

Durham E-Theses

The accusative in Arabic grammatical literature

David Roland Marshall

How to cite:

Marshall, David Roland (1963) The accusative in Arabic grammatical literature. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1983/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE ACCUSATIVE IN
ARABIC GRAMMATICAL LITERATURE

by

David R. Marshall

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

Thesis presented for the degree of Ph.D. in the
University of Durham.

April 1963.

School of Oriental Studies
Elvet Hill
Durham.

CONTENTS

Introduction	i
The Place of Arabic in the Semitic Languages	xvi
Terminology	xxx
The Direct Object	1
Nidā' - The Vocative	36
The Absolute Object	63
Accusative of Concomitance	72
Accusative of Purpose	83
Adverbial Accusative	88
State - Hāl - Accidental Qualitative	102
Tamyīz - Specification	128
The Verb Kāna - "To Be" - and its Sisters	149
"Inna" and its Sisters	162
Negation	175
Istithnā' - Exception	187
The Depth of the Arabs' Thought	211
Bibliography	221

- o - o - o - o - o - o - o -

FOREWORD

This thesis was envisaged while I was still an undergraduate, for I felt even then that I would like to do some research into some grammatical aspect of Arabic. Since my school days I have had an interest in languages for their own sake, and this work fulfils a desire to do something original in a linguistic field.

There is one important point which must be made. Much of the research was carried out from books written in Arabic. Other sources of information were written in French and German. I have therefore translated everything into English in order to make the work readable, and to give it uniformity. I must consequently apologise for the loss of certain of the literary and linguistic skills of the originals in the course of translation. I must also apologise for a certain clumsiness of translation in some places, but I have attempted to translate literally rather than freely in order to show the actual wording of the grammarians, thereby enabling the reader to see just how much this wording changed from one writer to another.

I would also like to take this opportunity of thanking J.A. Haywood, Esq., M.A., B.Mus., my supervisor, for his invaluable help: Professor T.W. Thacker, Director of the School of Oriental Studies, who furnished much useful information in the field of comparative linguistics: and Mr. I.G. Ismail, my fellow research student in the

Department, who helped me to look at things from an Arab's point of view. I would also like to thank both the first two aforementioned persons, and the Standing Committee for Research Awards in the Durham Colleges in the University of Durham, who enabled me to carry out this research.

INTRODUCTION

It would be well to ask first of all what the intention of this thesis is, and what is its aim. Perhaps the answer can best be summed up in the one word "why?" A large number of competent grammars have been written by scholars, both Oriental and Western, which deal at varying lengths with the various aspects of Arabic grammar. However, most of these works give only the rules for the various syntactical points: this work is concerned with trying to establish why, and not simply when, the accusative is used, and the depth of the Arabs' thought into their grammar and its analysis. This is not an endeavour to write another grammar, but of necessity much of what the grammarians had to say must be reproduced, since no analysis can be made until the facts have been revealed.

The reason why it is the accusative which has been chosen for examination is its wide range of uses, some of them obvious, some of them not so obvious. At first sight, it appears that the Arabs had very definite views about what went into the nominative and what went into the genitive: it is possible that in certain instances anything not conforming to the rules for these cases was put into the accusative, as it was the only remaining case. To establish how much truth there may be in this is the problem which this work will try to resolve.

It must also be established immediately why the word

accusative, and not نَصَبٌ, has been chosen for the title, and why this word and مَنْصُوبٌ have been translated in the pages that follow as "accusative". The reason is quite simple: in Arabic terminology نَصَبٌ serves to denote not only one of the oblique cases, but also the subjunctive mood of the verb, and the verb is of no concern here. (We shall see in a later chapter, when we examine the terminology used by the grammarians, how the word نَصَبٌ itself came into use.)

As this thesis deals specifically with a grammatical topic, it would be well to show briefly where and when the science of grammatical analysis originated, and in particular its beginnings as an Arabic science. Nowadays, when even a young schoolboy can quite easily categorise a given piece of language into its component parts, it is difficult for us to realise that at one time great scholars spent years breaking grammar down into these various component parts. Robins, in his "Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe" tells us: "There is ... one preliminary remark that it might be well to make. By all definitions and treatments grammar involves speaking or writing about the working of language or languages: grammar is "language about language". The language of grammar is a second-order language, subsequent in both temporal and logical succession to the use of language itself. Men, even learned men, spoke and wrote before they formulated grammatical rules

for their languages, just as John Locke rightly tells us that man thought rationally before Aristotle laid down the so-called "Laws of thought"; "God has not been so sparing to men, to make them barely two-legged creatures, and left it to Aristotle to make them rational". The same might be said of grammatical studies and with reference to any of the great grammarians. When this elementary fact has been realised we hear less of the deplorable assertions, based on little but a priori prejudice and ignorance, that the languages of unlettered and uncivilised peoples can "have no grammar", simply because no one has so far been willing, or competent, to discover and set down the structure of their language and the manner of their employment of it.

"In studying the history of grammar in the western world, as in so many other speculative subjects, one must start with the work of ancient Greece. Exactly what causes, geographical, political or racial, led to the miraculous flowering of the Greek genius for inquiry in so many fields is an absorbing question, but it cannot be pursued here. What must be said is that quite early in their history the attention of those Greeks who were later philosophers was turned to considering the facts of their own language".⁽¹⁾

This is taken a stage further by Collart in his book

(1) Robins, *Ancient & Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe*, London, 1951, p.2f.

about Varro: "The word 'grammar' evokes in us the idea of a precise and independent science: it is the study of the spoken language and of the written language, the analysis of sounds, of forms, of phrases, the history of words and the methods of expression.

"The taste for specialisation which to-day seems to us the only attitude possible and the only one fruitful was not in general that of the ancients. The reason for this was that grammar only very slowly disengaged itself from the disciplines which caused it to blossom: philosophy, criticism and rhetoric. Grammar, a science arriving very late in the history of sciences, a science for long in tutelage, acquired only at length its autonomy and its methods.

"The first philological speculations of the ancients ... are shown to us, it appears, under two different aspects. (i) With some of them grammar is treated only incidentally, in odds and ends, under the heading of an accessory branch of another discipline: philosophy, criticism or rhetoric. It remained in second place ... (Authors) drew from it only arguments valuable to their own speciality and in favour of their theses. They considered it as a convenient arsenal for their discussions. This, it appears, is the oldest attitude of all. Then the controversies of schools led the scholars to present an argument more elaborate on such-and-such a point of the grammatical arsenal. Then (ii) with

certain more tardy writers, in the hellenistic epoch, philological questions were treated for themselves, most often in the form of monographs. Here, the roles were reversed; grammar was often in first place; but the foreign preoccupations remained".⁽²⁾

We thus see grammar established as a science among the ancients. But what, it might be asked, is the connection between this and Arabic grammatical analysis? That the early grammarians of Arabic were affected by some external influence is reasonably certain. It seems too much to imagine that they invented their own system of grammatical analysis. We see also the extreme efficiency with which Sībawayh begins his grammar, immediately dividing language into its three main component parts - verb, noun and particle. It is therefore tolerably certain that he, as were his predecessors, was acquainted with a method of grammatical analysis before embarking on the task of analysing Arabic, and this influence was probably of Greek origin. We know that, before the days when any attempt was made to analyse Arabic, Greek philosophical methods were known in Persia, and indeed some philosophers had even gone there, so there was undoubtedly a close cultural contact between Greece and Persia. Indeed, it was a Persian, Ibn

(2) Collart, Varron; Grammarian Latin, Paris, 1954, p.1f.

al-Muqaffa'a, who was regarded as the founder of ^{أدب} , or belles lettres, in Arabic. It is therefore quite probable that the early grammarians - of whom Sībawayh was himself a Persian, and others had resided in Persia - were affected by the Greek influence, and based their method of analysis on that of the Greeks. This same Greek influence may also have reached Persia via Syria, since Syriac was an additional language used by Persian scribes, and there was contact between Greece and Syria. A further source of influence may well have been of Indian origin. The copious writings in Sanskrit had led to philosophical studies, and the Indian influence was to be felt in Persia - traces of it can be seen in the "Kalīla wa Dimna", and other literary works.

Thus the ancient science of grammar was to be adopted by the Arabs, although it had to be adapted to suit their own particular needs. "Arabs are most reluctant to admit foreign influence in their literature, especially anything connected with their language. This is not merely due to the particular role of the language as the vehicle for the Quranic revelation, but to the misguided idea that to admit the influence of foreign ideas detracts from their own achievements. This is not so. However much the early Arab philologists may have owed to Greek and Indian notions, nothing can belittle the use they made of such notions."⁽³⁾

(3) Haywood, Arabic Lexicography, Leiden, 1960, p.2.

"At about the time of the birth of Christ, the twin sciences of Grammar and Lexicography came into prominence in both Sanskrit and Greek. This is of special interest to us, for we know of Greek and Indian influence in other fields of Arabic literature - the former in philosophy and the sciences, the latter in fable and fiction.

"Greek philological ideas were coloured by philosophy, and the disputes of the Analogists and the Anomalists were transferred to linguistics. This was to have far-reaching influence in Latin, where it figured prominently in Varro's "De Lingua Latina", and perhaps also on Arabic? Is it too far-fetched to compare the Basrans, who set such store by "Qiyās", with the Analogists; and the Kufans, with their study of Arabic dialectical forms, with the Anomalists? Is not the notion of the Anomalists behind the much publicised visits of certain lexicographers to Arabian desert tribes, as a corrective and a supplement to the theorisings of pedantic teachers?

"..... in the Seventh Century, the Arabs, inspired by religion and love of war, burst forth from their barren peninsula, and created a world-empire. In that empire, scholarship was able to flourish because patronage was available in plenty. We have already seen that the dictates of religion demanded philological studies. These studies were especially necessary for foreigners who were subjects of the Khalifas. At the same time, those foreigners,

especially the Persians, provided the brains needed for scholarship. The Arabs were proud of their language - and in this respect some non-Arabs were "more Arab than Arabs". They were proud of its copiousness, proud of its many features which they fancied were peculiar to it, but chiefly proud because it was God's language. This language must be kept pure, free from foreign pollutions, and from the corruptions due to ignorance and laziness.⁽⁴⁾

"There is almost universal agreement among Mediaeval Arab writers that the first grammarian in their language was Abū l-Aswad al-Du'alī (d. 69 A.H., aged 85), a man who fought for 'Alī at the battle of Ṣiffīn, and a mediocre poet ... (The Spanish lexicographer Abu Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Husain al-Zadaidi) begins (his "Ṭabaqāt al-Naḥawīyīn wa l-Lughawīyīn) with an account of Abu l-Aswad, saying: "He was the first to establish (the science of) the Arabic language, to lay down its methods, and to establish its rules, and that was (at a time when) the speech of the Arabs became disturbed, and people high and low came to make mistakes ..." (There then follow a series of anecdotes about Abu l-Aswad, which will be omitted.) However, interesting as the speculation on the man himself may be, the stories are more important to the scholar for what they suggest than for what they say. The first point to be noted is that the *raison*

(4) Ibid., p.7f.

d'être for Arabic linguistic studies was religion - it is significant that Abū l-Aswad is stated to have been a qārī', a Quranic reader. Secondly, the growing ignorance of correct Arabic is attributed partly to foreign elements, especially Persian, and it takes the form primarily of mistakes in accident, in the vowel endings, and also in the pronunciation of those letters peculiar to Arabic. There are close parallels with the modern colloquial dialects, and the later therefore seem to date very far back. The need for grammatical teaching was felt in religion, then: no doubt it was also felt in government. Abū l-Aswad helped to fill that need. What his precise contribution was we cannot exactly assess, as no philological writings of his are extant. But the lack of an accepted system of indicating vowels must have made his work difficult".⁽⁵⁾

Thus we see the birth of Arabic grammatical analysis as a science, and the reasons behind its study. Nowadays, when we can open a book in Arabic and find the letters bearing their correct diacritical points and vowel marks, we might easily tend to forget the magnitude of the task which faced Abū l-Aswad. We take the vowel marks for granted, but what is their origin? "The vowel signs which were borrowed from Syriac seem ... to be very old, but as to the date of their introduction even less can be said at present.

(5) Ibid., p. 11f and 15f.

The original system of vowel marks differed considerably from that which is now in use; as Ewald recognised, it was based on the different phonetic strength of the vowels: "a (o)" as strong vowel was expressed by a dot above the letter, "u" occupying an intermediate position was denoted by a dot in the letter, as "i(e)" by a dot below: the nūnation being expressed simply by doubling the dots

"Towards the middle of the 11 century this system of marking the vowels was replaced by a new method which is still in use. Owing to the ignorance of the Arabs in all matters concerning the origin of their script, it is impossible to say whether the statement that it was invented by al-Khalīl (d. 786/7) is founded on fact. The vowel signs of this system are simply the corresponding vowel-letters: in the case of ḍamma this derivation is clearly discernible, fatha is a slanting (in the Maghrib) a horizontal alif, kasra obviously an analogous considerably shortened form of the old  .

"The other so-called orthographic signs were probably invented at a still later date than the vowel marks, but the date of their introduction is equally obscure".⁽⁶⁾

While the Arabs, once they had started, were to carry out a thorough analysis of their grammar, there is one question which arises, and to which this work will attempt

(6) "Encyclopaedia of Islam", Leiden 1913, Vol. 1, p.384.

to provide an answer: did the Arabs really think deeply about their system of grammatical analysis, or did they go only for the ظواهر, the externals?

In writing this thesis, most of the information has been furnished by six principal authors, so a short biography of each will be given.

Sībawayh, 763-796/7. Sībawayh was a learned grammarian, and surpassed in this science every person of former and latter times. He went to Basra when he was 32 years of age, and completed his studies there. He acquired his grammatical knowledge from al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmed and others. Ibn Khallikan tells us that Sībawayh's book, the "Kitāb", is based on 'Isa's "Jami", together with al-Khalīl's comment on it. Speaking of the "Kitāb" one day, al-Jāhiz said; "Never was the like of such a book written on grammar, and the books of other men have drawn their substance from it". (It was Sībawayh's wish that his book should be buried with him after his death. No one knows what title Sībawayh gave to his book, and so the Arabs have called it simply اَلْكِتَاب, or "THE Book", par excellence.) His manuscripts show that he won tremendous respect among his fellow academicians. He later moved to Baghdad, where he found life intolerable on account of his altercations with al-Kisā'ī, tutor of the son of Harun al-Rashīd, as to the accusative or nominative of a word. Infuriated at the venal testimony borne against him by desert Arabs on whose honour he had

fully depended, he returned to his native country, Persia, and died at a village near Shiraz. His book has remained the great and favourite authority, and no other work has ever been acknowledged its equal.

Al-Zajjājī, d. 949. Al-Zajjājī was an inhabitant of Baghdad from his early youth, but he was actually a native of Nahāwend. He was a master of the highest authority in the science of grammar, on which subject he wrote his "Kitāb al-Jumāl al-Kubrā, "The Greater Collection". He had been a private pupil of al-Zajjāj, and from this circumstance he obtained the surname of al-Zajjājī. Great numbers profited by his tuition and finished their studies under him at Damascus, where he had fixed his residence. It was here that he died in 949. His work كِتَابُ الْجُمَلِ الْكُبْرَى, is an instructive work, and of manageable size. It is said that he composed it at Mecca, and that on finishing each chapter he went seven times round the Kaaba, praying the Almighty to pardon his sins and render his book useful to those who read it.

Al-Zamakhsharī, 1075-1144. Al-Zamakhsharī was born at Zamakhshar in Khwārizm, and spent his youth travelling for the sake of study. He made the holy pilgrimage to Mecca and resided there for some time, whence he derived the title of جَارُ اللَّهِ, "neighbour of God", and he was designated by this appellation as by a proper name. One of his feet had been frost-bitten during a winter storm, necessitating

its amputation, and he wore a wooden leg. He always carried about with him the written testimony of eye-witnesses to prove he had been maimed by an accident, and not in consequence of a sentence in punishment of some crime. He was incontrovertibly the first Imām of the age in which he lived, and he attracted students from all quarters by his lessons in various branches of knowledge. He commenced the composition of his "Mufaṣṣal", a complete manual of Arabic grammar, in Dec. 1119, and finished it in Mar. 1121. He was a declared Mu'tazilite, and when he wrote his commentary on the Koran he began with the words "Praise be to God who CREATED the Koran". Orthodoxy at a later date changed the word "created" to "revealed". Although, as being more accessible to his readers, he used interpretations couched in Persian in his lexicographical works, he was so convinced of the superiority of the Arabic that he opposed all the Shu'ūbiyya tendencies. (The bolder spirits among the Shu'ūbites, not content with claiming an equal position, argued that the Arabs were absolutely inferior to the Persians and other peoples. The Shu'ūbites directed their attacks principally against the racial pride of the Arabs who were fond of boasting that they were the noblest of all mankind, and spoke the purest and richest language in the world).

Ibn Mālīk, 1203/4-1274. Ibn Mālīk was considered a great philologist, whose reputation almost overshadowed that

of Sībawayh. He wrote the "Alfiyya", a treatise on grammar composed in verse. On examining his works and the appreciations of them by his friends and criticisms by his enemies, one can say that he rendered a real service to the study of grammar by coordinating and simplifying the rules, although he may very occasionally be reproached with a want of that clearness and simplicity which is necessary in didactic works. This is possibly an inherent defect in versified writings.

Ibn Hishām, 1309-1360. He was a Shāfi'i doctor. Ibn Khaldun sums him up in these words: "Ibn Hishām was profoundly learned in grammar and possessed perfect knowledge of it. He followed in the path of those of the grammarians of Mosul who accepted Ibn Djinnī's views and followed this scholar's method of teaching. The knowledge displayed by Ibn Hishām is truly remarkable, and shows that he had a perfect mastery of his subject and that he was very clever".

Finally, we are probably most indebted to Ibn al-Anbārī, 1119-1181, not for any genuinely original work on his part, but for the way in which he recorded the conflicting views of the two principal grammar schools of Kufa and Basra on a variety of grammatical topics. He was one of the most distinguished masters in the science he professed. He resided at Baghdad, where he studied at the Nizāmiya college, from his early youth until his death. He studied the

system of grammar peculiar to the Shafite sect, and gave lessons in grammar. He had a profound knowledge of philology, and his own lessons were attended by great scholars who afterwards became conspicuous for their learning. All his productions are replete with information. Towards the end of his life he retired from public life, renouncing the world and worldly society, in order to devote himself entirely to his studies and to pious exercises.

Information has also been drawn from other authors, some of them Western, but these six are the main ones, each an expert and each highly esteemed by the Arabs. It is their facts which will be collated, and then analysed to find out why the accusative is used.

THE PLACE OF ARABIC IN THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES

Before embarking on a rather more comprehensive grammatical analysis of Arabic - by which, of course, we understand what is now called Classical Arabic, and which will be referred to later in this chapter as XXXX Arabīya - it might be well to examine, albeit rather briefly and superficially, the possible origins of Classical Arabic.

Arabic belongs to that group of languages known as Semitic. The languages in this group seem to have been originally peculiar to a geographical area, and the original home would seem to have been Arabia. From Arabia various waves of people migrated, and consequently the original form of the language, which modern philologists call proto-Semitic, became divided into various tongues. There are two main groups of tongues, the East Semitic and the West Semitic, Arabic falling within the latter category. The languages of the Semitic group have certain peculiar characteristics, but of course certain reservations must be made. These characteristics cannot be said to apply to all the languages that are termed Semitic, nor can they be said to apply exclusively to languages of the Semitic family. These principal characteristics are as follows:- the primary distinctions of meaning of words lie largely in the consonantal root, and roots themselves are predominantly tri-literal: nouns, pronouns and verbs have only two genders: there is an absence

of compound words, whether nouns or verbs, and there is also a lack of the use of possessive nouns - nothing quite corresponds to "mine, theirs", etc.: finally, verbs are not conjugated from a standpoint of time. Ullendorf, in his paper "What is a Semitic Language?" emphasizes the reservations which must be made when applying these criteria, and concludes by giving some suggestions which he hopes may be helpful in assessing the nature of a Semitic language. These suggestions - structural patterns, vocabulary, statistical studies, isoglosses and mental patterns - are offered only as possible methods and have not yet been applied to particular languages of the Semitic group. Indeed, he concludes the paper by saying: "These considerations may, in time, offer us yet another means of determining what a Semitic language is".⁽¹⁾

Attempting to show how Arabic came into being is rather like solving a crime; one must work backwards from the facts. "The question as to whether nouns or verbs came first in the historical evolution of language may be regarded as largely one of those theoretical exercises which are but little calculated to advance the practical work of philology. So far as the Semitic languages are concerned there are undoubtedly older forms surviving amongst the nouns than amongst the verbs, and the variety of noun forms as contrasted with the comparatively stereotyped verb form seems to support the view that the nouns present an earlier type

(1) Ullendorf, "What is a Semitic Language?" *Orientalia*, vol. 27, 1958. p.75.

than verbs".⁽²⁾

In the Semitic languages in their present form the majority of nouns are tri-literal - though some do have four or even five radicals. There are, however, a few which are bi-literal, and these words are amongst the commonest of everyday speech in all the languages: e.g. yd = hand, dm = blood, 'b = father, bn = son, my = water, ym = day. This would suggest, as these words are so common, that originally all nouns were bi-literal - as were verbs - and were expanded at a later stage to tri-literal nouns.

Gender in the Semitic languages is twofold. The difference is indicated in two ways: the first is by the use of a separate word for the masculine and the feminine; the second is by the addition to the word in the masculine of the ending "t" to denote the feminine. The former method is almost undoubtedly the older and the more primitive. However, the "t" ending must also have appeared at a very early date. It would seem to have had its origin in the deictic element "t" to draw attention to the difference of form between masculine and feminine.

Let us now examine the most complicated part of the noun, and that which is the prime concern of the present study, the case endings. "Of what we are accustomed to call "cases" - those varieties of terminations which express the relations to one another of a noun and verb or of two nouns - the

(2) O'Leary, Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, London, 1923. p.175.

Semitic languages possess but three: the "casus rectus", nominative or subject, and two "casus obliqui", the one indicating the accusative or direct object, and also serving in a variety of ways as a "casus adverbialis", the other corresponding most closely to the Indo-European genitive".⁽³⁾

"The proto-Semitic system of case endings would seem to have been:-

	Singular	Dual	Plural
Nom.	-u	-a-u(ni) > -au(ni)	-ū(na)
Gen.	-i	-a-i(ni) > -ai(ni)	-ī(na)
Acc.	-a	-a-a(ni) > -ā(ni)	-ā(na)

In the feminine the system is somewhat different:-

	Singular	Dual	Plural
Nom.	-at-u	-at-a-u(ni) > -atau(ni)	-āt-u
Gen.	-at-i	-at-a-i(ni) > -atai(ni)	-āt-i
Acc.	-at-a	-at-a-a(ni) > -atā(ni)	-āt-a " ⁽⁴⁾

What are the origins of these different cases, and how did they come to have this system of vowelings? "With regard to the accusative, the answer seems to be tolerably certain. It is a pronominal element, of a demonstrative nature, appended to the object noun to indicate the direction of the governing verb. It is in fact nothing but the demonstrative "ha".⁽⁵⁾ O'Leary supports this view when he

(3) Wright, Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, Cambridge, 1890, p.139.

(4) Gray, Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics, Columbia University Press, 1934, p.54.

(5) Wright, op. cit., p.143.

says: "The accusative has been associated with the demonstrative "ha"". (6) The accusative "a" may also be a directional deictic element, or it may be a limitative or restrictive case.

"The genitive "i" may perhaps be connected with the termination of the so-called relative adjectives" (iyy). (7) This is connected with that type of noun pattern - in arranging these patterns, adjectives are classed as nouns - which is used either in a gentilic sense, for the formation of names, or to form adjectives from nouns.

The origin of the nominative "u" is rather obscure: it is difficult to see what force the "u" could have had. Can one say that, of the three primary vowels, as "a" and "i" had already been used, "u" was the only one left, or is this too fanciful? Wright says: "We may possibly venture to see in it (i.e. the nominative "U") the pronominal element "hu" as designating the subject". (8) O'Leary supports this view, although with rather less confidence than that with which he was able to show the origins of the other cases.

"Semitic nouns (and adjectives) show a twofold mode of inflection according to whether (a) the noun (or adjective) in question is unlimited by another noun or by a pronoun ("casus

(6) O'Leary, op. cit., p.196.

(7) Wright, op. cit., p.143.

(8) Ibid., p.143.

rectus") or whether (b) it is so limited ("casus constructus"). When thus limited, the construct loses its accent in favour of the limiting noun, and has only a secondary accent, the complex of limited and limiting word becoming in reality a quasi-compound". (9)

"The use of the singular terminations u,i,a, in Arabic is restricted to the defined noun, whether the definition be by the article or by a following genitive. The undefined noun is inflected with the same terminations plus the sound of "n", viz. un, in, an. In the accusative form بيتاً the letter alif may perhaps serve to mark the pausal pronunciation baitā, or it may be a mere indication of the "a-" sound to distinguish this case more clearly in writing from the other two.

"What is the origin of these terminations un, in, an? I incline to derive them from an appended indefinite mā. That "n" and "m" readily interchange is known to us: and it is quite conceivable that some of the Semitic languages may have substituted "n" for original "m" in certain grammatical forms, whilst others carried out the change through the whole of them. That the word ل might have been used at an early period in the way suggested can only be inferred from the recurrence of the phenomenon at a later period. History is apt to repeat itself, especially linguistic history.

(9) Gray, op. cit., p.56.

Now we find this use of ما as an indefinite affix in Arabic in the so-called ما الِإِبْرَهَامِيَّة, i.e. ما appended to an indefinite noun with a vague, often intensifying force; e.g.

قَلِيلٌ ما, "give us some book (or other)", or أَعْطِنَا كِتَابًا ما, "some (small) quantity", or جِئْتَ لِأَمْرٍ ما, "thou art come for some matter (of importance)". For the rest, how readily ما may be shortened into ma and m appears from such Arabic forms as لِمَ, بِحَم, حَتَّى حَم, عَلَى حَم, shortened into لِم, بِحَم, حَتَّى حَم, عَلَى حَم. (10)

As this thesis is not concerned with the verb, there is no need to give a survey of its course of development.

How, then, was the Classical Arabic we know today developed from this proto-Semitic? Chaim Rabin offers this working hypothesis: "Classical Arabic is based on one or several of the dialects of Najd, perhaps in an archaic form". (11) He goes on to explain how this took place in an area where various dialects of East and West met. "This area was neither purely Eastern Arabic nor purely West-Arabian ... Here, apparently, Arabic poetry came into being. Just as in Spain lyrical poetry carried everywhere the idiom of its Galician cradle, so the new Arabic poetry spread together with the language in which the first poems had been composed. In view of the mixed character of the area it is likely to have been

(10) Wright, op. cit., p.144f.

(11) Chaim Rabin, Ancient West Arabian, London, 1951. p.3.

a compromise between Eastern Arabic and West-Arabian right from the outset. In its phonetic character (fulness of vocalization, absence of violent assimilation, etc.) it resembled more the West-Arabian type: in its grammar more the Eastern Arabic. The needs of poetical diction and of metre may have done something to shape it still further".⁽¹²⁾

However, since knowledge of the ancient dialects is rather scanty, any views on the relations between them and Classical Arabic are either guesses or working hypotheses, and the great scholars differ widely in their opinions. The most common view is that already expounded by Chaim Rabin.

Whatever the true origins of Classical Arabic may be, it stands unique among the Semitic languages, having certain characteristics distinct from the others. "The Arabic language seems best to have preserved the elements and primordial characteristics of proto-Semitic: yet this does not necessarily mean a connection between the fact of remaining in the primitive habitat (i.e. Arabia) and that of conserving the most conservative linguistic characteristics."⁽¹³⁾ ... Arabic has best of all kept the old consonantal system, as well as the old vocalism, especially in its declension. Despite this characteristic of great age, Arabic is altogether

(12) Ibid., p.3.

