

‘Alī Qūshjī’s Philosophy of Language: On the Metaphysical Principle of Linguistic Existence

Abdullah Yıldırım*

Abstract: In early Islamic thought, the phenomenon of wad', which is mostly studied as an indirect issue in scientific traditions such as language, logic and especially uṣūl al-fikḥ, has turned into an independent literature with the discussion of ambiguous words (*al-alfāz al-mubḥama*) that 'Adud al-Din al-Ījī brought to the agenda in *al-Risālah al-waḍ'īyyah* and the subsequent texts. As a part of that literature in the first chapter of *Unqūd al-zawāhir*, 'Alī Qushjī examined the phenomenon of wad' and its general problems and re-expressed the accumulated knowledge of nearly a century he inherited in a very systematic manner and enriched. Also he made the phenomenon of wad' the main subject of examination, thereby reorganized the issues into a new composition. In this context, unlike the previous works, the author positions the science of wad' as the principles of *ʿilm matn al-lughā*. As the discipline that determines the particular acts of designation (*waḍ'*) and signification (*dalāla*) of singular expressions, *matn al-lughā* constitutes the material foundation of linguistic existence. In this sense, Qushjī is essentially engaged in an inquiry into the philosophical foundations of linguistic being. In the article, based on Qushjī's positioning of wad' knowledge as the principle of *matn al-lughā*, the phenomenon of wad' is interpreted as the metaphysical principle of linguistic existence and signification. In this context, first of all, the universal-particular connection between the absolute phenomenon of wad' and *matn al-lughā* was touched upon, and then it was emphasized that the elements of wording and meaning, as the parties of the signification, became clear with the phenomenon of wad' and became part of the language and finally it has been indicated that all linguistic usages are extensions of the phenomenon of *wad'*.

Key Words: 'Alī Qushjī, Philosophy of Language, Signification, Wad' al-Lughā, Lexicology

* Assist. Prof., Istanbul Medeniyet University, Faculty of Literature. Correspondence: abdyld@gmail.com

1. Introduction

‘Alī Qūshjī (d. 879/1474) is one of the most prominent and influential figures of fifteenth-century Islamic science and thought. His intellectual journey, which began in Samarqand, passed through cities such as Kirmān, Harāt, and Tabrīz, eventually concluding in Istanbul.¹ Throughout this process, Qūshjī established himself as a multifaceted scholar proficient in both rational and transmitted sciences (*al-‘ulūm al-‘aqlīyyah* and *naqlīyyah*), leaving an impact that transcended political boundaries. He transferred the scientific knowledge he acquired in the Iranian and Turkistān regions to Istanbul through a new synthesis, generally rejecting Aristotelian principles in favor of a theological (*kalām*-oriented) approach.² Within this framework, it can be said that he had a profound and lasting influence on the development of mathematical and astronomical sciences in Ottoman thought. Fazlhoğlu summarizes this influence as the addition of a mathematical-theological (*riyāḍī-kalāmī*) dimension to the mystical-theological (*‘irfānī-kalāmī*) line already established in Ottoman thought by Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī (d. 751/1350) and Molla Fenārī (d. 834/1431).³

On the other hand, other aspects of this brilliant scientific career, which are relatively less known but have increasingly become the subject of research, include religious sciences such as *kalām* (theology), *uṣūl al-fiqh* (principles of Islamic jurisprudence), and *tafsīr* (Qur’anic exegesis),⁴ as well as, more specifically, Arabic linguistics

1 For the intellectual biography and details of Qūshjī’s works, see: Süheyl Ünver, *Türk Pozitif İlimler Tarihinden Bir Bahis: Ali Kuşçu-Hayati ve Eserleri* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Fen Fakültesi, 1948); Muammer Dizer, *Ali Kuşçu* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1988); İhsan Fazlhoğlu, “Ali Kuşçu (Qushji, Abu al-Qasim ‘Alā al-Din ‘Ali ibn Muḥammad Qushji-zade)”, *Encyclopedia of Ottoman Empire*, ed. Gabor Agoston - Bruce Masters (New York: Facts on File, 2009); Yavuz Unat, *Ali Kuşçu: Çağını Aşan Bilim İnsanı* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2009); İhsan Fazlhoğlu, “Ali Kuşçu”, *İslam Düşünce Atlası* (Konya: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017), 2/792-796; Hasan Umut, *Theoretical Astronomy in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire: ‘Ali al-Qūshjī’s Al-Risāla al-Fathīyya* (Montreal: McGill University, Institute of Islamic Studies, PhD diss., 2019), 7-112.

2 Fazlhoğlu, “Ali Kuşçu”, 2/793.

3 Fazlhoğlu, “Ali Kuşçu”, 2/793-794.

4 In recent years, some of the studies conducted in Türkiye on the author’s works and views in the field of religious sciences are as follows: Hasan Özer, “Ali Kuşçu ve ‘Hâşiye ‘Ale’t-Telvîh’ Adlı Eseri”, *İslam Hukuku Araştırmaları Dergisi* 13 (2009), 361-392; Mehmet Fatih Soysal, *Ali Kuşçu’nun Şerhu Tecrîd’i’l-Kelâm’ından Uṣûl-i Selâse Konularının Tahkiki ve İlâhiyat Meselelerinin Tahlili* (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, 2014); Muhammed Osman Doğan, *Tecrîd’i’l-itikâd Şârihlerinde İmâmet: İsfahanî ve Ali Kuşçu Örneği* (İstanbul: İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2018); Engin Erdem, “Ali Kuşçu: Zorunlu Varlık’ın Zorunluluğu Üzerine Bir Tartışma”, *Uluslararası 14. ve 15. Yüzyıl İslam Düşünc-*

and philosophy.⁵ It is known that the most significant and voluminous work of the author in this context is '*Unqūd al-zawāhir*'⁶ which he composed in Istanbul at the request of Sultan Mehmed II (1444–1446, 1451–1481).⁷ In addition to this, the author has other works, including his Persian commentary on *al-Shāfiyah* (titled *Sharḥ al-Shāfiyah*),⁸ his treatise *Risāla fī al-ḥamd*⁹ which evaluates 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Jurjānī's (al-Sayyid al-Sharīf) (d. 816/1413) explanations regarding the concept of "*ḥamd*" as well as *Risālah al-isti'ārah*¹⁰ and *Risālah "Mā anā qultu"*¹¹ which examine various issues in the science of *balāghah*.¹² Furthermore, when considering his contributions

esinde Felsefe, Kelam ve Tasavvuf Sempozyumunu Bildirileri (Ankara: Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2020), 91-98; Necmettin Pehlivan, "Bir Âdâbu'l-Bahs ve'l-Munâzara Uygulaması Olarak Ali Kuşçu (ö. 879/1474)'nın Şerhu Tecrîdî'l-Kelâm (= eş-Şerhu'l-Cedîd)'i", *Uluslararası 14. ve 15. Yüzyıl İslam Düşüncesinde Felsefe, Kelam ve Tasavvuf Sempozyumunu Bildirileri* (Ankara: Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2020), 172-193; Fevzi Yiğit, "Ali Kuşçu'nun İllet ve Malul Hakkındaki Görüşleri", *Uluslararası 14. ve 15. Yüzyıl İslam Düşüncesinde Felsefe, Kelam ve Tasavvuf Sempozyumunu Bildirileri* (Ankara: Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2020), 119-133; Özkan Tekin, "Ali Kuşçu'nun Şerhu Tecrîdî'l-Kelâm'ının Kelâm İlmi Açısından Önemi", *Orta Asya'dan Anadolu'ya İlimin Yolculuğu* (Karabük: Karabük Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2021), 805-818; Mehmet Çiçek, *Müfessir Olarak Ali Kuşçu* (İstanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2021).

- 5 For a detailed account of Qūshjī's linguistic texts and the correction of certain erroneous attributions, see: Musa Alp, *Arap Dili ve Belağatı Açısından Ali Kuşçu ve Unkûdü'z-zevâhir fî nazmî'l-cevâhir Adlı Eseri* (İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, 2006), 32-47. See also: Musa Alp, "Arap Dilinde Telif Edilmiş 'el-İfsah' Adlı Eserin Aidiyet Problemi, Kaynakları, İçeriği ve Değerlendirilmesi", *Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 10/2 (2010), 87-110.
- 6 Currently, we have only the critical edition of '*Unqūd al-zawāhir*' prepared by Ahmed Afifi (Cairo, 2001). However, the Istanbul manuscripts of the work were not consulted in this edition. Furthermore, the text contains various shortcomings. For this reason, a new critical edition of the work, alongside its commentary by Müftizāde (Müftizāde Abdurrahim, *Sharḥ 'Unqūd al-zawāhir*, n.d.), is deemed necessary. For an evaluation on this matter, see: Alp, *Ali Kuşçu ve Unkûdü'z-zevâhir*, 36-38.
- 7 The author explicitly states this in the introduction of '*Unqūd*'. For the relevant statements, see: Ali Kuşçu, *Unkûdü'z-zevâhir fî's-sarf*, thk. Ahmed Afifi (Kahire: Matbaatü Dâri'l-Kütübi'l-Misriyye, 2001), 163-164.
- 8 Alp, *Ali Kuşçu ve Unkûdü'z-zevâhir*, 40-41.
- 9 Alp, *Ali Kuşçu ve Unkûdü'z-zevâhir*, 282-291.
- 10 Musa Yıldız, *Ali Kuşçu ve İstiare Risalesi* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2020). See also: Murat Sula, *Trabzon İl Halk Kütüphanesindeki Arap Dili ve Belağatı Alanındaki Yazmalar ve Ali Kuşçu'nun Risâle fî'l-mecâz ve'l-isti'âresi'nin Edisyon Kritiği* (İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2000).
- 11 Sedat Şensoy, *Mâ Ene Kultu Risâleleri: Tahkik ve İnceleme* (Konya: Aybil Yayınları, 2013). See also: Musa Alp, "Ali Kuşçu'nun Takdimu'l-Musned İleyh (Mâ Ene Kultu) Risalesi: Tahkik ve Araştırma", *Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi (ÇÜİFD)* 7/2 (Haziran 2007), 147-168.
- 12 In addition to those listed here, there are two more treatises attributed to Qūshjī in manuscript libraries. Both of them are among the works on Arabic linguistics; the first is titled *Risālah fî waqf*

to linguistic thought, other works by Qūshjī that merit attention can be listed as follows: His gloss (*ḥāshiyah*) on Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī's (d. 792/1390) commentary on *al-Kashshāf*,¹³ his commentary on Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's (d. 672/1274) *Tajrīd al-ṭ-ṭiqād*¹⁴ and his gloss (*ḥāshiyah*) on Taftāzānī's *al-Talwīḥ*.¹⁵ Apart from the theological orientation in his general intellectual framework, an analysis of his works in terms of their content and theoretical approach reveals that Qūshjī adopted a markedly Taftāzānīan stance.¹⁶

