

Answer to Question

The Original Connotation (Dalalat Al-Asl) and the Appendant (Secondary) Connotation (Dalalah Tabi'ah)

To: Yeni Camii

(Translated)

Question:

It is stated in *The Islamic Personality* Volume I, p. 307 (Arabic version), that connotations (Dalalat) are divided into original connotation (**Dalalat Al-Asl**) and the appendant (secondary) connotation (Dalalah Tabi'ah) ... However, it was mentioned in *The Islamic Personality* Volume III, p. 129 (Arabic version), that the connotations (Dalalat) are divided into utterances (Mantooq) and concepts (Mafhoom), and that the utterance (Mantooq) is of two parts; conformity (Mutabaqa) and implication (Tadhamun), and that the concept (Mafhoom), i.e., the binding connotation (Dalalat Al-iltizam), is of different types. From these types is the indication connotation (Dalalat Al-Ishara). When explaining the indication connotation (Dalalat Al-Ishara), its examples were the same as those mentioned in the *The Islamic Personality* Volume I as examples of the appendant (secondary) connotation (Dalalah Tabi'ah) for some of them. This caused some confusion on the subject of divisions mentioned in Volume I and Volume III. So, is the original connotation (**Dalalat Al-Asl**) the utterance (mantooq) and the appendant (secondary) connotation (Dalalah Tabi'ah) is the concept (mafhoom)? Or is there a specific aspect for each division of connotations (Dalalat) in which it is used? Was the division of these connotations (Dalalat) in one or different times? May Allah reward you with good.

Answer:

1- The part you are asking about is in the book, *The Islamic Personality* Volume I, which fully clarifies the meaning of the original connotation (Dalalat Al-Asl) and the appendant (secondary) connotation (Dalalah Tabi'ah). It says in the chapter on "The Ummah's need today for Mufassirin" [on page 305-307 of the (Arabic Word file) / English version p. 228]:

[As for the reality of the Qur'an in terms of its vocabulary, we can see that it contains vocabulary on which the linguistic meaning applies literally (haqiqatan) and it also applies metaphorically (majazan). The linguistic and metaphorical meaning may continue to be used together. The intended meaning is known by the qarina (indication) in each phrase construction. The linguistic meaning may be intentionally forgotten with the metaphorical meaning continuing, so it becomes what is intended and not the linguistic meaning. We also notice vocabulary on which only the linguistic meaning applies. It is not used in the metaphorical sense due to the absence of any qarina (indication) which would divert us from the linguistic meaning. And within it, there is vocabulary on which the linguistic meaning and the new Shari'ah meaning applies to the exclusion of the literal and metaphorical meanings. Vocabulary in the linguistic and Shari'ah sense is used in various verses. What determines any intended meaning is the structure of the ayah. Otherwise, only the Shari'ah meaning applies to it and it is not used in the linguistic sense. For example, the word qarya (town) is used in the linguistic sense only. He (swt) says: ﴿حَتَّىٰ إِذَا أَتَيَا أَهْلَ قَرْيَةٍ اسْتَطَعُوا أَهْلِهَا﴾ **"Till, when they came to the people of the town"** [TMQ Al-Kahf: 77] ﴿أَخْرِجْنَا مِنْ هَذِهِ الْقَرْيَةِ﴾ **"Rescue us from this town"** [TMQ An-Nisa': 75] It is used in its metaphorical sense. He (swt) says: ﴿وَاسْأَلِ الْقَرْيَةَ﴾ **"And ask (the people of) the town where we have been"** [TMQ Yusuf: 82] The town is not questioned but rather those intended are the people of the town; this meaning is

metaphorical. And He (swt) says: ﴿وَكَايَ مِنْ قَرْيَةٍ عَتَتْ عَنْ أَمْرِ رَبِّهَا﴾ **“And many a town (population) revolted against the Command of its Lord”** [TMQ At-Talaaq: 8] The people of the town are intended here. And for example in His (swt) saying: ﴿أَرَأَيْتَ الَّذِي يَنْهَى * عَبْدًا إِذَا صَلَّى﴾ **“Have you (O Muhammad (saw)) seen him (that is, Abu Jahl) who prevents, a slave (Muhammad (saw)) when he prays?”** [TMQ Al-‘Alaq: 9-10] What is intended here is the Shari’ah meaning: ﴿يُصَلُّونَ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ﴾. And in the ayah: **“His angels too ask Allah to bless and forgive the Prophet”** [TMQ Al-Ahzaab: 56] what is intended here is the linguistic meaning which is the du’a (supplication). And for example, in His (swt) saying: ﴿فَإِذَا قُضِيَتِ الصَّلَاةُ﴾ **“Then when the (jum'a) salat (prayer) is finished”** [TMQ Al-Jumu’a: 10] and His saying (swt): ﴿يَا بُنَيَّ أَقِمِ الصَّلَاةَ﴾ **“O my son! Establish the salat (prayer)”** [TMQ Luqman: 17]. All the ayat in which salah is mentioned, they have only been used in the Shari’ah meaning.