(13) Fleisch, Introduction a l'etude des Langues Semitiques, 1947, p.24.

the most marked representative of a new manner in Semitic: certain liberties, certain uncertainties, certain indeterminations have been removed: in morphology, by a rigorous application of analogy, in syntax, by an exact delimitation of the semantic domain of all the means of syntactic expression. Thus there arises a system of great precision and of great clarity which uses fruitfully the greatest part of the possibilities offered".(14)

Having seen the historical background of Classical Arabic, or 'Arabīya, its history must now be shown briefly in the first several Islamic centuries, when most of the grammarians whose works are quoted lived. It will help in our appreciation of their work to know the state in which they found the language. (The main source of information used here is Fück's "Arabīya".(15)) Classical Arabic kept its final flexion, a characteristic of great antiquity, when most of the other Semitic languages had lost theirs. How often this flexion was kept in the spoken language of everyday is a controversial point. The bedouin poetry of the pre- and early Islamic age shows these final flexions in full use, and the fact that, at least until the 4th/10th centuries inclusive, the Arab grammarians spent some time among the bedouins to study their language indicates that the external

(14) Ibid., p.113.

(15) Fück, 'Arabīya. Recherches sur l'histoire de la langue et du style arabe. Tr. C. Denizeau. Paris, 1955.

signs of flexion were still in full use at this time.

With the Arab conquests the language spread and could not help but be affected by other tongues. However, many bedouins, even in foreign countries, kept their nomadic way of life, and thus preserved the purity of their dialects. The second Caliph 'Umar (635-644) greatly helped in the formation of a common, pure, bedouin Arabic language by putting the bedouins in special camps, out of which were to be born the great towns of the Muslim world, such as Kufa and Basra. The various bedouin dialects became integrated, and the result was a common bedouin Arabic language which provided the basis of the classical 'Arabīya of the following centuries. But where conquerors and conquered mixed, the language deteriorated, since the conquered preferred types of expression they knew to the complicated syntactical forms of the old language.

However, even the bedouin world did not remain free from foreign influences. Towards the end of the 1st century the introduction of post-classical usages, issuing from the vulgar tongue, into the old 'Arabīya took on such proportions that mistakes came to be made even in the highest spheres of Arabic society. It produced a reaction, and thus was born the Arabic purism which inscribed on its standard the conservation of the 'Arabīya in its purity. This process of preserving the purity was helped by the rising classes of non-Arab Muslims (mawālī) who were very zealous to speak

the pure language and thus assimilate themselves with the ruling classes. It was this zeal, together with the fidelity of the upper classes to the 'Arabiya, and the apparition of purism, which gave rise before the end of the 1st century to the impulse for grammatical studies. These were almost undoubtedly directed at establishing the correct usage of the language. In any argument over a variant reading the bedouin were regarded as the uncontested authorities.

During the 2nd Islamic century there emerged what is now termed Middle Arabic. Bedouin Arabic, as a result of this purism, took to all intents and purposes the value of a model, and cultivated people adopted it in oral and written usage, but the middle and lower classes adopted Middle Arabic. The difference between 'Arabiya and Middle Arabic is, in brief, that, in the place of a highly developed system of flexion with a complicated syntax of cases and moods, there appeared a state of the language in which flexion was fundamentally simplified and the syntactic connections of words constituting a phrase were represented largely by the external means of the arrangement of words and their order of succession.

Jahiz tells us⁽¹⁶⁾ that during the early part of the 3rd century the true bedouin still used flexion in their speech, but the masses spoke a very defective type of Arabic.

(16) Jāhiz, "Kitāb al-bāyan wa-t-tabyīn", and other works.

Over roughly the century from 849 to 936 the Abbasid empire weakened politically and economically and with the weakening the 'Arabīya lost ground, while other forms of post-classical language developed. It was no longer the "done thing" to have a grammatical education and speak like a bedouin, and even the grammarians no longer used the classical tongue in conversation. The separation of

'Arabīya, henceforward to become a literary language, from the everyday Middle Arabic occurred definitely towards the year 300/913 even in the circles of cultivated people.

Perfect imitation of the bedouin tongue, once the highest ambition of a cultivated citizen, had now become a pedantry, which gave the impression of mannerism, of ridicule, or even of incongruity. At the beginning of the 4th/10th century 'Arabīya had become a written language incapable of further structural development.

By now, even the bedouin dialects were beginning to be affected. Where the bedouins came into permanent contact with other classes of the population, primarily by transition to a sedentary life, and also commerce, it was inevitable that their tongue should lose most of its purity.

With the breaking up of the Abbasid empire in 324/936 into a dozen independent countries, 'Arabīya, now uncontested as the literary language of the Muslim world, saw a large expansion, because the several countries all began to share more actively in Muslim cultural activity than in the age

when the literature of Iraq enjoyed sole eminence. This extension of the domain of 'Arabīya was facilitated by the fact that it had become a classical language, and had no longer any reciprocal and living exchanges with the bedouin dialects. It could no longer be used in a living linguistic community, but had to be learned as a dead language.

The outcome of this was that mistakes no longer caused a serious conflict between the old and the new language. There then followed the period of the high Middle age, which lasted roughly from the 10th to the 12th centuries, during which time 'Arabīya, as the classical literary language, drew a unifying bond around all the countries of the Islamic world, while further decay continued in the speech of even educated people. During this period, even grammarians regarded non-classical usages as admissible, since the feeling for correct speech had become so weak. What correction there was consisted not so much in the use of the final flexion as in insistence on the use of the old vocabulary, but not necessarily only in ways used in the old 'Arabīya.

As this thesis is concerned with the accusative, it would be well if, having seen how the case endings originated and what was to be their fate, we were to see the various ways in which the accusative is formed. When definite, a noun has a fatha over its final letter, as in قَرَأَ الْكِتَابَ, "he read the book". When the noun is indefinite the final letter is nūnated, and the nūnation is appended to an alif,

as in **اِشْتَرَيْتُ ثَوْبًا**, "I bought a cloak". There are however, two instances when the indefinite termination is not supported by an alif: (a) when the final letter is a hamza, as in **قَضَى اللّٰهُ قَضَاءً**, "God made a decree"; there is one exception to this rule - the word **شَيْءٌ**, "thing", takes an alif, as in **مَا رَأَيْتُ شَيْئًا**, "I did not see anything"; and (b) when the final letter is a tā marbūṭa, the feminine ending, as in **رَأَيْتُ سَفِينَةً**, "I saw a ship". The above rules apply only to those words which are fully declined. Certain words by their nature are **غَيْرُ مُنْصَرَفٍ**, or not fully declined. Such words have only two case endings, and use the accusative termination "a" for the genitive, unless made definite by the article or by a following genitive: they have no nūnation, although they may be used in an indefinite sense. Any decent grammar will list the various categories of these words.

In the sound plural - the broken plural declines as a singular - the masculine accusative is "īna", as in **لَقِيتُ الْكَاتِبِينَ**, "I met the scribes", and the feminine accusative is "ātin" when indefinite, as in **أَبْصَرْتُ خَادِمَاتٍ**, "I saw some maid-servants", and "āti" when definite, as in **أَبْصَرْتُ الْخَادِمَاتِ**, "I saw the maid-servants".

TERMINOLOGY

Before studying the uses of the accusative in general, we must look at some of the more important Arabic terms used to describe the various parts of speech, so that, when we meet them later, we will know what they mean. The word for "a word" is لَفْظٌ , This is the noun of the verb لَفَظَ , meaning "to eject" or "to disgorge (something from the mouth)". Hence the word لَفْظٌ means something which comes from the mouth, and signifies "a way of expressing something" or "phrase" or "sentence" (each considered as such without regard to its meaning).

All Arabic words are divided into three different parts of speech. The first of these is the verb, فَعَلَ , from the verb فَعَلَ meaning "to do (something)", and this is the thing which actually carries out some action. There is secondly the noun, اِسْمٌ . The actual meaning of the word اِسْمٌ , is "the name of a thing", or "a sign (such as may be uttered or written) conveying knowledge of a thing". It is also the word applied to denote "a substance" or "an accident" or "an attribute", for the purpose of distinction (or "a substantive" in the proper sense of this term). According to al-Munāwī, the اِسْمٌ is that which denotes a meaning in itself unconnected with any of the three times (past, present and future). It is derived from the verb رَفَعَ , "to be high, be raised", because the اِسْمٌ is a means of raising into notice the thing denoted thereby, and

making it known. The third part of speech, which covers the numerous sub-divisions which we have in Western terminology is **حَرْفٌ**, the particle. Grammatically it is a particle, or that which is used to express a meaning and which is neither a noun nor a verb. The actual meaning of the word **حَرْفٌ** is "extremity, side, edge", and it thus serves also to denote a letter of the alphabet, since the letters are the extremities of a word or syllable.

These three types of words together go to make up a sentence, or **كَلَامٌ**, derived from the verb **كَلَّمَ**, "to speak to", from which we also get **كَلِمَةٌ** meaning "a word". **كَلَامٌ** thus signifies "a phrase" or "a proposition", or "a sentence". According to the Arab grammarians, a sentence is an intelligible group of words, after which silence seems good. By this, they mean it is a group of words which gives a complete sense, that naturally terminates with a stop or pause. Of course, what the Arabs would call a sentence is not necessarily a sentence to us in Western terminology - it might be simply the equivalent of a clause; "the equivalent of" a clause, because in Arabic a sentence need have no expressed verb, as we shall see in the following pages. Sentences are divided into two main types. There is firstly the verbal type - that in which the first word must be a verb. The other is the nominal type of sentence - that which begins with anything other than a verb. Under the category of a nominal sentence

falls that which begins with the particle **إِنْ**, even though **يَنْ** might be regarded as a verb.

We must now return to certain of the broad categories mentioned earlier, and define in more detail some of their member words. Two terms are derived from the word **فَعْلٌ**. There is firstly the **فَاعِلٌ**, which is the active participle of the verb, and signifies the actual doer of the action. We would translate this as the "subject". We must, however, add that the word **إِسْمٌ** may also be translated as the "subject", but it is used only of the group of words of the **كَانَ** family, which, in Western termination, take a predicate, and not an object, and words of the **يَنْ** family, which closely resemble **كَانَ**, and also take a predicate. The second term derived from **فَعْلٌ** is the **مَفْعُولٌ**, or the thing acted upon by the verb. It must be carefully emphasized that this is the thing acted upon by the verb, and not the thing done by the verb (with the sole exception of the absolute object). It is simply the passive participle of the verb. It must also be pointed out here what is referred to as the active participle is what we would call the present participle, and the passive is what we would call the past participle.

In connection with the **إِسْمٌ** we have the terms **مُبْتَدَأٌ** and **نَحْبَرٌ**. The word **مُبْتَدَأٌ** is the participle of the verb **أَبْتَدَأَ**, "to begin with, to make to be first". The

مُبْتَدَأ is also to be regarded as a subject - but it is the subject of some verb which is not expressed, but has to be understood, or one mentioned later. In grammar it is the correlative of the تَحْبَر . This means "knowledge, notification", and it is the predicate of some understood verb - this understood verb usually being كَانَ , "to be" - or the correlative of the أَشْم , the predicate of the nominative attributive verb كَانَ and the like.

Arabic has only three cases. The term for the nominative is رَفْعٌ , which is the infinitive of the verb رَفَعَ , "to raise", "elevate". رَفْعٌ also signifies the bringing a thing near or presenting it. But perhaps the best translation is the meaning "to make known", since it is the subject, which is in the nominative, which is directly connected with the verb and which is an integral part of it, which is made known. The vowel of the nominative is called ضَمَّةٌ . The genitive is called the جَرٌّ , from the verb جَرَّ , "to drag, pull". This is presumably used because the genitive is the most oblique case, and is thus pulled into this oblique state. This case has the vowel كَسْرَةٌ . Finally, the accusative, نَصْبٌ , the case with which this work is concerned which has the vowel فَتْحَةٌ . There are several meanings to the verb نَصَبَ . Some of these are "to set up, to set up as

a mark/sign", or **نَصَبْتُ فَلَانًا بِكَذَا**, "I set up such a one as an obstacle to such a thing", or "as a butt for such a thing". Here we have one possible explanation for the use of the word **نَصَب**, since it refers to the thing which is set up by the verb, or it refers to the thing which is the butt for the action of the verb - in other words, the action of the verb falls on it. This could also be closely connected with its meaning of "a goal, limit", since again the object, in the accusative if it is acted upon directly, is the goal for the action of the verb. In the use of this word we may detect Greek influence, since the contextual meaning of the Greek word "aitiatike" (used to denote the accusative) is referable to a basic concept of "aim" or "goal" (or "extent of action", which is the same thing from another point of view). This would seem to indicate, therefore, that the Arabic word **نَصَب** is a calque (loan translation) of "aitiatike": but of course, such translations can be incorrect.⁽¹⁾ This idea of the object being the target or butt of the action of the verb is also closely related to the Sanskrit idea, where the terminology for the accusative case means "that which is attacked by the verb". There is a further explanation which might be mentioned, but which seems a rather far-fetched and weak reason for the choice of the word **نَصَب**. In

(1) From a letter from Mr. N.E. Collinge, Lecturer in Classics in the Durham Colleges.

the sentence نَصَبَ الحَرْفَ , "he wrote/pronounced the (final) letter with نَصَبَ ", the explanation given is that the word نَصَبَ is used because the sound of a word of which the final letter is so pronounced rises to the highest cavity of the mouth. This view is expressed by both Lane, and in the "Lisān al-‘Arab". This latter word adds that نَصَبَ is making something accurate or perfect. The verb presumably falls on the نَصَبَ and completes its action.

All these things together give us a language, لُفَّةٌ , with the grammar of which we are concerned. The word for grammar is نَحْوٌ , from the verb نَحَا , meaning "to go towards". نَحَا نَحْوَهُ means "he followed the same course", and hence نَحْوٌ may be translated as "manner, intention", or even "system". The "Lisān al-‘Arab" tells us that the word نَحْوٌ comes from the people of Greece, and is what they called their tongue and their language. They call the knowledge of words and meaning in examining them "grammar". It seems strange, however, that if the Arabs borrowed any word at all, they should choose this one, when the Greeks' own word for grammar is "grammatike", which actually means "the art of writing".

Finally, the technical term with which we will be most concerned is the عَامِلٌ , the regent. It was stated earlier that this work is concerned with trying to establish why the

accusative should be used, and the **عَامِل** is of the utmost importance in this respect. The word itself is the active participle of the verb **عَمِلَ**, meaning "to do", or - and this is the meaning which is really important - "to govern (a word)". To the logical mind of the Arabs when they analysed their grammar, the case of any word in a sentence is due to the influence of another word, mentioned or understood, termed the **عَامِل**, "the regent". In a sentence of normal arrangement, the first word is usually thought not to be subject to **عَمَلْ** - i.e. the powers of influence of the **عَامِل**. The word affected by the **عَامِل** is known as its **مَفْعُول**. We will see much more of the influence of the **عَامِل** in the pages that follow.

THE DIRECT OBJECT

Let us now examine the various uses of the accusative and see how the different grammarians explain them. In doing this an attempt will be made to show how much one writer influenced another and see if the Arab grammarians really thought deeply about their system of grammatical analysis, or if they tended to treat it rather superficially, going only for the ظواهر , the externals: conclusions will be given at the end.

The most obvious use of the accusative is as the direct object of the verb, or المفعول به , so we shall deal with this first. The immediate question is why it should be called the

مفعول به : we have already seen the word مفعول explained, but why به ? Obviously some word other than just مفعول was needed to distinguish this from the other types of accusative bearing the name of مفعول . به is essentially the preposition of the agent, whereas the object is something to or upon which something is done - one might almost call it المفعول عليه . As Sībawayh was the first to use this terminology (as far as is known), can we detect in the use of به the Persian particle به - as we have seen, Sībawayh was himself a Persian - which is used after certain verbs in a wide variety of contexts? There are many instances in Persian where, after compound verbs, what might otherwise be the direct object is introduced by the particle به : (this is not to be confused with با).

About the direct object Sībawayh says: " ضربَ عبدُ اللهِ زيداً ,

"'Abdullah hit Zaid". زيدا is made accusative since it is مفعول به as the action of the verb passes on and affects it. It is acted upon by the direct action (فِعْل) of the doer (فاعل). The object may precede the subject without affecting the sentence or cases".⁽¹⁾

Ibn Hishām expands slightly on this: "It is known that the subject of an active verb is always put into the nominative. The verbal complement, however, is always governed in the accusative. The reason for this is that the nominative is heavy, whereas the complement may be of one or of several natures and the accusative is light, so that the heavy mode is the portion of the rarer, and the light mode the portion of the more frequent, and thus a balance is established⁽²⁾ ... The direct object - (objective complement). This it is on which happens the action of the subject:- ضربت زيدا , "I hit Zaid"⁽³⁾.

Al-Zamakhsharī further adds of the مفعول به : "It is this which distinguishes between transitiveness and intransitiveness ... It becomes accusative by a regent, hidden or pronominal, which may be clearly shown or pronominalised".⁽⁴⁾

(1) Sībawayh, Kitāb, Būlāk, ed. 1316, Vol. 1, p.14.

(2) Ibn Hishām, La Pluie de Rosée, Trans. Goguyer, Leyden, 1887.

(3) Ibid., p.218.

(4) Al-Zamakhsharī, Al-Mufaṣṣal, Alexandria, A.H. 1291, p.20.

So much for the seemingly obvious. It is Ibn al-Anbārī, who reported the conflicting opinions of the two principle grammar schools of Kufa and Basra, who throws light on the Arabs' conception of the regent governing the accusative. About the straightforward direct object he says: "The Kufans say that the thing acting on an accusative مفعول is both the فعل and the فاعل, such as ضربَ زيدٌ عمرًا, "Zaid hit 'Amr", Some say that the فاعل is the regent. Hishām ibn Mu'āwiya (d.824/5) says that in the sentence ظننتُ زيدًا قائمًا, "I thought Zaid was standing", زيدًا is made accusative by the ت, and قائمًا by the ظن. The Basrans, however, state that the verb alone acts on both the فاعل and the مفعول.

"Kufans:- We say that the thing acting on an accusative مفعول is both the فعل and the فاعل, because there cannot be a مفعول except after a فعل and a فاعل, be it actually expressed (لفظًا), or understood (تقديرًا): since the فعل and the فاعل are in place of the one thing And when the فعل and the فاعل are in place of the one thing, and the مفعول does not come except after both of them, this proves that it is made accusative by both of them together. ... And what proves that the thing which makes the مفعول accusative cannot be the verb alone is that, if it were, then it must follow it directly, and there must be nothing intervening between it (the فعل) and it (the مفعول). And since something can legally come between them, this proves that it is not along the regent: the regent is the فعل and the فاعل.

"Basrans:- The regent which makes the مفعول accusative is the فعل by itself without the فاعل : this is because we agree on the fact that the فعل has influence on the governing of a word, but the فاعل has no influence, because it is a noun, and nouns do not have influence.

"As for their statement: "If the فعل alone were the regent acting on the مفعول , then it must follow it directly, and there must be nothing intervening between them", we (the Basrans) say: this is annulled by the word إِنَّ . It is agreed by both sides that one may say إِنَّ زَيْدًا فِي الدَّارِ , "Zaid is in the house", or إِنَّ لَدَيْنَا أَنْكَالًا , "we have fetters". The noun is made accusative by إِنَّ , even if it does not follow it directly, and this is what happens here. If it is not necessary (that it should follow it directly) with a particle which is weaker than a verb because it is a branch of it in action, then it is because it is not necessary (that the مفعول should follow it directly) with a verb. We say: the verb may follow the

مفعول . Because the verb, when it is stronger than particles of meaning, may serve two influences: it makes the فاعل nominative and the مفعول accusative".⁽⁵⁾ One thing will be noticed repeatedly in these arguments is that the Kufans and Basrans hardly ever disagree in their opinions as to when the

(5) Ibn al-Anbārī. Al-Inṣāf fī masā'il al-Khilāf, ed. 'Abd al-Hamīd, 1945, p.56f.

accusative is used: they disagree only as to why it is used.)

We see a little more of this idea of the regent when we look at the instances of the object preceding the verb.

Sibawayh is quoted first of all. At first sight, his material may not seem to run in a consistent logical order, but in fact he deals first with compound sentences, and then with the specific case of the object preceding the verb:-

رَأَيْتُ زَيْدًا وَعَمْرًا كَلَّمْتُهُ, "I saw Zaid and spoke to 'Amr",
رَأَيْتُ زَيْدًا وَعَبْدَ اللَّهِ مَرَرْتُ بِهِ, "I saw Zaid and passed by 'Abdullah",
لَقِيتُ قَيْسًا وَبَكْرًا أَخَذْتُ أَبَاهُ, "I met Quais and took Bakr's
father", and لَقِيتُ خَالِدًا وَبَكْرًا اشْتَرَيْتُ لَهُ ثَوْبًا, "I met Khālīd
and bought a garment for Bakr". The accusative is chosen
because the first noun is governed by the first verb, and it is
preferable that the second noun should likewise be governed by
this first verb when it precedes its own verb, as it does not
know how its own verb is going to influence it - if the sense
is not complete. If the sentence has only one theme running
through it, there is nothing to stop the second noun being
governed by the same means as the first:-

يُدْخِلُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ فِي رَحْمَتِهِ وَالظَّالِمِينَ أَعَدَّ لَهُمْ عَذَابًا أَلِيمًا,
"He introduces whom He wishes into His mercy, and as for the
unjust, He has prepared for them a painful chastisement", or
كُنْتُ إِخَاكَ وَزَيْدًا كُنْتُ إِخَا لَهْ, "I was your brother, and as
for Zaid, I was his brother as well". When the object precedes
the verb one can say زَيْدٌ ضَرَبْتُهُ, "I hit Zaid", regarding زَيْدٌ as

a مبتدأ and therefore nominative. If one adds a further clause زيدٌ ضربته وحنٌ خليته, "I hit Zaid and freed Hasan", or زيدٌ ضربته وحنًا خليته, one can regard حنٌ in the nominative as a second مبتدأ, or حنًا in the accusative as referring back to the • of ضربته. When one regards the noun as a مبتدأ, then the verb and reflexive pronoun form the خبر. (6) ... In sentences of command and prohibition the noun on which the verb is built is preferably in the accusative, even if preceded by a particle:-

خالدًا! اضربه اياه, "hit Zaid", زيدًا! اضربه, "hit Khalid's father", اما عمرًا فاشتر له ثوبًا, "as for 'Amr, buy him a cloak", اما بكرًا فلا تمر به, "as for Bakr, do not pass by him". (7)

Al-Zamakhsharī talking about the منصوب باللائم اضماره, that which is made accusative by suppression, states:- "Another form of the منصوب باللائم اضماره is that which suppresses its regent by a condition of تفسير, explanation;

ضربت زيدًا ضربته, "I hit Zaid", which really is ضربته زيدًا, except that one does not put it in and lets the تفسير suffice. Likewise one says زيدًا لقيت اخاه, "I met Zaid's brother", and

بشرًا ضربت غلامه, "I hit Bishr's slave". (8) We can see the influence of the master Sibawayh in this connection, because immediately after this he says: "Sibawayh says: The use of the

(6) Sibawayh, op. cit., p.46.

(7) Ibid., p.69.

(8) Al-Zamakhsharī, op. cit., p.27.

accusative is a very Arabic custom. In the situations above the nominative is better - (this, of course, is what has just been quoted from his 'Kitāb') - but you will see that the accusative may be out of choice or compulsory. The accusative of choice occurs in two situations:- (a) when you place this sentence linked by a conjunction with a verbal sentence, as in *رَأَيْتُ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ وَزَيْدًا صَرَرْتُ بِهِ*, "I saw 'Abdullah and passed by Zaid", or (b) when the noun falls after a particle of interrogation, as *أَعْبَدَ لَكَ ضَرْبَتَهُ*, "did you hit 'Abdullah'".⁽⁹⁾ It seems rather paradoxical that al-Zamakhsharī should quote Sībawayh, and yet not follow his method - he uses the accusative when the object precedes the verb in a simple sentence.

Al-Zajjājī supports both points of view: "When the object precedes the verb it is permissible to use either nominative or accusative provided the verb has an attached pronoun referring back to the object:- either *الشَّاءُ شَرِبْتُهُ*, "I drank the water", or *الشَّاءَ شَرِبْتُهُ*. However the nominative is preferable except in the case of a question, command, prohibition, negation, protasis and apodosis, where the accusative is better. Also if one verb in a sentence is joined to another by a conjunction and the second verb has its object preceding it, then this object should be in the accusative:-

(9) Ibid., p.27.

أَكْرَمْتُ , قام زيدٌ و محمدًا أكرمته "Zaid got up, and I honoured Muhammad". (10) We see that the second part of his statement agrees entirely with Sībawayh.

Ibn Hishām, writing some centuries later, agrees with, and enlarges upon, the statements of his predecessors: "In the expressions زيدًا ضربت أخاه, "I hit Zaid", زيدًا ضربت أخاه, "I hit Zaid's brother", and زيدًا مررت به, "I passed by Zaid", one can put زيدٌ in the nominative, considering it as an independent noun with what follows it as its خبر; or it can be put into the accusative by the action of some understood, but not expressed verb. However, the accusative is preferable in cases like (i) زيدًا إضربه, "hit Zaid", on account of the trend of order, prohibition or request, (ii) والآنعام خلقها لكم, "He made blessings for you", on account of concordance, and (iii) أتبشروا منا واحدًا ننبه, "have we examined a single man amongst us?", or ما زيدا رأيته, "I have not seen Zaid", on account of the habitual use of the verb here. The accusative is necessary in cases like إن زيدًا لقيته فأكرمه, "if you meet Zaid, honour him", and هلّا زيدًا أكرمته, "did you honour Zaid?", on account of the necessity of using the verb here which alone is acted upon by the regents of condition and excitation, إن and هلّا. The nominative is necessary in cases like خرجت فاذا زيدٌ يضربه عمرو, "I went out, and there was 'Amr beating Zaid", on account of the impossibility

(10) Al-Zajjājī, Al-Jumal, Paris, 1957, pp.51 and 52.

of using a verb, since the regent **إِذَا** can act only on a nominal proposition. Both accidents of flexion are equally applicable in **زَيْدٌ قَامَ أَبُوهُ وَعَمَرُوهُ اِكْرَمْتُهُ**, "Zaid's father got up, and I honoured 'Amr", because there is an equivalence, since there is before the noun an adjunctive particle preceded by a verbal proposition, which acts as the **حَبَر** to a preceding noun, i.e. **زَيْدٌ قَامَ أَبُوهُ** is a complete double-faced proposition: complete, in that it is a self contained proposition, and double-faced, in that by its first term it is nominal and by its second verbal. Thus if one regards it as nominal, **عَمَرُو** is put into the nominative to make a second nominal proposition. If, however, one regards it as verbal,

عَمَرَا is put into the accusative to make a second verbal proposition. Thus either way one gets concordance, and the two constructions and two cases are equivalent".⁽¹¹⁾

Once again the two opposing grammar schools found themselves at variance over the sentence **زَيْدًا ضَرَبْتُ**, "I hit Zaid": "Kufans:- **زَيْدًا** is made accusative by the influence of the verb falling on the **و**. Basrans:- it is accusative by the action of the understood verb and its virtual sense is **زَيْدًا ضَرَبْتُ**, "I hit Zaid I hit him".

