referring to the cause... when the literal meaning of the word mentioned in the phrase is an effect of its figurative meaning."⁴³ Al-Qazwini exemplified this by saying: "The sky rained plants,"⁴⁴ meaning water, as plants are a metonymy with a causative relationship.

The context is "the sky rained," because plants do not literally fall from the sky.

Al-Alawi says: "The second is naming something by what it resembles, like calling severe humiliation 'death,' and severe illness 'death' as well, and similarly for terrifying matters and great horrors. The metaphor is either due to similarity or because it leads to it."⁴⁵

This aligns with the jurists in exemplifying this relationship, including Al-Razi, who says: "Using the name of the effect to refer to the cause, like calling severe illness and great humiliation 'death.' The metaphor here may be due to the similarity between the two."⁴⁶

Al-Isfahani explains the metaphor and its cause by saying: "The cause of the metaphor here may be the similarity between severe illness, great humiliation, and death."⁴⁷

It seems that the meaning of the example is the same for both rhetoricians and jurists, despite the difference in phrasing.

Examples used by jurists to clarify this relationship, followed by Al-Alawi, include calling severe illness 'death,' because illness is a cause of death, and death is an effect or result of severe illness.

What distinguishes the jurists is their prioritization of one relationship over another to determine the legal ruling: "Because a specific cause necessitates a specific effect by its nature, whereas a specific effect does not necessitate a specific cause by its nature."⁴⁸

This is further clarified by Al-Asnawi's statement: "If there is a conflict between the first relationship, which is using the name of the cause to refer to the effect, and the second, which is using the name of the effect to refer to the cause, the first is preferred, because the cause indicates the specific effect, unlike the reverse. For example, urination indicates the invalidation of ablution, but the invalidation of ablution does not indicate urination, as it may be due to touching or other reasons. Since understanding the effect from the cause is closer than the reverse, it is preferred."⁴⁹

It appears that using the cause to refer to the effect is preferred over using the effect to refer to the cause, because the former implies the latter without the reverse. For instance, a specific cause like urination indicates the specific effect of invalidating ablution, while the invalidation of ablution may result from other causes besides urination, such as touching or pre-ejaculate.

3. **Instrumental Relationship:** "It is the state of something being an instrument to convey the effect of something to another."⁵⁰ Or it is: "Expressing the instrument by its effect and what is practiced with it, when the literal meaning of the word mentioned in the phrase is a means and instrument for its figurative meaning."⁵¹

Abdul Qahir explains this relationship by saying: "His hand was generous to me... so you understand that the original meaning is the deeds of his hand, the benefits that come from his hand, and the effects of his hand..."⁵²

Al-Sakkaki believes that the hand is used metaphorically for blessing because blessings are given by it, and for power and strength because power is mostly exerted by the hand.⁵³

Al-Qazwini says: "Among them is naming something by its instrument, as in the verse: 'And We did not send any messenger except [speaking] in the language of his people' (Quran 14:4),⁵⁴ meaning in the language of his people."⁵⁵

He also says: "This is similar to their saying: 'I hit him with a whip,' because they expressed the strike made with the whip by the name of the whip, making the effect of the whip a whip, and they explained it by saying: the meaning is 'I hit him with a whip.'" Al-Qazwini sees in the example:

'I hit him with a whip,' that the intended meaning is the effect of the instrument (the whip), which is the strike.⁵⁶

A scholar comments on Al-Qazwini's statement, expressing his opinion: "In my opinion, there is room for another interpretation, because the mentioned effect, which is the strike, has been explicitly stated, so what is the point of referring to it by the name of the instrument after it has been mentioned? The intended meaning of the word 'whip' depends on the context; the speaker might intend to mention the instrument of the action, specify the number of strikes, downplay the action, or other reasons. Moreover, the strike is not an effect of the whip but an independent event." ⁵⁷

This opinion asserts that the strike is not a result of the whip but an independent event. Others believe that the instrumental relationship can be replaced by the causal relationship because they are closely related and can be merged.⁵⁸ The instrumental relationship is mentioned in the works of jurists, as in their saying: "The nineteenth: the instrument of something,⁵⁹ like the tongue for speech." Al-Zarkashi, paralleling Al-Qazwini, gives an example: "Using the name of the instrument for the thing... as in the verse: 'And We did not send any messenger except [speaking] in the language of his people' (Quran 14:4), meaning in the language of his people." It seems that the examples for this relationship are similar for both groups, and they have named the relationship as instrumental.