When we examine Qūshjī's works in the field of Arabic linguistics and philosophy, there is no doubt that his most significant and foundational work is '*Unqūd al-zawāhir*'. The work consists of an introduction (*muqaddimah*) and three chapters. In the introduction, drawing on the idea of the priority of the parts over the

- al-mufradāt* and the second is titled *Risālah fī taḥqīq lām al-ta'rīj*. [For the relevant texts, see: Abdullah Yıldırım, "Ali Kuşçu ve Risāle fī Vaz'ī'l-Müfredāt", *İslām Araştırmaları Dergisi* 19 (2008), 63-86; Ali Kuşçu, *Risāle fī tahkiki lāmī't-tarīj* (İstanbul: Köprülü Manuscript Library, Fazıl Ahmed Paşa Collection, 1593/21), 214^a; *ibid.*, *Risāle fī tahkiki lāmī't-tarīj* (İstanbul: Süleymaniye Manuscript Library, Reşid Efendi Collection, 1032/39)]. However, our recent studies have shown that these works are not independent treatises, but rather part of the author's *al-Kashshāf* gloss. For the relevant sections, see Ali Kuşçu, *Hāşiyetü Ali el-Kuşci alâ Şerhi'l-Keşşâf li't-Teftâzânî*, thk. Mehmet Çiçek (İstanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2021), 105-106; 123-126. For an evaluation of the topic, see Abdullah Yıldırım, *Ali Kuşçu ve Unkûdü'z-Zevâhir - Dil ile Anlam* (İstanbul: Ketebe Yayınları, 2024), 27-28.
- 13 Ali Kuşçu, *Hāşiyetü Ali el-Kuşci alâ Şerhi'l-Keşşâf li't-Teftâzânî*, thk. Mehmet Çiçek (İstanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2021).
- 14 Alâeddin Ali b. Muhammed el-Kuşci, *Şerhu Tecrîd-i'l-akâid*, 1-4, thk. Muhammed Hüseyin ez-Zirâî er-Rizâyî (Kum: İntişârât-ı Râid, 1393).
- 15 Ali Kuşçu, *Hāşiyetü 'ale't-Telwîḥ*, "Ali Kuşçu ve 'Hāşiyetü 'Ale't-Telwîḥ' Adlı Eseri", thk. Hasan Özer, *İslām Hukuku Araştırmaları Dergisi* 13 (2009), 361-392.
- 16 There exist various historical data supporting this view. First and foremost, Qūshjī's works such as his commentaries on *Kashshāf* and *Talwīḥ* as well as his treatise *Mā anā qultu*, which he compiled based on the relevant passages from *Muṭawwal*, are direct studies on the works of Taftāzānī. This undoubtedly reflects a particular scholarly preference. Furthermore, when examining the content of his works in general, it becomes evident that Qūshjī shares similar perspectives with Taftāzānī on many issues, striving to analyze his views and defend them against the critiques of scholars such as al-Sayyid al-Sharīf. [For an example illustrating this point, see Abdullah Yıldırım, "Zımnî Vaz'ın İmkânı: Dilde Gösteren ve Gösterilen Aynı Şey Olabilir mi? Taşköprülüzâde Ahmed Efendi'nin Nüzhetü'l-elhâz fî ademi vaz'ī'l-elfâz li'l-elfâz'ı Bağlamında Bir Değerlendirme", *İslām Tetkikleri Dergisi* 11/2 (Eylül 2021), 603-638]. Additionally, upon his arrival in Istanbul, in a dialogue with *Khā-jazâde* Muşlîḥuddīn (d. 893/1488), Qūshjī explicitly stated that he considered Taftāzānī to be correct in the renowned debate on *ist'ārāḥ* between Taftāzānī and al-Sayyid al-Sharīf. For the relevant anecdote, see Taşköprülüzâde Ahmed Efendi, *eş-Şekâiku'n-Nu'mânîyye fî ulemâ'id-devleti'l-Osmânîyye*, thk. Ahmed Suphi Fırat (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1985), 161.

whole, the author states that anyone wishing to construct a composite/whole made up of many elements must first acquire the parts or the material of that composite.¹⁷ When we recall that speech (*kalām*) is a composite/whole, we are inevitably confronted with the question of what constitutes the material of speech in the Arabic language and how this material can be acquired. The answer is clear: whether in spoken or written form, the material of the phenomenon of speech (*kalām*) is the Arabic language (*inna mawādd al-kalām al-lughāh al-‘arabiyyah wa al-kalimāt al-adabiyyah*).¹⁸ Therefore, anyone wishing to produce refined speech must necessarily have knowledge of the content (root letters) and form (*ṣīgha*) of these elements, which constitute the material of speech, in terms of their accuracy and quality. The author further explains that knowledge of the material of the elements composing speech—documented by the discipline of *matn al-lughah* (the corpus of the language)—and knowledge of its form—achieved through the sciences of *ishtiḳāq* (morphological derivation) and *ṣarf* (morphology)—are indispensable. Consequently, anyone embarking on the pursuit of knowledge should first focus on these three areas.¹⁹ Accordingly, *Unqūd al-zawāhir* consists of three chapters²⁰ encompassing these disciplines. As promised in the introduction, the second and third chapters are devoted to *ishtiḳāq* and *ṣarf*, respectively. However, contrary to expectations, the first chapter is not allocated to *matn al-lughah*. The author justifies this by noting the already abundant and comprehensive lexicographical works that identify and explain the material elements of linguistic existence, namely the meaningful utterances classified as nouns, verbs, and particles. Nonetheless, there are certain principles and foundations of the material (*al-māddah*) and formal (*al-ṣūrah*) knowledge of individual wordings (*al-alfāz al-mufradah*) that underpin these lexicons but are neglected by lexicographical works (*wa’qtāṣartu min dhālika al-fann ‘alā taḥqīq mabādī’ muhimmaḥ uhmilat fī kutub al-lughah mawqūfa ‘alayhā ma’rifat al-ṣīgha*).²¹ What Qūshjī refers to here is the phenomenon of *waḍ‘* and its

17 Kuşçu, *Unkūd*, 161.

18 Kuşçu, *Unkūd*, 162.

19 Kuşçu, *Unkūd*, 162.

20 As previously mentioned, *Unqūd* consists of an introduction and three chapters. Initially, the author intended to compose *Unqūd* as a comprehensive work encompassing all branches of Arabic linguistics, structured into twelve chapters. However, he later abandoned this plan and limited the work to three chapters. For an analysis on this matter, see: Yıldırım, *Ali Kuşçu ve Unkūdü’z-Zevâhir - Dil ile Anlam*, 30-31.

21 Kuşçu, *Unkūd*, 164.

general issues, which constitute the fundamental concept and subject matter of the literature initiated by ‘Aḩud al-Dīn al-Ījī’s (d. 756/1355) *al-Risāla al-waḩḩyyah*. Thus, instead of identifying the individual components of the Arabic language in the first chapter, the author examines these principles and foundations (*‘ilm mabādi’ matn al-lughah*)—what could be termed as *waḩḩ* knowledge—which later came to be codified as an independent science (*‘ilm al-waḩḩ*). Essentially, this amounts to a philosophical inquiry into the foundations of linguistic existence or, in other words, the philosophy of language.²² Building on this general observation, the article will focus on the nature and significance of *waḩḩ* knowledge as articulated by Qūshjī and its role as the principle of *matn al-lughah*, and consequently of language as a domain of existence. Since the subject of inquiry is the principle of *matn al-lughah*, the first step will be to elucidate, within a general framework, what Qūshjī means by *matn al-lughah*. This will be followed by an analysis of the meaning of its being a principle.

- 22 What is meant by the term “philosophy of language” here, in its broadest sense, is the philosophical investigation of language or certain phenomena related to language. Within this framework, Qūshjī’s inquiry into the principle of linguistic existence and signification undoubtedly falls within the scope of the philosophy of language. As is well known, the term “philosophy of language” generally refers to a subfield of philosophy, much like epistemology or ethics. Unlike linguistics, this field addresses issues such as the existence and structure of language, the relationship between language and thought, as well as between language and the world, the use of language, the nature of meaning, reference, and many other related topics. On the other hand, “linguistic philosophy” or “analytic philosophy” is not an independent domain of philosophical problems but rather a method, a school of thought, or a way of doing philosophy aimed at solving philosophical problems. Although it encompasses various approaches, analytic philosophy is fundamentally based on the analysis of linguistic expressions. It began to take shape in the early 20th century, particularly through the works of Gottlob Frege (d. 1915) and Bertrand Russell (d. 1970), and was predominantly developed by Anglo-Saxon philosophers. The analytic philosophy tradition, during its emergence and development, intensely engaged with language, meaning, and logic-centered philosophical problems. For this reason, in academic discourse, the term “philosophy of language” sometimes refers to analytic philosophy as a modern approach to doing philosophy and the issues that constitute this body of literature. In this sense, the scope of the term is restricted to the aforementioned modern experience. However, independent of its geographical, historical, and cultural context, the philosophy of language encompasses all philosophical inquiries and analyses concerning language and, in this broader sense, is as old as the history of philosophy and thought itself. For information and evaluation on the subject, see: bkz. Bryan Magee, *Men of Ideas - Some Creators of Contemporary Philosophy* “The Philosophy of Language - Dialogue with John Searle” (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 154-155; Hans-Johann Glock, *What Is Analytic Philosophy?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 52; Atakan Altınörs, *Dil Felsefesine Giriş* (İstanbul: İnkılâp, 2003), 46-53; Atakan Altınörs, *50 Soruda Dil Felsefesi* (İstanbul: 7 Renk Basım Yayım, 2012).