"Kufans:- The **و** refers back to **زَيْدًا**, and as the **و** is accusative, then so is **زَيْدًا**. They give in support of their theory the examples **اِكْرَمْتُ اَبَاكَ زَيْدًا**, "I honoured your father Zaid", and **ضَرَبْتُ اخَاكَ عَمَرًا**, "I hit your brother 'Amr".

(11) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.200f.

"Basrans:- The Kufans' argument is false. In the sentence
 , أكرمت إياك زيداً , زيداً is a بدل and this is quite
 permissible because it follows the thing of which it is the
 بدل : but it is not permissible to have the بدل anywhere
 but after the مُبدل منه ; and in the sentence in question
 زيداً precedes the • , and thus it cannot be a بدل .
 The regent in the بدل is not the regent in the مُبدل منه :
 the regent in the مُبدل منه is in the virtual sense of the
 repetition in the بدل . The proof of this is its mani-
 festation (إظهاره) in the بدل just like its
 manifestation in the مُبدل منه . In this case the regent
 of the بدل is not the regent of the مُبدل منه ."(12)

Yet it is to Ibn Malik, with the aid of De Sacy's commen-
 tary that we turn for the fullest help in attempting to show
 the occupation of the governing word, the عامل . {The
 commentary will be inserted in brackets where it is relevant).
 We read: "If the pronoun of a noun placed before a verb pre-
 vents it from governing really or virtually in the accusative,
 then make the noun be governed in the accusative by a verb
 which can only be understood and which is in concord with the
 expressed verb. The accusative is necessary if the noun
 placed before follows something which is peculiar to the verb,
 such as حيثما and إن .

"(This concerns the case where the noun which, logically,
 should be the direct or indirect complement of a verb is placed

(12) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.60f.

before the verb and purloins the grammatical action of the verb, this action expressing itself immediately or mediate-ly on a pronoun placed behind the verb, and which relates to a preceding noun. This is what happens, for example, if, instead of saying *إِضْرِبْ زَيْدًا*, "hit Zaid", and *أُذْهِبْ بِصَحْرٍ*, "bring 'Amr", one says *زَيْدًا إِضْرِبْ* and *عَمْرًا اذْهِبْ*. In the system of the Arab grammarians the noun is, in this case, put into the accusative, as if being governed by a verb which must necessarily remain understood and which is identical, for the sense, with the expressed verb.)

"If the noun placed before follows something peculiar to the independent noun, always use the nominative. It is the same when the verb follows an expression such that what is before it would not know that it must show itself governed by what comes after.

"(Thus one must say *زَيْدٌ مَا ضَرَبْتُهُ*, "I did not hit Zaid", and *عَمْرٌو أَكَلْتُ*, "I speak to 'Amr", putting the nouns in the nominative, because the negative adverb *مَا* and the adverb of affirmation *أَ* oppose the verbs exercising any influence on what precedes these particles. From the preceding verse it results that the noun placed by inversion before the verb of which logically it is the complement must be put in the nominative if, before the noun, there is a word which, by its nature, must be followed by an inchoative, such as *إِذَا*, and *كَيْتَمًا*. It is also the same if, between the displaced noun and the verb, there is a particle of interrogation, like

هَلْ , or of condition, like اِنْ , مَتَى , etc., or of affirmation, like ج , or of negation like مَا , or of excitation, like هَلَّا , or some other word which operates an analogous effect.)

"One prefers the accusative (i) after a verb of tendence, (ii) after an expression which one often makes a verb follow, (iii) immediately after a particle which adjoins an expression governed by a verb placed at the head.

"(By a verb which expresses demand or desire (a verb of tendence), فعل ذر طلب , one must understand a command, دَعَا , a prohibition, نَهَى , or a vow, اَمَرَ . Thus one must say زيدا الرمة , "honour Zaid", عمرًا لا تقتله , "do not kill 'Amr", اللهم عبدك ارحمه , "oh God have pity on your servant". In saying يصدم ايلأوه الفعل غلب , the author indicates those cases where the displaced complement is preceded by a word whose ordinary place is to be immediately before the verb, like a particle of interrogation, اِسْتَفْهَام , the negations مَا and لَا , and the particle حَيْثُ . In all these cases the accusative must be preferred to the nominative. It is then suitable to say اَزَيْدًا قَتَلْتَهُ , "have you killed Zaid?", مَا عَمْرًا لَقِينَاهُ , "we have not met 'Amr", حَيْثُ طَلَحْتَ تَلْقَاهُ فَلِّمْ عَلَيْهِ , "wherever you meet Talha greet him". It is also good to remark that if, in the cases which concern it, one uses for interrogation the particle هَلْ , one must definitely put the displaced complement in the accusative. The accusative is also preferable to the nominative

if the displaced complement is in grammatical relationship to a conjunction, عطف , with the government of a verb,

مصنوع فعل , which includes also the regent governed in the nominative with the complement governed in the accusative.

Thus, to conform to this rule, one would have to say,

جاء زيد وعمرًا أخرجه , "Zaid came and I made 'Amr go out",
لقيت بشرًا وخالداً ابصرته , "I met Bishr and I saw Khālīd".

The author adds the words بلا فصل , "immediately", because if one put أمّا before the displaced complement, the nominative would then be preferable to the accusative.)

"If the adjoined noun follows a verb acting as a خبر to another noun, then make the adjunction according to your own choice.

"(Ibn Mālik talks here of the case where a verb has served as an inchoative, as in زيد مات , "Zaid died", that is to say, of those propositions which one calls ذوات الوجّهين . If after having said زيد مات one adds "and God conserved 'Amr, one can say at will وعمرًا أبّقاء الله , or وعمرًا أبّقاء الله .

"The cases where the governing word is separated by a preposition or an annexation are governed in the same way as those where there is contiguity.

"(The syntax in question applies in principle to cases where the verb, placed after its logical complement, exercises its grammatical action, be it immediately on a pronoun which refers to the preceding noun, as in زيدًا ضربته , "I hit Zaid",

or be it mediatly by the intermediary of a preposition, *زیدًا ذہبتُ بہ*, as in *مشغول بحربِ جیر*, "I brought Zaid". The same syntax has place if the grammatical action of the verb, instead of being influenced on the pronoun, be it mediatly or immediately, is exercised on the antecedent of a relationship of annexation, *مشغول باضافة*, of which this pronoun is the complement, as in *زیدًا ضربتُ اخاه*, "I hit Zaid's brother", and *زیدًا ذہبتُ بخلامہ*, "I brought Zaid's servant". The word which separates the verb and the pronoun is called *مبتدی*. Finally, it has place if the verb exercises its grammatical action on a word completely strange, *أجنبي*, to the preceding noun, and to the word to which is attached the pronoun which serves as a link, the word which one calls *مبتدی*. This presents three different types, but which all have in common the fact that the *مبتدی* serves the function of *تابع*, while the *اجنبی* word serves the function of *متبوع*. An example of the first sort is *زیدًا ضربتُ غلامًا یخدمہ*, "Zaid, I hit a servant who was serving him": The *اجنبی* word is *غلامًا*, the *مبتدی* word is *یخدمہ*; it is a *تابع* of the category called *نعت*. An example of the second sort is *زیدًا ضربتُ فاطمة و اخاه*, "Zaid, I hit Fāṭima and his brother": the *اجنبی* word is *فاطمة*, the *مبتدی* word is *واخاه*; it is a *تابع* of the category called *عطف*. An example of the third sort is *زیدًا ضربتُ عمرا اخاه*, "Zaid, I hit 'Amr his brother":

the *اِخَاه* word is *سَبِيٍّ*, the *عَمْرًا* word is *اِجْنَبِيٍّ*; this is a *تَابِع* of the category called *عطف بيان*. (13)

Returning to the straightforward direct object - the preceding section has dealt with the more complicated aspects of its use, but has served to tell us more about the power of the regent, the *عَامِل*, - we see that in Arabic, as in other languages, one verb is capable of taking two objects.

Sībawayh says of this: "The *فَاعِل* which through the medium of a verb governs two objects:- *أَعْطَى عَبْدُ اللَّهِ زَيْدًا دِرْهَمًا*, "Abdullah gave Zaid a dirham, or *اخْتَارَ مُوسَى قَوْمَهُ سَبْعِينَ رَجُلًا*, "Moses chose for his people seventy men". Some verbs may take two objects, or have a preposition before the second:-

عَرَّفْتُ زَيْدًا, or *عَرَّفْتُ بِزَيْدٍ*, "I acquainted him with Zaid": or, *سَمَّيْتُهُ فُلَانًا*, *سَمَّيْتُهُ بِفُلَانٍ*, "I named him such-and-such". In the above examples, the first object may be omitted, while the verb acts on the second only. In some cases, as follows, neither object can be omitted without the other:- *حَسِبَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ زَيْدًا بَكْرًا*, "Abdullah thought Zaid was Bakr"; and *أَظُنُّ زَيْدًا مُنْطَلِقًا*, "I think Zaid is eloquent". (14)

Ibn Hishām, talking about words which suppress independence, says: "The third group of words which suppress independence is

(13) Ibn Mālik, *Alfiyya*, trans. Goguyer, Beyrouth, 1888. Commentary, De Sacy, Paris, 1833, lines 255f.

(14) Sībawayh, *op, cit.*, p.16, 18 and 61.

that of the words which put both the **مبتدأ** and the **خبر** in the accusative: these words are **ظن** , **راى** , **حسب** , "to think", **دري** , "to know", **خال** , "to suppose", **زعم** , "to assert", **وجد** , "to find", and **علم** , "to know". If they are placed at the end of a sentence their influence is preferably revoked: one can say either **زيدًا عالمًا ظننتُ** , "I thought Zaid was wise", or preferably **زيدٌ عالمٌ ظننتُ** . If the verb comes in the middle either construction may be used:- **زيدًا ظننتُ عالمًا** , or **زيدٌ ظننتُ عالمٌ** . However, if these verbs are followed by the negative particles **لا** , **ما** , or **إن** , or by **ج** as a particle of independence or as an oath, or by an interrogative, their influence necessarily becomes null, and is said to be suspended".⁽¹⁵⁾

Again we can turn to the "Alfiyya": "Words of the **ظن** family:- Put into the accusative both terms of independence after words of opining

"(What characterises certain of these verbs is that, besides their regent which they govern in the nominative, following the general rule, they govern in the accusative two terms which are between themselves in the logical relationship of subject and attribute, or, to use the language of the grammarians, **مبتدأ** and **خبر** . On account of the action which verbs of this category exercise on these two terms, the first is called **المفعول الاوّل من باب ظن** , and the second

(15) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.171.

(16). "المفصول الثاني من باب ظنّ

After dealing with verbs of which the two objects are in relationship with each other, Reckendorf adds:- "Often two accusatives come together by chance without being in an "inner" relationship with each other, i.e. without forming a double accusative in the strict sense of the word: وَيَقْرَأُ شَهْدَانَهُ سَلِيمًا , "like many a day when we were with the Salīm", In this way are used verbs of expressing an opinion when they have their original meaning of perceiving with the senses: وَجَدَكَ ضَالًّا , "he found you wandering", مَا رَأَى مُتَقَرِّبًا , "when he saw him standing there", (as double accusative, "when he regarded him as a standing there one"). Further, for instance when one accusative is an inner accusative: الَّتِي قَتَلْتَهُ غَضَبًا , "the one who killed you by force"."(17)

One also finds verbs with three objects: "Some verbs take three objects, none of which can be omitted without the other two; أَعْلَمَ اللَّهُ زَيْدًا عَمْرًا خَيْرًا مِنْكَ , "God informed Zaid that 'Amr was better than you"."(18)

Reckendorf says: "Genuine triple accusative: i.e. accusatives of verbs which already take a double accusative in the first conjugation, are apparently very rare. Apparent

(16) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 200f.

(17) Reckendorf, Arabische Syntax, Heidelberg, 1921, p.89.

(18) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.19.

triple accusatives: ضَرْبُهُ الْخَدَّ ضَرْبًا مُبْتَرِحًا, "they hit him painfully on the cheek", نَبَيْعُكَ نَبْعًا, "we are selling it to you".⁽¹⁹⁾ Although this is classed by Reckendorf as a triple accusative, it would seem to be nothing more than a double accusative, with a third noun acting as an absolute object - a type of accusative to be considered later.

A further extension of the direct object is the feature known as بَدَل, substitution. An example of this is

ضَرَبَ زَيْدُ الظَّهْرَ وَالْبَطْنَ, "Zaid was hit on the back and front". "When accusative the nouns are regarded as the objects of the verb. However, they may equally well be in the nominative, and as such are regarded as the بدل of the subject or its تَوْكِيد."⁽²⁰⁾

Bravmann has quite a good deal to say on this theme. He deals with two types of بدل, the بَدَلُ الْكُلِّ, substitution of the part for the whole, and بَدَلُ الْإِسْتِمَالِ, comprehensive substitution, i.e. the permutative which indicates a quality or circumstance possessed by or included in the preceding substantive. "One type of this construction is exemplified by the following instance: عَجَبَنِي زَيْدُ عِلْمُهُ, "Zaid's learning filled me with surprise", literally, "there filled me with surprise Zaid, his learning", which, according to my theory, is to be traced back to زَيْدٌ - عَجَبَنِي عِلْمُهُ,

(19) Reckendorf, op. cit., p.90.

(20) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.79.

"Zaid, his learning filled me with surprise".

"The more frequent construction is that with the noun in the accusative. In the first place, we would refer to expressions of the type (*الظهر* or) *ضربَ زيدًا ظهره*, "he hit Zaid on his (or: the) back", literally, "he hit Zaid, his back (or: the back)."; or, *سلبَ زيدًا ثوبه*, "he robbed Zaid of his garment", literally, "he robbed Zaid, his garment" These constructions ... are derived from a basic type like *زيدٌ - ضربتُ ظهره*, "Zaid, I hit his back", i.e. the variant with Isolated Natural Subject of the simple construction *ضربتُ ظهرَ زيدٍ*, "I hit Zaid's back".

"As against this, both Indo-European and Semitic scholars are apt to regard these constructions (as *ضربتُ زيدًا ظهره*) as primary, considering the two nouns to be separately dependent on the verb from the outset and the second to be an apposition to the first. Reckendorf comments as follows upon the relation of this construction, as *ضربتُ زيدًا ظهره* to the construction *ضربتُ ظهرَ زيدٍ*: "The essence of this construction and how it differs from *ضربتُ ظهرَ زيدٍ*, "he hit Zaid's back", consists of the fact that the individual part - (the first accusative usually seems to be a living being) - is to be affected by an action, although only one member of it is directly affected: the individual part gets a feeling from its member, the first accusative is related to the second as a subject to its object".

"In certain of the cases quoted by Brockelmann as

instances of the type under discussion, the similarity to the sentence type called "acc. c. verbo finito" is obvious, as

فذكرت قوسي التي تركتها, "then I remembered my bow, that I had left it". It is evidently justified, therefore, to assume the same development in this case too.

"A further case of the category of بدل , but demanding special treatment, is the dual accusative after verbs of asking, demanding, depriving, on the one hand, and of giving, providing, filling, etc., on the other. This type is very common also in Indo-European languages. With regard to this and certain other types of dual accusative, Reckendorf ... remarks, "In the case of verbs like "to fill, to give, to withdraw, to ask, to render, etc.", a zeugma takes place which employs one verbal notion for two different objects." Furthermore he says ... concerning the same types: "The two accusatives are related to each other like the subject to the object: one of the accusatives produces in the imagination of the speaker, together with the other partner, a physical or mental action as does a subject with its object. One need not understand any specific action; in fact this is impossible."

"Brockelmann, like Reckendorf, treats the dual object after the words of asking and depriving together with the accusatives (in form or meaning) of verbs which from the outset require the accusative of material, explaining the first type (like certain other types of dual object) as developed in analogy to the latter, on the basis of the similarity, or the

contrast, respectively, of the concepts involved. As far as the verbs of asking, demanding, depriving, are concerned, it is clear from the outset that the first accusative designating the owner of the thing which is asked for or taken away is to be regarded as an original genitive, dependent on the accusative (or nominative, respectively) designating the thing:

(الثوب or) بَرَّ الرجل ثوبه , "he robbed the man of his (or: the) garment", is therefore to be derived from an original construction, as, "the man, he took away his garment",

بَرَّ الرجل - ثوبه , and it is only by penetrating into the interior of the sentence that the Isolated Natural Subject became subordinate to the governing verb.

"It is evident that on the basis of the similarity or the contrast of the concepts, the dual accusative thus developed could be extended to verbs of different meaning".(21)

When the verb is passive virtually the same rules apply to the مفعول به . "The مفعول in passive verbs:-

كُتِيَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ الثوبَ , "Abdullah was clothed with the cloak", or أُعْطِيَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ الْمَالَ , "Abdullah was given the money".

The words الثوب and المال are made منصوب as they are direct objects acted upon by the transitivity of the فعل which takes the place of the فاعل .(22)

(21) Bravmann, Studies in Arabic and General Syntax, Cairo, 1953, p.97f.

(22) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.19.

Al-Zajjājī, on the other hand, shows the passive verb with two objects: "سِيرَ زَيْدٌ يَوْمَانِ فَرَسَخَيْنِ", "Zaid travelled for two days over two parasangs"; when يَوْمَانِ takes the place of the فاعل, and فَرَسَخَيْنِ is in the نصب since it is adverbial, or one can regard it as a مفعول به. Alternatively one can say سِيرَ زَيْدٌ يَوْمَيْنِ فَرَسَخَانِ, when exactly the same explanation of cases is applicable. One can further make both words accusative, and say سِيرَ زَيْدٌ يَوْمَيْنِ فَرَسَخَيْنِ. (23)

Before moving on from the simple direct object, mention must briefly be made of those instances of the straightforward direct object in which it is not the accusative which is employed, but the oblique case. Certain verbs are made transitive through the medium of a preposition, and yet the object is still referred to as the مفعول به. Random examples are

حَاجَ إِلَى شَرْبِ مَاءٍ, "I passed by Zaid", صررتُ زَيْدًا, "he needed a drink of water", أَغَارَ الْجَيْشُ عَلَى الْمَدِينَةِ, "the army attacked the town", and رَغِبَ الْكَاذِبُ فِي الرَّحْمَةِ, "the liar desired forgiveness".

From the simple direct object we have the instance of one word being the object of one verb and the subject of another.

"ضَرَبْتُ وَضَرَبَنِي زَيْدٌ" or "زَيْدًا" or "me", or "ضَرَبَنِي وَضَرَبْتُ زَيْدًا" or "زَيْدًا". Although the cases are interchangeable, the noun would seem to be governed

(23) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.91.

preferably by the nearer verb. If a pronoun, however, is included, then there is no ambiguity of case at all, as one has introduced *ضربوني وضربتهم قوسك بدل* "your people hit me and I hit them". On the other hand there can be no ambiguity of cases if the sense demands one explicitly:

كفاني ونعم أطلب قليل "a little sufficed me, and I did not ask (for it)": The sense is that a little suffices, but a little was not the thing asked for, and therefore not really the object of *أطلب*. (24)

Al-Zajjājī seems slightly less committal: "When a word is the object of one verb and the subject of another it can be either nominative or oblique, but the nominative would seem to be preferred: *ضربت وضربني زيد* or *ضربت وضربني زيد*, "I hit Zaid and he hit me", or *مررت ومررت بي زيد* or *مررت ومررت بي زيد*, "I passed by Zaid and he passed by me".

It depends whether one regards the first or second verb as having more influence on the noun in question. A further accusative can be added without altering the reasoning for the case into which the first noun goes: *ظننت وظنني زيد* or *ظننت وظنني زيد*, "Zaid and I thought each other were appearing in view". (25)

Again Ibn al-Anbārī shows us the arguments for either case. "About the sentences *أكرمت وأكرمت زيد*, or *أكرمت وأكرمت زيد*, "I honoured Zaid and he honoured me", the Kufans say the action of the first verb is preferable,

(24) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.37.

(25) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.123.

while the Basrans maintain that the action of the second is better.

"Kufans:- Two things prove that the action of the first verb is preferable:- tradition and analogy. As for tradition they quote -

فَلَوْ أَنَّ مَا أَشْعُرُ بِأَذْنِي مَعِيشَةً كَفَانِي وَلَمْ أَطْلُبْ قَلِيلًا مِنْ الْحَالِ ,

"if I exert myself to live a lower standard of life, a little quantity of money would satisfy me, and never would I ask for

much"; if the second verb wielded the influence, one would then

say وَلَوْ أَنَّ تَحَمَّلَ آلَ لَيْلَى صَعَتُ بَيْنَهُمْ نَعَبَ الْغُرَابِ ; قَلِيلًا ,

"and since the clan of Laylā have moved, I hear the raven

croaking their separation"; the first verb wields the influence,

and thus makes الْغُرَابِ accusative. If it were the second

verb which governed it, it must be nominative.

"As for analogy; the first verb precedes the second and thus has a sounder influence - provided it comes at the beginning. Otherwise its influence may be annulled, just as

one says زَيْدٌ ظَنَنْتُ قَائِمٌ , "I thought Zaid was standing",

or زَيْدٌ كَانَ قَائِمٌ , "Zaid was standing". What strengthens

the fact that the first verb has a stronger influence than the

second is that, when you make the second verb exercise the

influence, it transmits to the idea rather than to the actual

mention; and the actual mention must precede the idea.

"Basrans:- The proof that the influence rests with the second verb is twofold: tradition and analogy. As for

tradition; there is a great deal of evidence -

أَتَوْنِي أَخْرُغُهُ عَلَيْهِ قَطْرًا, "bring me (molten brass) which I may pour over it", and the second verb wields the influence: if the first had done so, it would be أَخْرُغُهُ عَلَيْهِ: likewise, هَاؤُمِ اقْرَأْ كِتَابِي, "Lo, read my book": the second verb wields the influence, for if the first one had done so, it would be اقْرَأْهُ. Also in -

وَلَكِنْ نَصَفًا لَوْ سَبَبْتُ وَسَبَبَنِي بَنُو عَبْدِ شَمْسٍ مِنْ مَنَافٍ وَهَاشِمٍ, "but it is just if I had insulted (Banu 'Abd al-Shams) and Banu 'Abd al-Shams from Manaf and Hāshim insulted me"; the second wields influence, since if the first had done so it would be سَبَبْتُ, with accusative بَنِي and the showing of the pronoun in سَبَبَنِي.

"As for analogy: the second verb is nearer to the noun than the first, and in its regency there is no destruction of the meaning, against that of the first; and its influence is preferable, for one says حَشَنْتُ بَصْدْرَهُ وَصَدْرَ زَيْدٍ, "I became coarse in his chest and Zaid's", and the influence of the preposition بِ on the noun is chosen, not the influence of the verb, because it is nearer to it; and in its influence there is no destruction of the meaning.

"In reply to the Kufan's statement about كَفَانِي وَلَمْ أَطْلُبْ قَلِيلٌ, etc., they say:- The first wields influence, showing regard to meaning, because if the second wielded influence the sentence would be contradictory for two reasons:- (i) If the second wielded influence the virtual meaning would be

كَفَانِي قَلِيلٌ وَلَمْ أَطْلُبْ قَلِيلًا مِنْ الْحَالِ, "a little suffices, and I do

not ask for a little wealth", and this is contradictory to the first part of the line; and (ii) The next line says -

وَلَكِنَّا أَسْعَى لِسَجْدٍ مُّوْتَلٍ وَقَدْ يُدْرِكُ الْمَجْدَ الْمُوْتَلُ أَمْثَالِي

"but I am seeking for noble glory, and one who is like me definitely might obtain it", and this shows that the first and not the second wields the influence.

"As for their statement that "the first verb comes first, and its influence is necessary for the meaning", we (the Basrans) say:- They are even concerned with the ابتداء , but they are concerned more with nearness and proximity as we have shown in our proof. (In other words though they say this they do not mean it, as they are really concerned with the nearer word.)

"As for their saying: "if we made the second wield influence it would transmit to the idea rather than to the actual word", we say:- We allow the idea before the actual mention, because what is after it (i.e. the mention) comments on it: this is because they have made some words suffice for others when there was in the uttered proof of the suppressed, to the knowledge of the مخاطب , the person addressed. God said -

وَالْحَافِظِينَ فُرُوجَهُمْ وَالْحَافِظَاتِ وَالذَّاكِرِينَ اللَّهَ كَثِيرًا وَالذَّاكِرَاتِ

"and the men who guard their private parts and the women who guard, and the men who remember God much, and the women who remember (God)", and the second does not wield influence on that on which the first wields influence, doing without it on account of what was mentioned before, and the مخاطب knows

that the second may enter into the ruling of the first.

Likewise - *إِنَّ اللَّهَ بَرِيءٌ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ وَرَسُولُهُ*, "God is free from obligation to the idolators and (so is) his messenger", and the mention of the *حبر* of the first suffices for the mention of the second to the knowledge of the *مخاطب*.

"The witnesses of this grammar are plenty, and it proves the permissibility of having the idea before the actual mention, because what follows it comments on it".(26)

From one type of compound sentence we turn to another - that in which the *مفعول* is corroborated, or *مؤكّد*. Sībawayh says: " *مفعول* of the *توكيد* ". *رَأَيْتُ قَوْمَكَ أَكْثَرَهُمْ*, "I saw most of your people", or *رَأَيْتُ بَنِي زَيْدٍ ثُلَاثَهُمْ*, "I saw the Banu Zaid, a third of them". The second noun or adjective stands as *توكيد* for the first. The sentence can be even more compound:- *ضَرَبْتُ النَّاسَ بَعْضُهُمْ قَائِمًا وَبَعْضُهُمْ قَاعِدًا*, "I hit the people, some of them (were) standing and some of them (were) sitting".(27)

We will find as we examine the uses of the accusative that the Arabs seemed incapable of visualising an accusative without there being a verb present somewhere, even if only in the imagination of the reader. Thus they frequently refer to suppressed verbs, which are quite capable of governing a direct

(26) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.61f.

(27) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.75.

object. Within the sphere of the accusative governed by a suppressed verb falls the example of the alif of interrogation (*الف الاستفهام*). Sībawayh says: "Interrogatives. When the noun follows a particle of interrogation, and precedes the verb, it is put into the accusative, as in *هَذَا زَيْدًا ضَرَبْتَ*, "did you hit Zaid?", *أَلَمْ تَقْتُلْ زَيْدًا قَتَلْتَ*, "have you not killed Zaid?" This is permissible if there is no reflexive pronoun attached to the verb. Such sentences have the sense of excitation (*تَحْضِيضٌ*) or command, and are therefore permissible".⁽²⁸⁾ He then goes on to deal specifically with the alif which governs the accusative: "The alif which governs the accusative. *أَعْبَدَ لَهْ ضَرَبْتَهُ*, "did you hit 'Abdullah?", *أَعْمَرَ قَتَلْتَ إِخَاهُ*, "did you pass by Zaid?", *أَزِيدًا مَرَرْتَ بِهِ*, "did you kill 'Amr's brother?", *أَعْمَرَ إِشْتَرَيْتَ لَهُ ثَوْبًا*, "did you buy a garment for 'Amr?" The nouns are in the accusative because there is a hidden verb interposed between the alif and the noun. Likewise in indirect speech,

مَا أَبَالِي أَعْبَدَ لَهْ لَقِيتُ إِخَاهُ أَمْ عَمْرًا, "I did not notice whether I met 'Abdullah's brother or 'Amr's".⁽²⁹⁾

Al-Zajjājī corroborates this view of Sībawayh's: "The noun following a verb of question is put into the nominative provided it is not followed by a verb: *قَدْ عَلِمْتُ أَزِيدٌ عِنْدَكَ أَمْ عَمْرٌو*:-

(28) Ibid., op. cit., p.50.

(29) Ibid., p.52.