Conclusion

From the above, it appears that the name of the relationship is derived from the description of the word in the sentence. Jurists have utilized metonymic relationships to determine legal rulings based on adapting the relationship and extending it over the logical mental space, dividing the cause into material, formal, agent, and purpose causes, and the indication of a specific cause for a specific effect, unlike the reverse. It is also clear that jurists sometimes agree with rhetoricians in naming the relationship or exemplifying it, and they may add other examples mentioned by Al-Alawi in his rhetorical work, taking a jurisprudential approach in his examples, unlike Al-Asnawi, who sometimes takes a rhetorical approach in his examples. This suggests that jurists have benefited greatly from the field of Arabic rhetoric, leading to mutual influence. However, the credit for pioneering the types of metonymy, including metonymy by association, goes to Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani. Subsequent scholars added and summarized what they could after Abdul Qahir elucidated the principles and foundations of rhetoric, making significant contributions to many rhetorical issues.

Footnotes:

1. **Sharh Al-Waraqat fi Usul Al-Fiqh**, by Abdullah bin Saleh Al-Fawzan, presented by Ahmed bin Abdullah bin Humaid, Al-Noor Printing Press, Somalia, 1st edition, 2006, p. 75.
 - See also: **Usul Al-Fiqh (Mabahith Al-Kitab wa Al-Sunnah)**, by Dr. Muhammad Saeed Ramadan Al-Bouti, University of Damascus, Tarbin Printing Press, 1980, p. 60.
2. **Asrar Al-Balagha**, by Sheikh Imam Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani, edited by Muhammad Al-Fadhli, Al-Maktaba Al-Asriya, Sidon, Beirut, 2003, p. 260 and beyond.
3. **Al-Taswir Al-Bayani**, by Dr. Muhammad Abu Musa, Wahba Library, 3rd edition, 1993, p. 345.

4. **Asrar Al-Balagha**, p. 260 and beyond.
5. **Miftah Al-Ulum**, by Abu Yaqub Yusuf bin Muhammad Ali Al-Sakkaki, edited by Dr. Abdul Hamid Hindawi, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2000, p. 473.
6. **Al-Idah fi Ulum Al-Balagha**, by Al-Khatib Al-Qazwini, edited by Dr. Abdul Hamid Hindawi, Al-Mukhtar Foundation, Cairo, 3rd edition, 2007, p. 233.
7. **Opp cite**
8. **Jawahir Al-Balagha**, by Sayyid Ahmad Al-Hashimi, presented by Dr. Yahya Murad, Al-Mukhtar Foundation, 2nd edition, 2006, p. 238.
9. **Arous Al-Afrah fi Sharh Talkhis Al-Miftah**, by Bahaa Al-Din Al-Subki, Issa Al-Babi Al-Halabi Printing Press and Co., Egypt, within the explanations of Talkhis, vol. 4, p. 54.
10. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool fi Ilm Al-Usul**, by Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Mahmoud bin Abbad Al-Ajli Al-Isfahani, edited by Sheikh Adel Ahmed Abdul Mawjood, Sheikh Ali Muhammad Muawwad, presented by Prof. Dr. Muhammad Abdul Rahman Mandour, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, 1st edition, 1998, vol. 2, p. 271.
11. **Sharh Noor Al-Anwar ala Al-Manar**, by Mawlana Hafiz Sheikh Ahmed known as Mulla Jiwan bin Abi Saeed bin Ubaidullah Al-Hanafi, Al-Siddiqi Al-Miyawi, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, vol. 1, p. 246.
12. **Uloom Al-Balagha**, by Ahmed Mustafa Al-Maraghi, no printing house, no printing year, p. 250.
13. **Al-Balagha Al-Istilahiya**, by Dr. Abdu Abdul Aziz Qaliqila, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi, 3rd edition, 1992, p. 80.
14. **Asrar Al-Balagha**, p. 292. See also: **Nihayat Al-Ijaz fi Dirayat Al-Ijaz**, by Imam Fakhr Al-Din Al-Razi Muhammad bin Umar, edited by Dr. Ahmed Hijazi Al-Saqqqa, Dar Al-Jeel, Beirut, Al-Maktab Al-Thaqafi, Cairo, 1st edition, 1992, p. 114 and beyond. Also see: **Miftah Al-Ulum**, p. 473.
15. **Al-Idah**, p. 235.
16. **Surat Al-Shura**, verse 40.
17. **Al-Idah**, p. 235.
18. **Surat Al-Shura**, verse 40.
19. **Kitab Al-Tiraz Al-Mutadammin li Asrar Al-Balagha wa Uloom Haqaiq Al-Ijaz**, by Sayyid Imam Amir Al-Mu'minin Yahya bin Hamza bin Ali bin Ibrahim Al-Alawi Al-Yamani, reviewed by a group of scholars, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1980, vol. 1, p. 70. See also: **Tayseer Al-Wusool ila Minhaj Al-Usul min Al-Manqool wa Al-Ma'qul "Al-Mukhtasar"**, by Imam Faqih: Kamal Al-Din Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Abdul Rahman known as "Ibn Imam Al-Kamiliya", edited by Dr. Abdul Fattah Ahmed Qutb Al-Dakhmisi, Al-Farouq Al-Haditha, 1st edition, 2002, vol. 3, p. 14.
20. **Surat Al-Sawa**, verse 40.
21. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 272.
22. **Opp cit**
23. **Opp cit**