2. Language and Linguistic Signification in the Context of the Classification of *'ilm al-adab*

In the introduction to *'Unqūd*, Qūshjī defines what Arabic linguistics (*'ilm al-'Arabiyyah*, referred to here as *'ilm al-adab*) entails, and classifies its various disciplines under this heading based on their subject matter. Essentially, this definition and classification attempt largely consist of al-Sayyid al-Sharīf's explanations in his commentary on *Miftāḥ al-'Ulūm*.²³ According to this, *'ilm al-adab* is the knowledge of topics that, when mastered, enable one to avoid errors in the speech (*kalām*) and writing of the Arabs (*'ilām anna 'ilm al-'Arabiyyah al-musammā bi-'ilm al-adab 'ilmun bi-umūr yuqtadaru bi'l-wuqūf 'alayhā 'ala'l-ihtirāz 'anil-khalāl fī kalām al-'Arab lafẓan wa khaṭṭan*).²⁴ Maḥmūd al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144) listed these sciences²⁵ as comprising twelve types.²⁶ Sirāj al-Dīn al-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229) limited the content of *Miftāḥ* to those disciplines deemed essential by *adab*,²⁷ while al-Sayyid al-Sharīf categorized these disciplines into *uṣūl* (fundamentals) and *furū'* (branches) based on their aim of avoiding such errors.²⁸ Accordingly, the fundamental disciplines (*uṣūl*)

23 For relevant explanations, see: Seyyid Şerif el-Cürcânî, *el-Misbâḥ fî şerhi'l-Miftâḥ*, ed. Yüksel Çelik (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, 2009), (Critical Edition), 8-9.

24 Cürcânî, *el-Misbâḥ*, 8; Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 165.

25 Zamakhsharī in the introduction to *al-Qisṭas al-mustaqīm fī 'ilm al-'arūḍ* states that the sciences of the Arabic language and literature (*al-'ulūm al-adabiyyah*) consist of a total of twelve categories. The author, in this context, sequentially mentions the following disciplines: *Lughah*, *şarf* (*abniyah*), *ishtiqaq*, *naḥw* (*irāb*), *ma'ānī*, *bayān*, *'arūḍ*, *qawāfi*, *inshā'* *al-naṣr*, *qarḍ al-shi'r*, *'ilm al-kitābah wa muḥāḍarāt*. For further explanation, see: Ebü'l-Kâsım Maḥmūd b. Ömer Zemahşerî, *el-Kustâs fî ilmi'l-'arūḍ*, ed. Fahreddin Kabâve (Beyrut: Mektebetü'l-Meârif, 1989), 15-16.

26 Ibn al-Akfânî (d. 749/1348), unlike Zamakhsharī and his followers, asserts that *'ilm al-adab* comprises ten categories. For further details, see: Muhammed b. İbrâhîm b. Sâid el-Ensârî İbnü'l-Ekfânî, *İrşâdi'l-kâsîd ilâ esne'l-makâsîd fî envâ'il-ulûm*, ed. Abdülmün'im Muhammed Ömer (Kahire: Dârü'l-Fikri'l-Arabî, 1990), 109.

27 Ebû Ya'kûb Yusuf b. Muhammed Sekkâkî, *Miftâhu'l-ulûm*, ed. Abdülhamid Hindâvî (Beyrut: Dârü'l-Kütübü'l-İlmiyye, 2000), 37.

28 al-Sayyid al-Sharīf's distinction within the context of *'ilm al-adab* is essentially rooted in the conceptualization of *adab* presented in the *Miftāḥ*. al-Sakkākî envisions the concept of *adab* as a theoretical investigation and a study of forms (*al-şūrah*). Within this framework, his primary concern lies in codifying the various types of *adab* as independent disciplines. Accordingly, the author structured the content of the *Miftāḥ* based on this principle, excluding lexicography—expected to be addressed within the examination of words—and other disciplines listed by al-Sayyid al-Sharīf in the section on *furū'*. For an evaluation of this subject, see: Abdullah Yıldırım, "Miftâhu'l-Ulûm'da İlmü'l-Edeb Kavrayışı", *İhya Uluslararası İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi* 8/2 (Temmuz 2022), 877-882, 885-891.

focus on the study of individual (*mufrad*) or compound (*murakkab*) utterances. The study of individual utterances from the perspective of their essence and material is called *lughah* (lexicology), while their form and structure fall under *ṣarf* (morphology). If the study concerns the connections between utterances based on origin and derivation rather than their material or form, this is termed *ishtiqaq* (morphological derivation). Compound utterances are analyzed either as absolute or metrical. When studied absolutely, the analysis of compound utterances in terms of their structure (*hay'a*) and expression of basic meaning (*aṣl al-ma'nā*) falls under *naḥw* (syntax). However, if the focus shifts to secondary meanings revealed in a specific context beyond the basic meaning, this belongs to *ma'ānī* (semantics). If the study concerns the clarity of the expression of these secondary meanings in compound utterances, it is referred to as *bayān* (rhetoric). When compound utterances are examined in metrical form, the focus is on either prosody (*'arūd*) or the end of a couplet (*qāfiya*). Thus, the *uṣūl* section of *'ilm al-adab* is classified into a total of eight disciplines. The section on *furū'* expands *'ilm al-adab* to encompass a total of twelve genres, including four disciplines categorized as *khaṭṭ* (orthography), *qarḍ-i shī'r* (the composition of poetry), *inshā' al-nathr* (prose composition) including letter writing and oration and *muḥāḍarāt* (anecdotes and historical narratives) of which history itself constitutes a part.²⁹ After presenting al-Sayyid al-Sharīf's explanation of the definition and classification of *'ilm al-adab*, Qūshjī offers evaluations on topics such as whether *ishtiqaq* is an independent science apart from *ṣarf*, why disciplines like *'arūd-qāfiya*, *muḥāḍarāt*, and *khaṭṭ* are considered part of *'ilm al-adab*, and how *badī'* arts can be integrated into the classification of *'ilm al-adab*.³⁰ When the aforementioned image is examined as a whole, it can be stated that each discipline constituting *'ilm al-adab* essentially focuses on a specific aspect of the linguistic domain of existence, or in other words, it investigates a particular dimension of this linguistic reality. Accordingly, *lughah* deals with individual utterances (*al-lafẓ al-mufrad*) from the perspective of their material essence, while *ṣarf* examines their forms. Similarly, *naḥw* pertains to the primary meanings of compound utterances (*al-lafẓ al-murakkab*), whereas disciplines like *ma'ānī* and *bayān* focus on secondary meanings that emerge in specific contexts. All

29 al-Sayyid al-Sharīf states that the *badī'* arts, which are not included in the aforementioned classification but are known to have been categorized as an independent science in the post-Qazwīnī history of *'ilm al-balaghah*, were not regarded as an independent discipline by the earlier scholars (*mutaqaddimūn*), particularly al-Zamakhsharī in this context. Instead, they were considered as an annex (*dhayl*) to the sciences of *ma'ānī* and *bayān*. Cürçânî, *el-Misbâh*, 8-9; Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 166.

30 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 166-168.

these inquiries are made possible and meaningful because language forms an independent plane of existence apart from the external world (*al-khārij*) and the mind (*al-dhihn*). This is undoubtedly tied to the existence of linguistic signification, which occurs as a relationship between utterance (*lafẓ*) and meaning (*ma'nā*). The classification of '*ilm al-adab*' demonstrates that each discipline examines the outcomes of linguistic signification at various levels. However, there is a fundamental difference between *lughah* and the other disciplines of '*ilm al-adab*' regarding their approach to linguistic signification.

Qūshjī defines *matn al-lughah* (lexicology) as the examination of individual utterances from the perspective of their essence and material.³¹ By "essence and material" he refers to the root letters of words. Thus, *matn al-lughah* records the meanings signified by all individual utterances³² used in the language, whether nouns, verbs, or particles. This is not a theoretical investigation into forms but rather a historical documentation.³³ Beginning with Khalīl b. Aḥmad's (d. 175/791) *Kitāb al-'ayn*, the Islamic tradition has produced an extensive body of literature³⁴ on this subject using various methods. As a result, we have a vast corpus of meaningful utterances, which forms the foundational material and basis for all linguistic research. The other sciences that constitute '*ilm al-adab*' develop theories based on this material foundation, whether at the level of individual or compound utterances. Thus, there is a relationship between *matn al-lughah* and the other disciplines of '*ilm al-adab*' that resembles the matter-form connection. In other words, all linguistic research, including grammar

31 Kuşçu, *Unkūd*, 166.

32 Qūshjī has titled the section discussing issues related to the phenomenon of *waqf* as "*mabādī 'ilm matn al-lughah*" instead of "*mabādī 'ilm al-lughah*". The reason for this distinction lies in the varied uses of the term *lughah*. In this context, *lughah* is often used in an absolute sense, encompassing both individual and compound forms. When used in this way, *lughah*, as pointed out by Müftizāde Abdürrahim, refers to a science that is related to the lexicon and includes all aspects of the Arabic language. Therefore, when considered in its broad sense, *lughah* can be said to encompass the entire vocabulary of the Arabic language, also known as *kalām al-'Arab*. However, in the specific way that Qūshjī defines *lughah*, it focuses not on the absolute meaning of the lexicon but on the singular lexeme, which corresponds to modern lexicography. To emphasize this specific meaning, Qūshjī has added the term "*matn*" to the title. For a detailed explanation, see Müftizāde Abdürrahim, *Şerhu'l-Unkūd*, 38-39.