"I have learned whether Zaid is with you or 'Amr". But if there is another verb following, this second verb - NOT the verb of **استفهام** - acts upon the noun and makes it accusative:- **قد علمت أزيداً ضربت أم عمرو**, "I have learned whether you hit Zaid or 'Amr". (30)

Extending the idea of interrogation Sībawayh says:

" **استفهام** and **إخبار**, informing and interrogation. **ما أنت إلا سيرا**, "what are you doing but journeying?", or **ما أنت إلا الضرب الضرب**, "what are you doing but striking blows?" This is as if the sentence were actually **ما أنت إلا تفعل فعلاً**, or **ما أنت إلا تفعل الفعل**, only the verb has been suppressed in these cases, as in the cases of **نهر** and **امر**. One may reduce these sentences still further to **زيد سيرا سيرا**, or **إن زيدا سيرا سيرا**. Coming to **استفهام** we have **أجلوساً**, "are you standing, so-and-so?", or **أجلوساً**, "are you sitting down?"; as in other cases the verb is suppressed, the sentence being in full **أقفوم قياماً يا فلان**, or **أجلس جلوساً**. The accusative is the بدل of the actual expression (**لفظ**) of the suppressed verb". (31)

CONCLUSIONS

After seeing what the grammarians had to say about the

(30) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.298.

(31) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.168.

direct object, there are several points which must be made in conclusion.

There is an unanimous agreement among the grammarians that the straightforward direct object is made accusative by the action of the verb. It is this regent which passes on and affects the object. We see, however, that there is some difference of opinion as to whether the verb itself, or the verb plus its subject, the *فاعل*, makes the object accusative. The Basrans, who claim that it is the verb alone which is the regent, seem to have the stronger argument; as they rightly say, the *فاعل* can have no influence as it is a noun.

We must also look closely at the direct object which precedes the verb. One explanation for the use of the accusative is that there is an understood verb before it. The Kufans say that the accusative is used because in the sentence *"إِذَا ضَرَبْتُ زَيْدًا"*, "I hit Zaid", the *ضَرَبْتُ* refers back to the *زَيْدًا*, and makes it accusative as a *محل*. If this is the case, how then is the accusative governed when there is no *ضَمِيرُ الْعَائِدِ*, the pronoun which refers back, as if the sentence were *زَيْدًا ضَرَبْتُ*? We see that al-Zajjājī allows either the accusative or the nominative, even when there is a *ضَمِيرُ الْعَائِدِ*, so either the argument about the *محل*, or the opinions of al-Zajjājī must be at fault. From the Arabs' point of view, since the other principle grammarians say that the nominative may be used, and thanks to the shrewd reasoning of the Basrans about the positions of words in a construction with *محل* - a view which we would not accept

from a Western approach -- the Kufan view would appear to be at fault. (We must always remember that the Arabs' way of examining their grammar is different from ours in the West - this is a basic point which we might easily tend to overlook.) However, even after the removal of this point of view, we are still left with the interesting situation of having two explanations as to why either the accusative or the nominative may be used, both of them soundly reasoned from the Arabs' point of view, and both permitted by the grammarians. Their view as to why the nominative is permitted, we remember, is that the word **زید** , in **ضربتُ زید** , is a **مبتدأ** , and what follows is its **خبر** . It is also to be noted that there are certain instances where the accusative alone is permitted - Ibn Hishām shows why - and instances where the nominative alone is allowed - as Ibn Mālīk shows when dealing with the **عالم** , the regent. The Arabs seem to have presented themselves with a paradox by saying that the preceding direct object may be in the nominative. Taken at face value, their argument about it being a **مبتدأ** is quite sound. But they have overlooked their own explanations as to why the preceding direct object may be in the accusative. If the Kufans were right, and the object were a **بدل** of the pronoun which refers back, then it should be an accusative all the time. And if we accept the Basran's theory that the word is made accusative by a preceding understood verb, then it too should be accusative all the time.

Under the heading of the direct object which precedes the

verb, mention must be made of sentences of the type زَيْدًا ذَهَبْتُ بِهِ,
 "I brought Zaid". The grammarians are content to accept a
 sentence like this, but it would seem wrong to use the accusative.
 If - and this is purely for the sake of argument - we were to
 allow that the preceding noun should be in apposition to the ○,
 then the genitive would be called for, as the ○ is governed
 by the preposition بِ. Likewise, if we were to imagine
 an understood verb before the noun, then the noun must still be
 genitive - the Arabs state firmly that the understood verb must
 be identical with the expressed verb. Finally, this type of
 construction cannot even be construed as a خبر - مبتدأ type
 of sentence, since the noun would have to be in the nominative
 for this to be the case. It would appear that the Arabs have
 used the accusative, regarding this type of sentence as identical
 with that with a transitive verb, failing to take into
 consideration that they have here a verb which is made transitive
 only through the medium of a preposition. It is possible,
 however, that the Arabs allow the accusative to be used by
 looking at the sentence from the point of view of meaning,
 rather than going by the actual letter of the word.

Turning to the verb with two objects preceding it we again
 find two explanations, one allowing the nominative and the other
 the accusative, and both quite plausible to the Arabs' way of
 thinking. When both are accusative, they are governed by an
 understood preceding verb identical with the expressed verb;
 and when both are nominative, they act as the خبر to the مبتدأ.

Later in the chapter we have the situation of one word being the subject of one verb and the object of another, and we see two opposing points of view. While the Kufan view is sound, the view of the Basrans - which was also that of Sībawayh - would seem to carry more weight. It would seem more sound to argue that the nearer verb to the noun is the one which exercises the influence.

The final point which need be mentioned is the alif of interrogation. The grammarians agree that the accusative is governed by an understood verb, and this helps to show the tremendous importance which the Arab grammarians attached to verbs - we will see that they seemed incapable of visualising any accusative without there being a verb somewhere.

At the end of these conclusions on the different uses of the accusative reference will be made, where possible and where relevant, to some similar use in other Semitic language. For this purpose Arabic will be compared with Hebrew, Syriac, Ethiopic and Accadian. The point must, however, be stressed that in other Semitic languages, while certain usages resemble usages in Arabic, there are usually no visible case signs left. There are, nevertheless, certain vestigeal forms which justify the reference to accusative usages. (For this information on the usages in other Semitic languages acknowledgement must be made to the works of Gesenius (Kautzsch), Dillman-Bezold, Von Soden and Nöldeke, since it is from these that the

material has been drawn and greatly condensed.⁽³²⁾ In both Hebrew⁽³³⁾ and Ethiopic⁽³⁴⁾ the accusative serves as the case for the direct object, and in Ethiopic not only may all transitive verbs take the accusative, but so also may many which were originally semi-passive, by becoming transitives through a new turn of the conception. In Accadian also⁽³⁵⁾ the object is in the accusative. Some verbs are only transitive in their secondary sense, such as causatives and factitives of root forms which are intransitive.

Also, just as in Arabic, certain verbs in each of these three languages may govern two accusatives. In Hebrew⁽³⁶⁾ these two objects may have no relation to one another (as "he showed him the place"), or they may act as subject and predicate (as, man is dust, "he made man (of) dust"), or the action may be performed upon the main object through the medium of some other thing, which acts as a means, and is considered a remoter object (as "they stoned him (with) stones"). Likewise in Accadian⁽³⁷⁾ one of the two objects is usually an accusative of person, and the other is an accusative of thing, content or means. In this category fall in particular the causitives and factitives of

-
- (32) Gesenius (Kautzsch), Hebrew Grammar, 2nd English Ed., Oxford, 1910.
 Dillman-Bezold, Ethiopic Grammar, London, 1907.
 Von Soden, Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, Rome, 1952.
 Nöldeke, Syriac Grammar, Trans. Crichton, London, 1904.
- (33) Gesenius. (Kautzsch) op. cit., p.366.
- (34) Dillman-Bezold, op. cit., p.435.
- (35) Von Soden, op. cit., p.198.
- (36) Davidson, Hebrew Syntax, Edinburgh, 1902, p.107.
- (37) Von Soden, op. cit., p.199

verbs which take a single accusative in their root form, and verbs of covering, demanding, removing etc., and verbs whose second object is translated by "with so-and-so", such as washing, burning etc.. Finally in Ethiopic⁽³⁸⁾ many verbs may be associated with a double accusative. A transitive verb may take, besides its nearest object - accusative, a farther accusative of an adverbial or locative nature, but there are also many verbs which govern a double object-accusative.

There is one final point which must be mentioned here. Earlier in this conclusion mention was made of the power of the verb. In the last comparison we can see that in Ethiopic also the verb may govern an adverbial or locative accusative. This is something which will become much more apparent when we come on to deal with the adverbial types of accusative, but we would be well advised to bear in mind all the time the power of the main verb of a sentence, even if this verb be an understood one.

(38) Dillman-Bezold, op. cit., p.438.

NIDĀ' - THE VOCATIVE

We come now to a further use of the مفعول به as the object addressed. Western languages are accustomed to class the vocative as a separate case, but in Arabic the word addressed - the term for appellation is نِدَاءٌ - is none other than a direct object. It is in fact an extension of the use of the accusative after a suppressed verb.

" نداءٌ , summoning, calling. Each noun which is annexed is made accusative on account of some obviously suppressed verb. (When the noun stands by itself it is in the nominative in place of the accusative noun.) Examples are يا عبدالله , 'oh 'Abdullah', يا اخانا , 'oh our brother', يا رجلاً صالحاً , 'oh honest man'. So with prepositions, هو قبلك , 'he is before you', هو بعدك , 'he is after you', as distinct from simply قبل , بعد . One finds this accusative in the إضافة - type construction. In the sentence الطويل يا زيد الطويل , 'oh tall Zaid', is made accusative as it is an epithet of a منصوب , or it is accusative on account of an understood أعني , 'I mean'. As for يا تميم كلهم , 'oh Zaid himself', or يا تميم كلهم , 'oh Tamim, all of them', these words are accusative as in يا زيد ذا الجمّة , 'oh Zaid, with the luxurious hair'. As for the مضاف as an epithet, it can only be accusative".⁽¹⁾

(1) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.303.

It was, however, one of Sībawayh's successors, Ibn Hishām, who was most explicit on the subject of **نداء**. Talking about the objective complement he says:- "This category also includes the vocative, since in effect the origin of the expression **أَدْعُرُ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ**, 'oh 'Abdullah', is **يَا عَبْدَ اللَّهِ**, 'I call 'Abdullah', in which the verb has been suppressed and replaced by **يَا**. However, this only goes into the accusative if it fulfils one of three conditions: (i) when it has an annexed complement, **يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ**, 'oh 'Abdullah', **يَا عَبْدَ اللَّهِ**, 'oh Prophet of God'; (ii) when it is as if annexed: i.e. if it is followed by some expression which completes the sense. This complement can be a noun:- (a) which it governs in the nominative, as **يَا مَحْمُودًا فِعْلُهُ**, 'oh the one praised for his work', **يَا حَسَنًا وَجْهُهُ**, 'oh the one with the handsome face'; (b) which it governs in the accusative, as **يَا طَالِعًا جَبَلًا**, 'oh the one climbing a mountain'; (c) or which it governs in the genitive by means of some preposition dependent on it as **يَا خَيْرًا مِنْ زَيْدٍ**, 'oh friend to slaves', or **يَا رَفِيقًا بِالْعِبَادِ**, 'oh better than Zaid'; (d) or which was joined to it before the vocation, as **يَا ثَلَاثَةً وَثَلَاثِينَ**, 'oh thirty three', addressed to a man whose name this is; and (iii) when it is indefinite and is not directed at anyone in particular, as **يَا رَجُلًا خُذْ يَدِي**, 'some man, take my hand'. (The simple definite vocative takes a nominative ending, as **يَا زَيْدٌ**, 'oh Zaid', **يَا رَجُلٌ**, 'oh man'; to take this ending it must be addressed to some specific person.)

"When the vocative is inflexible - i.e. in the nominative - and when the noun in concordance with it is qualificative, corroborative, expositive, or finally has *أَلْ* and is joined in a series, this second concordant noun can be put in the nominative, in concordance with the real form of the vocative, or in the accusative, in concordance with the influence to which it is virtually submitted. Thus with:- (a) a qualificative, as *الظريف*, or *يا زيد الظريف*, 'oh noble Zaid'; (b) a corroborative, as *أجمعين* or *يا تميم أجمعون*, 'oh Tamīm, all of you'. (c) an expositive, as *كرزاً* or *يا سعيد كرز*, 'oh happy sermon'; or (d) joined in a series, as *والضحاك* or

الحسن الوجه, 'oh Zaid and the laughing one', or *يا زيد الحسن الوجه*, 'oh handsome faced Zaid'. If the concordant noun is annexed, but has not got *أَلْ*, it can go only into the accusative:- *يا زيد صاحب عمر*, 'oh Zaid, friend of 'Umar', or *يا زيد أبا عبدالله*, 'oh Zaid, father of 'Abdullah'.

"When the simple vocative is repeated, and then annexed, as in *يا زيد زيد اليمثلات*, 'oh Zaid, Zaid of the swift camels', one can pronounce the first noun in two ways: (i) with 'u', as if the first were just a simple vocative, or (ii) with 'a' as if the original construction had been

يا زيد اليمثلات زيد اليمثلات.

"A sub-division of the vocative is that of imploring, This takes only *يا* as a particle of appellation. It is used most often with *ج* with 'a' followed by the genitive.

The particle $\bar{ج}$, with fatha, is dependent, according to Ibn Jiniyy (941-1002) on the $ي$, on account of the verbal sense contained in the latter: or, according to Ibn al-Sā'igh, Ibn Usfūr, and even Sībawayh, it is dependent on an understood verb.

"Ibn Qarūf, on the other hand, says it is expletive, and depends on nothing at all. An example of this imploration is:- $يَا لِّلْمُسْلِمِينَ$, 'oh God help the Muslims'. The noun of the being for whom one is imploring goes into the genitive after $لِ$, with kasra. A further form of this imploration is to omit the prefixed $\bar{ج}$ and to suffix to the word an alif:-

$يَا زَيْدَا$, 'Zaid, help'. A further alternative is to omit both the $\bar{ج}$ and the alif, and to submit the word to the ordinary rules of the vocative:- $يَا زَيْدُ لِمَصْرُو$, 'oh Zaid, help 'Amr', and $يَا عَبْدَ اللَّهِ لِمَزِيدٍ$, 'oh 'Abdullah, help Zaid'.

"The two particles of deploring, $وَ$ and $يَا$, may be followed by the noun deplored with a suffixed alif, as $وَ زَيْدَا$ or $يَا$, and $وَ أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ$, 'woe to the Commander of the Faithful', or alternatively by the ordinary rules of the vocative, as $وَ زَيْدُ$ and $وَ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ$. The suffixed alif may also be followed by an unvowelled $وَ$:- $وَ زَيْدَاهُ$,

$وَ عَمْرَاهُ$. This usage occurs only at a pause: if the phrase runs on, the $وَ$ must be omitted (except by poetic licence)⁽²⁾.

(2) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.218f.

Al-Zamakhsharī corroborates these words in considerably less: he says:- " **المنصوب باللازم إضراره** , that which is made accusative by the action of something which must be hidden. This comprises the case of address. When one says **يا عبدالله** , one is saying 'I want' or 'I mean 'Abdullah', but this has been dropped in the usage of the expression, and **يا** has taken its place; however, it is not deprived of the power of governing a word in the accusative".⁽³⁾ He then goes on to give examples of the uses of the vocative: it would be too repetitive to give them here after the full treatment given to them by Ibn Hishām.

Ibn Mālik, after giving the rules of the vocative, but omitting to give the reasons for its syntax, deals a little later with **فصل** , section, and as this is relevant to the vocative, the writer will quote him: " **فصل** . Always put in the accusative the noun which concords with the inflexiblised vocative, and which is annexed without having **أل** , e.g.

أزیدُ ذا الحیل , 'Oh Zaid, endowed with perspicacity'. Put all the rest in the nominative or the accusative: always consider as quite independent that joined in series, and the permutative, unless the first is accompanied by **أل** , for then two conjugations are permitted, but the nominative is preferred.

"(It results from what is said that the appositive of a compellative which has become indeclinable and which is terminated by a damma must necessarily be put in the accusative

(3) Al-Zamakhsharī, op. cit., p.21.

if it fulfils certain conditions: (i) that it must in no way be of the nature of appositives called *عطف نقي*, conjunctive of order, or *بدل*, permutative; (ii) that it should be in a relationship of annexation, *مضاف*; and (iii) that it should in no way be affected by the article,

دون أل, although furthermore it can be determined by the word which acts as its complement. Thus one must say

يا زيدُ صاحبَ العلم, 'oh Zaid, friend of learning'; but if one says *يا زيدُ الحسنِ الوجه*, 'oh Zaid with the handsome face', one can pronounce it *الحسن* or *الحسن*.

"In expressions like *سعدُ سعدِ الأوس*, 'Sa'ad, Sa'ad of the wolf', the second is in the accusative, and as for the first, give it either 'u' or 'a' and you will be right.

"(In the particular case concerned, where the same noun is repeated as a form of pleonasm, one puts the second comparative *سعد* in the accusative, in conformity with the general rule, because it is *مضاف*; as for the first *سعد*, if one puts it in the nominative, or rather if one makes an indeclinable of it by giving it damma as a final vowel,

صبرني مفر, it is because it is *صبرني*; if one puts it in the accusative, it is because one supposes that it governs the complement of annexation *الأوس*, of which one makes an ellipsis)".⁽⁴⁾

The grammarians who have been quoted have all given the

(4) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 585f.

rules of the vocative, but have not explained why one type should be governed in the nominative, and another in the accusative. It is hardly surprising that such a seemingly blatant paradox should have been treated by the main grammar schools. "The Kufans say that the noun addressed,

إِسْمُ الْمُنَادَى, when definite and singular, is declinable and is مرفوع without nūnation. Al-Farrā' (d. 822) says it is indeclinable with ḍamma, with neither مفعول nor فاعل. The Basrans say it is indeclinable with ḍamma, but its actual case should be the نصب because it is a مفعول.

Kufans:- We say this because we have found it has no declining word going with it that would make it neither nominative nor accusative nor genitive, and we have found it objective in meaning: and we do not make it genitive, so that it does not resemble the مضاف; and we do not make it accusative, so that it does not resemble what does not decline. We make it nominative without nūnation, in order to differentiate between it and what is made nominative by a sound agent (برافع صحيح). As for the مضاف, we make it accusative because we have found it most commonly منصوب, and we use the accusative because it is more commonly used than any other case.

"As for Al-Farrā', he says:- the root in يا زيدا is نداء, as with نذبة, lamentation (which will be dealt with immediately after نداء), and the noun is between two long sounds - the يا and the ا -; and the noun is neither a فاعل,

nor a *مفعول* , nor a *مضان* الیه : and when they commonly make do with the first sound (یا) only, they suppress the second, and put a ḍamma on the end of the noun, resembling *فیل* and *بعد* ; because when the alif is suppressed and is implied with it, and the noun is as if annexed to it when it is attached to it, its ending resembles the ending of something from which has been suppressed the *مضان* الیه , and is implied with it, as in *وَمِنْ قَبْلِ ذَلِكَ وَمِنْ بَعْدِ ذَلِكَ* , i.e., *وَمِنْ قَبْلِ ذَلِكَ وَمِنْ بَعْدِ ذَلِكَ* , 'I came before that and after that'.

"The Kufans say the Basrans say: "it may not be said that, if the alif at the end of the *مضان* were in place of the *مضان* الیه , then the nūn of the plural must drop out, as in *وَأَقْرَبُوهَا* , 'you broken by age'". To this the Kufans reply: we do not allow *ندبة* of the plural which has two letters, nor do we allow *ندبة* of *قنرون* with the suppression of the nūn, nor by leaving it, just as neither the dual nor the plural is allowed.

"The Basrans also say: "it may not be said that this is wrong with the annexed *مضان* , like *يَا عَبْدَ عَمْرِو* , 'oh servant of 'Amr', for it is reduced in respect of pronunciation to the same thing as the singular is reduced, and it would be necessary to say *يَا عَبْدَ عَمْرِو* , with ḍamma, because its root is *يَا عَبْدَ عَمْرَاه* "; we say that this is not possible in the annexed *مضان* on account of its length, contrary to the singular, and thus the difference between them is clear. As for the *مضان* , it must have a fatha because the second noun takes the place of the alif of *ندبة* , as in *يَا زَيْدَاه* , and

the dāl in يا زيدا has fatha, and the fatha remains in
 يا عبد عمرو as it was in يا زيدا, and the منصوب
 here is in place of the منصوب, and the منصوب is in
 place of the منصوب; and it may not be said that it is
 accusative either by a verb or by a particle. What proves
 that the singular is in place of the مضاف is the inadmis-
 sibility of inserting the definite article; and what proves
 that it is not منصوب by a verb is the inadmissibility of
 having حال with it: one may not say يا زيد راكبًا, 'oh
 Zaid riding'; and what proves that it is in place of the مضاف,
 even if it be singular, is that one may put its epithet in the
 accusative, as in يا زيد الطريف, 'oh intelligent Zaid',
 just as one may put its epithet in the nominative as in
 يا زيد الطريف.

"Basrans:- We say it is indeclinable, even if, in its root,
 it must be declinable, because it resembles the kāf of the
 second person, and the kāf of the second person is indeclinable,
 and likewise so is what resembles it. This likeness between
 them is threefold:- (i) الخطاب, addressing a second person,
 (ii) التصريف, definition, and (iii) الإفراد, singularity.
 Some say it must be indeclinable because it occurs just as does
 the يا اياك, because the root in يا زيد is يا اياك or
 يا انت; because the thing addressed (the منادى), when
 it is a second person, can dispense with the mention of its اسم
 and employ the اسم الخطاب, such as يا اياك or يا انت.
 And when the اسم المنادى occurs just as does the اسم الخطاب,

it must be indeclinable, and must be indeclinable in ḍamma for two reasons: (i) it is not free to be indeclinable with either a fatha or a kasra or a ḍamma: it is wrong to be constructed with a fatha, because it may be confused with what does not conjugate: and it is wrong to be constructed with kasra, because it may be confused with what is مضاف to itself: and as it is wrong to be constructed with either fatha or kasra, this specifies it to be constructed with ḍamma: and (ii) it is constructed with ḍamma in order to make a difference between it and the مضاف , because if it were مضاف to itself, it would have kasra, and if it were مضاف to something else it would be in the نصب : and so it is constructed with ḍamma in order not to be confused with the مضاف , because it does not introduce the مضاف .

"The Basrans also say it is in place of a نصب because it is a مفعول : because the virtual meaning in يا زيد is انا دى زيد ; and when ادعُ زيدا , 'I call Zaid', or

يا takes the place of ادعُ it also wields its influence. What proves that it takes its place is twofold: (i) اِمَالَةٌ * takes place in expressions such as يا عمرو and يا زيد , and اِمَالَةٌ may occur in the اِمْ and the verb without the particle, and when اِمَالَةٌ is permissible, this proves that it may take the place of the verb, and (ii) the lām followed by the genitive is attached to it, such as يا لزيد and يا لعمرو , and this lām is the lām which calls for help (لَامُ الْإِسْتِغَاثَةِ), and this is a particle demanding the genitive, and if it were not

* اِمَالَةٌ "deflection"; the name given to the inclination of "a" towards "ā, e, i".

that **يا** takes the place of the verb it would not be permissible for a particle demanding the genitive to be attached to it, because one particle may not be attached to another: and this proves that it may take the place of the verb. Some of the grammarians assert that there is a pronoun in it as there is in the verb.

"Some Basrans deny that **يا** takes the place of **أدعُر**, and that the regent of the **إِسمِ المُنَادِي** is understood **أُدعُو**, besides **يا**.

"What proves that it is in the place of a **نصب** is that one says with the epithet **يا زَيْدُ الظَّرِيفِ**, in the accusative, in conformity with the position (**السَّوْضُ**), just as one says **يا زَيْدُ الظَّرِيفِ**, in the nominative, in conformity with the actual letter. Likewise one says

مررتُ بِزَيْدِ الظَّرِيفِ or **الظَّرِيفِ**, 'I passed by the intelligent Zaid', with the genitive, according to the letter, or with the accusative according to the position. This is the case here: it is made accusative because the singular noun addressed is in place of an accusative since it is a **مفعول**, and this is the root of every **مُنَادِي**; and for this, if there is no sign expressed to decline any word as a singular word concerning **مُضَانِ** and what resembles **مُضَانِ**, they (**المُضَانِ وَالْمُشَبَّهَ بِالْمُضَانِ**) will stay at the actual origin in the accusative.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "the **مُنَادِي** has nothing with it to put it into a case" the Basrans say:

We do not agree and we have shown this in our proof. As for the Kufans' statement that "we make it nominative" the Basrans say: How can you make it nominative when there is no regent to make it nominative? Where in Arabic does one find a **مرفوع** with no **ناصب**, or a **منصوب** with no **رافع**, or a **مخفوض** with no **حافض**? The Basrans also say: How can you make it nominative with no **تنوين**? And as for the Kufans' statement that "there should be a difference between it and what is made nominative by a **رافع**", the Basrans' reply is: This is false: the only thing which goes into the nominative without **تنوين** and yet is sound as far as **اعراب** is concerned is an indeclinable noun (الاسم الذي لا ينصرف). Then their statement "we make the **مضاف** accusative in the letter on account of its frequency in speech": the Basrans reply that this is annulled by the singular: it may be fitting that it should be put into the accusative on account of its frequency, but when the singular is not put into the accusative, this proves that it was not originally on account of this motive. As for the statement of al-Farrā', that "the root in **نداء** is that one should say **يا زيدا** as in **نُدْبَة**", this is a lone claim in need of proof. As for the statement that "the added alif at the end is in place of the **مضاف اليه**, and when they suppress it they construct the word with damma, just as when the **مضاف اليه** is suppressed in **من قبل** and **من بعد**", we (the Basrans) say: This is annulled by the **منادى** which is **مضاف**, such as

يا عبد عمرو : this needs by way of sound what the singular needs, and one would have to say يا عبد عمرو, with damma, because its root is يا عبد عمراه. And as for the statement that "it is not permissible in المنادى المضاف on account of its length", we say this is false, because the length does not prevent a word from being afforded what is due to it of establishing the sound at its beginning and end, since there is no difference in نداء between either the length of nouns or their shortness; thus if one addressed a man whose name was قرعبلانه or عزنيان or اخناندانه, then it would still be necessary to use damma, even though there are more letters than in يا عبد عمرو. This proves the fallacy of this point.