This is with regards to the vocabulary. As for the phrases, the Arabic language (is composed of) words which indicate meanings; when we examine these words in terms of their presence in phrases whether in terms of their existence in phrases whether relating to its isolated meaning in the phrase or the meaning of the whole phrase, we will only find two perspectives. **Firstly, they should be viewed from the angle of being general words and expressions which indicate general meanings, and this is the original connotation. Secondly, they should be viewed from the angle of being words and expressions which indicate meanings which serve general words and expressions; this is the appendant (secondary) connotation.**

As for the second category i.e., the fact that the structures are composed of words and expressions indicating meanings which serve general (mutlaqa) words and expressions, every peice of information stated in the sentence necesitates the clarification of what is intended in the sentence in relation to this piece of information. So the sentence is composed in a manner which leads to the intention, according to the informer and the one who is being informed of it, with the same report, in the same state in which it existed and in the same context in which the sentence cites and in the type of style in terms of clarity, ambiguity, brevity and vorbosity etc. So you would say at the beggining of a report: qaama (stood up) zayd, if there is no concern about the one being informed rather the report. If the concern is about the one being informed you would say: zayd qam. And in response to a question or something on the level of a question you would say: Indeed zayd did stand up (inna zaydan qam) and in respose to someone who refuses to believe: By Allah! Indeed zayd did stand up (wallahi inna zaydan qam). In notifying someone who expects Zayd to stand up: zayd has stood up (qad qama zayd) and other such issues which should be considered in Arabic texts. The Qur’an has come fulfilling those two viewpoints.

So the absolute words and expressions indicating absolute meanings and the words and expressions with restricted meanings have come serving absolute meanings in various rhetorical aspects. One of finest aspects evident in it is the existence of the words with serving meanings which is the appendant connotation, the ayaat and the parts of ayaat which repeat in the Qur’an in a single Sura or in different Sura’s and similarly the stories and the sentences which repeat in the Qur’an and the preference of the attribute (Mahmul) over the subject (Maudu’), and the different types of emphasis or a single type according to the course of the sentence, and negational enquiries etc.; all of this implicate the highest type of appendant connotation. You will find an ayah or a part of an ayah or a sentence or story in a certain sequence in some Sura’s and in another sequence in another Sura and it is seen in a third style in another Sura etc. You will not find one expression where the original sequence has been changed like the precedence of the predicate before the subject, or mentioning a certain part of some information in preference to another part of the same information that is usually used, we will find an eloquent witty point aimed at generating a meaning that serves the general meanings contained in the words and phrases of the Ayah.] **End**

2- As you can see, the original connotation **is what is seen from the point of view of being absolute words and phrases indicative of absolute meanings, which is the**