33 For this very reason, Qūshjī, unlike al-Sakkākī who focused on identifying the individual terms of the language in *Miftāh*, did not engage in such analysis in *Unqūd*, but instead examined the principles of this field.

34 İsmail Durmuş, "Sözlük", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 2009), 37/398-401.

and *balaghah*, depends on the specific significations identified by *matn al-lughah*. Without the significance of the root letters of individual utterances, there would be no form to signify. Consequently, words would not exist as linguistic entities, and the disciplines of *matn al-lughah* and *ṣarf* would lose their meaning. Furthermore, due to the part-whole relationship, compound utterances (*al-laḥẓ al-murakkab*) require individual utterances and their specific significations. Thus, the same applies indirectly to disciplines like *naḥw* and *balaghah*, which examine compound utterances.

The evaluations we have made so far within the framework of the material-form relationship are essentially related to the question of what constitutes the material foundation of linguistic existence. Considering that language is a whole composed of structured and meaningful utterances,³⁵ *‘ilm al-adab* studies this whole in two parts: individual (*mufrad*) and compound (*murakkab*) utterances. The study of individual utterances necessarily precedes that of compound utterances due to the nature of the part-whole relationship. As noted in the introduction, Qūshjī, taking into account this rational order that determines the classification of *‘ilm al-adab*, emphasizes the importance of the study of individual utterances.³⁶ According to Qūshjī, the material of speech (*kalām*), whether in spoken or written form, is *lughah*, i.e., the Arabic language.³⁷ Therefore, individual utterances in the form of nouns, verbs, and particles form not only the foundation of *‘ilm al-adab* but also the basis of linguistic existence. When Qūshjī refers to the principles of *matn al-lughah* (*mabādī’ ‘ilm matn al-lughah*),³⁸ he is essentially investigating the foundations of linguistic existence.

35 What is meant by “structured-meaningful utterances” is the following: Language consists of utterances that signify specific meanings, and it is only within the boundaries defined by grammar that one can speak of speech and writing, or in other words, the use of language.

36 The example of a “person who wishes to string a necklace from precious stones” mentioned by the author within this context [Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 161-162], evokes the title *‘Unqûd al-zawāhîr* in certain respects. Indeed, the author names the main chapters of *‘Unqûd* with the word *‘iqd* and the subchapters with *simt*. In the dictionary, the term *‘iqd* refers to the string itself on which beads or similar objects are threaded, while *simt* describes the state when beads are strung on the thread. The rationale behind the author’s preference for these terms for chapter and subchapter headings becomes evident when the title of the text is considered. Specifically, *‘Unqûd al-zawāhîr fî naẓm al-jawāhîr* can roughly be translated as “a cluster of brilliant objects in the arrangement of jewels”. In other words, Qūshjī envisions himself as a jeweler and perceives *‘Unqûd*, in terms of its content and scholarly value, as akin to an ornament composed of precious jewels and brilliant stones. The example provided by the author aligns with the choices made for both the general and subchapter headings of the work.

37 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 162.

38 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 169.

But what exactly is meant by language (*lughah*) in this context? In other words, what is the subject of study for all the disciplines that constitute '*ilm al-adab*, including *matn al-lughah*, which forms an independent plane of existence apart from the external world and the mind? This question was answered relatively early in the Islamic tradition by Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1002):

"Language (*lughah*) consists of sounds through which every community expresses its purposes (*aghrāḍ*)" (*al-lughah aswātun yu'abbiru bihā kullu qawmin 'an aghrāḍihim*).³⁹

Ibn Jinnī's definition emphasizes two points: first, that language consists of meaningful sounds, and second, its social nature. Many languages are spoken in the world, and each is meaningful and valid within its community. As Ibn Jinnī points out, the social aspect of language is its most fundamental characteristic and is directly related to the fact that humans are, by nature, social beings (*al-insān madanīyun bi'l-ṭab'*). Every individual is inevitably born into a human and cultural environment. Both the presence and continuation of our existence in this worldly life depend on this. One of the most dominant elements of this environment is the use of a specific natural language (*isti'māl*). In other words, a person encounters an already existing language upon entering the world. By acquiring and using this language, the individual becomes part of the community and culture. In this sense, each of us essentially emerges as a user of language. In this process, an individual's relationship with language primarily develops through acceptance and adoption. Otherwise, it would not be possible to integrate into society and the cultural milieu. Thus, language, as a given totality (*waḍ'*), imposes itself on individuals due to its social and binding nature.

Moreover, the use of language ultimately involves forming sentences by combining individual utterances, which are given as meaningful elements, within the boundaries of grammar, which is also a given. This is because a person is considered to have truly spoken only when they construct a sentence. This brings about the phenomena of speech (*kalām*) and indirectly, writing.⁴⁰ Within this framework language use manifests at various levels, ranging from daily conversational practices

39 Ebū'l-Feth Osmān İbn Cinnī, *el-Hasâis*, ed. Abdülhamid Hindâvî (Beyrut: Dârü'l-Kütübî'l-İlmiyye, 2003), 87.

40 Speech (*kalām*) involves engaging with our immediate interlocutors, while writing entails communicating with distant interlocutors, both synchronously and diachronically.

that occur within linguistic habits to formal correspondence, slang, and the production of scientific and artistic works. It is intricately connected to all elements of the human/cultural world.⁴¹ Unlike Ibn Jinnī, Qūshjī defines language (*lughah*) within a more limited framework as “any individual utterance established for a meaning” (*al-lafẓ al-mawḍū‘ li-ma‘nan al-mufrad*).⁴² Qūshjī’s definition, following scholars like Ibn al-Ḥājjib (d. 646/1249) and Jamāl al-Dīn al-Isnawī (d. 772/1370),⁴³ emphasizes the principle of the relationship of signification between structured-meaningful utterances and their meanings.

Thus far, the discussions concerning the existence and use of language, as well as the scientific investigations that constitute ‘*ilm al-adab*, demonstrate that linguistic signification (*al-dalālah al-lughawiyyah*) is taken as a given in principle. This is evident because, otherwise, thinking, speaking, interpersonal communication, and the cultural and human achievements realized through language—including scientific inquiries like ‘*ilm al-adab*—would not be possible. Even the existence and continuity of life would be unfeasible. Since linguistic signification is accepted as given, none of the disciplines constituting ‘*ilm al-adab* question how signification is possible or realized—that is, its principle. This is precisely what Qūshjī refers to when he mentions the principles of *matn al-lughah*. If *matn al-lughah* determines the specific significations of individual utterances, then asking about the principle of *matn al-lughah* essentially means investigating the possibility of linguistic signification.

41 Approximately a century after Ibn Jinnī, the issue of language and its usage, which we touched upon above in the context of the distinction between *waḍ‘* (establishment) and *isti‘māl* (use), was perhaps most profoundly addressed within the Islamic tradition by ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078). al-Jurjānī developed an anti-verbalist (mentalist) theory of language and discourse, emphasizing theses such as the innate presence of grammar in the mind and the precedence of meaning over expression in linguistic existence. For an evaluation on this subject, see: Sedat Şensoy, *Abdülkâhir el-Cürcânî’de Anlam Problemi* (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, 2001), 51-61; M. Taha Boyalık, *Dil, Söz ve Fesahat: Abdülkâhir el-Cürcânî’nin Sözdizimi Nazariyesi* (İstanbul: Klasik, 2017), 118-146.

42 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 169.

43 Ibn al-Ḥājjib defines language as “all words established for any meaning” (*al-Lughah: kullu lafẓin wuḍ‘a li ma‘nan*), while Isnawī defines it as “words established for various meanings” (*al-Lughah ‘ibaratun ‘an al-alfāẓ al-mawḍū‘a li al-ma‘āni*). For the relevant definitions, see: Celālüddin Abdurrahman b. Ebî Bekr es-Süyûtî, *el-Müzhir fî ‘ulûmîl-luga*, thk. Rıdvan Mâmû - Mervan Zühûrî (Beyrut: Müessesetü’r-Risâle Nâşirûn, 2021), 1/40; Hüseyin Küçükkalay, *Kuran Dili Arapça* (İstanbul: Muarrif Yayınları, 2021), 23-25; Ramazan Demir, *Arap Dilbilimcilerine Göre Dillerin Kaynağı Meselesi* (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, 2008), 20.

3. The Phenomenon of *Waḍ'* as the Principle of Linguistic Existence and Signification

As mentioned above, it is clear that the most fundamental principle of linguistic existence and, consequently, of linguistic studies (*'ilm al-adab*) is the acceptance that the *lafẓ* (sound/word) signifies the *ma'nā* (meaning). According to this principle, a speaker articulates specific sounds, which in turn correspond to a particular meaning, and all parties involved in the communication process understand the intended meaning in a natural way.⁴⁴ Moreover, this process of expression and understanding is not confined to a limited group but is shared and followed by all members of society by principle.

Linguistic signification, due to the nature of divine speech, has been one of the most frequently discussed topics in the history of Islamic science and thought. The signification of the *lafẓ* to its *ma'nā* has been studied in detail from different perspectives in disciplines such as *lughah*, *manṭiq*, and *uṣūl al-fiqh*.⁴⁵ In this context, absolute signification is defined as: "A situation in which the knowledge of one thing necessitates the knowledge of something else" (*al-Dalālah hiya kawn al-shay' bi-ḥālatin yalzamu min al-'ilmi bi al-'ilmu bi-shay'in ākhar*)⁴⁶. More specifically, linguistic signification is defined as: "When a utterance is used or imagined, its meaning is understood due to the knowledge of its *waḍ'* (*al-Dalālah al-lafẓiyyah al-waḍ'iyyah hiya; kawn al-lafẓi bi-ḥaythu matā uṭliqa aw tukḥuyyila fuhima minhu ma'nāhu li al-'ilmi bi-waḍ'ihi*)".⁴⁷ Signification does not exist as an independent object in external reality; rather, it occurs as a relationship between two elements. These elements form the parties of the relationship: the first element is the *dāll* (signifier), the second is the

44 This is a rather comprehensive and equally contentious claim. Indeed, modern philosophy of language is replete with debates of this nature. However, what is meant here, in its most straightforward sense, is the common-sense notion that speech signifies a state of communication among individuals rather than one of disagreement or chaos.