"As for their making the نصب of the مضاف indeclinable in fatha, which is before the added alif at the end of منادى, this is false also; for when one says يا خيرا من زيد, 'oh better than Zaid', when it is singular and specified, then it is not free as to whether the نصب of خير is borne on the alif which is inserted on account of the sound, or on something else; if one says 'on the alif', then one should say

يا خيرا من زيد, and no one says this: and if the alif does not come into it, and it may be accusative, this proves that it is not borne on the alif but on something else. (They are, in fact, confusing the الف at the end of a word with a genuine accusative: خيرا is not indeclinable - it is an accusative in its own right.) What proves the fallacy of asserting that the alif is put at the end of the منادى in place of the

الىه مضانه is that, if this were the case, then the nūn of the plural would have to be dropped from something like
 . وا قنروناه . Then as for their statement "we do not allow ندة of the plural which has a two-letter ending, nor do we allow the ندة of قنرون with the suppression of the nūn, nor with the retention of the nūn", the Basrans say: This is incumbent upon you when you make يا take the place of
 : you allow وا قنريناه , even if you are prevented from saying وا قنروناه , and yet both of them are plural words. As for "the singular is in place of the مضانه ; the proof is the prevention of the introduction of the definite article", the Basrans say: We do not agree that the prevention of the introduction of the definite article is for the reason you have given: the prevention of its introduction is caused by the fact that that to which you point and that which you approach dispenses with the introduction of the definite article. As for the statement that "what proves that it is not منصرب by a verb is that one cannot have حال with it", the Basrans say: We do not agree that the prevention of حال accompanying it is on account of the عامل , but on account of the opposition of the meaning of the sentence: this is because, if we said
 يا زيد راكباً , with the meaning of حال , then the virtual meaning would be that the نداء is in the state of riding, and that if he (Zaid) were not riding there would be no نداء , and this is absurd; because the نداء occurred in his saying يا زيد , and if he is not riding, this does not prevent him

from having called Zaid by his statement *يا زيد*, and this does not occur in other speech form. Thus, if one had said *أضرب زيدا راكباً*, 'I hit Zaid riding', and did not find him riding, one cannot strike him. Abu al-'Abbās al-Mubarrad (826-898) said to Abu al-'Uthman al-Māzini (d. 863); "Why have you denied the use of *حال* with the vocative?" He replied; "I have not denied anything, except that the Arabs do not allow it in a qualified manner, for they do not say *يا زيد راكباً* at all. We call you in this state, and we refrain from calling you (when you are) walking; because when one says *يا زيد* this call may be made under any condition". I said; "If one needs him riding, and not in any other state". And he said; "Did you not say *يا زيد* is a true vocative?", and I said: "Yes". And he said: "For what reason do you use the *مصدر*?", and I said: "Because my saying *يا زيد* is like my saying *أدع زيدا*, and it is as if I had said *أدع دعاء حقاً*". And he said: "I do not see any objection to saying *يا زيد راكباً* on account of this; so stick to analogy".

"As for "what proves that it is in place of the *مضارع* even if it is singular is your putting its epithet in the accusative, such as *يا زيد الطريف*, just as its epithet may be put in the nominative, such as *يا زيد الطريف*", we (the Basrans) say: we do not agree that the epithet is put in the accusative, because the singular is in place of the *مضارع*; indeed its being in the accusative is because the thing described (*الموصوف*), even if it is indeclinable with

damma, is in the place of an accusative because it is a مفعول , and its epithet is made accusative having respect to its place, just as it is made nominative, having respect to the actual letter; and putting the وصف and عطف in respect of the place is quite permissible, just as is putting it in respect of the actual letter. It is universally allowed to have ما جاني من احد غيرك , 'no one besides you came to me', with the nominative, just as one may with the genitive, as in ما لكم من الله غيرهُ , 'there is no god for you apart from Him', with the nominative and genitive: the nominative according to place, and the genitive according to the letter. And the witnesses for putting the adjective and epithet according to place are greater in number than can be reckoned and more abundant than can be investigated". (5)

Similar to نداء are the forms of warning (تنذير) and encouragement (إغراء). "Whoever puts anyone on guard makes to be governed in the accusative expressions analogous to إياك والشر , 'beware of evil', by a regent necessarily understood. Apply this rule to إياك without adjunction. In any other warning ellipsis of the verb is not necessary, if it is not with either adjunction or repetition, e.g., الضيفم الضيفم يا ذا الاري , 'the lion, the lion, the voyager of the night'.

(5) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.200f.

"(By **إِذَا** which is here the direct complement, **المفعول به**, of the verb **انصب**, one must understand **النصب** **بأضمار فعل** **يجب** **استتاره** by a verb necessarily understood. The author wishes to say that the words **إِيَّاكَ**, **إِيَّاكَ**, etc., when they are not followed by another word which is joined to them by a conjunction, as in the example **إِيَّاكَ** **والشر**, are put in the accusative by virtue of an antecedent verb which must, however, never be shown. The rule given here would also apply to the examples **إِيَّاكُمْ** **من الجور**, 'beware of evil', and **إِيَّاكَ** **من الشر**, 'beware of tyranny', etc. But if, instead of **إِيَّا**, one uses another word to express either the person 'to whom one addressed the words', **المخاطب**, or 'the thing from which one calls him to protect himself', **المحذر منه**, one can, as one wishes, show the verb which acts as an antecedent, or not show it. Thus one can say **رَأْسَكَ** **نَحْ**, or simply **رَأْسَكَ**, 'turn your head', and likewise **الأسد** **أحذر**, or simply **الأسد**, 'beware of the lion'.

"(This faculty of showing the verb ceases, however, with the conjunction: e.g., if one says **رَأْسَكَ** **والحائط**, 'move your head and (mind) the wall': and also with repetition, as in the example given by Ibn Mālik, and in this, **الأسد** **الأسد**, '(beware of) the lion, the lion'. One can observe that these ellipses are a natural sequel to the haste with which one warns someone to avoid some imminent danger.)

"Treat what you encourage like the object of warning

expressed in **إِذَا** in all the cases when it is treated".⁽⁶⁾

The subject of **إِذَا** came under the critical eye of the grammar schools, who, as usual, expressed differing views, this time about word order; this in turn helps to throw a little more light on the subject for us. "The Kufans say that **عليك** ,

دونك , **عندك** , may be preceded by the thing affected, such as **بكراً دونك** , **عمرًا عندك** , **زيدًا عليك** . The Basrans say the thing affected may not precede the word of **إِذَا** .

"Kufans:- The proof is to be found in tradition and analogy. As for tradition there is the Koran, **كِتَابَ اللَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ** , 'there is for you the book of God': the word **كِتَابَ** is made accusative by **عليكم** . One also has

يا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ دُونَكُمْ إِنِّي رَأَيْتُ النَّاسَ يَحْمَدُونَكَ , 'oh water-drawer, behold my bucket. Verily, I have seen people praising you', where **دَلْوِي** is in the position of an accusative after **دُونَكُمْ** . As for analogy - these words stand in place of a verb. Thus when one says **عليك زيدًا** , it is the same as **عندك عمرًا** , **أَلْزَمَ زيدًا** , 'stick to Zaid', or **دونك بكرًا** , it is the same as **تناولَ عمرًا** , 'take 'Amr', or **أَخَذَ بكرًا** , 'take Bakr'. If one had said **أَلْزَمَ** or **تناولَ** **زيدًا** or **أَخَذَ** **بكرًا** , it would be quite permissible in these cases to put the **مَفْعُول** first: and so

(6) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 622f.

it is permissible to put it before what stands in place of the verb.

"Basrans:- What proves that the affected word may not precede these words is the fact that these words are a branch of the verb in their influence, because they perform the action of the verb in its place. However, they do not conjugate as a verb does, and the thing affected must not precede them. This is the same as is the case when the regent is without a verb, and so the thing affected may not precede it on account of its lack of conjugation. It is the same with these words in question. If one were to say that they are conjugated, and it was permissible for the thing affected to precede them, this would mean that the branch and the root were equal - and this is not allowed: because the branch is always humbler than the root.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement about كِتَابَ اللَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ,
The Basrans say: This is no argument at all, since كِتَابَ اللَّهِ
is not accusative on account of عَلَيْكُمْ at all. It is
accusative because it is a مصدر, and the regent acting
upon it is a conjectured verb, the conjecture being
كَتَبَ كِتَابَ اللَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ, 'He wrote the book of God for you'.
It would originally have been كَتَبَ كِتَابًا لِلَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ, 'God
wrote a book for you', but then the مصدر became مضاف
to the (اللَّهُ) فاعل, as in:-

وترى الجبال تحببها جامدة وهي تسرّ مرّ السحاب صنع الله

'and you see the mountains, you think them to be solid, and they shall pass away as the passing away of the cloud; the handiwork of God', where *صَنَعَ* is a *مصدر* after a conjectured verb which would really be *صَنَعَ صُنْعًا لِلَّهِ*, 'God did a job of work', only the verb has been omitted, and *إضافة* has taken place.

"As for the Kufans' statement about the line *يا أيها الصالح دَلْوِي دُونُكَ*, the Basrans say that their argument is wrong in two respects: first, *دَلْوِي* is not in place of an accusative, but it is in place of a nominative as the *خبر* of a conjectured *مبتدأ*, which should be *دُونُكَ* : and second, even if it were in place of an accusative, it would not be accusative on account of *دُونُكَ*, but on account of the virtual meaning (*تَقْدِير*) of a verb, i.e. *دَلْوِي دُونُكَ*, and *دُونُكَ* is a comment on that conjectured verb.

"And as for the Kufans' statement that these words take the place of a verb, and thus the affected thing may precede them, as is the case with a verb, the Basrans say this is wrong, because the verb in whose position these verbs stand must in its root form govern the accusative, and it conjugates. But these words need not necessarily in their root form govern the accusative, but are made to have influence by their being in place of a verb, and are without conjugation. Their action does not conjugate, and so the thing affected may not precede the words themselves".(7)

(7) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.140f.

Lamentation, or نَدْبَةٌ, works in exactly the same way as نَدَاءٌ. "Make the deplorative follow the same rules as the vocative. One does not deplore an indefinite or vague noun: one deplores the noun conjoined to a conjunctive by which it becomes well known, e.g. **وَإِنْ حَفَرَ زَمْزَمَ**, after **وَإِنْ حَفَرَ**, 'alas, you who dig out the well Zamzam'. Suffix with an alif the end of the deplorative, suppressing it if it is an alif already, as well as the nūnation of the complement, this being a conjunctive or something else.

"(It is in the nature of things that the **مَنْدُوبٌ**, i.e. 'the object of which one deplores' the death, the loss or the absence, should be determined. But for the same reason, if by using an indetermined conjunctive like **مَنْ** or **مَا** one associates with it ideas which define it and specify it in a precise manner, one can then make a **مندوب** of it. This is what happens in the following example

وَإِنْ حَفَرَ بَنُو زَمْزَمَ, because it is known to everybody that it is 'Abd al-Mutallib, son of Hashim, who has drained the well of Zamzam.

"(The alif of نَدْبَةٌ requires the suppression of the nūnation which might be found at the end of the word to which it is attached, whether the word be the last of a conjunctive proposition, **صِلَةٌ**, as in the example

وَإِنْ حَفَرَ بَنُو زَمْزَمَ, or something different, as in **وَإِنْ تَأْتَيْتَ شَرًّا**, 'oh Muhammad', **وَإِنْ تَأْتَيْتَ شَرًّا**, 'oh

Ta'abbata Sharra(n)', etc.)"(8)

Sībawayh tells us a little more. "The word following the وا of lamentation may have a long alif after it:-

وا زيدا , 'oh Zaid'. This long alif makes into a fatha the vowel before it, no matter what this vowel may have been before the long alif was joined on to the word. Consequently the possessive, which would normally be يا غلامي , 'oh my slave', etc., becomes وا زديا . Al-Khalīl, however, says one can say وا غلامية . (However, when one does not use the long alif one puts simply وا زيد , when there is no possession, and وا زيدر when there is, or (وا زيدى).

Another example of the optional alif with an accusative is

وا انقطاع ظهرياه , 'oh you breaking my back', or
 (9). "وا انقطاع ظهري

It can be seen from this that, whereas Ibn Mālik states that one should suffix an alif to the deplored word, Sībawayh says that one may do so - there is no sense of compulsion.

The Kufans and Basrans again found themselves arguing about نَدْبَة . They first argued about the permissibility of having نَدْبَة with indefinite nouns - a branch outside the sphere of this work - and then discussed the permissibility of appending the sign of نَدْبَة to the adjective. "The Kufans say that the sign of نَدْبَة may be appended to the

(8) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 601f.

(9) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.321.

adjective, as in **وا زيد الظريفاه**, 'oh intelligent Zaid'.
The Basrans say this is not allowed.

"Kufans:- We are agreed that the sign of **ندبة** may follow the **مضاف اليه** as in **وا عبد زيدا**, 'oh servant of Zaid', or **وا غلام عمراه**, 'oh slave of 'Amr', and so it may likewise do so in the case in question, because the **صفة** with the **مقصور** is in place of the **مضاف** with the **صفة**. so the sign of the **ندبة** may follow the **مضاف اليه**.

"Basrans:- We say it is not permissible that the sign of **ندبة** should follow an adjective, because the sign of the **ندبة** really is attached to that which it follows to give the indication of calling to lengthen the sound, and that is not present in the epithet, because mention of it is not necessary with the thing described (**موصوف**), and so it must not be permissible.

"The Basrans reply to the Kufans' statement that "as the sign of **ندبة** may follow the **مضاف اليه** and so thus it may follow the **صفة**", is as follows: We do not agree, because the **مضاف** is not complete without the mention of the **مضاف اليه**, in contrast to the state of affairs with the **موصوف** with the **صفة**; for the **موصوف** is complete without the mention of the **صفة**. Thus if one simply said **عبد** in the saying **عبد زيد**, 'servant of Zaid', or **غلام** in **غلام عمرو**, 'servant of 'Amr', the one word would not be complete without the **مضاف اليه**. But if one just said

زيد in the saying **هذا زيد الظريف**, 'this is the

intelligent Zaid', the *موصوف* would be complete without the mention of the *صفة* ; one may or may not mention it as one wishes, and this is the difference between the two constructions".

CONCLUSIONS

In their arguments about the cases involved in *نداء* we have a very clear example of the Arabs trying to explain something away - or so it would appear. It immediately strikes the student of grammar as illogical that one type of noun addressed should be in the accusative, while another should be in the nominative. There is the impression, in reading the arguments and reasons for the cases involved, that the Arabs were very aware of what was a blatant paradox in their language, the language which they considered to be the finest in the world, and attempted to discover or invent sound reasons for the facts - rather unsuccessfully, it would seem.

What factors do emerge, however? First and foremost there is a majority agreement - but the Kufans do not accept this view - that the vocative appellative *ل* is essentially verbal in action, such as "I mean" or "I call", and that therefore the *منادى* is a direct object. This seems to be perfectly sound reasoning and a satisfactory explanation: but why, then, should the definite singular term be an unnūnated nominative? In their arguments one cannot help feeling that

the grammarians realised it should be in the accusative, and tried valiantly to give sound reasons as to why it was not. In starting their arguments the Kufans had the advantage that they did not accept that the *منادى* was a direct object, but even so their reasoning is weak and negative. Their strongest point against the *منادى* being a direct object is that one may not have *حال* accompanying it. This at first sight appears a strong point, but it is later to be rejected by the Basrans, as were their other points. The Basrans' reasoning as a whole is slightly more sound than that of the Kufans, but even it tends to be negative: both schools say the nominative is used because neither the accusative nor the genitive may be used. The Basrans, however, do admit that this nominative is in place of an accusative. They do not only say that it is in place of a direct object, but can give proof of this in the form of the particle *ج*, and the use of the accusative epithet with the nominative noun.

In connection with this explanation there is one important point which must be made here, as we are to meet anomalies in other uses of the accusative. One of the main sources for the grammarians when they wished to illustrate some vocalization was the Koran. However, the question of the vocalization of the Koran is a problem in itself. The text was vocalized at the time of al-Hajjāj (late 7th century): indeed it is not inconceivable that some of the early

grammarians may have themselves assisted in the vocalization. As far as the anomalies and seeming imperfections are concerned, it is well known that there are a considerable number of variant readings in the different MSS,⁽¹¹⁾ and therefore, while the final vocalized form might have supported one view on a certain topic, certain of the MSS might have supported another. It is possible that certain MSS might have given a reading which would not seem anomalous, but of course the grammarians relied on the final vocalized form which came to be generally accepted. Such anomalous usages may have crept into Arabic, and gaining currency in the course of time, may have been followed in the vocalization. While the accusative - or originally the "a" sound - may at one time have been used in all instances of نَدَا, the use of the nominative - or the "u" sound - may have been introduced as a result of human error, or of historical change during the ages, presumably during that period before the language was written. Of course the Arabs could not admit such an explanation, because if they were to suggest that these anomalies and illogicalities were the result of human error, and were genuine mistakes in the language, this would be tantamount to saying that the Koran, which was the language of God, contained mistakes. We would be well advised to bear these points in mind when we look at the conclusions on negation, نَفَى, and exception, إِسْتِثْنَاء.

About تَخْذِير there appears to be agreement among the grammarians: this is the direct object of a suppressed verb, which may also be shown at times. We also once again find

(11) Jeffrey, "Materials for the History of the Text of the Qur'an", Leiden, 1937.

the Basrans' arguments stronger than those of the Kufans when they are dealing with the questions of the noun preceding the word of warning, and, under the heading of **ندبة** , the suffixing of the sign of **ندبة** to the epithet.

It is interesting to note here - and this is something which we will notice in future chapters - that the Basrans almost invariably seem to have the stronger arguments, and one wonders just how biased Ibn al-Anbārī might have been in his reporting.

THE ABSOLUTE OBJECT

From the direct object, let us now turn our attention to what is perhaps its nearest relation, the absolute object, or المفعول المطلق. This is also referred to as the verbal noun, or مصدر, since the verb emanates from it - يصدر عنه.

Ibn Hishām says: "Absolute object, which is also the infinitive - ضربت ضرباً, "I struck a blow" The absolute object is an infinitive employed as an accessory, subjected to some governing word (a) of the same root, or (b) of the same sense, as in:- (a) ضربت ضرباً, "I struck a blow", or (b) قعدت جلوساً, "I sat down a sitting." In certain cases a noun which is not an infinitive finds itself governed in the accusative as an absolute object; this is a form of substitution. Such words are:-

(a) كُلّ, "all", and بعض, "some", annexed to the infinitive:- فلا تميلوا كُلاًّ الميل, "do not incline fully", and فلا تقول علينا بعض الأقاويل, "and if you forge out upon us some reports";

(b) the numeratives:- فأجلدوهم ثمانين جلدةً, "then lash them eighty lashings";

(c) the nouns of instrument:- ضربه سوطاً أو عصاً أو مقرعةً, "I hit him with a whip or a stick or a cudgel." (1)

Al-Yāzījī, writing in the 19th century, says much the same thing: المفعول المطلق. This is the thing which the verb actually does, such as ضربه ضرباً, "I hit him

(1) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., pp.217 and 240.

a blow." The word need not be from the same root, as long as the meaning is the same. The absolute object may also be increased by numbers, such as:-

ضَرْبَتُهُ ضَرْبَتَيْنِ , "I hit him two blows;" or by some form of manner (نَوْعٍ):-

ضَرْبَتُهُ ضَرْبَ الظَّالِمِ , "I hit him an unfair blow", lit., "I hit him the blow of one acting wrongfully". Everything which indicates the مصدر fills the place of it, and the resultant effected accusative is like the accusative in

ضَرْبَتُهُ ثَلَاثَ ضَرْبَاتٍ , "I sat down a sitting", or جَلَسْتُ قَعُودًا "I struck him three blows", or قَعَدْتُ الْقَرْفَصَةَ , "I sat down squatting". (2)

A western author, Sterling, sub-divides the absolute object into different categories: "The absolute object,

المفعول المطلق . The absolute object is so called because it has not a preposition attached to its name, limiting or defining its action, like the other مَفَاعِيلُ *.

It expresses simple action of the verb, and is originally the noun of action of the same verb; as قَتَلَ قَتْلًا ,

he surely killed, ضَرَبَ ضَرْبًا , he surely beat,

إِسْتَحْسَنْتُ إِسْتِحْسَانًا عَظِيمًا , I greatly approved it. This

noun of action must follow (a) a strong verb, not such as

كَانَ , نَعِمَ , مَا أَحْسَنَ , (b) another noun of action, or (c) an adjective expressing accidental qualities; as (a)

أَحْبَبْتُهُ حُبًّا عَظِيمًا , I loved him with a great love,

(b) عَجِبْتُ مِنْ ضَرْبِكَ زَيْدًا ضَرْبًا شَدِيدًا , I wondered at thy

(2) Al-Yāzījī, Faṣl al-Khitab fī Usul Lughat al-‘Arab. Beirut, 1887, p.192.

* مَفَاعِيلُ is the plural of مفعول .

striking Zaid severely, (c) زَيْدٌ فَاضِلٌ فَضْلًا, Zaid is very accomplished.

"The absolute object is of two kinds: 1) الْمَوْكَّدُ, "that which assures", is the noun of action of the same verb and simply strengthens its meaning thereby removing the idea of metaphor. This noun of action is always in the singular; as قَتَلْتَهُ قَتْلًا, I assuredly killed him:

2) الْمُبَيِّنُ, "that which makes manifest". This noun of action gives more meaning than the verb itself, and is used to express number and form; it may be dual or plural; as

قَعَدْتُ الْقَرْفَصَاتِ, I squatted, رَكَضَ رَكْضًا سَرِيعًا, he ran swiftly, خَطَوْتُ خَطَوَتَيْنِ, I took two steps, جَلَسْتُ جَلْسًا مُتَقِيمًا, I sat upright".(3)

These writers have told us how the absolute object works, but have not really told us why it works in the manner in which it does. The "Alfiyya", with its commentary, rectifies this omission. "The absolute complement,

المفعول المطلق. The infinitive is the noun which excludes the time (element) of the two tenses of the verb, as أَصِنَ from أَصْنُ, "to be safe". It is governed in the accusative by another infinitive, a verb or an adjective. That it should be a root of these is the preferred opinion. It expresses corroboration, sort, number, e.g.

سَرَّحْتُ سَيْرَتَيْنِ سَيْرَ ذِي رَشَدٍ, "I walked twice, the sort of walk of him who goes right".

(3) Sterling, A Grammar of the Arabic Language. London, 1904, p.181f.

"(The noun of action serving the function of *مفعول مطلق* is governed in the accusative, be it by the noun of action itself, like *أَعْجَبَنِي ضَرْبُكَ زَيْدًا ضَرْبًا*, "your striking Zaid a blow surprised me", that is to say, *أَنْ ضَرَبْتَ زَيْدًا*, or by the verb, as *قَامَ قِيَامًا*, "he got up a getting up", or by the verbal adjective, like *أَنْتَ جَالِسٌ جُلُوسًا*, "you are sitting down a sitting". It can be used either simply to corroborate and make more energetic the expression of the verb, or to modify the general idea of the verb by some special nuance, like *ضَرَبْتُ ضَرْبًا مُوجِعًا*, "I struck him a painful blow", or to indicate the number, as *ضَرَبْتُ ضَرْبَتَيْنِ*, "I struck him two blows", and *ضَرَبْتُ ضَرْبَةً وَاحِدَةً*, "I struck him one blow").

"The noun which it designates can very well be governed in its place, e.g. *جِدِّ كُلَّ الْجِدِّ*, "use all your efforts", and *أُفْرَحُ الْفَرْحَ*, "rejoice gaily".

"(Ibn Mālik troubles himself to indicate two cases where the noun of action proper to the verb set forth in the phrase, and having a common root with it, can be represented, in grammatical analysis, by a noun of action borrowed from another verb, or by words which are in no way in the category of nouns of action).

"Always put in the singular that which corroborates: put the others in the dual, plural and singular. It is impossible to suppress the influence of the infinitive which corroborates, but, for the others, the sense being indicated,

one is free to do it. This suppression is necessary with an infinitive which finds itself in the place of its verb, like نَدَّكَ , "to snatch", which is like اُنْدَكَ , "snatch". From that which expresses co-ordination as in اَمَّا مِنْكَ , "well, be generous", ... one suppresses its governing word everywhere.

"(Nothing is more frequent, above all in proverbial expressions and formulae, than this usage of the noun of action with suppression of the antecedent, as سَمِعْتُ وَطَاعَةً for اَسْمَعُ سَمْعًا وَاَطِيعُ طَاعَةً, "I hear your orders and am disposed to obey them", and مَرْحَبًا وَسَهْلًا, "welcome, and be at ease").

"Likewise is an infinitive, repeated or serving as a restriction which replaces a verb, an attribute of a concrete noun. In fact another part of it is that of which one says that it corroborates itself or corroborates something other than itself, namely: the first, like لَهُ عَلَى الْفَرَسِ عَرَفًا, "I owe him a thousand, (I make) a confession"; and the second, like اِنِّى اَنْتَ حَقًّا صَرَفًا, "you are my son, (I am sure that this is) very truth". Likewise is that which serves to compare, coming after a proposition like this -

بَكَاءُ بَكَاءِ ذَاتِ عُصْدَةٍ, "I cry the tears of an unfortunate woman".

"(The author points out two particular cases when one must understand the antecedent by which the noun of action is governed in the accusative. The two cases are 1) when

the noun which designates a substance (and not an abstract idea or quality) has a verb as attribute, and one expresses the noun of action doubled, and 2) when, in the same case, the proposition is set forth with restriction. Thus one must say *زَيْدٌ سَیْرًا سَیْرًا*, "Zaid is making a journey", instead of *زَيْدٌ سَیْرٌ سَیْرًا سَیْرًا*, and likewise *إِنَّمَا أَنْتَ سَیْرًا*, "you are making a journey", or *مَا أَنْتَ إِلَّا سَیْرًا*, instead of *مَا أَنْتَ سَیْرٌ إِلَّا سَیْرًا* and *إِنَّمَا أَنْتَ سَیْرٌ سَیْرًا*. Apart from the two circumstances indicated, the omission of the antecedent could take place, but this would only be facultative.

"(In the case with which the next lines are concerned) the noun of action is employed as fortifying or corroborating, *مَوْكَّدٌ*, the statement of a preceding proposition. If it only states, in another form, the thought expressed in a complete manner by this proposition, in such a way that the result of the proposition and that of the noun of action which corroborates it are identical, one says that it corroborates itself, *مَوْكَّدٌ لِنَفْسِهِ*: but if it adds to the thought expressed by the proposition a determination or a plenitude of affirmation which it did not have by itself, one says that it corroborates something else, *مَوْكَّدٌ لِغَيْرِهِ*. One sees this difference in the two examples given by Ibn Mālik. In effect, the first signifies: "I owe him a thousand (pieces of silver), confession", that is to say, "I confess it". The word *عَرَفًا*, "confession", only expresses, in another form, the thought already stated by "I owe him etc." In

the second example, "you are like my son, certainly in very truth"; this addition **حقاً صريحاً** affirms positively what the preceding proposition expressed only as something possible".⁽⁴⁾

Often we find a word standing by itself in the accusative for no apparent reason. This accusative may well, in fact, be the absolute object of some verb which has been suppressed.

Al-Zamakhsharī sums up the situation neatly by saying: "Verbal nouns in the accusative with suppressed verbs are of three sorts: (i) That in which the verb may or may not be removed, as **خير مقدم**, "(you have come) the best coming", with **قدّمت** omitted, or **غضب الخيل على اللجم**, "(you are as angry) as a horse against the bit", with **تغضب** omitted; (ii) That in which the verb is never shown, and that which has no verb whatsoever, as **شكراً**, "thank(you)", **عجباً**, "wonderful": one does not say **أشكرُ شكراً**, or **أعجبُ عجباً**; and (iii) **دُعَاً**, or imprecation, such as **وَيْحَكَ**, or **وَيْلَكَ**, "woe to you": these are always in the accusative".⁽⁵⁾

Al-Zajjājī re-affirms part of this when he says: "Some words, such as greetings and invocations, go into the accusative:- **اهلاً**, "hello", **بُعداً**, "hard luck", (lit. "may he be far off"). Such words as these are made

(4) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 286f.

(5) Al-Zamakhsharī, op. cit., p.18.

accusative by the influence of some verb which is not shown". (6)

Sībawayh expands this idea just a little further:
 "Verbal nouns which go into the accusative by the influence of some suppressed verb:- مَقِيًّا وَرَعِيًّا , "God grant you rain and safety", and خَيْبَةً وَدَفْرًا , "may God disappoint you and make you smell". These nouns are made accusative when there is some optative sense - one wishes good (دَعَا لَه) or evil (دَعَا عَلَيْهِ) - through the sense of some omitted verb, as if one had said in full مَقَاكَ آلَلُ مَقِيًّا وَرَعَاكَ آلَلُ رَعِيًّا , or خَيْبَكَ آلَلُ خَيْبَةً . This is similar to تَحْذِيرٌ , warning, in that the nouns act as the بَدَل of the verb". (7)

CONCLUSIONS

About the absolute object there is little to add to what has been said by the grammarians, who agree with one another in what they say. The absolute object is the thing which the verb actually does, as distinct from the person/ thing to whom/ which it does it. The actual thing done is nevertheless a مَفْعُول , as it is a product of the verb, and as such should rightly be put into the accusative.