24. **Sharh Al-Badakhshi Manahij Al-Uqul**, by Imam Muhammad bin Al-Hasan Al-Badakhshi, along with **Sharh Al-Asnawi Nihayat Al-Sool**, by Imam Jamal Al-Din Abdul Rahim Al-Asnawi, both are explanations of **Minhaj Al-Wusool fi Ilm Al-Usul**, authored by Qadi Al-Baydawi, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, Sharh Al-Asnawi, vol. 1, p. 365.
25. **Surat Al-Shura**, verse 40.
26. **Sharh Al-Badakhshi**, vol. 1, p. 360. See also: **Al-Ibhaj fi Sharh Al-Minhaj**, an explanation of **Minhaj Al-Wusool ila Ilm Al-Usul** by Qadi Al-Baydawi, authored by Sheikh Al-Islam Ali bin Abdul Kafi Al-Subki and his son Taj Al-Din Abdul Wahab bin Ali Al-Subki, studied and edited by Dr. Ahmed Jamal Al-Zamzi and Dr. Nour Al-Din Abdul Jabbar Saghiri, Dar Al-Buhuth for Islamic Studies and Revival of Heritage, 1st edition, 2004, vol. 3, pp. 773-775. Also see: **Al-Bahr Al-Muhit**, by Imam Al-Zarkashi Badr Al-Din Muhammad bin Bahadur bin Abdullah Al-Shafi'i, edited by a committee of Al-Azhar scholars, Dar Al-Kutub, 3rd edition, 2005, vol. 3, p. 73 and beyond.
27. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 271.
28. **Sharh Al-Asnawi**, vol. 1, p. 357 and beyond.
29. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 274.
30. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 275. The ellipsis in the example indicates: "The water of the valley flowed."
31. **Al-Ihkam fi Usul Al-Ahkam**, by Imam Muhammad bin Ali Al-Amidi, commentary by Sheikh Abdul Razzaq Afifi, Al-Maktab Al-Islami, Beirut, 2nd edition, 1402 AH, vol. 1, p. 28.
32. **Tuhfat Al-Mas'ool fi Sharh Mukhtasar Muntaha Al-Sool**, by Abu Zakariya Yahya bin Musa Al-Rahuni, edited by Dr. Al-Hadi bin Al-Hussein Shibili, Dar Al-Buhuth for Islamic Studies and Revival of Heritage, 1st edition, 2002, vol. 1, p. 335. See also: **Sharh Mukhtasar Al-Muntaha Al-Usuli**, by Imam Abu Amr Uthman bin Al-Hajib Al-Maliki, explained by Al-Qadi Adud Al-Din Abdul Rahman Al-Iji, edited by Muhammad Hussein, Muhammad Hassan Ismail, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2004, vol. 1, p. 515.
33. **Sharh Al-Asnawi**, vol. 1, p. 363.
34. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 274 and beyond.
35. **Surat Al-Fath**, verse 10. See also: **Sharh Al-Asnawi**, vol. 1, p. 363 and beyond.
36. **Sharh Al-Asnawi**, vol. 1, p. 364.
37. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 275.
38. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 275. See also: **Al-Tiraz**, vol. 1, p. 69.
39. **Al-Ihkam**, Al-Amidi, vol. 1, p. 28. See also: **Sharh Mukhtasar Al-Muntaha Al-Usuli**, vol. 1, p. 577, **Sharh Al-Asnawi**, vol. 1, p. 364, **Sharh Al-Badakhshi**, vol. 1, p. 358, **Al-Ibhaj**, vol. 3, pp. 766-770, **Tayseer Al-Wusool**, vol. 3, pp. 8-11, **Al-Bahr Al-Muhit**, vol. 3, pp. 67-69, and **Jami' Al-Jawami'**, by Taj Al-Din Abdul Wahab bin Abi Al-Hussein Al-Subki, Dar Ibn Hazm, 1st edition, 2005, p. 16.
40. **Surat Yusuf**, verse 36.
41. **Uloom Al-Balagha**, by Ahmed Mustafa Al-Maraghi, p. 250.
42. **Al-Balagha Al-Istilahiya**, p. 81.