45 From a general perspective, the examination of the relationship between expression and meaning, as well as the issue of linguistic indication in the sciences of *al-lughah*, *manṭiq*, and *uṣūl al-fiqh*, is directly related to the subjects and objectives of these disciplines, as well as to the historical development, interrelation and other aspects of the issues that constitute these fields. In this regard, addressing the matter comprehensively necessitates a multidimensional investigation and a comparative analysis. For a research on this topic, see: Mehdi Cengiz, *Klasik İslam Düşüncesinde Delâlet - Göstergebilim Tarihinin Kayıp Halkası* (Ankara: Kitabe Yayınları, 2023), 51-162.

46 Cürcânî, *Kitâbü't-Tarifât*, 104.

47 Cürcânî, *Kitâbü't-Tarifât*, 104.

madlûl (signified), and the relationship between the two is called *dalâlah*.⁴⁸ Absolute signification is categorized based on the nature of the signifier into verbal (*lafẓî*) and non-verbal (*ghayri lafẓî*); based on its principle or source, into rational (*‘aqlî*), conventional (*waḍ‘î*), and natural (*ṭab‘î*) and based on its relation to and nature of content, into total correspondence (*muṭābaqa*), partial correspondence (*taḍammun*), and entailment signification (*iltizām*).⁴⁹

However, the core issue for us here is not the nature or function of signification, but the question of how it is possible. Accordingly, how can the relationship of indication between the wording (*lafẓ*) as sound and *meaning* be explained? In other words, how does a sound uttered by a person indicate a specific meaning, and how is this understood and shared by others? According to the view that has been implicitly accepted in Islamic thought from the beginning, there is no natural or rational connection between *lafẓ* and *ma’nā*. Rather, the relationship of signification between *lafẓ* and *ma’nā* is established by a thinking and willing subject outside of the *lafẓ* itself. This process of assigning a specific meaning to a *lafẓ* is called *waḍ‘*.

From a historical perspective, in the *mutaqaddimîn* period, the knowledge of *waḍ‘* was often referred to indirectly and secondarily in works related to *‘ilm al-‘Arabiyyah* (broadly grammar), the first example of which can be found in Sîbawayh’s (d. 180/796) *al-Kitâb*. It was debated in theological circles such as the *Mu’tazila*, represented by Abû Hâshim al-Jubbâ‘î (d. 321/933), and the *ahl al-Sunnah*, represented by Abû al-Hasan al-Ash‘arî (d. 324/935-36), primarily in terms of the origin of language and the identity of the linguistic creator (*wāḍi‘*). In logic, particularly through the works of Abû Naşr al-Fârâbî (d. 339/950), it began to emerge more clearly in discussions of signification and terms. The concept was more explicitly and comprehensively explored in the foundational works of the *muta’akkhkhir* period, such as Fakhr al-Dîn al-Râzî’s (d. 606/1210) *al-Maḥsûl* and Sayf al-Dîn al-Âmidî’s (d. 631/1233) *al-Iḥkâm* in the field of *uşûl al-fiqh* and in the subsequent texts. Approximately a century later, *waḍ‘* knowledge became an independent field of literature, with ‘Aḍud al-Dîn al-Îjî’s (d. 756/1355) *al-Risâlah al-waḍ‘iyyah* and the commentaries and glosses that followed, and in the subsequent period, it was formally defined and

48 Cürcânî, *Kitâbü’t-Tarîfât*, 104.

49 For general information on the subject, see: M. Naci Bolay, “Delâlet (Mantık)”, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1994), 9/119; Mehmet Erdem - Tahsin Deliçay, “Mantık, Belâgat ve Uşûl-ü Fıkıh İlimleri Arasında Ortak Bir Kavram Olarak ‘Delâlet’”, *Marîfe Dini Araştırmalar Dergisi* 2/1 (Mayıs 2002), 171-180.

systematized as a science.⁵⁰ One of the most significant elements of this period, following al-Ījī, is the debate between al-Taftāzānī and al-Sayyid al-Sharīf. It is certain that these debates, which can be traced in texts such as *al-Kashshāf*, *al-Muṭawwal* and *al-Tawīh* as well as their commentaries, have undoubtedly expanded the scope and depth of the subject. This debate continued in the fifteenth century with figures like Hājī Pāshā (d. 827/1423), Hodja 'Alī al-Samarqandī (d. 860/1457), Shaykh al-Bukhārī (d. 868/1464), and Gars al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Shāhīn (d. 873/1468), who wrote classical commentaries on *al-Risālah al-waḍ'īyyah*. By the time of *Unqūd*, Qūshjī was synthesizing and enriching the accumulated knowledge of *waḍ'* over more than a century since the time of 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī. He presented these issues in a comprehensive and systematic manner, positioning them, unlike previous authors, as principles of linguistic structure (*matn al-lughah*). Furthermore, by making the phenomenon of *waḍ'* the subject of detailed examination, he restructured the discussions into a new composition.⁵¹

As stated above, it is clear that the principle of linguistic signification in the Islamic tradition is the phenomenon of *waḍ'*. However, it is also well-known that various debates have occurred throughout this long process. Qūshjī addresses all these debates systematically, reminiscent of the explanations found in al-Fakhr al-Rāzī's *al-Maḥṣūl* and al-Sakkākī's *Miftāḥ*.⁵² According to Qūshjī, all wordings are initially at an equal distance from meanings. Therefore, a *lafẓ* can signify a particular meaning only if this equality is not disrupted. In other words, for linguistic signification to occur, it is necessary for the *lafẓ* to be specific to one of the meanings (i.e., *ikhtiṣāṣ*). Thus, the *lafẓ* becomes associated with a specific meaning, while its potential connection to other meanings is severed. This specificity (*ikhtiṣāṣ*) does not occur automatically but requires a principle (*mukhaṣṣis*) to establish the relationship. Qūshjī argues that this principle (*mukhaṣṣis*) is either: i) "the *lafẓ* itself," or ii) "something other than the *lafẓ*," which itself could be either iia) "the Creator," (*khālīq*) or iib) "the

50 For some attempts on this matter, see: Timur Aşkan, "Abdullah Necib el-Ayıntâbî'nin er-Risâletü'l-Vaz'ıyye Adlı Eserinin Tahkikî Neşri", *Tahkik İslami İlmler Araştırma ve Neşir Dergisi* 2/1 (Hazariran 2019), 62; Musa Alak, "Meşihat Müsteşarı Eğinli İbrahim Hakkı Efendi'nin Vaz' İlmine Dair Risâlesinin Tahkik ve Tahlili", *İstanbul Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 25 (2011), 47-48.

51 For an assessment of Qūshjī's role in this process, see: Yıldırım, *Ali Kuşçu ve Unkûdü'z-Zevâhir - Dil ile Anlam*, 92-102.

52 Fahreddin er-Râzî, *el-Maḥṣūl fî ilmi usûl'l-fikh*, ed. Taha Cabir Feyyâz el-Alvânî (Beyrut: Miesse-setü'r-Risâle, 1996), 1/181; Sekkâkî, *Miftâhu'l-ulûm*, 466-467.

created" (*makhlūq*).⁵³ According to this division, the principle of linguistic signification involves three main options: the *lafẓ*, God, and human.⁵⁴ Each of these views has been supported by different individuals or groups in the Islamic tradition.⁵⁵

When considering Qūshjī's logical division, the first and fundamental distinction in the debate is whether linguistic signification is an inherent and necessary attribute of the *lafẓ* itself, or a contingent and constructed quality that arises subsequently through deliberate intention and volition. Claiming that signification inherently exists in the *lafẓ* means that the relationship between *lafẓ* and *ma'nā* is intrinsic, in other words it means asserting that the utterance signifies not due to any other reason but solely because it is a type of sound. This implies that the relationship of indication between the *lafẓ* and *ma'nā* exists inherently, necessarily, and perpetually. This is because what originates from the essence cannot cease to exist due to any cause external to that essence. In classical *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *balaghah* texts, this view⁵⁶ is generally attributed to the *Mu'tazilī* theologian and jurist Abbād b. Sulaymān al-Ṣaymarī (d. 250/864). However, *muta'akhkhir* scholars reached a consensus on the incorrectness of this notion. Based on this statement, Qūshjī argues that if the natural language theory proposed by Ṣaymarī is correct and valid, all languages in the world would be understood by everyone. Essentially, this is equivalent to stating that there should be only one language spoken in the world. This is because, in such a case, there would be no distinction between a word in a language showing its own meaning and the existence of the person pronouncing it. On the other hand, Qūshjī

53 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 180.

54 According to Qūshjī's statement, the views presented regarding the origin of language and the principle of linguistic indication essentially encompass more than these three options. Indeed, when parameters such as whether designation applies to all words or only a subset, and whether the judgment is issued definitively or with doubt and hesitation, are considered, numerous subcategories emerge beyond the aforementioned three possibilities. In this context, Abū Ishāq al-Isfarayīnī (d. 418/1027) asserts that the essential part of language necessary for human communication was established by almighty God, while the remaining portion is open to both divine and human volition. On the other hand, most later scholars adopted the *tawaqquf* view. Nevertheless, all opinions can ultimately be reduced to these three fundamental options. For the author's related explanations, see: Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 180.

55 For detailed information and analysis on the subject, see: Bernard George Weiss, "Medieval Muslim Discussions of the Origin of Language", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 124/1 (1974), 33-41.