This use of the accusative occurs also in Hebrew.

(6) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.295.

(7) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.157.

Gesenius⁽⁸⁾ tells us that the internal or absolute object may be classed with the proper accusatives of the object: this consists of the addition of an object in the form of a noun derived from the same stem, e.g. they feared a fear. This usually takes the form of an indeterminate substantive which, except in the case of the addition of the internal object to demonstrative verbs, like the infinitive absolute, is never altogether without force, but rather serves to strengthen the verbal idea. Likewise in Ethiopic⁽⁹⁾, a verb may govern a substantive derived from itself in order to explain itself by itself, as "let us swear an oath".

(8) Gesenius, op. cit., p.366.

(9) Dillman - Bezold, op. cit., p.432.

ACCUSATIVE OF CONCOMITANCE

In our study of the accusative per se, it would be well if we were first of all to examine those branches which in their Arabic terminology have the title of a مفعول. The third type with which we shall deal is المفعول معه, or the accusative of concomitance. This is the thing which happens in accompaniment to the action of the verb - it happens معه.

Sibawayh shows us examples of its use, but fails to explain why it is used. " المفعول معه. In sentences such as ما صنعت وَاَبَاكَ, "what have you done with your father?", and لَوْ تَرَكْتُ النّاقَةَ وَفَصِيلَهَا لَرَضَعَهَا "if the she-camel were left with her young, it would suck her breasts", the sense is really لَوْ تَرَكْتُ النّاقَةَ مَعَ فَصِيلِهَا لَرَضَعَهَا, and ما صنعت مَعَ ابيك. The words او and مفعول معه are each a مفعول معه. The words اب and فصيل does not alter the sense at all. Also جاء البرد والطّيالة, "the cold came with the hood", is really مع الطّيالة.⁽¹⁾ Sibawayh then goes on to say that in some cases there may be a verb. "In examples such as ما لك وزيد there is an understood verb:- ما خأندك وتناولك زيد, lit. "what is your state and your taking Zaid?" Also in ما لزيد و اخاه, which is the same as ما كان لزيد و اخاه, the sense is ما كان شأن زيد و اخاه, "how are Zaid and his brother?"⁽²⁾

(1) Sibawayh, op. cit., p.150.

(2) Ibid., p.155.

Al-Zajjājī tells us almost as little as Sibawayh.

"جاء البرد والطيالة" is their saying المفعول معه
you make البرد nominative on account of (its being the
subject of) the verb, and you make الطيالة accusative,
because you do not mean جاءت الطيالة, "the hood came",
but you mean جاء البرد مع الطيالة, "the cold came with the
hood", and the واو has the meaning of مع. The verb
which is before it acts on what comes after it and makes it
accusative. One also says كنت ومحمداً كالأخوين,
"Muhammad and I were like brothers".

"What also falls under the heading of this chapter is
their saying ما لك وزيد, "what have you to do with
Zaid?", when the زيد cannot be joined to the كان, and it
is made accusative by an understood verb, as if it had been
ما لك ومالك, "how are you and your knowing
Zaid?"⁽³⁾ We see from this that not only does al-Zajjājī
use almost the same wording as his predecessor - he even
uses the same examples.

Ibn Hishām, however, tells us that al-Zajjājī regarded
this as an objective complement, giving as an equivalent
example جرت وجاوزت النيل, "I walked and passed near
the Nile".⁽⁴⁾ Ibn Hishām himself has this to say;

"Complement of concomitance - المفعول معه. This is a
noun, employed as an accessory, following the particle و,
by means of which one wishes to convey expressly the idea of

(3) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.306f.

(4) Ibn Hishām, op. cit. p.217.

accompaniment, and which is preceded by a verb, or a word verbal both in root and in sense:- *سِرْتُ وَالنَّيْلَ*, or

أَنَا حَائِزٌ وَالنَّيْلَ, "I walked by the Nile". The accusative can be called for in cases like:- (a) *لَا تَنْتَهَ عَنِ الْقَبِيحِ وَاتَّبَانَهُ*, "do not defend evil when you yourself do it", (b)

صَرَرْتُ بِكَ وَزَيْدًا, "I rose with Zaid", or *قَعْتُ وَزَيْدًا*, "I passed by you and Zaid", or (c) it is preferable in cases like *كُنْ أَنْتَ وَزَيْدًا كَالْأَخِ*, "be with Zaid like a brother".

It is mediocre in *قَامَ زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرُو*, "Zaid and 'Amr got up". In examples (a) and (b) it comes in the accusative as a verbal complement. In the third example it would be better to consider it as a complement of concomitance than to use adjunction".⁽⁵⁾

Sterling adds that "the *وَ* must not have the meaning of conjunction ... The *مَعَهُ* is also found after *كَيْفَ* and *مَا* of interrogation: as *كَيْفَ أَنْتَ وَزَيْدًا*, how art thou together with Zaid?, *مَا لَكَ وَآخَاكَ*, what hast thou to do with thy brother?".⁽⁶⁾

Again it is the "Alfiyya" which tends to deal more than the other books with the reason for the use of this accusative, rather than just when it is employed. "The complement of concomitance, *الْمَفْعُولُ مَعَهُ*. The noun which follows *وَ* is put in the accusative, in the quality of a complement of comcomitance, in cases like *سِيرَى وَالطَّرِيقَ مُسْرِعَةً*, "go

(5) Ibid., p.251.

(6) Sterling, op. cit., p.190.

with the road, hurrying". It is by what precedes, verb or equivalent, that this accusative is governed, not by *و*, following the most just opinion. Certain Arabs, after interrogative *ما* or *كيف* make the accusative to be governed by a verbal derivative of *كَوَّنَ* understood. Adjunction (*المطف*), if it is possible without rendering the construction weak, is more rational: one prefers the accusative in cases where the copulative adjunction would be weak. If this construction is not permitted, the accusative is imposed; or better still, think of the suppression of a governing word, and you will be right.

"(It suffices to give examples of the different cases indicated in these lines:- 1) Following some Arabs, one must say with *كيف* and *ما* followed by *و*, using the accusative, *ما انت وزيد*, "what have you with Zaid?", and *كيف انت وقصعة من الشريد*, "how are you with a bowl of soup?": more generally, in this case, one makes *زيد* and *قصعة* agree with *انت*. Without a doubt, what determines the grammarians to suppose, in this case, that there is suppression of the verb *كان*, and that it is this verb which governs *زيد* and *قصعة* in the accusative, is that, following their opinion adopted by Ibn Mālik, it is it not the *و*, called *المصية*, which governs in the accusative the noun which follows it. The contrary opinion seems to offer a more natural analysis. 2) The accusative after the *و* called *المصية* must be preferred only in the case where concordance would offer something contrary,

be it to the ordinary rules of grammar, or be it to the sense. Thus it is quite all right to say ذَهَبْتُ وَزَيْدًا, "I went with Zaid", and مَا لَكَ وَزَيْدًا, because, to adopt concordance here, it would be necessary, following the ordinary rules, to say ذَهَبْتُ أَنَا وَزَيْدٌ, and مَا لَكَ وَزَيْدٍ.

Likewise, by reason of the sense, it is impossible to say سِيرَ الطَّرِيقَ, and it is absolutely obligatory to use the accusative. In this other example, عَلَفْتُهَا تَبْنًا وَمَاءً بَارِدًا, "I fed it straw with cold water", the words مَاءً بَارِدًا would be put in the accusative, be it as a مَفْعُولٌ مَعَهُ, or be it as the ruling of the verb سَقَيْتُ, "I watered", understood, and virtually understood in عَلَفْتُ⁽⁷⁾.

The grammarians at whom we have looked have all offered us the same explanation for the uses of the مَفْعُولٌ مَعَهُ. This was the view of the Basrans, but the Kufans offer an alternative explanation. "The Kufans say that the مَفْعُولٌ مَعَهُ is made accusative as a difference (عَلَى الْخِلَافِ), such as اسْتَوَى الْمَاءُ وَالْخَشَبَةُ, "the water and the wood reached the same level", or جَاءَ الْبَرْدُ وَالطَّيَالَةُ, "the cold came with the hood". The Basrans say it is made accusative by the verb which precedes it and is contained in the وَاو. Al-Zajjāj (d. 922) says it is made accusative by the virtual meaning of a regent, the virtual meaning being وَلَاسَرَ الْخَشَبَةَ, "it was mixed up with the wood", because the verb does not act on the مَفْعُول, and between the verb and the مَفْعُول there is the وَاو.

(7) Ibn Mālik, op. cit. lines 311f.

Abū al-Hasan al-Akhfash (d.835) says that what follows the **واو** is made accusative by the accusativeness of **مع** , as in **جئتُ معه** , "I came with him".

"Kufans:- In defence of their argument that the noun is made accusative in order to be different, they say that when one says **استوى الماء والخشب** , it is not good to repeat the verb, as in **استوى الماء واستوى الخشب** , because the wood was not uneven - it was equal (on the same level). And when it is not good to repeat the verb the second noun differs from the first and is made accusative on account of this difference. And what proves that a preceding verb is not allowed to act on it is the fact that verbs like **استوى** and **جاء** are intransitive verbs, and intransitive verbs cannot make this type of noun accusative.

"Basrans:- The regent is the verb, because this verb, even if it is in its origin intransitive, is strengthened by the **واو** , and becomes transitive on the noun and makes it accusative, just as **أخرجتُ زيداً** , "I took Zaid", becomes transitive by the hamza, and **خرجتُ المتاع** , "I took the food", becomes transitive by the doubling of the letter, and just as **خرجتُ به** , "I brought him", is made transitive by the letter demanding the genitive, except that the **واو** does not have any action, because it is originally a conjunction, and as such does not act. But just as in the case of **استثنى** , (exception, with which we shall be concerned later) the noun is made accusative by the preceding verb by

the power of ^{أَلَا} , so here the مفعول معه is made accusative by the preceding verb by the power of the ^{وَأَنَّ} . According to the Basrans, this is trustworthy evidence.

"As for al-Zajjāj's statement that it is accusative by the virtual meaning of a regent - namely ^{وَلَا بَسَرَ الخشبَةَ} - because the verb does not act on the مفعول because there is a ^{وَأَنَّ} between them, the Basrans say: this is false. Because the verb acts on the مفعول by the way in which it is connected to it: if it needs the mediation of a particle it would act with its presence, and if it does not need that mediation it would act when it was absent. And we have shown that the verb may be attached to the مفعول معه by the mediation of the ^{وَأَنَّ} , and that it needs its action, and it suffices that it acts with its presence. And how can the reason for the existence of the action be also a reason for its absence? And what is this but dependence on the cause contrary to that necessitated? And if this is one aspect, surely the opinion of the majority is preferable, because the first aspect requires a virtual meaning, but the aspect of the majority does not require a virtual meaning, and what does not require a virtual meaning is preferable to what does.

"As for the theory of al-Akhfash that it is made accusative just as the accusativeness of ^{مَعَ} , the Basrans say: this is a weak theory also, because ^{مَعَ} is a ^{ظَرْفٌ} , preposition, but the مفعول معه in the examples

is ^{جَاءَ الْبَرْدُ وَالطَّيَالَةُ} and ^{اِسْتَوَى الْمَاءُ وَالْخَشْبَةُ}

not a ظرف and cannot be made accusative as a ظرف .

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that the مفعول معه is accusative because it should differ from the first noun when the verb is not repeated, the Basrans say: this is false, on account of the عطف which differentiates between the two meanings, as in ما قام زيدٌ لكن عمرو , "it was not Zaid who rose but 'Amr", and ما مررتُ بزیدٍ لكن بكرٍ , "I did not pass by Zaid but Bakr". Here, what follows لكن differs from what is before it, and it is not accusative. According to the Kufans' argument, it should be accusative, since it is different from the first. In the case of لكن , the second noun differs from the first, as with لا in

قام زيدٌ لا عمرو , "Zaid rose, not 'Amr", and
مررتُ بزیدٍ لا عمرو , "I passed by Zaid, not 'Amr".

This is not accusative, so this proves that a difference does not need to have the accusative.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that the preceding verb is intransitive and cannot act on the مفعول معه , the Basrans say: the verb can be made transitive by the strength of the واو , and it comes out of its intransitive state".⁽⁸⁾

CONCLUSIONS

Once again we find a diversity of opinion amongst the

(8) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.155f.

grammarians as to why the accusative is used in the مفعول به .

The two main points which must be emphasised first are that the

و' does not alter the sense at all, and that the accusative is used only in those instances where concordance - making the noun after و agree in case with the noun before it - would offer something contrary either to the ordinary rules of grammar, or to the sense. One view which is extremely weak is that of the Kufans in their assertion that the accusative is used as a difference - this is once again negative reasoning which the Basrans were easily able to refute.

However, the grammarians do all agree that it is definitely not the و' which governs the accusative. In certain cases there may be a verb present which accounts for the accusative - a verb which is shown; indeed, in certain cases, Ibn Hishām states, the accusative is a verbal complement - or, as we would prefer to call it, a direct object. But what of those many instances when there is not a verb which can specifically govern the accusative? Some grammarians tell us that the regent is the verb which comes before the accusative; this view is quite acceptable, but the Basrans' explanation as to the manner of this verb's regency is questionable. They say that the و' makes any intransitive verb transitive, but this seems false. Admittedly the intransitive root-form verb

خَرَجَ , "to go out", is made transitive by the prefixing of an alif (form 4), or by the doubling of the middle radical (form 2), but these are both changes to the actual verb itself.

Moreover, while certain verbs, such as *حاج الى* , "to need", and *أغار على* , "to attack", are made transitive by the mediation of a preposition, *و* is not a preposition (*ظرف*), but a conjunction (*عطف*), which, unlike prepositions, is incapable of wielding any influence. We know, then, that the *مفعول معه* must be a noun, in the accusative, after the particle *و* with the meaning of *مع* , "with", but how is this accusative governed by the verb which precedes it, the main verb of the clause, or something which resembles a verb? To take this argument further we must look at it from the Arabs' point of view. This preceding verb may quite well be an intransitive verb, but it may still govern the accusative - although this accusative will not, of course, be a direct object. The influence of the main verb reaches the noun through the medium of the *و* , but of course the *و* simply transmits this influence, and does not exert any itself. Though this explanation may seem completely false from a Western viewpoint, it is quite sound from that of the Arabs, who felt that even an intransitive verb could exercise influence over a noun, and make it accusative in an indirect way. (We shall see this same idea again in later chapters).

A usage which closely resembles the accusative of concomitance existed in Accadian. Von Soden⁽⁹⁾ tells us that the concomitative accusative appears to exist only in old Assyrian, as "a sack with my seals". He adds that apparently

(9) Von Soden, op. cit., p.201.

without any difference of meaning the same case can be used in these expressions in apposition.

ACCUSATIVE OF PURPOSE

المفعول من أجله , or, as it is sometimes called, is an accusative of purpose. It enables one to introduce a final clause without the necessity of using either the subjunctive, or the particle لِ followed by the genitive, and hence the origin of the title لِ.

Ibn Hishām says simply: "Complement of motive - Accusative of purpose. This is an infinitive (we have seen earlier that the name 'infinitive' is given to what we would call the verbal noun, or مصدر) expressing the action of some accident which concords with it (i.e. the main verb) in both time and subject:- قُمْتُ لِإِجْلَالِكَ , 'I rose to honour you'. If either of these two conditions cannot be fulfilled the construction takes the form of the preposition لِ (1).

Al-Zamakhsharī reiterates these same conditions: "المفعول لِ. This is a way of using an accusative rather than a verb, and is a جواب (correlative) to it:- فَعَلْتُ كَذَا خَافَةً الشَّرِّ , 'I did so-and-so fearing evil', or ضَرَبْتُهُ تَأْدِيبًا , 'I hit him to correct him'. There are three conditions attached to this usage:- that it should be a verbal noun, a deed of the subject of the verb, and contemporary with it in action; if anything is missing, there should be a لِ, as جِئْتُكَ بِإِكْرَامِكَ الزَّائِرَ , 'I came to

(1) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.244.

you for you to honour the visitor', and

خَرَجْتُ الْيَوْمَ لِخُصَامَتِكَ زَيْدًا أَمْرًا, 'I went out today on account of your quarrelling with Zaid yesterday'. The word in question can be either definite or indefinite".(2)

Al-Yāzījī shows us that the thought of the grammarians is still the same in the late 19th century." المفعول به

This is that of which the action of the verb happens to its cause, being a مصدر which is identical in time and

regent:- هَرَبْتُ خَوْفًا, 'I fled through fear'. If this is

not the case, then the genitive is used, following a

particle of allegation (explanation) (حرف التعليل):-

قَصَدْتُهِ لِفَائِدَةٍ مِنْهُ, 'I intended it in order to draw some advantage from it' If the noun is preceded by أَنْ

then the genitive must be used, هَرَبْتُ لِلْخَوْفِ. But if the

word is definite by إِضَافَةٌ, then there are two courses

open:- هَرَبْتُ خَوْفَ الْقَتْلِ, 'I fled through fear of being

killed', or بِخَوْفِهِ, 'through fear of it'".(3)

None of the grammarians seems disposed to tell us the reason why the accusative should be used. Even the

"Alfiyya", on which we can normally rely, is no more helpful than the works we have already mentioned. "The complement

of motive, المفعول به. One puts in the accusative, as a

complement of motive, the infinitive, if it expresses the

reason why, e.g., بَحْدُ شُكْرًا وَدِينًا, 'be generous by thanks,

(2) Al-Zamakhsharī, op. cit., p.31.

(3) Al-Yāzījī, op. cit., p.198.

and also humble'. It must be identical with its governing word with regard to time and subject. If one condition is lacking, make it be governed in the genitive by a preposition. This is not, however, forbidden when the conditions are fulfilled, as in *بِرْزِهِ ذَا قَنِفٍ*, 'by abstinence he has been satisfied'. It is rare that the preposition is accompanied by this infinitive deprived of the article: the converse takes place with that which is prefixed to it. One quotes:-

لَا أَقْعُدُ الْجُبْنَ عَنِ الرِّجَاءِ وَلَوْ تَوَالَتْ زُمُرُ الْأَعْدَاءِ, 'I would not stay out of the melee out of cowardice, should the enemy's troops come consecutively'.

"(When the noun of action is used as a complement indicating the motive, *مفعول له*, if it is made definite by the article or by a complement of annexation, one ordinarily expresses it by means of a preposition, as *ضَرْبُهُ لَتَأْدِيبِهِ*; if it is indefinite, one ordinarily expresses it by the accusative, as *ضَرْبُهُ تَأْدِيبًا لَهُ*. Ibn Mālik, however, quotes an example where the noun of action is made definite by the article, and one has not used any preposition: one has said *الْجُبْنَ*, and not *لِلْجُبَنِ*." (4)

To what we know already, Sterling adds that the *مفعول له* "must be a noun of action, but not of the same verb, and agree with the verb in respect to agent and time, and also be indefinite, as *هَرَبْتُ خَوْفًا*, I fled from fright.

(4) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., Lines 298f.

Here **خَوْفًا** expresses the cause of flight: it is a noun of action, although not of the same verb, and agrees with the verb to flee as to its agent, because the one who fled is the one who feared: it is also indefinite. If any of these conditions are not fulfilled, the noun of action must be introduced by one of the particles of causation ... The particles of causation are **لِ** , **بِ** , **عِنْدَ** , **سَبَبِ** . Sometimes the **لِ** **مَفْعُولٍ** is itself the cause of the action, and must then be a noun of action of a verb denoting a mental process; as **مَاتَ الْمَسِيحُ حُبًّا لَنَا**, the Messiah died from love to us. At other times the verb is the cause of the action and then **لِ** **الْمَفْعُولِ** may be the noun of action of any verb; as **ضَرَبْتُهُ تَأْدِيبًا لِّ**, 'I beat him to correct him. If the **لِ** **مَفْعُولٍ** is made definite by the article, it may be put in the accusative; as **هَرَبْتُ الْخَوْفَ**, I fled from fear. Also if in construction it may be put in the accusative; as **هَرَبْتُ خَوْفَ الْقَتْلِ**, I fled fearing slaughter, but it is better to use the preposition".⁽⁵⁾

CONCLUSIONS

None of the grammarians whom we have studied has been disposed to tell us why the accusative should be used in certain instances to avoid the use of a final clause, or the use of a preposition followed by the genitive. Further, if the accusative may be used in some cases, why may it not

(5) Sterling, op. cit., p.188.

be used all the time? As it is, the accusative may be used only when three conditions are fulfilled - these conditions are that the word should be an infinitive, it should explain the reason for the action of the main verb, and it should agree with it in time and subject. What, then, is the regent governing the accusative? It would appear once again - as with the *مفعول* - that it is the force of the main verb which wields the influence; however, again, of course, the accusative is not a *مفعول*, but is governed indirectly. When one of the three conditions is not fulfilled, the verb can no longer transmit its influence to the *مفعول*, which must then become a genitive after a preposition, or must be replaced by a final clause.

ADVERBIAL ACCUSATIVE

The last type of accusative to bear the Arabic terminology of a *مفعول فيه* is *المفعول فيه*, known as the accusative of place and time, or alternatively as the limitative accusative, or more generally as the adverbial accusative. There can be no doubt as to the reason for the choice of the preposition *في* to describe this *مفعول*; it obviates the necessity of having to use the preposition "in", *في*, to define the place or the time of an action.

Sībawayh sums up its use neatly: "Temporals and locatives; In the sentence *يَوْمَ الْجُمُعَةِ أَقَاكَ فِيهِ*, 'I meet you on Friday', the temporal noun is in the nominative as it is a *مبتدأ*, and what follows it is built upon it. Likewise with a noun of place, *مَكَانَكُمْ قَسْتُ فِيهِ*, 'I got up in your place'. One can also say *يَوْمَ الْجُمُعَةِ أَصُومُ فِيهِ*, 'I fast on Friday', or *يَوْمَ الْجُمُعَةِ أَقَاكَ فِيهِ*, 'I meet you on Friday'. When the temporal is accusative it takes the place of a preposition. The *أَقَاكَ فِيهِ* is a form of *تفسير*, commentary, on the temporal accusative. Alternatively, the temporal phrase can be regarded as being made accusative by the verb itself, even though this be intransitive. A third explanation is that this type of sentence,

يَوْمَ الْجُمُعَةِ أَقَاكَ فِيهِ, is syntactically similar to (1) *عَبْدَ اللَّهِ ضَرَبْتُهُ*, 'Abdullah, I hit him'.

Ibn Hishām expands this a little further: "Limitative

(1) Sībawayh, op.cit., p.43.

object; Adverbial accusative. It is this which is subjected to the action of some governing word with the sense of *في* , in; (a) With nouns of time, such as *أُسْبُوعًا* or *جِنًا* or *صُمْتُ يَوْمَ الْخَمِيسِ* , 'I fasted on Thursday', or 'for a time', or, 'seven times'. (b) With

nouns of vague places, which are the nouns of the six aspects, like *أَمَامَ* , 'before', *أَفْوَجَ* , 'above',

الْيَمِينِ , 'on the right hand side', and the opposing aspects, as well as those resembling them, such as *لَدَى* , *عِنْدَ* , 'at'. (c) With nouns of measure, like *فَرَسَنَ* , 'parasang',

مِيلَ , 'mile'. (d) With those words which are derived from the infinitive of their governing word, like

قَعَدْتُ مَقْعَدَ زَيْدٍ , 'I sat down in the place where Zaid sat'. (This must not be confused with 'I sat down like Zaid sat', which is a form of absolute object)."(2)

We have seen *الفعل فيه* used both definitely and indefinitely. Al-Zajjājī explains when each is called for.

"Noun of time: This is always in the accusative, *اليَوْمَ* , 'today', *سَأَرْكَبُ غَدًا* , 'I will ride tomorrow',

تَخَرَّجَ ; 'he went out on Friday', N.B. *الجمعة* ; when this refers to a definite specified day it does not take nūnation, and is therefore not *منصرف* ; however, when it refers to any day it is nūnated, as *فَرَجْتُ يَوْمَ الْجُمُعَةِ تَخَرَّجَ* , 'I went out on Friday morning', but *لَقِيتُ زَيْدًا سَحَرًا* , 'I

(2) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.246.

met Zaid in the morning'.

"Noun of place: When this is put in its proper place, (i.e. when it is a locative or a genuine مفعول فيه) it is put in the accusative, as جَلَسَ عِنْدَكَ, 'he sat near you', زَيْدٌ عِنْدَ أَخِيكَ, 'Zaid is with your brother', and فَرَسَخًا, 'I travelled for a mile', سِتًّا مِيلًا, 'a parasang', سِتَّيْنِ, 'two miles'. When moved from its proper place, however, it becomes like any other noun". (3)

Al-Zamakhshari classifies the مفعول فيه into various sub-divisions: "المفعول فيه. This is the noun of time and place. It is sub-divided into (a) unknown, or vague, (b) fixed, (c) taking a noun and adverb, or (d) taking an adverb only. (a) Unknown or vague. الوقت, الحين, 'time', الجبهات, 'the aspects'. (b) Fixed. اليوم, 'today', الدار, '(in) the house', السوق, '(in) the market'. (c) Taking a noun and an adverb. This can be followed by regents. (d) Taking an adverb only. This must be followed by the accusative, as سِرْنَا ذَاتَ سُرَّةٍ, 'we travelled for a while', سِرْنَا بِكْرًا, 'at daybreak', سِرْنَا سَكْرًا, 'in the morning', سِرْنَا ضَحَى, 'we travelled in the forenoon'. One also says سِيرَ عَلَيْهِ طَوِيلًا, lit., 'it was journeyed a long way', كَثِيرًا, 'much'. Since the accusative is stronger than the nominative one says أَتَيْتُ بِهِ جَيِّدًا, 'I brought it in a good condition'; جَيِّدًا is an understood حال, and nothing is stronger than حال, and the meaning is

(3) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., pp.45 & 46.

بدرهم جيد , 'for one good dirham'. In certain cases, the accusative مفعول فيه can be regarded almost as a مفعول به; in other cases it is made accusative by some unknown or hidden regent".⁽⁴⁾

It is, however, the "Alfiyya" which gives us the clearest overall picture of المفعول فيه. "Complement of place, called also limitative; ظرف or المفعول فيه. The limitative is a noun of time or place to which one regularly attaches the sense of في , e.g. هنا أمكث أزمنًا, 'stay here for a while'.

"(In giving for a sign of 'circumstantial terms of time and place', ظرف , which contain the sense of the preposition في wherever they occur, the intention of the author is to remove from this category the nouns of place which usage allows to be put in the accusative, but in certain exceptional cases only. It is thus that one says

دخلت المسجد , 'I entered the house', and دخلت الدار , 'I entered the mosque', without one's being able to say

صليت المسجد , 'I slept in the house', or نمت الدار , 'I prayed in the mosque'. It is not in those cases, like

ظرف , that المسجد and الدار are put in the accusative. The Arab grammarians belonged to diverse schools of thought to give a reason for this exceptional syntax).

