



Samariddin AHMEDOV^a 

^aLecturer of the “Languages” department
of Tashkent Islamic institute named after Imam Bukhari
email: samariddin2023@gmail.com

Saidahmadkhon GAYBULLAYEV^b 

^bInternational Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan
Lecturer of the IRCICA Chair of Islamic History and Source Studies
E-mail: saidiy4200@gmail.com

THE VIEWS OF QOSIM KHWARAZMI, THE AUTHOR OF “AT-TAHMIR,” AND UMAR JANDIY, THE AUTHOR OF “AL-IQLID” REGARDING THE SYNTACTIC FUNCTION OF THE VOCATIVE

Abstract. *This article examines one of the fundamental issues of classical Arabic linguistics the syntactic function of the munodo (the vocative). As the object of the study, two important commentaries on Mahmud al-Zamakhshari’s renowned work al-Mufassal were selected: at-Takhmir by Qosim al-Khwarizmi and al-Iqlid by Umar al-Jandi. The article comparatively analyzes the distinctive scholarly views of both linguists regarding the munodo, its position within the sentence, its governing elements (awomil), and its syntactic relationships.*

Keywords: “al-Mufassal”, “at-Takhmir”, “al-Iqlid”, Qasim al-Khwarazmi, Umar al-Jandi, munada, vocative, Arabic linguistics, syntactic function, Nahw, comparative analysis.

INTRODUCTION

In Arabic, المنادى (“vocative”) is also considered one of the nouns that appear in the accusative (nasb) case. However, Khwarazmi did not classify the vocative as a separate type of nouns in the accusative case. Instead, he explained it in detail within specific sections of the topic of المفعول به (“direct object”), which itself belongs to the nouns in the accusative case.

MAIN PART

Mahmud Zamakhshari emphasizes that the vocative appears in the accusative case in three situations:

1. If it is a **muḍof**. For example: يا عبد الله (O Abdullah), يا رسول الله (O Messenger of Allah). In these two sentences, the words رسول and عبد are vocative **muḍāf** and therefore appear in the accusative case;

2. If it is similar to a **muḍof**. For example: يا خيرا من زيد (O better than Zayd), يا ضاربا زيدا (O better than Zayd's wife). In these two sentences, the words خيرا and ضاربا are vocative **muḍāf** and therefore appear in the accusative case;

3. If it is an indefinite noun. In this case, when addressing an unknown person, the vocative appears in the accusative case. Similar to the words of a blind man: يا رجلا خذ بيدي (O man, take my hand). In this sentence, the word رجلا is in the indefinite form and thus comes in the accusative case. However, if an address is made to a specific person, the vocative appears in the nominative case. Yet, it is assumed to be in the accusative case in meaning. For example: يا زيد (O Zayd), يا رجل أقبل (O man, come closer). In these two examples, زيد is a proper noun, and the word رجل (man) is known to the addressee, so they appear in the nominative case. Nevertheless, since they are vocatives (**munodo**), we consider them to be in the accusative case (al-Zamakhshari, 2004:61).

Regarding the governing element (**omil**) of the vocative, scholars of the field have expressed various opinions. Most grammarians have emphasized that the governing element of the vocative must be an implied verb, and Sibawayh, Mahmud Zamakhshari, and Umar Jandiy are among those who hold this view (Sibawayh, 1988:182; al-Zamakhshari, 2004). The renowned grammarian al-Mubarrad stated that the governing element of the vocative is the vocative particle (**ḥarf al-nido**) (al-Jami, 2015:199). The grammarian Abu Ali in some places, mentioned that “يا” and its counterparts are verbal nouns (**ism fi’l**), and therefore the governing element of the vocative is “يا” or one of its counterparts (al-Jami, 2015:199).

Umar Jandiy provided a detailed commentary on the text of “Mufassal,” and then cited some opinions regarding the governing element of the vocative, demonstrating that they were contrary to the rules of grammar.

Umar Jandiy stated: “According to the author of Mufassal, the governing element (omil) of the vocative is not the particle of calling (ḥarf al-nidā), but rather a verb that must be implied. This verb is assumed between the vocative particle and the vocative noun, and it is usually either ‘أريد’ (I want) or ‘أعني’ (I mean). For example, when one says ‘يا عبد الله’ (O Abdullah), the meaning is as if one were saying ‘يا أريدُ عبد الله’ (O, I want Abdullah) or ‘يا أعني عبد الله’ (O, I mean Abdullah). Because the vocative is so frequently used, the Arabs omitted this verb and left it permanently implied, while the vocative particle, since it conveys the intended meaning, came to function as its substitute. For when you pronounce the vocative particle, it immediately becomes clear that you are referring to a person. It is as though you were asked, ‘Whom do you mean?’ and you respond, Abdullah (al-Jandi, 2002:400).