56 The attribution of this view to Ṣaymarī is disputable both in terms of authorship and nature. Indeed, Sakkākī reinterpreted this view within the framework of the characteristics of letters. For an assessment of the topic, see: Yıldırım, *Ali Kuşçu ve Unkûdî'z-Zevâhir - Dil ile Anlam*, 228-230.

also states that, under such circumstances, no word in a natural language could be transferred to another meaning beyond its own, in a way that makes the understanding of the original meaning impossible. In light of this and similar evidence, the view attributed to Şaymarī is clearly incorrect.⁵⁷

Given that the view of inherent signification is refuted, the principle of signification must be attributed to something other than the *lafẓ*. This means that there is no natural or rational connection between *lafẓ* and *ma'nā*, and this relationship is established by a thinking and willing subject outside of the *lafẓ* itself. This process of determination and allocation, which we can refer to as "linguistic specification" is called *waḍʿ*. Qūshjī defines the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* as "the act of assigning something to signify another thing by itself" (*ta'yīn al-shay' li-dalālatihi bi-nafsihi 'alā shay'*).⁵⁸ Thus, signification is not essential, but rather a possible quality that is subsequently attributed to the *lafẓ* as an external characteristic.

Once the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* is accepted as the principle of linguistic signification, it inevitably leads us to the question of who the subject performing the *waḍʿ* is.⁵⁹ However, in the historical development of *waḍʿ* knowledge, the debate has

57 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 182. Similarly, Sakkākī enumerates the problems that would arise if the signification were to be considered an intrinsic characteristic of the word itself, in order to demonstrate the incorrectness of the view attributed to Şaymarī. Sakkākī, *Miftāhu'l-ulûm*, 466.

58 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 170.

59 Since the act of *waḍʿ* inherently necessitates a *wāḍiʿ* to perform this act, as previously indicated, language must have been formed by a conscious and willful agent. Consequently, the likely answer to the question of agency is either one or a group of individuals who speak the language or God. In Qūshjī's classification, this is expressed under the option of "something other than the utterance" as iia) "creator" (*khāliq*) and iib) "created" (*makhluq*). Indeed, in Islamic thought, the debate regarding the identity of the agent responsible for linguistic existence has emerged primarily within the framework of two theories. The first theory, *iştilāḥ*, attributes the origin of language to human will and social convention, while the second theory, *tawqif*, grounds it in divine revelation and inspiration. The well-known representatives of the *iştilāḥ* and *tawqif* theories are the prominent *Mu'tazilī* thinker Abū Ḥāshim and the founder of *Ash'arī* theology Abū al-Hasan al-Ash'arī, respectively. Thus, the issue has been prominently discussed within a theological context, manifesting as a *Mu'tazilī-Sunni* dichotomy and analyzed extensively through rational and scriptural arguments. However, since the assignment of utterances is ultimately a contingent choice and occurred in a historical phase beyond our direct observation, it is not possible to reach a definitive rational conclusion on this matter. Religious arguments, on the other hand, are open to interpretation. For this reason, approximately a century later, Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1012) adopted a position of reservation (*tawaqquf*), stating that no theory could be definitively proven. This perspective was subsequently upheld by scholars such as Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111) and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210), becoming the prevailing view of the later period. Similarly,

focused more on the nature and categories of *waḍʿ* rather than the identity of the *wāḍʿ*. This is because questions about the origin of language and the identity of the language creator cannot be definitively resolved, either historically or theoretically. Therefore, when we refer to the *wāḍʿ*, we must always remember that its existence is certain, but its identity remains unknown.⁶⁰ In this context, the central issue in the literature of *waḍʿ* is to analyze how words are established in language and how they signify meaning, taking into account their usage and signification. There are clear distinctions between the use of proper names, generic terms, and ambiguous words (pronouns, demonstratives, etc.) in the language. In fields like *ṣarf*, *naḥw* and *balāghah* the signification of such words has been studied at various levels. However, what is important from the perspective of *waḍʿ* science is to identify and analyze the ways in which the relevant terms were coined, in a manner that would establish the principle of the existing differences in usage.⁶¹ In this sense, we can say that the perspective in the science of *waḍʿ* is a realistic approach that takes into account the current state of the language. In this context, the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* has been discussed under general headings such as isolative-subsumptive, general-particular, direct-indirect and intentional-implicit (the categories of *waḍʿ*) with all types of terms used in the language being interpreted within these categories. Indeed, a significant portion of *ʿUnqūd* is dedicated to these fundamental debates that form the basis of the science of *waḍʿ*.⁶²

The explanations provided thus far in the context of the principle of linguistic indication show the existence of two relationships: *waḍʿ* and *dalālah* between *lafẓ* and *maʿnā*. Since *waḍʿ* is the principle of signification, signification arises as a result of *waḍʿ*. At this point, we can take a closer look at why Qūshjī positions the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* as the principle of *ʿilm matn al-hughah*.

it appears that Qūshjī did not adopt a definitive stance toward the existing theories but instead evaluated all possibilities, highlighting their problematic aspects. For related explanations, see Kuşçu, *Unkūd*, 180-191.

60 For a detailed evaluation of the debate surrounding the identity of the *wāḍʿ* in Qūshjī's work, see Yıldırım, *Ali Kuşçu ve Unkūdü'z-Zevâhir - Dil ile Anlam*, 226-248.

61 For a study analyzing the issue of the establishing of ambiguous terms (*al-alfāẓ al-mubhamah*), see Abdullah Yıldırım, "Adudüddin el-İcî ve er-Risâletü'l-vaz'iyye", *İslâm İlim ve Düşünce Geleneginde Adudüddin el-İcî*, ed. Eşref Altaş (İstanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2017).

62 Kuşçu, *Unkūd*, 171-179.

4. *Waḍʿ* as the Principle of *Matn al-Lughah*

Qūshjī defines *ʿilm matn al-lughah* as the study of the establishment of words in Arabic based on their material and essence (*maʿrifatu awḍāʾi mufradāt al-kalām al-ʿArabī min ḥaythu mawwāduḥā wa jawāhīruḥā*).⁶³ According to the definition, the subject of lexicology, in terms of its substance and essence, is the word. When the word is examined in terms of its substance, information is obtained regarding the meaning for which it has been designated. Therefore, it can be stated that lexicology determines for which meaning all individual utterances, such as nouns, verbals and letters, have been designated. Since lexicology provides us with knowledge of the meanings for which all utterances used in language have been designated, what is mentioned in the definition refers not to universal designation but to particular designations.

As a state that precedes language in essence, *waḍʿ* constitutes the principle underlying all fixed and possible instances of *waḍʿ* within language. From this perspective, it is independent of the given materials of language, namely individual utterances and can be considered as a universal state in itself. The establishment of individual utterances, on the other hand, constitutes instances in which this universal state is realized by being attached to a material form (sound/utterance).⁶⁴ Since *waḍʿ* constitutes a relation between utterance and meaning, it is not possible to discuss an independent *waḍʿ* phenomenon apart from utterance and meaning when considering external existence. However, given that all words used in language are designated to correspond to a meaning, by abstracting from particular instances, *waḍʿ* can be conceived as a universal principle underlying all such instances in external reality. Since the universal is inherently contained within the particular, the absolute phenomenon of *waḍʿ* manifests in each individual word, albeit in a non-identical manner. Accordingly, what occurs in the external world is a particular instance of *waḍʿ*, either this or that specific designation. In contrast, *waḍʿ* as a universal phenomenon, independent of particular instances, exists solely as a conceptual entity in the mind.

63 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 169.

64 Qūshjī, in defining lexicology, employs the term *al-maʿrifah* instead of *al-ʿilm*. Although *al-maʿrifah* is sometimes used synonymously with *al-ʿilm*, it can also, as in this context, denote knowledge of the particular or the simple, as opposed to *al-ʿilm*. In this case, *al-ʿilm* signifies knowledge of the universal and complex, whereas *al-maʿrifah* refers to the knowledge of the particular and simple. Since the definition pertains to particular *waḍʿ*, it can be inferred that Qūshjī uses the term *al-maʿrifah* in its specific sense of knowing particulars. See also: Müftizâde Abdürrahim, *Şerhu'l-Unkûd*, 37.

The discussions thus far indicate that there exists a universal-particular relationship between the knowledge of *waḍʿ* and lexicology. This is because *waḍʿ* knowledge, as a universal concept, examines the nature of *waḍʿ*, its components and general issues, while lexicology seeks to identify particular instances of *waḍʿ* as they manifest in external reality. In this context, the principle of *waḍʿ* in lexicology can be understood in two primary senses: one ontological and the other epistemological. The ontological sense refers to the fact that absolute *waḍʿ* establishes and enables all fixed and possible particular instances of *waḍʿ* within language. The epistemological sense, on the other hand, signifies that knowledge of *waḍʿ* as a universal concept provides an implicit understanding of the designation of a particular utterance. Consequently, this elucidates Qūshjī's rationale for considering *waḍʿ* knowledge as the foundational principle of lexicology.

Essentially, considering the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* solely as the principle of lexicology constitutes an incomplete assessment. Indeed, Qūshjī explicitly states that, in addition to the substance of singular utterances, the knowledge of form is also contingent upon the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* (...*mabādī muhimmaḥ ... mawqūfatun ʿalayhā maʿrifah al-ṣiḡha*).⁶⁵ Furthermore, in the science of *waḍʿ*, alongside isolative *waḍʿ* (الوضع الشخصي), the subsumptive *waḍʿ* (الوضع النوعي) of singular utterances is also examined as a distinct category. The concept of subsumptive *waḍʿ* refers to the establishment of a general rule through which multiple utterances are designated based on a common meaning (form). The conditions that attach to words by virtue of their forms, however, are studied within the discipline of morphology (*ṣarf*). Hence, the knowledge of *waḍʿ* not only serves as the foundational principle of lexicology but also constitutes the principle of morphology.⁶⁶

It should be noted that the discussion thus far regarding *waḍʿ* as a principle has primarily been conducted within the context of singular utterances. This may cre-

65 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 164.