"Make it be governed in the accusative by the word

(4) Al-Zamakhshari, op. cit., p.29.

expressing the fact of which it indicates the place, whether this word is expressed or not; and if it is not, understand it while admitting suppression. Every noun of time is appropriate to this rule, but the noun of place only accepts it vaguely, like the six aspects, measures, and what is taken from the verbs, like *مَرَمِي* from *رَمَى*, 'to throw'. The condition for this to be in regular usage is that it should be limitative of the fact with which the expression, at its source, forms an alliance.

"(The reason for which 'verbal nouns of place',
 مَحْتَضَرٌ, indicating a 'special' place, إِسْمُ الْمَكَانِ, although
 directly opposed by their nature to the 'vague' or
 'indefinite' nouns of place, مَبْرَأَتُهُمْ, (such as before,
 behind, above, to the right, etc., or a thousand, a
 parasang, etc.) can be employed adverbially, as ظَرْفٌ,
 is very likely their intimate connection with the 'nouns of
 action', مَفْعُولٌ مَطْلُوقٌ, serving the function of مَصْدَرٌ.
 Always, as this is an exception to the rule, these nouns
 only rarely enjoy this privilege, as long as they have as
 an antecedent 'the same verb from which they are derived',
 ذَهَبْتُ مَذْهَبَ زَيْدٍ; thus one says ذَهَبْتُ مَذْهَبَ زَيْدٍ;
 'I went in the way of Zaid', but one must not say
 أَسْرَعُوا مَذْهَبَ آبَائِهِمْ, 'they went in the way of their
 father'. Contrary examples are exceptions).

"That which one finds sometimes limitative and sometimes otherwise is, in grammatical terminology, variable;

invariable is that which can only be limitative, or analogous to the limitative from the words.

"(The words which express circumstances of time or of place are not all of the same nature: there are some which can enter into the discourse as subjects, attributes, direct complements of verbs, etc., which consequently can be used in all the cases, like *يوم* : others, on the contrary, are never used except adverbially, like *قبل* , 'before', *تحت* , 'under', etc.).

"Sometimes an infinitive replaces a local limitative, and this is frequent with the temporal limitative".⁽⁵⁾

We have seen that several of the grammarians have mentioned the prepositions of the six aspects. Why should these words be in the accusative? This was another of the questions over which the Kufans and Basrans disputed, so we can find various reasons if we examine their arguments. "The Kufans say that a preposition is in the accusative, as a difference, when it is the *حبر* of the *مبتدا* , such as *زيد امامك* , 'Zaid is in front of you'. Abu al-'Abbās Ahmed ibn Yahyā Tha'alib (815-904) says it is made accusative because the root in *زيد امامك* is *حل* , and the verb is suppressed; it is not necessary, and the preposition is considered sufficient, and remains accusative on account of the form it had with the verb. The Basrans say it is accusative on account of a conjectured verb,

(5) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., Lines 303f.

it being really *زَيْدٌ اسْتَقَرَّ اَمَامَكَ*, 'Zaid settled in front of you', or *عَمْرُو اسْتَقَرَّ وِرَاءَكَ*, 'Amr settled behind you'. Some Basrans say it is made accusative by the virtual meaning of the *اسْمُ الْفَاعِلِ* (present participle), and it really means *عَمْرُو مُتَقَرِّرٍ وِرَاءَكَ*, or *زَيْدٌ مُتَقَرِّرٌ اَمَامَكَ*.

"Kufans:- It is made accusative, as a difference, and that is because the *حَبْر* of the *مُبْتَدَأ* in meaning is the *صِبْغَةٌ*; thus when one says *زَيْدٌ قَائِمٌ*, 'Zaid is standing', and *عَمْرُو مُنْطَلِقٌ*, 'Amr is eloquent', *قَائِمٌ* has *زَيْدٌ* in its meaning, and *مُنْطَلِقٌ* has *عَمْرُو* in its meaning. So when one says *زَيْدٌ اَمَامَكَ*, or *عَمْرُو وِرَاءَكَ* does not have in its meaning 'it is Zaid', nor does *وِرَاءَكَ* have in its meaning 'it is Amr'. And since it is different from it, it is made accusative as a difference in order that one may distinguish them.

"Basrans:- It is accusative on account of a conjectured regent, and this is because the root of *زَيْدٌ اَمَامَكَ* and *عَمْرُو وِرَاءَكَ* is *فِي اَمَامِكَ* and *فِي وِرَائِكَ*; because the preposition is a noun of place or time with the meaning of *فِي*, 'in', which takes the genitive: and words which take the genitive must be connected to something, because they introduce a tie which connects nouns with verbs, as in *نَظَرْتُ اِلَى عَمْرُو*, 'I marvelled at Zaid', or *عَجِبْتُ مِنْ زَيْدٍ*, 'I looked at Amr': and if one says *اِلَى عَمْرُو* or *مِنْ زَيْدٍ* one may not do so until one has conjectured, for the word

taking the genitive, something to which it can be connected. This proves that the virtual meaning in *زيد امانك* or *عسرو استقرني وراك* is *زيد استقرني امانك* or *عسرو استقرني وراك*. Then the particle (*ن*) has been suppressed and the verb has been joined to the preposition, and makes it accusative. And the verb, which is *استقر*, is conjectured with the preposition, just as it was conjectured with the particle (*ن* etc.).

"As for the Basrans who say the preposition is made accusative by the virtual meaning of the *اسم الفاعل* (present participle), they say this is because the virtual meaning of the *اسم الفاعل* is preferable to the virtual meaning of the verb; because the *اسم الفاعل* is a noun which can be joined to a particle taking the genitive, for the noun is the root, but the verb is a branch. Thus when one has to use the virtual meaning of one, it is preferable that one should use the *اسم الفاعل*.

"In my opinion the first explanation is the right one, and that is because the *اسم الفاعل* is a branch of the verb in influence, even if it is the root in other than influence. And when it is necessary to have the virtual meaning of a regent, the virtual meaning of what is the root in influence - i.e. the verb - is preferable to the virtual meaning of what is a branch of it - i.e. the *اسم الفاعل*. What proves this is the fact that the preposition may be

found as a link with **الذى** , as in **رَأَيْتُ الذى امامك** ,
 'I saw (the person) who (was) in front of you', and
الذى وراءك , '(the person) who (was) behind you', and a
 link can be only a sentence (**جُمْلَةٌ**): and if the
 conjectured thing were the **الفاعل** **إِحم** , then it would be
 isolated: because the **الفاعل** **إِحم** with a pronoun is not a
 sentence, but it is isolated. And an isolated thing cannot
 be a link. So the conjectured thing must be the verb, which
 is **استقر** ; because the verb with the pronoun can be a
 sentence.

"As for the Kufans' statement that "the **حبر** of the
صِبْدًا has the same meaning as the **مبتدأ** , and when it is
 different it must be accusative as a difference", the
 Basrans say this is wrong: because if the justification
 for the accusative of the preposition were its difference
 from the **صِبْدًا** , the **مبتدأ** also would have to be accusative,
 because the **صِبْدًا** is different from the preposition, just as
 the preposition is different from the **مبتدأ** . The
 difference cannot be imagined as being in one only - it is
 in both. One should say **عمرًا وراءك** and **زيدًا امامك** . But
 as this is not allowed, it shows the error of their
 statement.

"As for the statement of Abu al-'Abbās that "it is made
 accusative by a verb which is missed out and is not assumed",
 the Basrans say this also is false. This is because it

leads to a position in which it is an accusative by a verb which does not exist either expressed or in virtual meaning, and the verb must be shown and present or conjectured to be present. And when it is not shown and present, nor is it conjectured to be present, it does not exist either actually or in virtual meaning. And what does not exist cannot be a regent: just as it is absurd to have a cutting with a non-existent sword, or a burning with a non-existent fire: it is thus absurd to have an accusative with a non-existent regent. For grammatical deficiencies are like sensual deficiencies. And what proves that the statement in question is wrong is that it has no equal in Arabic".⁽⁶⁾

CONCLUSIONS

Once again we find the grammarians agreeing on the fact that the accusative may be used in an adverbial sense, but not unanimous in their reasoning as to why it is used. At first sight, one might mistake certain uses of the adverbial accusative as being very similar to the absolute object, but this is false. We will remember that the grammarians all emphasised that *المفعول المطلق* must be of the same root, or of the same meaning, as the main verb: in the adverbial accusative there need be no relationship at all, and therefore any similarity grammatically must be denied.

(6) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.152f.

Why, then, is the accusative used? The main facts which we know about the adverbial accusative are that it has the meaning of either time or place, and is used, as a general rule, after the meaning of *في*, "in". It is certain that there is a verbal element somewhere which governs this accusative, so we must establish what it is. Sībawayh says that the sentence *يَوْمَ الْجُمُعَةِ أَلْقَاكَ فِيهِ* is like *عَبَدَ لِلَّهِ ضَرْبَتُهُ*, but this would seem to be wrong: the understood verb which precedes the noun of time/place must be identical with the expressed verb, and must govern the noun as a direct object: as this verb may be intransitive, it cannot do this. The Basrans - who did not have a great deal of difficulty in refuting the arguments of the Kufans which were once again of a negative nature - support the view that there is somewhere an understood verb, but they differ from Sībawayh by saying that the understood verb is *اِسْتَقَرَّ*. They say that in the course of time, the preposition which should follow *اِسْتَقَرَّ* has been dropped, and the verb has become directly transitive on the noun. We see, then, that this adverbial accusative is yet another instance of the government of the main verb, even though this latter may be intransitive. In this respect the *مَفْعُولٌ فِيهِ* is similar to the *مَفْعُولٌ بِهِ*, but is not, as Sībawayh and the Basrans would have us believe, a genuine *مَفْعُولٌ بِهِ*. (It must again be emphasized that it is quite permissible from the

Arabs' point of view for an intransitive verb to govern an accusative in an indirect way, and for it to transmit its influence through some bearer - in this case an understood preposition *في*).

Having given this explanation, examination must be made of another of the points made by Sībawayh. He says that in the sentence *يَوْمَ الْجُمُعَةِ أَلْقَاكَ نَبِيٌّ*, the nominative is used as a *مبتدأ*. We must always remember that the Oriental method of analysis is different from ours in the West, and this use of the nominative, to their way of thinking, is quite logical and acceptable. We find again, however, (as we found when dealing with the instances of the direct object preceding the verb and being put in the nominative)), that, as the accusative may also be used, we have two apparently sound arguments which allow for two different cases to be used.

The accusative is used in Hebrew, Ethiopic, Syriac and Accadian in an adverbial way - although the warning must be given that the word "adverbial" tends to cover a variety of uses. Gesenius⁽⁷⁾ tells us that in Hebrew the noun may be more loosely subordinated to the verb, and thus tends to specify not the person or thing directly affected by the action, but some more immediate circumstance under which the action takes place. One such use of the accusative serves to define more precisely the place, either in answer to the

(7) Gesenius, op. cit., p.372.

questions whither? and where?, or to show the extent in space, in answer to some question such as how far? or how much? In the case of Ethiopic⁽⁸⁾, when the most direct and usual form of subordination of the noun to the verb, using the accusative, falls short, recourse is had to prepositions to assist the verb. The so-called adverbs are almost invariably dependent on the verb as accusatives or as prepositional forms, and even the small number of adverbs which are not formed either by the accusative or by prepositions must yet be thought of as subordinated to the verb as quasi-accusatives. In Syriac⁽⁹⁾, where a lack of case endings tends to make comparison difficult, there are adverbial usages which resemble those in Arabic. Some nouns of place serve, just as they stand, for adverbs of place, but more frequently there occurs an analogous use of nouns of time. Expressions of measure of various kinds fall under this heading, such as "they rejoiced the whole way", or "in large quantity", "very much". In fact, even the object, when it is not formally indicated, might be brought under the category of adverbial expressions. Lastly, in Accadian⁽¹⁰⁾ the accusative is used independently in an adverbial sense, particularly in expressions of place and time, and is

(8) Dillman - Bezold, op. cit., p.430.

(9) Nöldeke, op. cit. p.188.

(10) Von Soden, op. cit., p.200.

occasionally interchangeable with other types of adverbial expression. The accusative of place with a locative meaning is rare except in the expressions which have become petrified to particles, and even more archaic is the accusative of place with a meaning of direction. The accusative of time is used to denote extent of time, as "for days and nights", and instead of "ina" with a genitive in certain set expressions, such as "on the day when you read my letter", and in numerous prepositions and adverbs of time.

STATE - ḤĀL - ACCIDENTAL QUALICATIVE

In Western languages in which a definite system of case endings still exists we are accustomed to put the words which qualify some part of a sentence in the same case as the word(s) which they qualify. In Arabic this happens only up to a certain extent. An adjective agrees with its noun when it forms one idea with the noun. Should some qualifying word come at the end of the clause, then it does not follow this rule of agreement, and falls under the heading of **حال**, or state. **حال** is an addition to a sentence which qualifies that sentence by the addition of circumstances obtaining at the time of the main action, and in this respect it is similar to a **مفعول**. It may show the condition of any part of the main sentence.

" **حال**. This is the name given to every indefinite noun which comes after a definite noun and helps to complete the sense further. It is always in the accusative -

سار أخوك عَجْلاً, "Zaid came riding", **جاء زيدٌ رَكْباً**, "your brother travelled quickly". **حال** can only be indefinite, it can follow only something which is complete in itself, and it must have some regent acting on it. If this regent is a verb, then it can either precede or follow it. However, if the regent is not a verb, then the regent must precede the **حال** : verb as regent - **خَرَجَ زيدٌ مَسْرُوعاً**, "Zaid went out quickly", or **مَسْرُوعاً خرج زيدٌ**, or **خرج مَسْرُوعاً زيدٌ** ; other than verb as regent -

هَذَا مُحَمَّدٌ رَاكِبًا, "this is Muḥammad riding", or
(1). "رَاكِبًا هَذَا مُحَمَّدٌ", NOT هَذَا رَاكِبًا مُحَمَّدٌ

We see that al-Zajjājī states quite definitely that the *حال* may precede its governing word, if the said governing word is a verb. In this respect he supported the view of the Basrans, who argued with their fellow grammarians of Kufa over this point. "The Kufans say it is not permissible to put a

حال in front of the verb governing it when the subject is an obvious noun, as in رَاكِبًا جَاءَ زَيْدٌ, "Zaid came riding", but it is permissible when the subject is a pronoun,

رَاكِبًا جِئْتُ, "I came riding". The Basrans say the *حال* may precede its governing verb, whether the subject be obvious or a pronoun.

"Kufans:- The *حال* may not precede the thing governing it because it results in the pronoun preceding the obvious noun: thus, when one says رَاكِبًا جَاءَ زَيْدٌ, there is in رَاكِبًا the pronoun of زَيْد, and it precedes it, and the precedence of the pronoun over the obvious noun is not allowed.

"Basrans:- The *حال* may precede its governing verb on account of tradition and analogy. As for tradition, one says شَتَّى تَوُوبُ الْجَلْبَةِ, "confused voices come back in scattered ways", and شَتَّى is a *حال* preceding the verb governing it with an obvious noun. As for analogy, it is

(1) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.47.

permissible because the thing acting on it is conjugable; and when the regent is conjugable, its **عمل** must also be conjugable; and if the **عمل** is conjugable, then it must be permissible for the thing affected to precede it, as in **عَمْرًا ضَرَبَ زَيْدٌ**. And, as a **حال** resembles the **مفعول**, as the **مفعول** may precede the verb, so also may the **حال**.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement, the Basrans say this is false. Because, even if it (the pronoun) does precede (the obvious noun) in letter, it is actually posterior in virtual meaning; and if it is posterior in virtual meaning, it may precede: the Koran says **فَأَوْجَسَ فِي نَفْسِهِ خِيفَةً مُوسَى**, "Moses conceived a fear in his mind", and the pronoun in **نَفْسِهِ** returns to **مُوسَى**, even though it be posterior in letter. If it (the pronoun) be posterior in virtual meaning it may precede. Likewise in the sentence - **مَنْ يَلْقَ يَوْمًا عَلَى عِلَاتِهِ هَرِمًا يَلْقَ السَّامِعَةَ مِنْهُ وَالنَّدَى خُلُقًا**, "he who meets Harim one day in his ordinary way of life would find out that forgiveness and generosity are part of his character", the **و** of **عِلَاتِهِ** returns to **هَرِمًا** because it (**هَرِمًا**) precedes it in virtual meaning, because the virtual meaning is **مَنْ يَلْقَ يَوْمًا هَرِمًا عَلَى عِلَاتِهِ**, "he who meets one day Harim in his ordinary way of life", and when **هَرِم** precedes in virtual meaning, the pronoun is posterior in virtual meaning: then it must be permissible".(2)

(2) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., pp.158f.

Al-Zamakhsharī is not at all committal on this point.

" حال . This is similar to a مفعول in that it comes at the end of a sentence and serves to explain the state of the فاعل or the مفعول; ضربت زيداً قائماً, "I hit Zaid standing", or لقيته مصعداً, "I met him journeying". The عامل bears a resemblance to a verb, and indeed has the meaning of a verb, هذا عمرو منطلقاً, "this is 'Amr eloquent", or ما لك واقفاً, "what is the matter with you standing still?" In the same way, words like كَيْتَ, "would that", لَعَلَّ, "perhaps", and كَأَنَّ, "as if", are followed by the accusative on account of their strong resemblance to verbs. The مصدر may act as a حال, قُمْ قائماً, "stand up standing", as may an adjective, لقيته كفاحاً, "I met him face to face". The حال itself must be indefinite, and the thing governed by the حال must be definite. The حال must be indefinite as it is a second خبر. Sometimes the verbal noun is used instead as a صفة. Instead of saying - رسلها مصتركة or رسلها مصتركة, one can say رسلها الصراة, "he sent them fighting (the fight)"; and likewise, in the sentence "you acted energetically and capably", instead of فعلته جاهدًا وطائفاً, one says فعلته جاهدك وطاقتك. Though these words are actually definite, the idea behind them is indefinite. Some nouns also act in the same way as these مصادر. The thing described by the حال should not be put in the indefinite, (as this

is ugly and undesirable Arabic) unless the حال comes first. The qualifying word must then of necessity be a حال, as an adjective cannot precede its noun". (3)

Dealing with the حال, Ibn Hishām is quite clear and precise. He shows us the different conditions needed for the employment of this type of accusative. "Secondary uses of the accusative. The accidental qualicative is an adjective used accessorially, and replying to the question "How?":

ضربت اللص مكنوفاً, "I hit the thief pinioned". The accidental qualicative must be indefinite. If it is met in the form of a definite noun, it must be interpreted in translation by an indefinite noun:- أَدْخُلُوا الْأَوَّلَ خَلَاوَل, "enter in the order in which you are". In this example, and other similar ones, the case must be refuted on account of the article being an expletive. Also, the antecedent must satisfy one of four conditions. It must be:- (i) definite;

خَاشَعًا أَبْصَارَهُمْ يَخْرُجُونَ, "their eyes lowered, they will go out"; (ii) particularised; اَرْبَعَةَ أَيَّامٍ سَوَاءً السَّائِلِينَ, "in four days exactly ..."; (iii) a general sense

وَمَا أَهْلَكْنَا مِنْ قَرْيَةٍ إِلَّا لَهَا مُنْذِرُونَ, "we have not destroyed any city except it had warners"; (iv) placed after the accidental qualicative; لَمَيَّةٌ سَوْحًا طَلٌّ يَلُوحُ كَأَنَّهُ خَلٌّ, "Of Mayyah remain only desolate ruins ...". (4)

(3) Al-Zamakhsharī, op. cit., p.32.

(4) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.257.

It is yet again to the "Alfiyya", with its commentary, that we turn for the most detailed account of **حال**. "The accidental qualicative; **حال**. The accidental qualicative is an adjective, used accessorially, governed in the accusative, signifying "in the state of ...", as **فردًا أذهب**, "I am going alone". The most ordinary (use) is that it expresses an accidental quality, with a derived word: but that is not necessary.

"(What one understands by **فضلة**, ("accessorially"), in a proposition is all that is not necessary for the proposition to have a complete sense, that is to say, in order that it may express a judgment of the mind: it is the opposite of **عمدة**, a word by which one designates that which is indispensable to the constitution of the proposition. For example, if one says **لقيتُ عمرًا راكبًا**, "I met 'Amr, (he) being on horseback", **راكبًا** is a **حال**, and a **فضلة**, because the words **لقيتُ عمرًا** would form by themselves a complete proposition. Sometimes, however, the **حال** or "circumstantial term of state" forms a necessary part of the proposition, either because it takes the place of the enunciative (or **مجرر**) as in the example **ضربُ زيدًا قائمًا**, "my hitting Zaid standing", of which the sense is **ضربُ زيدًا حاصلٌ في حالٍ قيامه**, "my action of hitting Zaid took place when he was standing up": or because it enters into the phrase as an essential part of the sense, as in the following example:-

إننا البیت من عشر كنييا كاسفا باله قليل الرجا, "veritable

death is that which alone lives afflicted, being in a distressing situation with little hope". In effect, it is evident that the enunciative would only express an incomplete sense, and even false, if the circumstantial terms كنيًا etc. were suppressed.

"(The حال of its nature must be an adjective: it must be put in the accusative: finally, it must contain the value of the words في حال, "in the state of". It must further "express a transitory, accidental state", منتقلاً, and not inherent to the thing or person to which it refers. Finally, it must be a "verbal adjective", مشتقًا. These last two conditions are not always absolutely necessary).

"The primitive word is often in the enunciation of a rate, and (in general) in every expression which inspires a natural interpretation, e.g. بعه صدًا بكذا يدًا بيد, "sell it, so much a measure, in ready money", and كثر زيد أسدًا, "Zaid charged, as a lion, i.e., like a lion". (The writer feels that the words "natural interpretation" need clarifying. The Arabic actually says "which shows an explanation without strain". حال is normally an epithet, but it may take the place of the noun, being of the same derivation: it gives an explanation in an easily comprehensible way.)

"(The noun called جامد (which was translated as "primitive"), which is the contrary of مشتق, can serve as a حال when it indicates a value, a price, and also when it is easy to bring it back to the value of a noun adjective, of the

category of those which one calls *مشتق*).

"If the accidental qualificative is made definite for the letter, be sure that it is not (made definite) for the sense, e.g., *وَخَدَكَ اجْتَهِدْ*, "strive alone".

"(It is in the nature of *حال* to be indefinite, *نكرة* ; if then it seems definite grammatically, as in *وَخَدَكَ* , it is necessary, by analysis, to bring it back to an indefinite sense).

"An indefinite infinitive is often used as an accidental qualificative, e.g. *بَغْتَةً زَيْدٌ طَلَعَ*, "suddenly Zaid got up".

Ordinarily the noun qualified accidentally is not indefinite, unless it is postponed, or particularised, or unless it is shown after a negation, or something analogous, as

لَا يَبْغِ امْرُؤٌ عَلَى امْرِئٍ مِثْلَهُ, "let no-one outrage his like in despising him."

"(The object of the circumstantial term of state, i.e. the noun which expresses the thing or the person "modified by this term", *دَوْرُ الْحَالِ*, or *صَاحِبُ الْحَالِ*, is ordinarily definite,

مصرفة : there are, however, cases where it can be indefinite: (i) if it is placed after the *حال* ; (ii) if it is particularised, *مختص*, i.e. if it has a beginning of determination; (iii) if it is shown after a negation; (iv) after a form of speech which resembles negation, i.e., after an interrogation or a prohibition).

"It has been forbidden for the accidental qualificative to precede its qualified noun which is governed by a preposition: but I will not forbid this, for there is no lack of examples.

"(One finds ... an example which justifies the opinion given by Ibn Mālik:-

"تَلَيْتُ طَرًّا عَنْكُمْ بَعْدَ بُقْدِكُمْ بِذِكْرِكُمْ حَتَّى مَا أَنْتُمْ عِنْدِي", "I am consoled at the absence of you others, all, however many you are, in thinking of you, in such a way that it seems that you were with me". The word طَرًّا serves the function of حال, and yet it is placed before its antecedent, صاحب الحال, which is the affixed pronoun كُمْ, although this antecedent is governed by the preposition عَنْ).

"Do not allow an accidental qualificative to refer to a complement of annexation, lest the antecedent of this be not proper to govern it, or lest it be a part, or like a part, of its complement.

"(There is, properly speaking, only a verb, or a word containing the value of a verb, i.e., a noun of action or a verbal adjective, which can govern a circumstantial term of state. From this it follows that every word which forms the "second term of a relationship of annexation", المضاف إليه, cannot be the "object of a circumstantial term of state",

صاحب الحال. But there are three exceptions: (i) if the "first term of a relationship of annexation", مضاف, is, by its nature, proper to govern the حال, i.e., is a noun of action or a verbal adjective, whence it follows that one can say أعجبتني ضرب هندية قائمة, "the hitting of Hind, standing, surprised me"; (ii) if the first term of the

relationship of annexation forms part of the idea expressed by the second term, as in the example *نزعنا ما في صدوركم من غلٍ إخواناً*, "we will root out whatever of rancour is in your breasts - (you shall be) as brethren"; (iii) if the first term of the relationship of annexation can be suppressed, without the sense being altered, which assimilates this third case to the second, e.g. *اتَّبِعْ مِلَّةَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ حَنِيفاً*, "follow the faith of Abraham who is a hanīf". It is evident that one could say, without the sense being essentially altered, *اتَّبِعْ إِبْرَاهِيمَ حَنِيفاً*, as in the second case one could say *نزعنا ما فيكم من غلٍ إخواناً*, instead of *(ما في صدوركم)*.

"If the accidental qualificative is governed by a verb entirely conjugable, or an adjective which resembles it, it is permissible to place it at the beginning, as in *سرعاً ذا راحلٍ*, "at speed he makes off", and *مخلفاً زيدٌ دعا*, "Zaid prayed with all his heart". A governing word which embraces the sense of the verb, but not its elements, cannot govern when placed behind, e.g., *كَأَنَّ*, "as if", *لَيْتَ*, "would that", *تِلْكَ*, "that" (fem.), and it is rare that one finds expressions like *سعيدٌ مستقراً في هجر*, "Sa'īd is at Hajar, in residence". The construction *زيدٌ منفرداً انفعٌ من عمرو معاناً*, "Zaid all alone is more useful than 'Amr helped", is permissible and is not weak.

"(It seems natural that the noun which is modified by the *حال* should precede this modicative term: however, the

converse very often takes place. This is permitted if the **حال** is governed by a verb which can be conjugated, or by a verbal adjective which resembles the conjugated verb, i.e., which receives the "indicative inflexions of gender and number", which the grammarians call **علامات الفرعية**. This is forbidden, on the other hand, if the **حال** is governed by a word which expresses the sense of a verb, without being in the nature of the verb, as are all the demonstrative articles **هذا**,

ذلك, etc.; or by certain particles such as **كَيْت**, which contain the sense of **أَتَمَنَّى**, "I desire", **كَأَنَّ**, "as if", which contains the sense of **أَشَبَّهَ**, "I compare". Finally, this happens only rarely with the prepositions **فِي**, "in", **عِنْدَ**, "at", and others similar which contain the sense of the verb **اسْتَقَرَّ**, "to be in a place". As for adjectives of the form **أَفْعَلُ**, expressing the comparative, it is not generally permitted for them to make to govern, with inversion, the **حال**, because they partake only very imperfectly of the nature of verbal adjectives, as their particular syntax proves: however, this is authorised in expressions similar to the example given by Ibn Mālik. One can likewise say **عَمْرُو قَائِمًا أَحْسَنُ مِنْهُ قَاعِدًا**, "Amr standing is better than (him) sitting". One sees that, in this exceptional case, the comparative adjective governs the **حال** which precedes it, like that which follows it.)

"The accidental qualicative may be found as a multiple with a singular qualified noun, or a multiple.