43. **Al-Idah**, p. 235.
44. **Al-Tiraz**, vol. 1, p. 70.
45. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 271.
46. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 275. See also: **Al-Ibhaj**, vol. 3, p. 770, and **Sharh Al-Asnawi**, vol. 1, pp. 357-359.
47. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool**, vol. 2, p. 271.
48. **Sharh Al-Asnawi**, vol. 1, p. 363.
49. **Uloom Al-Balagha**, by Ahmed Mustafa Al-Maraghi, p. 252.
50. **Al-Balagha Al-Istilahiya**, p. 86.
51. **Asrar Al-Balagha**, p. 261. See also: **Nihayat Al-Ijaz**, p. 114 and beyond.
52. See also: **Miftah Al-Ulum**, p. 473.
53. **Surat Ibrahim**, verse 4.
54. **Al-Idah**, p. 237.
55. **Al-Idah**, p. 233.
56. **Al-Takweenat Al-Nahwiyya lil Majaz Al-Mursal fi Al-Quran Al-Kareem**, by Dr. Falah Hassan Kati', Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2008, p. 89.
57. **Al-Balagha Al-Istilahiya**, p. 86.
58. **Hashiyat Al-Jurjani ala Sharh Al-Mukhtasar**, vol. 1, p. 521.
59. **Surat Ibrahim**, verse 4.

List of Sources and References:

1. **Sharh Al-Waraqat fi Usul Al-Fiqh**, by Abdullah bin Saleh Al-Fawzan, presented by Ahmed bin Abdullah bin Humaid, Al-Noor Printing Press, Somalia, 1st edition, 2006, p. 75.
2. **Usul Al-Fiqh (Mabahith Al-Kitab wa Al-Sunnah)**, by Dr. Muhammad Saeed Ramadan Al-Bouti, University of Damascus, Tarbin Printing Press, 1980, p. 60.
3. **Asrar Al-Balagha**, by Sheikh Imam Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani, edited by Muhammad Al-Fadhli, Al-Maktaba Al-Asriya, Sidon, Beirut, 2003, p. 260 and beyond.
4. **Al-Taswir Al-Bayani**, by Dr. Muhammad Abu Musa, Wahba Library, 3rd edition, 1993, p. 345.
5. **Miftah Al-Ulum**, by Abu Yaqub Yusuf bin Muhammad Ali Al-Sakkaki, edited by Dr. Abdul Hamid Hindawi, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2000, p. 473.
6. **Al-Idah fi Uloom Al-Balagha**, by Al-Khatib Al-Qazwini, edited by Dr. Abdul Hamid Hindawi, Al-Mukhtar Foundation, Cairo, 3rd edition, 2007, p. 233.
7. **Jawahir Al-Balagha**, by Sayyid Ahmad Al-Hashimi, presented by Dr. Yahya Murad, Al-Mukhtar Foundation, 2nd edition, 2006.
8. **Arous Al-Afrah fi Sharh Talkhis Al-Miftah**, by Bahaa Al-Din Al-Subki, Issa Al-Babi Al-Halabi Printing Press and Co., Egypt, within the explanations of Talkhis, vol. 4, p. 54.
9. **Al-Kashif an Al-Mahsool fi Ilm Al-Usul**, by Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Mahmoud bin Abbad Al-Ajli Al-Isfahani, edited by Sheikh Adel Ahmed Abdul Mawjood, Sheikh Ali

Muhammad Muawwad, presented by Prof. Dr. Muhammad Abdul Rahman Mandour, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, 1st edition, 1998, vol. 2, p. 271.