66 This issue is not explicitly discussed in *Unqûd*. However, the commentator Müftizâde Abdurrahim first identifies the problem and then provides the following explanation: In lexicography, the establishment of singular terms (isolative *waḍʿ*) is examined explicitly. What is studied in morphology, on the other hand, is the subsumptive *waḍʿ*. Since the subsumptive *waḍʿ* emerges as an extension of the isolative *waḍʿ*, *waḍʿ* simultaneously forms the principle of morphology. The reason for the attribution of *waḍʿ* as a principle specifically to lexicography lies in its close connection with singular elements. In this case, *waḍʿ* becomes directly the principle of lexicology and indirectly the principle of morphology. For relevant explanations, see Müftizâde Abdürrahim, *Şerhu'l-Unkûd*, 36.

ate the mistaken impression that the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* pertains solely to words. While it is true that both the material and formal aspects of a word are designated, language as an ontological domain does not consist solely of words. Rather, what we refer to as "meaning" fundamentally emerges within the sentence. What enables specific sentence constructions to be possible is the sentence form as a universal structure. In this sense, the sentence constitutes the subject matter of syntax (*ʿilm al-naḥw*). As the principle of all possible sentence structures, the designated status of the sentence form allows for both primary and secondary meanings to be inferred. What enables the primary indication of sentence form as the principle of all sentence examples, and consequently its secondary meanings, is the fact that this form has been established through designation. Indeed, in his discussion on the classifications of *waḍʿ*, Qūshjī adopts the view that all compound expressions are designated generically (*Wa min al-waḍʿ al-nawʿiyyi an yathbuta min al-waḍʿi ḥukmun kullīyyun ... wa kullu al-murakkabāti min hādha al-qabīl*).⁶⁷ Consequently, beyond being the principle of lexicology and morphology, *waḍʿ* must also be recognized as the direct principle of syntax and by extension the indirect principle of *maʿānī* and *bayān*.⁶⁸

Up to this point, it has been demonstrated that the phenomenon of universal *waḍʿ* serves as the principle for particular instances of *waḍʿ* in external existence, and consequently, for particular significations (*dalālah*). However, more fundamentally, *waḍʿ* constitutes the metaphysical foundation (*mabdaʿ*) of language as a domain of existence. This is because the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* brings about a distinct ontological domain. Accordingly, language, independent of external existence and the mind, establishes a unique ontological level in itself. Indeed, even if a person who lived centuries ago or an event that once took place has entirely disappeared, we are still able to articulate and discuss them today. In other words, although such a person or event no longer exists in external reality, they can still exist within language. Thus, to articulate something is to bring it into existence at the level of language.

67 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 171.

68 While a word is designated both in terms of its substance and its form, a sentence is designated only in terms of its form. As a universal form, the sentence has been established through designation; however, it is the language user who constructs sentences by combining words within this universal form and thereby expresses entirely new meanings. This is because forming a sentence by attributing one word to another is entirely an intellectual process and therefore, is not dependent on *waḍʿ*. Consequently, an infinite potential for speech is made available to humans. Thus, it cannot be stated that individual sentence examples are designated.

What is meant by the principle of linguistic existence becomes evident in the relationship between the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* and the elements of utterance (*lafẓ*) and meaning (*maʿnā*) as the two components of relation. Before the *waḍʿ* process as a type of sound, an utterance exists independently, just as meaning, as a concept in the mind does. Therefore, the existence of neither the utterance nor the meaning is contingent upon *waḍʿ*. However, prior to *waḍʿ*, neither the utterance nor the meaning can be characterized as singular (*mufrad*) or compound (*murakkab*). Indeed, in defining the singular elements of a lexicon, Qūshjī first identifies the utterance as designated (*mawḍūʿ*), then describes it as singular.⁶⁹ In this context, designation is primary, whereas singularity and composition emerge as secondary attributes derived from it.⁷⁰ This is because an utterance is characterized by these attributes in relation to the meaning it conveys. However, before an utterance is designated as corresponding to a specific meaning, such an attribution is naturally impossible. Hence, while it is possible to assert that both the utterance and the meaning exist prior to *waḍʿ*, this existence remains indeterminate. In this state, neither the utterance nor the meaning can be considered part of language. Their specification and ability to be discussed only become possible through *waḍʿ*. Consequently, utterance and meaning become components of language solely through the signification relationship (*dalālah*) established between them by *waḍʿ*. Ultimately, utterance and meaning exist independently of *waḍʿ* in external reality. However, after an utterance is designated to correspond to a meaning, a second relationship—what we term signification (*dalālah*)—emerges between these two units. The existence of utterance and meaning as linguistic elements is only possible through this second relationship of signification. What enables signification is the establishment of the utterance in return of meaning, that is, the first relationship. Therefore, as a universal phenomenon, *waḍʿ* does not constitute the absolute principle of utterance, meaning, and signification, but rather serves as their principle insofar as they function as components of language.

What is meant by the metaphysical nature of the principle is that the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* is merely a relational attribution (*nisbah*) and has a conventional/constructed (*ʿtibārī*) nature. In other words, *waḍʿ* does not exist as an independent entity in external reality but is merely a relationship established between utterance

69 Kuşçu, *Unkûd*, 169.

70 Müftîzâde Abdürrahim, *Şerhu'l-Unkûd*, 38.

and meaning. In the context of language, what is fundamentally at stake here is the cognitive act of symbolization. That is, any given sound or utterance is assigned as the symbol of a specific meaning. Therefore, the existence of this relationship depends on the will and preference of a thinking mind, while its function of producing linguistic signification relies on all members of a linguistic community knowing, accepting, and utilizing this relationship. In both cases, the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* does not possess an inherently perceptible, material existence. Rather, it is an intelligible (*ʿaqlī*) entity, grasped by the mind through its effects rather than through direct sensory perception.⁷¹

In the context of the principle of *waḍʿ*, we must finally address the emphasis in Qūshjī's definition of lexicology, which states that it is "the knowledge of which meanings words have been established for." The key point to note here is that the author does not define lexicology as the study of *what meaning a word signifies*, but rather as *the knowledge of which meaning a term has been designated for*. The signification of a term necessitates its use by an intentional agent; therefore, a word's signification cannot be discussed unless it appears within a given sentence. Indeed, Avicenna asserts that the signification of a word is absolutely contingent upon the speaker's intention.⁷² Otherwise, all utterances would have a single, fixed meaning and could not be used in any other sense. However, in actual linguistic practice, this is not the case. That is, words may be used directly in their designated meanings, but they may also undergo semantic shifts such as generalization and specification depending on contextual conditions, or they may be employed metaphorically or allusively beyond their primary meanings. In this case, determining what a term intends to convey—and consequently whether it falls into the category of literal meaning, metaphor, or allusion—necessarily requires its use within a sentence in accordance with the speaker's intent. However, the situation is different when it comes to the *waḍʿ* of a term. The meaning for which a term is designated remains fixed, even though some terms may have been separately designated for multiple meanings;

71 John R. Searle, one of the modern philosophers of language, examines how phenomena whose existence depends on human agreement—such as money, property, etc., with language being one of the most prominent and developed examples—are possible and established. In his work on this subject, he employs terms such as metaphysics and ontology while analyzing the presuppositions and processes that make such phenomena possible. John R. Searle, *The Construction of Social Reality* (London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1995), 1-29.

72 Ebû Alî el-Hüseyn İbn Sînâ, *Mantûḡa Giriş*, çev. Ömer Türker (İstanbul: Litera Yayıncılık, 2006), 19.

thus, it does not change. Therefore, it becomes evident why Qūshjī, in defining lexicology, refers not to the meaning signified by a word but to the meaning for which a term has been designated. This is because signification is only possible within a given linguistic context, which is contingent upon the speaker's intention. Consequently, the meaning signified by a word can only be understood after an instance of its use is observed. Lexicology, therefore, identifies the meanings that terms have been designated for prior to their use. The meaning for which a word is used, on the other hand, is determined by the speaker's intent. As later texts on *waḍʿ* state, the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* is the fundamental principle, while usage (*istiʿmāl*) is merely an extension (*farʿ*) of this principle.⁷³

5. Conclusion

In the first section of *ʿUnqūd al-zawāhir*, ʿAlī Qūshjī examines the phenomenon of *waḍʿ* as the metaphysical principle of the linguistic domain and its general issues. Essentially, *ʿUnqūd* is part of the independent literature that began with Ījī's *al-Risālah al-waḍʿiyyah*. In this sense, it can be said that Qūshjī systematically rearticulated the intellectual legacy he inherited while enriching it with his personal preferences and interpretations. *ʿUnqūd* is based on the assumption that there is no natural or rational connection between *lafẓ* as a type of sound and *maʿnā*; rather, linguistic signification is established by a thinking and volitional agent. In this respect, linguistic signification, which results from *waḍʿ* as a relational attribution, is not necessary but entirely contingent, shaped by the will of the language creator. However, the author refrains from adopting any particular theory regarding the origin of language or the identity of the language creator. Unlike his predecessors, Qūshjī directly situates the knowledge of *waḍʿ* within the principles of *ʿilm matn al-lughah*. The discipline of *matn al-lughah*, which records the specific designation knowledge of singular utterances used in language—hence their signification in terms of root letters—essentially constitutes the material foundation of linguistic existence. Therefore, examining the principles of *matn al-lughah* is fundamentally a philosophical inquiry into the foundations of linguistic existence. Since the primary

73 Salih Sürücü, *Eğimli Mehmed Rahmi Efendi'nin el-'Ucâletü'r-Rahmiyye fî Şerhi'r-Risâleti'l-vaz'îyye Adlı Eseri (Metin ve İnceleme)* (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2017), 244.

subject of the science of *waḍʿ* is the universal phenomenon of *waḍʿ*, it can be argued that *matn al-lughah* and the knowledge of *waḍʿ* share a universal-particular relationship. Moreover, the formal structure of both singular and compound utterances is also dependent on the phenomenon of *waḍʿ*. Consequently, *waḍʿ* constitutes the principle of lexicography (*lughah*), morphology (*şarf*), and syntax (*naḥw*) directly, and that of rhetoric (*balāghah*) indirectly. Furthermore, the elements of utterance and meaning become part of language through the relationship of signification after *waḍʿ* as the primary attribution and are thus subject to fundamental classifications. In this respect, universal *waḍʿ* as a whole constitutes the metaphysical principle of linguistic existence.