original connotation. That is, the meaning of the words according to the methods of the language, such as bringing forth (taqdeem) and delay (ta'kheer), expansion (itnab) and brevity (ljaz), fact (haqiqa) and metaphor (majaz)... etc. In other words, it is the utterance (mantooq) of the text, so the utterance, as stated in *The Islamic Personality* Volume III p. 180, is: (If the denotation of the assignment address over the verdict is benefited directly from the expression, then it is the literal denotation (دلالة المنطوق), and if the denotation is from the meaning which the expression denotes, then it is the connotation denotation (دلالة المفهوم). The mandtooq is that which the expression denotes it decisively in the place of its utterance, that is which is understood from the expression directly without any means or possibility, like the obligation of fasting the month of Ramadhan which is understood from the saying of Allah Ta'ala: ﴿فَمَنْ شَهِدَ مِنْكُمْ الشَّهْرَ فَلْيَصُمْهُ﴾ **“So whosoever of you is present during (witnesses) that month must fast it”** (Surat Al-Baqarah: 185), and that is when the expression is uttered, it denotes the meaning, which is called the expressional denotation. So what the expression denotes by correspondence or inclusion is the literal denotation, it is not that which is understood from the context of the talk, because the expression with regard to the denotative is divided into three divisions; they are: the corresponding denotation (دلالة المطابقة), the inclusion denotation (دلالة التضمن), and the binding denotation (دلالة الالتزام). So the denotation of the expression upon its meaning completely and correspondingly is from the literal denotation, and the denotation of the expression upon its meaning partially is inclusion denotation and it is from the literal denotation too. And if the address denotes the verdict by its literal denotation, it should primarily be regarded as a shari'ahi reality like the saying of the Messenger (saw): «لَيْسَ مِنَ الْبِرِّ الصِّيَامُ فِي السَّفَرِ» **“It is not of the piety to fast while travelling”** compiled by Ahmad, it should be regarded as the shari'ahi sawm not the linguistic sawm, because the prophet (saw) was sent to clarify the shari'ahi matters. If the expression is not a shari'ahi reality or it is but it cannot be carried out on it, it should be regarded as the conventional reality that existed at era of the Prophet (saw), because this should be firstly regarded to understand, and because the shari'ah considers the convention in many issues like the belief. If it is impossible to carry it out on the shari'ahi reality, or on the conventional reality which existed at Messenger's era, then it should be regarded as a linguistic reality. So the texts of the shari'ah are legislative expressions came to clarify the Islamic shari'ah, so properly their denotation is the shari'ahi meaning, then the conventional meaning, then the linguistic meaning. This is if the use of the shari'ahi and conventional meanings increase so that one of them overcomes the linguistic meaning, but if it is not like that, then the meaning is common between the three and cannot be outweighed without an indication, and if it is impossible to carry it out on the three realities; it should be carried out on the metaphorical meaning to safeguard the talk from the negligence).

3- Thus, we can see that the original connotation is the utterance connotation and both mean the expression connotation. The speech connotation on the ruling, if it was from the expression, then it is the utterance connotation. **The original connotation is what is seen from the point of view of being absolute words and phrases indicative of absolute meanings, which is the original connotation.** The appendant (secondary) connotation is a servant of the original connotation and clarifies it in a wonderful manner that shows the splendor of the meaning and the splendor of the structure; that is, it is a servant of the utterance that clarifies it and clarifies it in terms of truth (haqiqa) and metaphor (majaz), expansion (itnab) and brevity (ljaz), bringing forth (taqdeem) and delay (ta'kheer),...etc., i.e. with everything that clarifies the meaning and highlights (the manifestation of His eloquence and the ability of His miraculousness)..and this means **appendant (secondary) connotation is an explanation of the utterance confirming its ruling and not an explanation of another ruling, as it serves the original connotation i.e. the utterance to clarify its meaning and not to create a different ruling, i.e. the appendant (secondary) connotation is not the concept (mafهوم) nor is it a type of its types.** The mandtooq is what is understood from the denotation of the expression, but the mafهوم is what is understood from the denoted meaning of the expression like His Ta'ala's saying: ﴿فَلَا تَقُلْ لَهُمَا﴾ **“say not to them (ugh) a word of disrespect”** (Surat al Israa': 23), the denotation of

the expression is that you don't say 'ugh' to them and this is the mandtooq, but the denoted meaning of the expression which is the forbiddance of saying 'ugh' to them can be understood from it that you mustn't hit them, so the mafhoom of His Ta'ala's saying: ﴿فَلَا تَقُلْ لَهُمَا أُفٌ﴾ **“say not to them (ugh)”** is don't hit them. So the forbiddance of hitting the parents which is understood from the Aayah is denoted by the denoted meaning of the Aayah...).

4- And for your information, the utterance (mantooq) and the concept (mafhoom) were focused on by scholars of fundamentals (usool) in the first centuries since the era of Ash-Shafi'i, [died 204 Hijri], as Al-Juwayni said in Al-Burhan, and it flourished in the fifth century AH, especially according to Al-Juwayni, the Imam of the Two Holy Mosques in his book (Al-Burhan fi Usul al-Fiqh) who died in the year 478 AH And Al-Ghazali in his book (Al-Mustasfa), who died in 505 AH, and we will mention some of what Al-Ghazali said about Al-Mustasfa:

On p. 25: [The first chapter is about the utterance connotation on meanings]

The first art in the antecedents has three chapters

The first chapter: on the utterance connotation on the meaning, it is clear that the intention behind it are divisions:

The first division: that the utterance connotation on the meaning is limited to three aspects, which are conformity (mutabaqa), implication (tadhamun) and binding (Iltizam)...etc

On page 246: the Fifth: Understanding by the context, like forbidding beating the father, since it is understood from the prohibition of expressing disappointment (oof). It is definite like the text. Even if it is not based on an expression. We are not after the exact expression but its indication. Every audible evience is definite, and is like the text. The mafhoom (concept) according to those who follow this opinion is also like the mantooq, what is uttered, even if it is mentioned in general in the obligation of the zakat of goats and the Legislator then says: «فِي سَائِمَةِ الْغَنَمِ زَكَاةٌ» **“There is zakat in the pasturing goat”**, they take the non pasturing goats from the mafhoom (concept) of this expression of the general name of goats, ghanam, na'am etc]

Then the scholars of fundamentals (Usool) followed, so there was “Al-Mahsool Fi Usool Al Fiqh” in the fundamentals of jurisprudence by Ibn Al-Arabi who died in 543 AH, and “Al-Mahsool” by Al-Razi who died in 606 AH, and “Rawdat Al-Nazir” by Ibn Qudamah who died in 620 AH, then “Al-Ahkam Fi Usool Al-Ahkam” by Al-Amdi who died in 631 AH... then the scholars of fundamentals (Usool) after that.

5- Then there was the division of connotations into original and appendant, and the most focused on this matter was Imam Al-Shatibi who died in 790 AH in his book Al-Muwafaqat - volume I - Chapter on “Types of Arabic Meanings and Its Ranks”, first edition 1417 AH / 1997 CE (pp. 51-52), where he said:

[(3) Types of Arabic meanings and its ranks... It is customary for Arabs in discourse - as Al-Shatibi mentions - that the Arabic language has two indications:

The first: In terms of being absolute words and expressions, indicative of absolute meanings. It is the original connotation, and this is shared by all tongues, and to it the aims of the speakers end, and it is not specific to one nation over another, and it is the one that can be translated into other languages, and it is correct to interpret the Qur'an from, and clarifying its meaning to the public, and whoever has no understanding is able to obtain its meanings.

And the second: in terms of being utterances and restricted expressions, indicative of servant meanings. And this is the appendant connotation to the original connotation. This is specific to Lisan al-Arab. (“Every news requires matters in this aspect that serve that, according to the informant, the one who is informed about him, the one who is informed of him, and the same news, in the case and context, and the type of method of clarification and concealment, brevity and expansion, and according to the metaphor of it, and stating it, and according to what is intended in the course of informing, and what the case may be... and other matters that cannot be counted.. Such behaviours, according to which the meaning of a single speech differs, are not the original intention, but they are among its complements and

having patience in this type, improves the speech if there is no reprehensible in it”) And he adds, saying about this second connotation: (“It is what is searched for in the science of rhetoric, and the rhetoricians call it “consequences of compositions”; it is the characteristics of the systems that raise the status of speech. If the Qur’an, as linguistic utterances, has an original and appendant connotation (which is the manifestation of its eloquence, and the ability of its miraculousness); Its translation, given the secondary meaning, is not easy. Al-Zamakhshari said in “Al-Kashshaf”: “In the speech of the Arabs especially the Qur’an - there are subtle meanings that no tongue can perform independently.” As for what can be transferred to another language, it is the original meaning, where foreign languages do not fall short in translating them, and this is what al-Shatibi decided on the issue of translating the Qur’an...)] **End**

6- It is worth mentioning that there is a difference of opinion on this issue among the scholars of Usul. Some of them said similar to what we have mentioned, that the appendant connotation does not bring a new ruling, but rather it serves to explain the original connotation. Some of them make the appendant connotation from the mafhoom (concept), especially the indication connotation (Dalalat Al-Ishara), such as the minimum period of pregnancy...etc. We have explained the indication connotation (Dalalat Al-Ishara) as part of the mafhoom (concept) in *The Islamic Personality* Volume III page 186, and we said:

[The indication connotation (Dalalat Al-Ishara): the indication of the indication is that the speech was conveyed to clarify a ruling, or indicated a ruling, but it is understood from it another ruling other than the ruling that was cited to clarify it, or came to indicate it, even though this other ruling was not intended by the speech, so the indication of the speech is on. This ruling, which was not irrigated for, nor indicated for, but is understood from, is the indication of the sign. An example of this is the indication of the sum of His words, the Most High: ﴿وَحَمْلُهُ وَفِصَالُهُ ثَلَاثُونَ شَهْرًا﴾ **“And his carrying and his weaning is thirty months”** and the Almighty’s saying: ﴿وَفِصَالُهُ فِي عَامَيْنِ﴾ **“And his weaning is in two years”** that the minimum period of pregnancy is six months, even if it is not that was not intended by the word. Likewise, the Most High’s saying: ﴿فَالآنَ بَاشِرُوهُمْ﴾ **“So now, have good relations with them”** He permitted direct relations until the onset of dawn by saying: ﴿حَتَّىٰ يَتَبَيَّنَ لَكُمُ الْخَيْطُ الْأَبْيَضُ مِنَ الْخَيْطِ الْأَسْوَدِ مِنَ الْفَجْرِ﴾ **“Until the white thread becomes clear to you from the black thread of dawn”** and the statement of that was what was intended, and yet it was necessary for him that whoever had intercourse on the night of Ramadan and became junub did not invalidate his fast; because if someone has intercourse at the end of the night, his washing must be delayed until the day]

Al-Shatibi confirms that there are scholars of original and appendant connotation who say this, i.e., the appendant connotation is the indication connotation and give it the same examples that we mentioned for the indication connotation. So he said in Al-Muwafaqat 2/151-154, explaining the difference in the appendant connotation, under the title (the fifth issue), and he says:

[If it is established that the speech in terms of its indication of the meaning has two considerations, from the aspect of its indication of the original meaning, and from its aspect of the appendant indication that is a servant of the original, then it is necessary to consider the aspect from which the rulings are derived, and whether it is specific to the original meaning or covers both aspects.

As for the aspect of the original meaning, there is no problem with the validity of considering it in denoting rulings in general, and there is no room for disagreement about it in any case. As for the aspect of the appendant meaning, **is it correct** to consider it in denoting rulings in terms of getting extra meanings from them to the original meaning, or not? This is a matter of hesitation, and each of the parties has a point of view.

The proofreader may refer to aspects:

The second is that the inference of the Shari’ah on rulings is in terms of their being in the tongue of the Arabs, not in terms of their being words only. This consideration includes what

is indicated by the first aspect and what is indicated by the second aspect. So the specification of the first by denoting the rulings without the second is the specification of those that are not specific, and the outweighing of those that are not likely, and all of that is invalid, because the first is not prior to the indication than the second, so considering them together is the determinant.

And the third is that the scholars considered it and inferred rulings from it in many places:

The first, then, is not prior to the indication than the second, so considering both of them together is the determinant.

And the third is that the scholars considered it and inferred rulings from it in many places:

They inferred that the longest period of menstruation is fifteen days, because of his saying (saw): «تَمَكُّثُ إِحْدَاكُنَّ شَطْرَ دَهْرِهَا لَا تُصَلِّي» “**One of you should stay for part of her life, not praying.**” What is meant is to tell of a decrease in debt, not to tell of the maximum period, but exaggeration necessitated mentioning that, and if the increase was imagined, it would be presented.

And as their evidence for estimating the minimum period of pregnancy is six months, taking Allah’s saying (swt): ﴿وَحَمْلُهُ وَفِصَالُهُ ثَلَاثُونَ شَهْرًا﴾ “**And his gestation and weaning [period] is thirty months**” [Al-Ahqaf: 15] along with His (swt) saying: ﴿وَفِصَالُهُ فِي عَامَيْنِ﴾ “**...and his weaning is in two years**” [Luqman: 14] so the intent in the first verse is to explain the duration of both matters without elaboration, then He (swt) explained in the second the period of weaning intentionally and was silent about the duration of pregnancy alone, not intentionally, and He (swt) did not mention its duration, so it was necessary for that to be at least six months.

And they said regarding His (swt) saying, ﴿فَالآنَ بَاشِرُوهُمْ﴾ “**So now have relations with them**” [Al-Baqara: 187] And they said regarding His (swt) saying: ﴿حَتَّىٰ يَبْيُنَّ لَكُمُ الْخَيْطُ الْأَبْيَضُ مِنَ الْخَيْطِ الْأَسْوَدِ مِنَ الْفَجْرِ﴾ “**...until the white thread of dawn becomes distinct to you from the black thread [of night]**” [Al-Baqara: 187] The verse indicates that it is permissible to wake up in a state of impurity (junub) and the validity of fasting, because the permissibility of direct intimacy until the rising of dawn requires that, even if the explanation is not intended because what is bound to the intention is the explanation of permissibility of intimacy, eating and drinking.