10. **Sharh Noor Al-Anwar ala Al-Manar**, by Mawlana Hafiz Sheikh Ahmed known as Mulla Jiwan bin Abi Saeed bin Ubaidullah Al-Hanafii, Al-Siddiqi Al-Miyawi, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, vol. 1, p. 246.
11. **Uloom Al-Balagha**, by Ahmed Mustafa Al-Maraghi, no printing house, no printing year, p. 250.
12. **Al-Balagha Al-Istilahiya**, by Dr. Abdu Abdul Aziz Qaliqila, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi, 3rd edition, 1992, p. 80.
13. **Nihayat Al-Ijaz fi Dirayat Al-Ijaz**, by Imam Fakhr Al-Din Al-Razi Muhammad bin Umar, edited by Dr. Ahmed Hijazi Al-Saqqa, Dar Al-Jeel, Beirut, Al-Maktab Al-Thaqafi, Cairo, 1st edition, 1992.
14. **Kitab Al-Tiraz Al-Mutadammin li Asrar Al-Balagha wa Uloom Haqaiq Al-Ijaz**, by Sayyid Imam Amir Al-Mu'minin Yahya bin Hamza bin Ali bin Ibrahim Al-Alawi Al-Yamani, reviewed by a group of scholars, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1980, vol. 1.
15. **Tayseer Al-Wusool ila Minhaj Al-Usul min Al-Manqool wa Al-Ma'qul "Al-Mukhtasar"**, by Imam Faqih: Kamal Al-Din Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Abdul Rahman known as "Ibn Imam Al-Kamiliya," edited by Dr. Abdul Fattah Ahmed Qutb Al-Dakhmisi, Al-Farouq Al-Haditha, 1st edition, 2002, vol. 3, p. 14.
16. **Sharh Al-Badakhshi Manahij Al-Uqul**, by Imam Muhammad bin Al-Hasan Al-Badakhshi, along with **Sharh Al-Asnawi Nihayat Al-Sool**, by Imam Jamal Al-Din Abdul Rahim Al-Asnawi, both are explanations of **Minhaj Al-Wusool fi Ilm Al-Usul**, authored by Qadi Al-Baydawi, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, Sharh Al-Asnawi, vol. 1.
17. **Al-Ibhaj fi Sharh Al-Minhaj**, an explanation of **Minhaj Al-Wusool ila Ilm Al-Usul** by Qadi Al-Baydawi, authored by Sheikh Al-Islam Ali bin Abdul Kafi Al-Subki and his son Taj Al-Din Abdul Wahab bin Ali Al-Subki, studied and edited by Dr. Ahmed Jamal Al-Zamzi and Dr. Nour Al-Din Abdul Jabbar Saghiri, Dar Al-Buhuth for Islamic Studies and Revival of Heritage, 1st edition, 2004, vol. 3, pp. 773-775.
18. **Al-Bahr Al-Muhit**, by Imam Al-Zarkashi Badr Al-Din Muhammad bin Bahadur bin Abdullah Al-Shafi'i, edited by a committee of Al-Azhar scholars, Dar Al-Kutub, 3rd edition, 2005, vol. 3, p. 73 and beyond.
19. **Al-Ihkam fi Usul Al-Ahkam**, by Imam Muhammad bin Ali Al-Amidi, commentary by Sheikh Abdul Razzaq Afifi, Al-Maktab Al-Islami, Beirut, 2nd edition, 1402 AH, vol. 1, p. 28.
20. **Tuhfat Al-Mas'ool fi Sharh Mukhtasar Muntaha Al-Sool**, by Abu Zakariya Yahya bin Musa Al-Rahuni, edited by Dr. Al-Hadi bin Al-Hussein Shibili, Dar Al-Buhuth for Islamic Studies and Revival of Heritage, 1st edition, 2002, vol. 1, p. 335.
21. **Sharh Mukhtasar Al-Muntaha Al-Usuli**, by Imam Abu Amr Uthman bin Al-Hajib Al-Maliki, explained by Al-Qadi Adud Al-Din Abdul Rahman Al-Iji, edited by Muhammad Hussein, Muhammad Hassan Ismail, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2004, vol. 1, p. 515.
22. **Al-Takweenat Al-Nahwiyya lil Majaz Al-Mursal fi Al-Quran Al-Kareem**, by Dr. Falah Hassan Kati', Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2008, p. 89.