References

- Alak, Musa. "Meşihat Müsteşarı Eğinli İbrahim Hakkı Efendi'nin Vaz' İlmine Dair Risâlesinin Tahkik ve Tahlilî". *İstanbul Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 25 (2011), 29-76.
- Alp, Musa. "Ali Kuşçu'nun Takdimü'l-Musned İleyh (Mâ Ene Kultu) Risalesi: Tahkik ve Araştırma". *Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi (ÇÜİFD)* 7/2 (Haziran 2007), 147-168.
- Alp, Musa. *Arap Dili ve Belağatı Açısından Ali Kuşçu ve Unkûdû'z-zevâhir fî nazmî'l-cevâhir Adlı Eseri*. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, 2006.
- Alp, Musa. "Arap Dilinde Telif Edilmiş 'el-İfsah' Adlı Eserin Aidiyet Problemi, Kaynakları, İçeriği ve Değerlendirilmesi". *Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 10/2 (2010), 87-110.
- Altınörs, Atakan. *50 Soruda Dil Felsefesi*. İstanbul: 7 Renk Basım Yayım, 2012.
- Altınörs, Atakan. *Dil Felsefesine Giriş*. İstanbul: İnkılâp, 2003.
- Aşkan, Timur. "Abdullah Necîb el-Ayıntâbî'nin er-Risâletü'l-Vaz'îyye Adlı Eserinin Tahkikli Neşri". *Tahkik İslami İlimler Araştırma ve Neşir Dergisi* 2/1 (Haziran 2019), 31-80.
- Bolay, M. Naci. "Delâlet (Mantık)". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. C. 9. İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1994.
- Boyalık, M. Taha. *Dil, Söz ve Fesahat: Abdülkâhîr el-Cürcânî'nin Sözdizimi Nazariyesi*. İstanbul: Klasik, 2017.
- Cengiz, Mehdi. *Klasik İslam Düşüncesinde Delâlet - Göstergibilim Tarihinin Kayıp Halkası*. Ankara: Kitabe Yayınları, 2023.
- Cürcânî, Seyyid Şerif. *el-Misbâh fî şerhi'l-Miftâh*. thk. Yüksel Çelik. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2009.
- Cürcânî, Seyyid Şerif. *Kitâbü't-Tarîfât*. Beyrut: Dârü'l-Kütübî'l-İlmiyye, 1983.
- Çiçek, Mehmet. *Müfessir Olarak Ali Kuşçu*. İstanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2021.
- Demir, Ramazan. *Arap Dilbilimcilerine Göre Dillerin Kaynağı Meselesi*. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, 2008.

- Dizer, Muammer. *Ali Kuşçu*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1988.
- Doğan, Muhammed Osman. *Tecrîdî'l-itikâd Şârihlerinde İmâmet: İsfahanî ve Ali Kuşçu Örneği*. İstanbul: İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2018.
- Durmuş, İsmail. "Sözlük". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 37/398-401. İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 2009.
- Erdem, Engin. "Ali Kuşçu: Zorunlu Varlık'ın Zorunluluğu Üzerine Bir Tartışma". *Uluslararası 14. ve 15. Yüzyıl İslam Düşüncesinde Felsefe, Kelam ve Tasavvuf Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. 1/91-98. Ankara: Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2020.
- Erdem, Mehmet - Deliçay, Tahsin. "Mantık, Belâgat ve Usûl-ü Fıkıh İlimleri Arasında Ortak Bir Kavram Olarak 'Delâlet'". *Marîfe Dini Araştırmalar Dergisi* 2/1 (Mayıs 2002), 171-180.
- Fazlıoğlu, İhsan. "Ali Kuşçu". *İslam Düşünce Atlası*. 2/792-796. Konya: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017.
- Fazlıoğlu, İhsan. "Ali Kuşçu (Qushji, Abu al-Qasim Ala al-Din Ali ibn Muhammad Qushji-zade)". *Encyclopedia of Ottoman Empire*. ed. Gabor Agoston - Bruce Masters. 35-36. New York: Facts on File, 2009.
- Glock, Hans-Johann. *What Is Analytic Philosophy?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- İbn Sînâ, Ebû Âlî el-Hüseyn. *Mantûğa Giriş*. çev. Ömer Türker. İstanbul: Litera Yayıncılık, 2006.
- Kuşçu, Ali. *Risâle fî tahkiki lâmi't-tarîf*. İstanbul: Köprülü Kütüphanesi, Fazıl Ahmed Paşa, 1593/21.
- Kuşçu, Ali. *Risâle fî tahkiki lâmi't-tarîf*. İstanbul: Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Reşid Efendi, 1032/39.
- Kuşçu, Ali. *Unkûdî'z-zevâhir fî's-sarf*. thk. Ahmed Affî. Kahire: Matbaatü Dâri'l-Kütübî'l-Mısıriyye, 2001.
- Küçükcalay, Hüseyin. *Kuran Dili Arapça*. İstanbul: Muarrif Yayınları, 2. Basım., 2021.
- Magee, Bryan. *Men of Ideas - Some Creators of Contemporary Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Müftizâde Abdürrahim. *Şerhu Unkûdî'z-zevâhir*, ts.
- Özer, Hasan. "Ali Kuşçu ve 'Hâşiye 'Ale't-Telvîh' Adlı Eseri". *İslam Hukuku Araştırmaları Dergisi* 13 (2009), 361-392.
- Pehlivan, Necmettin. "Bir Âdâbu'l-Bahs ve'l-Munâzara Uygulaması Olarak Ali Kuşçu (ö. 879/1474)'nın Şerhu Tecrîdî'l-Kelâm (= eş-Şerhu'l-Cedîd)'i". *Uluslararası 14. ve 15. Yüzyıl İslam Düşüncesinde Felsefe, Kelam ve Tasavvuf Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. 1/172-193. Ankara: Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2020.
- Râzî, Fahreddin er-. *el-Mahsûl fî ilmi usûli'l-fıkh*. thk. Taha Cabir Feyyâz el-Alvânî. 1-6 Cilt. Beyrut: Müessesetü'r-Risâle, 1996.
- Searle, John R. *The Construction of Social Reality*. London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1995.
- Sekkâkî, Ebû Ya'kûb Yusuf b. Muhammed. *Miftâhu'l-ulûm*. thk. Abdülhamid Hindâvî. Beyrut: Dâri'l-Kütübî'l-İlmiyye, 2000.
- Soysal, Mehmet Fatih. *Ali Kuşçu'nun Şerhu Tecrîdî'l-Kelâm'ından Usûl-i Selâse Konularının Tahkiki ve İlâhiyat Meselelerinin Tahlili*. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, 2014.

- Sula, Murat. *Trabzon İl Halk Kütüphanesi'ndeki Arap Dili ve Belâğatı Alanındaki Yazmalar ve Ali Kuşçu'nun Risâle fi'l-mecâz ve'l-isti'âresi'nin Edisyon Kritiği*. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2000.
- Süiyûtî, Celâlüddin Abdurrahman b. Ebî Bekr es-. *el-Müzhir fi 'ulûmi'l-luga*. thk. Rıdvan Mâmû - Mervan Zühûrî. Beyrut: Müessesetü'r-Risâle Nâşirûn, 2021.
- Şensoy, Sedat. *Abdülkâhîr el-Cürcânî'de Anlam Problemi*. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, 2001.
- Şensoy, Sedat. *Mâ Ene Kultu Risâleleri: Tahkik ve İnceleme*. Konya: Aybil Yayınları, 2013.
- Tekin, Özkan. "Ali Kuşçu'nun Şerhu Tecrîdî'l-Kelâm'ının Kelâm İlmi Açısından Önemi". *Orta Asya'dan Anadolu'ya İlmî Yolculuğu*. 805-818. Karabük: Karabük Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2021.
- Umut, Hasan. *Theoretical Astronomy in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire: 'Alî al-Qūshjî's Al-Risâla al-Fathîyya*. Montreal: McGill University, Institute of Islamic Studies, PhD diss., 2019.
- Ünver, Süheyl. *Türk Pozitif İlimler Tarihinden Bir Bahis: Ali Kuşçu-Hayatı ve Eserleri*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Fen Fakültesi, 1948.
- Yıldırım, Abdullah. "Adudüddin el-Îcî ve er-Risâletü'l-vaz'îyye". *İslâm İlim ve Düşünce Geleneginde Adudüddin el-Îcî*. ed. Eşref Altaş. İstanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2017.
- Yıldırım, Abdullah. "Ali Kuşçu ve Risâle fi Vaz'î'l-Müfredât'ı". *İslâm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 19 (2008), 63-86.
- Yıldırım, Abdullah. *Ali Kuşçu ve Unkûdü'z-Zevâhir - Dil ile Anlam*. İstanbul: Ketebe Yayınları, 2024.
- Yıldırım, Abdullah. "Miftâhu'l-Ulûm'da İlmü'l-Edeb Kavrayışı". *İhya Uluslararası İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi* 8/2 (Temmuz 2022), 870-892.
- Yıldız, Musa. *Ali Kuşçu ve İstiare Risalesi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2020.
- Yiğit, Fevzi. "Ali Kuşçu'nun İlet ve Malul Hakkındaki Görüşleri". *Uluslararası 14. ve 15. Yüzyıl İslam Düşüncesinde Felsefe, Kelam ve Tasavvuf Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. 1/119-133. Ankara: Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2020.