This practice involves compactness (ixtisor), and frequent usage necessitates such compactness. Moreover, it also serves to eliminate spiritual ambiguity. Indeed, if the verb “أعني” (I mean) is not omitted, the call may potentially apply to the present, past, or future tense. As a result, there arises a risk that the addressee may not understand that the intention is directed specifically at the present moment. Therefore, the Arabs refrained from mentioning the verb in vocative expressions, and instead used this sound (the vocative particle) as a signal to alert the addressee that they are being addressed at that very moment (al-Jandi, 2002:400).

In Arabic, in expressions such as «اذك لعفت نأ كايي» (Beware of doing this), the verb is also regularly omitted. However, in this case, the omission of the verb does not provide significant benefit in eliminating semantic ambiguity, since the meaning is essentially “keep yourself away from this.” By contrast, in vocatives, the omission of the verb not only removes ambiguity but also provides an additional benefit. Therefore, such usage naturally aligns more closely with the intended purpose of the vocative (al-Jandi, 2002:400).

In the above text, the author’s phrase “frequent usage necessitated the omission of the verb” (al-Jandi, 2002:400) does not mean that the Arabs first used the verb explicitly and then, for the sake of ease, later omitted it. For such a situation would imply that the verb had been frequently employed in its explicit form. What we are discussing here, however, is a verb that was never used openly, but rather remained permanently

implied. In fact, the intended meaning is that the Arabs, having anticipated the frequent use of this verb, chose from the very beginning to employ it in an implicit form.

Umar al-Jandiy, in this matter, supports the opinion of the author of Mufassal and says: “Our conclusion that the vocative (munodo) is governed by a verb that is permanently implied has been accepted by the majority of grammarians (al-Jandi, 2002:400).”

Umar al-Jandiy: Some grammarians have stated the view that “the governing element (omil) of the vocative is a verbal noun (ism fi‘l), namely “يا” and one of its counterparts.” However, the opinion of the majority of grammarians is correct in two respects. If the governing element of the vocative were a verbal noun, then it would necessarily require a subject. Yet in the structure, there is no subject explicitly, nor is there one implicitly. If there were an implicit subject, it would belong to either the first, second, or third person. If the subject of the verbal noun were the first person, it could not remain hidden. If it were the second or third person, it would not fit the meaning of the discourse. For the second person (the one being addressed) is precisely the person being called, and therefore it cannot be imagined that the verbal noun claimed to be the governing element of the vocative has a subject. And if we were to say that the subject of this verbal noun belongs to the third person, it would not correspond to the meaning of the discourse, since no third person is being spoken of.

Some grammarians have regarded the combination of the vocative particle and the vocative noun as an independent, complete sentence, emphasizing that no verb has been omitted in this construction (al-Jandi, 2002:401). In their view, vocative particles belong neither to the category of nouns nor verbs, but together with the vocative they are capable of expressing a complete judgment. However, this opinion lacks a sound scholarly basis, for a structure consisting of only one particle and one noun cannot constitute an independent and complete sentence.

Another group of grammarians interpret the vocative as an introductory element that serves to bring forth the sentence which follows, and therefore they do not consider it part of an independent, complete sentence (al-Jandi, 2002:401). In their view, the vocative expresses only the meaning of address, while the main judgment arises through the subsequent statement. However, this approach does not fully conform to grammatical principles. Since the vocative, as a unit belonging to the category of nouns, must fulfill a specific syntactic function within the sentence, in practice it occupies the

position of a direct object, that is, it appears in the accusative case. It is well known that every governed element (ma' mūl) must have a governing element ('āmil). Accordingly, although the governing element in the vocative construction is not expressed explicitly, it is considered to exist implicitly. This very hidden governing element and its subject provide the semantic and syntactic basis for interpreting the vocative construction as complete and independent speech.

In conclusion, according to the majority of grammarians, including Umar al-Jandiy, the most well-founded view in this matter is that the accusative state of the vocative المنادى (al-munādā) is explained through an implied verb. The vocative particle is not an independent governing element, but rather is interpreted as a means pointing to that implied verb. Other opinions-such as considering “ya” to be a verbal noun, or regarding the particle and noun together as a complete sentence-do not have sufficient scholarly basis. The vocative expression is a communicatively complete unit and is treated as an independent sentence. Therefore, the classical grammatical approach, namely the theory of the implied verb is recognized as the most correct and consistent interpretation.