The preventer (mani’) may also be inferred by the following aspects:

One of them is that this aspect is by imposition a servant of the first and by following it. Its indication of a meaning is only in terms of it affirming the first, strengthening it, clarifying its meaning, and listening to it is accepted and is comprehensible to the minds.

What we say regarding: ﴿وَاسْأَلِ الْقَرْيَةَ الَّتِي كُنَّا فِيهَا﴾ “**And ask the village in which we were in**” [Yusuf: 82] the intent is to ask the people of the village, but the village was made responsible, an exaggeration in fulfilling the question and other than that, so there was no ruling based on attributing the question to the village.

And the third is that setting this aspect to be dependent on the first one requires that what it fulfills in terms of meaning cannot be taken except from that aspect. If it is permissible to take it from something else, it would be a departure from its position, and that is not correct, and its indication of a rule that is added to what is in the first is a departure from it being dependent on the first. So, the use of the ruling on its part will be based on a non-Arabic understanding, and that is not correct.

As for the period of menstruation, we do not accept that the hadeeth indicates it, and there is a dispute about it. Therefore, the Hanafis say that the most of it is ten days, and if it is correct, then this is not from the aspect of the wording connotation denoting the situation, and there is discussion on it... and the minimum period of pregnancy is taken from the first side, not from the second side, and the same applies to the issue of waking up in impurity (junub), since otherwise is not possible.

And so is the rest of what is imposed in this section. The conclusion is that the inference on the second side of the rulings is not proven, so it is not correct to implement it at all.

It is correct, then, to say that it is absolutely forbidden, and Allah knows best, meaning that Al-Shatibi does not take the opinion of the first group, but rather the second, but after that he adds:

[Chapter: The contradiction of the evidence in the matter has been shown and it has appeared that the stronger of the two sides is the side of the objectors, so the case necessitates that the second side, which is the signifier of the consequential meaning, has no indication of an extra Shariah ruling at all. But there remains another consideration, perhaps I think that it has an indication of extra meanings to the original meaning; which are Shariah etiquette and good morals recognized by every person with a sound mind, so they have consideration in the Shariah, so the second aspect is not completely devoid of the connotation.

7- In conclusion:

a- The original connotation (Dalalat Al-Asl) is the utterance (Al-Mantooq) and both mean the expression connotation. The utterance connotation is the speech connotation on the ruling, if it was from the expression directly, in the place of definite pronunciation. **The original connotation is what is seen from the point of view of being absolute words and phrases indicative of absolute meanings, which is the original connotation.**

So, the mantooq and the original connotation are both connotations directly from the expression.

b- The appendant (secondary) connotation is a servant of the mantooq and clarifies it in a wonderful manner that shows the splendor of the meaning and the splendor of the structure; that is, it is a servant of the utterance that clarifies it and clarifies it in terms of truth (haqiqa) and metaphor (majaz), expansion (itnab) and brevity (Ijaz), bringing forth (taqdeem) and delay (ta'kheer),...etc.; that is, with everything that clarifies the meaning and highlights (the manifestation of His eloquence and the ability of His miraculousness)..**and this means appendant (secondary) connotation is an explanation of the utterance confirming its ruling and not an explanation of another ruling, as it serves the original connotation i.e. the utterance to clarify its meaning and not to create a different ruling, i.e. the appendant (secondary) connotation is not the concept (mafهوم) nor is it a type of its types...neither the indication connotation (Dalalat Al-Ishara) or any other type.**

c- For your information, there is a difference of opinion on this issue among scholars of fundamentals (Usool). Some of them said similar to what we have mentioned, that the appendant connotation does not bring a new ruling, but rather it is a servant that explains the original connotation. Among them are those who make the appendant connotation from the concept (mafهوم), especially the indication connotation (**Dalalat Al-Ishara**), such as the longest period of menstruation and the shortest period of pregnancy, and the waking in the morning with impurity (junub) does not invalidate the fast, etc, as indicated above. However, the most preponderant view to us is what we have mentioned above.

Your brother,

Ata Bin Khalil Abu Al-Rashtah

6 Sha'ban 1444 AH

26/2/2023 CE

The link to the answer from the Ameer's Facebook page:

<https://www.facebook.com/HT.AtaabuAlrashtah/posts/761354582218580>