When Qasim Khwarazmi sets forth the views on this issue, he first presents the traditional perspective of the representatives of grammar. According to this view, the vocative (المنادى) is governed not by the vocative particle, but by an implied (muzmar) verb. This implied verb is assumed to exist between the vocative particle and the vocative noun. The reason for this is that as soon as the vocative particle is pronounced, it becomes understood that the speaker is addressing a specific person. This situation logically produces a kind of question-and-answer form: when the speaker says “O,” the question arises, “Whom do you mean?” and he replies, “a certain person” or “the slave of Zayd.” However, because this verb is used so frequently, it is consistently omitted from pronunciation. For this reason, most grammarians have included the vocative among those nouns that are governed by a verb permanently implied (al-Khwarizmi, 1990:325).

However, Qasim Khwarazmi sharply criticizes this approach, evaluating it as scientifically unfounded and even incorrect. He emphasizes that if, in this case, the existence of an implied verb were assumed, then such a structure would necessarily have the status of a declarative sentence (kalam khabari) that accepts affirmation

and negation. Yet, the vocative construction, by its very nature, does not constitute a predicative sentence. In fact, the vocative (nida) structure itself is not a fully declarative (semantically complete) sentence, but rather a construction of address that does not independently express a complete statement. Therefore, assuming the hidden existence of a verb here is not scientifically justified (al-Khwarizmi, 1990:326). As a result, Khwarazmi rejects explaining the i' rāb of the vocative through the assumption of an implied verb. His critique prompts a reconsideration of the syntactic and semantic nature of vocative constructions within grammatical theory and demonstrates the necessity of prioritizing a functional approach over a purely formal one in determining the syntactic status of the vocative.

The critical view advanced by Qasim Khwarazmi necessitates a reconsideration of the logical foundations of this theory. In his opinion, if a verb were to be assumed within the vocative construction, then the vocative structure would have to possess the status of a complete sentence. However, the vocative expression, from a semantic standpoint, does not accept affirmation or negation; rather, it functions purely as a unit of address and summons. Therefore, to regard a verb as implied in this context contradicts the logical nature of speech.

The results of the analysis show that the disagreement surrounding this issue is not limited to grammatical interpretation alone, but is closely connected with kalām theory, the relationship between meaning and function, as well as the boundaries of grammar and logic. While the approach of the majority of grammarians proves convenient and effective in explaining the practical language system, Khwarazmi's critique deepens the theoretical dimension and more clearly reveals the independent communicative character of the vocative construction.

CONCLUSION

From this perspective, regarding the issue of the governing element of the vocative, it is appropriate not to reject either approach absolutely, but rather to distinguish them on the basis of functional and theoretical levels. That is, in grammatical-practical analysis, the acceptance of an implied verb may be possible, whereas in logical-semantic analysis, evaluating the vocative construction as an independent speech unit without a verb appears scientifically more justified. This, in turn, allows for the interpretation of the classical heritage of Arabic grammar in harmony with modern linguistic thought.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Jāmī, N. al-D. ‘A. al-R. (2015). Al-Fawā’id al-ḍiyā’iyya. Author.
2. Al-Jandī, T. al-D. A. ibn M. ibn ‘U. (2002). Al-Iqlīd (Vol. 1). King Fahd National Library.
3. Al-Khwārizmī, Q. ibn al-Ḥ. ibn A. (1990). At-Takhmīr (Vol. 1). Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī.
4. Sībawayh, A. B. ‘A. ibn ‘U. (1988). Al-Kitāb (‘A. al-S. Hārūn, Ed.; Vol. 2). Maktabat al-Khānjī.
5. Mamatkulova, N. (2025). Enhancing Students’ecolinguistic Awareness as a Key Educational Priority in the 21st Cyentury. *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, 152-166.
6. Mamatkulova, N., & Nilufar, M. (2020). Independent study skills as a key to succyess in higher education system. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciyencyes*, 8(10 Part II), 96-100.
7. Al-Zamakhsharī, A. al-Q. M. ibn ‘U. (2004). Al-Mufasssal fī ‘ulūm al-‘arabiyya (The detailed treatise on the sciences of the Arabic language). Dār ‘Ammār.