"(One and the same object can be modified by several circumstantial terms of state, as جاء زيدٌ ضاحكًا راكبًا, "Zaid came, laughing, riding": this is what Ibn Mālik primarily states in this line. But it can also happen that several circumstantial terms of state joined together belong to different objects, as occurs in several ways: (i) the حال being put in the dual or plural, because it expresses a modification common to several objects, as in the example سَخَّرَ لَكُمُ اللَّيْلَ وَالنَّهَارَ وَالشَّمْسَ وَالْقَمَرَ وَالنُّجُومَ مُسَخَّرَاتٍ, "and He has made subservient for you the night and the day and the sun and the moon, and the stars are made subservient"; (ii) each حال modifying a particular object. In this latter case, each modicative term can follow the noun which it modifies, as لَقِيتُ رَاكِبًا عَمْرًا مَاشِيًا, "I, riding, met 'Amr, walking": or else the different modicatives can be put back after the different modified terms, as لَقِيتُ عَمْرًا مَاشِيًا رَاكِبًا. The relationship between each modicative term and the term which it modifies is then indicated by the gender or the number, if this can happen: otherwise, the modicative term, placed at the end of the phrase, must be related to the first modified term. Thus, رَاكِبًا modifies the pronoun contained in لَقِيتُ, and مَاشِيًا modifies عَمْرًا).

"The term which governs the accidental qualificative can be corroborated by it, in cases like لَا تَمُتْ فِي الْأَرْضِ سَفَرًا, "do not be a transgressor on the earth, causing trouble". If a proposition is corroborated, the governing influence of the

accidental qualificative is omitted, and itself is moved back.

"(The circumstantial term of state is sometimes used to express an explicative idea, restrictive or otherwise modicative, which one would not guess if it were not set forth, as when one says ذَهَبَ عَمْرُو مَرَعًا, "Amr went quickly": one then calls it مَبْتَنٍ or مُؤَيَّدَةٍ : at other times it serves only to corroborate an idea already set forth, and one then calls it مُؤَكَّدَةٌ. In this latter case the حال can corroborate, be it only the antecedent which governs it, as in the example given by Ibn Mālik, where the word مُفَدِّدًا corroborates تَعَثَ ; be it a complete proposition, which is always a nominal proposition, of which the two terms are definite, and are neither nouns nor verbal adjectives, e.g., زَيْدٌ أَخُوكَ عَطُوفًا, "Zaid (is) your brother (being) affectionate", هَذَا الْكَلَمُ بَيِّنٌ, "this (is) the truth (being) evident". To analyse these propositions one supposes that there is ellipsis of the antecedent which governs the حال , an antecedent which is أَعْرِفُهُ , or أَحَقُّهُ , "I know it", "I am certain of it".

"(The proposition corroborated by the حال must be a nominal proposition whose two terms are definite, and are nouns other than verbal nouns. Ibn Mālik does not express these conditions, but they result from the very nature of things; for (i) if the proposition were verbal, the حال would corroborate the verb, and not the proposition; (ii) the corroborative حال always follows the term which it corroborates: now the حال , when there is no inversion, always supposes that

the **صاحب الحال** is definite; (iii) if one of the terms of the proposition were a verbal noun, it would be it which was corroborated by the **حال**, and not the whole proposition.)

"In the place of the accidental qualificative a proposition appears; e.g. **جا، زيدٌ وهو نافر رحلة**, "Zaid comes, thinking of departure". That which starts with a future affirmative includes a pronoun, and does not take **و**; as for that which has **و**, understand after this particle an independent noun to which you will give this future as an attribute. Any accidental qualificative proposition other than this is fastened by **و**, or a pronoun, or the two together.

"(The **حال** can be replaced by a proposition, be it nominal or verbal. If the proposition is verbal, and the verb is in the aorist, ordinarily it is detached from what precedes it, and is in no way connected by the conjunction **و**. If however, in this case, one uses this conjunction, one must suppose, before the verb, an inchoative to which the verb serves as an enunciative; by this, this proposition returns into the category of nominal propositions. Apart from the aforementioned cases, the proposition which serves the function of **حال** is joined to its antecedent, either by the conjunction **و**, or by a "pronoun of recall/return", **ضمير عائد**, or by these two means together).

"Sometimes the accidental qualificative has its governing word omitted, and certain of these omitted governing words would not be able to be expressed.

"(The ellipsis of the antecedent of the **حال** occurs necessarily in certain proverbial formulae hallowed by usage, and it is forbidden to express this antecedent: it also occurs sometimes in a facultative manner; for example, if one said to someone, **كَيْفَ رَجَعْتَ**, "how did you come back?", he can reply, **رَاكِبًا**, "on horseback", with **رَجَعْتُ**, "I came back", understood)".⁽⁵⁾

There are, however, other ways, less obvious, in which the **حال** is employed. Sībawayh shows us some of these further uses. "A form of **حال**, This occurs when there is a question and a thing asked:- **مَا تَأْتِيكَ قَائِمًا**, "how are you, standing?", **مَا لِأَخِيكَ قَائِمًا**, "what is your brother doing, standing?". The accusative is used in the same way as in **هَذَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ قَائِمًا**, "this is 'Abdullah standing", on account of what is before it. In these sentences there is the meaning of **لِمَ قُمْتَ**, "why did you get up?"⁽⁶⁾ ... Sentences in which the definite predominates over the indefinite. In the sentence

هَذَانِ رَجُلَانِ وَعَبْدُ اللَّهِ مُنْطَلِقِينَ, "these are two men and 'Abdullah, eloquent", **مُنْطَلِقِينَ** is made accusative because there is no way in which it can possibly be an epithet of

عَبْدُ اللَّهِ, nor of the dual. It is thus a **حال**, as if one had said simply **هَذَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ مُنْطَلِقًا**, "this is 'Abdullah,

(5) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 332f.

(6) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.247.

eloquent".⁽⁷⁾ However, having told us that the word منطلقين is a حال, Sībawayh then seems to contradict himself when he says afterwards: "However, منطلقين may permissibly be in the nominative".⁽⁸⁾ Sībawayh then gives us an example similar to that of Ibn Hishām, but again seems to argue with himself. "More about the accusative acting like a حال, but having the definite article:- دَخَلُوا الْأَوَّلَ فَالْأَوَّلَ, "they entered in the order in which they were". This works in the same way as does دَخَلُوا رَجُلًا رَجُلًا, or دَخَلُوا رَجُلًا رَجُلًا, "they came in man by man". One may, however, use the nominative and regard the أَوَّلَ as a بدل referring back to the verb. If however, one makes it a command and says اُدْخُلُوا, "enter", then only the accusative can be used, as there will be no بدل, since the words will not have their intended meaning".⁽⁹⁾

A further branch of حال is the accusative after اما, "as for". This is treated by Sībawayh, but it is also examined by Chaim Rabin, who deals with it in a rather more general sense, so the writer will quote him, and thus include Sībawayh as well. "In cases such as اما علمًا فعالمٌ, "as to knowledge, he is knowledgeable", or اما علمًا فلا علمٌ عنده, "as for knowledge, he has no knowledge", where the extraposed

(7) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.258.

(8) Ibid., p.258.

(9) Ibid., p.198.

noun is an indeterminate verbal noun, the accusative was the rule, only the Tamim used the nominative, though even in their dialect the accusative was considered more correct. An example of the accusative is a phrase ascribed to a man of Harith:-

أَمَّا قَتْلًا فَلَسْتُ قَاتِلًا, "as for killing, I am no killer".

"In the case of أَمَّا الْعِلْمُ فَعَالِمٌ, with a determinate verbal noun, the Hijaz dialect had either accusative or nominative, the Tamim always nominative.

"The next class is described as Sībawayh as صِفَاتٌ, but the term seems to be taken in a rather wide sense. The model is:-

أَمَّا عَالِمًا فَعَالِمٌ, "as for being knowledgeable, he is knowledgeable". Here all dialects have accusative.

Sībawayh cites one example with a substantive:-

أَمَّا صَدِيقًا مَصَانِيًا فَلَيْسَ بِصَدِيقٍ مَصَانٍ, "as for being a sincere friend, he is not a sincere friend". The same

applies - in spite of the participial pattern of جَابٍ - to

أَمَّا جَابِيًا فَلَا, "as for being a tax-gatherer, no". The adjectival character is stronger in أَمَّا صَادِرًا فَوْسِيْقُهُ جَمِيلٌ, "as for one who returns from battle, his booty is fine". One could, however, take the accusative as circumstantial: "as for when he returns ..."

"Sībawayh analyses these accusatives variously as حَالٌ and تَصْيِيرٌ. This is accepted by Reckendorf. It seems more likely that the accusative spread analogically from those cases where it was justified by the virtual place of the extra-posed word. Thus the prototype of أَمَّا عَالِمًا فَعَالِمٌ is

Sībawayh uses this criterion himself when he rejects *أما عبيدٌ فذو عبيدٍ*, "as for servants, he is the possessor of servants", on the ground that one cannot say *هو الرجلُ عبيدٌ*. Later philologists abandoned the elaborate classification of Sībawayh".⁽¹⁰⁾

Within the framework of *حال* fall the verb *كان*, "to be", (which we shall be examining later) and those verbs which take two objects, of which the model is usually *ظنَّ*, "to think". Ibn al-Anbārī again reports the conflicting views of the Kufans and the Basrans. "The Kufans say that the *خبر* of *كان* and the second *مفعول* of *ظننتُ* are accusative by virtue of being a *حال*. The Basrans say that they are accusative by being a *مفعول*, and not being a *حال*.

"Kufans:- The proof that the *خبر* of *كان* is accusative by being a *حال* is that *كان* is an intransitive verb. The proof that it is intransitive is that a verb in the dual, when it is transitive, acts on both the singular and the plural, as in *ضَرَبَا رَجُلًا*, "they (two) hit a man", or *ضَرَبَا رَجَالًا*, "they (two) hit some men". This is not permissible with *كان*, for one cannot say *كَانَا تَائِسًا*, "they (two) were standing (sing.)", or *كَانَا فَيَّامًا*, "they (two) were standing (pl.)". What also proves this is that one can express in another way the transitive verb, as in *ضَرَبْتُ زَيْدًا*, "I hit Zaid", and one says *فَعَلْتُ بِزَيْدٍ*, "I so-and-soed

(10) Chaim Rabin, op. cit., pp.183 and 184.

Zaid"; but one does not say in the case of **كُنْتُ أَخَاكَ**, "I was your brother", **فَعَلْتُ بِأَخِيكَ**. Thus when the verb is not transitive, the word in the accusative must be in the accusative by virtue of being a **حال**, and not as a **مفعول**. And we have not found any verb which makes the **مفعول** accusative which is itself the **فاعل** in meaning, without the **حال**, and with **كان** this is preferable, because it is better to say **كان زيدٌ في حالةٍ كذا**, "Zaid was in such-and-such a state", just as, in the case of **ظننتُ زيدًا قائمًا**, "I thought Zaid was standing", it is better to say **ظننتُ زيدًا في حالةٍ كذا**, "I thought Zaid was in such-and-such a state". This proves that the accusative is in fact a **حال**.

"The Kufans also say that it may not be said: "If it were accusative as a **حال**, then it would not be permissible for it to govern a definite, as in **كان زيدٌ أخاك**, "Zaid was your brother", and **ظننتُ عمرًا غلامك**, "I thought 'Amr was your servant", and **حال** cannot be definite". We (the Kufans) say: this is permissible because **أخاك** and **غلامك** are in the place of the **حال**, as in **ضربتُ زيدًا سوطًا**, "I hit Zaid with a whip", where **سوطًا** is accusative as a verbal noun (**مصدر** here represents the absolute object, for it is **المفعول المطلق** which is used to denote the noun of instrument), even if the instrument for its taking the place of the **مصدر** were **ضربه**: the same is the case here: just as the **حال** is definite as in **أرسلتها العراكَ**, "he sent them fighting", or **طلبتَه جهْدَكَ**, "you pursued it with

zeal". These examples prove what the Kufans claim.

"Basrans:- The accusative is the accusative of the مفعول , and not of the حال , because both (ظنّ and كان) govern a pronoun, as in كُنَّا هُمْ وَإِذَا لَمْ يَكُنْهُمْ فَهَمَّ ذَا يَكُونُهُمْ "we are they, and if they are not they, then who are they?" Likewise one says ظَنَنْتُهُ أَيَّاهُ , "I thought he was he (the one)", and the pronouns are by no means in a state of حال , and there is in them an absence of the conditions of حال , and so they must be in the accusative as a مفعول and not as a حال .

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "when a verb is transitive, a dual verb acts on both the singular and the plural, etc.", the Basrans say:- This is not permissible in the case of كان , as it is in the case of ضرب , because the مفعول in كان is the فاعل in meaning, and thus the dual cannot be the singular or the plural: because the مفعول in كان is the فاعل in meaning because it introduces the مبتدأ and the خبر , and the مبتدأ stands in place of the فاعل , and the خبر in place of the مفعول : and, as the خبر must be the same as the مبتدأ in meaning, as in زَيْدٌ قَائِمٌ , "Zaid is standing", so must the مفعول be the same in meaning as the فاعل . On account of this, there are prevented in كان some things which are allowed in ضرب , not on account of what they (the Kufans) claim, provided that we do not claim that كان is in place of ضرب : for ضرب is a proper verb (فعل حقيقي) having regard to both an event and time, and the منصوب in it is a proper فاعل , and the منصوب is

a proper مفعول : but كان is not a proper verb; it has regard to time apart from event, and is thus called a verb of meaning (فعل العبارة) : the مرفوع resembles the فاعل and the منصوب resembles the مفعول : and so the مرفوع is known as the خبر and the منصوب as the مفعول .

"In reply to the Kufans' statement: "It is better to say ظننت زيدًا قائمًا , and in the case of كان زيدًا في حالة كذا , it is better to say ظننت زيدًا في حالة كذا ; and this proves that the accusative is the accusative of حال ", the Basrans say: certainly this would prove a حال when all the conditions of حال were present, but this is not so; because one of the conditions of حال is that it should come after a complete clause, and this is not found with the defective كان , (كان الناقصة) in which the difference lies; nor is it found in the second مفعول after ظننت , which has the meaning of thought or knowledge, in which lies the difference, not which has the meaning of suspicion. Likewise, another of the conditions (of حال) is that it must be indefinite, and much of what stands as the خبر of كان , or as the second object of ظننت is definite: if it were a حال , it would have to be indefinite, and as it is sometimes definite, it cannot be a حال .

"Then in reply to the Kufans' statement: "This is permissible because the definite stands in the place of the حال , just as the instrument stands in the place of the مصدر in the saying ضربت زيدًا سوطًا , "I hit Zaid with

a whip", the Basrans say: the difference between the two is obvious. It is right that **مَوْلاً** should be made accusative as a **مصدر**, because it is one indefinite taking the place of another indefinite, and serving the same usefulness; and it is right that it should be made accusative because it takes its place; and for this reason, it is not right that the definite should take the place of the **حال**, because the **حال** can only be indefinite, and this is definite, and neither of them serves the same usefulness as the other. So it may not take its place, nor may it be made accusative as it (the other) is.

"As for the Kufans' saying that: **حال** may be definite, as in the saying **أَرْسَلَهَا الصَّرَاكَ**, and **طَلَبَتْ جِهْدَكَ**, and

رَجَعَ عَوْدَهُ عَلَى بَدْنِهِ, "he went back to where he started", the Basrans say: these words, with their exceptional form and small number, are not instances of **حال**, and are in fact

مصادر, which indicate verbs in the place of the **حال**. And when one says **أَرْسَلَهَا الصَّرَاكَ**, the virtual meaning is

أَرْسَلَهَا تَصَرَّكَ الصَّرَاكَ, "he sent them to fight the fight", using **تَعَرَّكَ** with the meaning of **إِعْتَرَاكَ**; and **الصَّرَاك** has

been put in the place of **إِعْتَرَاكَ**. As the Koran says, **وَاللَّهُ أَنْبَتَكُمْ مِنَ الْأَرْضِ نَبَاتًا**, "God made you to grow out of the earth as plants"; then **تَعَرَّكَ** was suppressed, and it is

a sentence in the place of the **حال**, and the **مصدر** was used to indicate this; just as we say **إِنَّمَا أَنْتَ سِيرٌ**,

"you are journeying", or **تَسِيرٌ سَيْرًا**. And likewise with

طَلَبَتْ تَجْتَهَدُ اجْتِهَادَكَ, as if it were **طَلَبَتْ جِهْدَكَ وَطَاقَتَكَ**,

"you sought it as you strived your striving", and then **تَجْتَرِدُ** was suppressed, and it is a sentence in the place of the **حال**, and the **مصدر** was used to indicate this. Likewise with the virtual meaning in **رجع عودته على بدئه**. Some grammarians say that **عودته** is made accusative by **رجع**, and it is accusative as a **مفعول**, and not as a **مصدر**, because **رجع** can be transitive, as in **فَإِنْ رَجَعَكَ اللَّهُ إِلَى طَائِفَةٍ مِنْهُمْ**, "if God returns you to a party of them". However, the majority agree with the former explanation; and they put these **مصادر** in place of verbs in these cases, because in verbal noun-type-words there is an indication of verbs - provided that one does not draw analogy on the exceptional circumstances of these words, and likewise any verbal nouns or nouns which have the definite article in a case of **حال** are rare exceptions, and should not be used for analogy".⁽¹¹⁾

Bravmann, in his study of syntax, mentions this accusative after **كان**. As he disagrees with the theory that it is a **حال**, his views will be omitted until we examine **كان** and its sisters, and we will then see why Bravmann thinks the accusative is used, and of what sort it is.

CONCLUSIONS.

Arising from the arguments of the grammarians there are several points which deserve our attention. Firstly, the

(11) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.489f.

grammarians agree that **حال** is used in answer to the question "how?"; it may be of two types, either a single word, or a sentence. Indeed, any **حال** may be replaced by a proposition, either verbal or nominal. The second important point is that

حال must come only with a complete proposition - the proposition must still make sense if the **حال** is removed. The grammarians also agree that **حال** must be indefinite.

Once again, it must be established why the accusative is used. It appears that there are two possible explanations. The first, expressed by some of the grammarians, is that the accusative **حال** is the direct object of some suppressed verb - this view is corroborated by the Hebrew usage - such as **أَعْرِفُهُ** or **أُحِقُّهُ**. This view is supported by Bravmann, as we shall see when dealing with **كان**, who regards the **حال** accusative as apparently having its origin in nominal clauses with the function of object to a verb of sensation. As such, the **حال** would be simply another use of the direct object. The second explanation, which the majority of the grammarians seem to favour, is that the **عامل** which governs the **حال** is the main verb of the clause, and as we have seen before, it is the indirect influence of this verb which puts the word describing the state of the action into the accusative. This influence may pass to the **حال** through either the subject or the object of the main clause, depending on which is being described.

About the permissibility of the precedence of the **حال**, the grammarians seem to allow this; it is quite possible for

the influence of the verb to reach the **حال** , even if the **حال** does precede the main verb.

Finally, we turn to the question of **حال** being the explanation of the accusative after **كان** and the second object after **ظن** . This point appears to be false, as was shown in the view of the Basrans as they refuted this Kufan theory. This point, as was stated, is brought up by Bravmann under the heading of **كان** , and we see then that he also rejects this theory.

This use of the accusative also occurs in three of the four other Semitic languages which are being used for the purpose of comparison. In Hebrew⁽¹²⁾ any word describing the condition of the subject or object of an action during the action is put into the accusative, as are words describing the manner of the action. Dealing with the adverbial accusative under a slightly more broad heading, Gesenius⁽¹³⁾ says that the relation existing between the circumstantial accusative and the accusative of the object is especially apparent when the former, as, for instance, in a statement of the goal after a verb of motion, is immediately connected with its verb. However, even the more loosely connected circumstantial definitions can certainly be regarded as originally objects of a governing word which was habitually omitted. The result was that the consciousness of this closer government was at length lost, and the accusative more and more acquired an

(12) Davidson, op. cit., p.100.

(13) Gesenius, op. cit., p.373.

independent value as an adverbial case. In Syriac⁽¹⁴⁾ adverbs of quality occur, but they are not numerous. Examples are "they went naked", or "he shall lead away the captives ... young and old ... naked and barefooted". And finally in Accadian⁽¹⁵⁾ the adverbial accusative of state is found mostly in adverbs and adverbial expressions which are made up with formative abstracts or pronoun suffixes, such as "in my childhood", "hand in hand". However, the accusative of state in the case of adjectives which describe a state in which somebody is doing something is to be found only in old Assyrian.

(14) Nöldeke, op. cit., p.190.

(15) Von Soden, op. cit., p.200.

TAMYİZ - SPECIFICATION

Closely related to حال is تمييز , or specification. Like حال , it adds to the meaning of a sentence. Al-Yāzījī tells us: " تمييز . This is that which clarifies the uncertainty of a substantive noun, or the summary of a relationship".⁽¹⁾

Sterling continues to give abundant examples of the various uses of the accusative, but does not help us in trying to establish why the accusative is used: " التمييز is the primitive noun which explains what would otherwise have been indefinite: this indefiniteness has respect either to ذات , substance, or نِسْبَة , relation.

1. تمييز النسبة limits or defines the predicate; as
كُرِّمَ زَيْدٌ مَوْلِدًا , Zaid is honourable in respect to birth,
ما أكرم زيدا رجلا , how noble a man is Zaid,
زيدٌ أكثر من عمرو أقارب , Zaid has more relatives than 'Amr.
2. تمييز الذات explains what is indefinite in respect to number, weight, measure, quantity, similarity, dissimilarity or area; as
لَهُ عَشْرُونَ نَاقَةً , he has twenty she-camels,
اِشْتَرَيْتُ رَطْلًا زَيْدًا وَصَاعًا قَمْحًا وَمِيلِينَ أَرْضًا , I bought a rotal of butter and a saa of wheat, and two miles of land,
عِنْدِي حَفْنَةٌ طَحِينًا وَمِثْلُهَا رِزًّا , I have a handful of flour and the like of it of rice. The noun which is specified must not be deprived of any of the signs of

(1) Al-Yāzījī, op. cit., p.205.

declension. الذات may be put in construction with the
تمييز , and the تمييز may be put in the genitive by
as ; عندي شاة فضة, I have a shekel of silver,
غرسنا الأرض من الشجر, we planted the land with trees,
لي خاتم من ذهب, I have a ring of gold".⁽²⁾

Let us now return to al-Yāziǝ for a slightly more
detailed explanation of its uses; " تمييز must be an
indefinite underived word, except that what elucidates the
uncertainty of a substantive may be explanatory to an
isolated thing having regard to its species. And it may
be for the most part:- (i) a weight - عندي مثقال ذهباً,
'I have a weight of gold', (ii) or a measure -

إشتريت صاعين تمرًا, 'I bought two sā'a of dates', (iii) or
a number - أخذت عشرين درهماً, 'I took twenty dirhams'.

And what elucidates the summary of relation may be
explanatory to a sentence with regard to some aspect which
connects the relation occurring with it. And it may be
for the most part:- (i) transmitted from the regent -

طاب زيد نفاً, 'Zaid was good in his soul', or
طابت نفس زيد; (ii) or from the مفعول (the thing/
person to which it is done) - رفعت الشيخ قدراً,

'I extolled the shaykh in respect to wealth', or

رفعت قدر الشيخ; (iii) or from the مبتدأ -
زيد أكثر منك مالاً, 'Zaid is greater than you in respect to

(2) Sterling, op. cit., p.196.

wealth', or *مال زيد أكثر من مالك*. Specification is also used after nouns of number from 11 to 99:- *ثلاثة عشر رجلاً*, 'thirteen men', *ثلاث عشرة امرأة*, 'thirteen women', or *جاءني اثنا عشر عبداً*, 'twelve slaves came to me'.⁽³⁾ The writer will in fact be dealing with the numbers in more detail just a little later.

Al-Zamakhsharī tells us that within the category of *تعيين* "come verbal nouns and participles acting like verbs:- *ضاربان زيداً*, 'the person hitting Zaid', *ضارب زيداً*, 'the two people hitting Zaid', *ضاربون زيداً*, 'the people hitting Zaid', but *ضرب زيد عمراً*, 'Zaid's hitting 'Amr'. The specificative does not go into the accusative when singular unless it is complete: four things make it complete: (i) nūnation, (ii) the nūn of the dual, (iii) the nūn of the plural, and (iv) *إضافة*. These are further divided into two groups; *زائل*, comprising i and ii, and *لازم*, comprising iii and iv. With *زائل* one can choose to have either *إضافة* or *تعيين*; - *رطل زيتاً*, or *رطل زيت*, 'a rothl of oil'. With *لازم* the nūn is retained, and must be followed by *تعيين*:- *مك عسل*, 'fulness of honey', or *عشرون درهماً*, 'twenty dirhams'.⁽⁴⁾

Once again, Ibn Hishām is quite detailed in his explanation of *تعيين*. The writer will quote what he has to

(3) Al-Yāzijī, op. cit., p.205.

(4) Al-Zamakhsharī, op. cit., p.35.

say on the numbers and كَمْ , although he will be returning to these points later. "The specificative, تَمْيِين . This is a noun, used accessorially, indefinite, with no verbal sense, serving to explain vague substances. There are two kinds of specificatives: (1) one explaining a simple term, and (2) the other a result or connection.

"1. The first can be found after several expressions. (i) Measures, مقادير , a term which applies to three things, - dimensions, جَرِيْبُ نَخْلًا , 'a measure of palm'; capacity, مَنَوَانُ عَسَا , 'a sāl'a of dates'; weight, اَحَدُ عَشَرَ دِرْهَمًا , 'two pounds of honey': (ii) Numbers, like 'eleven dirhams'. The rule for the numbers is the same from 11 to 99. كَمْ occurs under this heading, but in a different way. When used as an interrogative كَمْ takes its specificative in the accusative singular - كَمْ دَارًا بَنَيْتَ , 'how many houses have you built?'. If, however, كَمْ is used as an apostrophe, its specificative is always in the genitive, and it may be plural - كَمْ عَبِيدٍ مَلَكَتَ , 'how many slaves you have.' If the interrogative كَمْ is itself governed by a genitive, then its specificative also may be in the genitive - بِكَمْ دِرْهَمٍ اشْتَرَيْتَ , 'for how many dirhams did you buy (it)?'. In this case, the word governing the specificative is مِنْ understood, but not the annexation, contrary to the opinion of Zajjāj. (iii) Words indicating parity - وَلَوْ جِئْنَا بِسَلَةٍ مَدَدًا اِنْ لَنَا اَمْثَالُهَا اَبَدًا , 'if we came

an equal number of times to him, we have an equal number of camels'. (iv) Words indicating disparity -

إِنْ لَنَا غَيْرُهَا أَبَدًا وَشَاءُ, 'we are unequal in respect to camels and sheep'.

"2. The specificative which explains result or connection is of two sorts - transposed and not transposed. The transposed specificative is of three sorts:- (i) That which is transposed from the verbal subject, as in

وَإِشْتَمَلَ الرَّأْسُ شَيْبًا, 'my head shines with white hairs', where the original construction was إِشْتَمَلَ شَيْبُ الرَّأْسِ.

(ii) That which is transposed from the object, as in

وَفَجَّرْنَا الْأَرْضَ عَيْونًا, 'we made the earth give vent into fountains', where the original was فَجَّرْنَا عَيْونَ الْأَرْضِ.

(iii) That which is transposed from an antecedent of annexation which is neither one nor the other of the above, and which comes after an elative, this latter serving as a

حبر to something which is different from the specificative - زَيْدٌ أَكْثَرُ مِنْكَ عِلْمًا, lit., 'Zaid is greater than you in respect to knowledge', where the original was عَلِمَ زَيْدٌ أَكْثَرَ. But if the specificative coming after the elative does not differ from the subject of the enunciation made by it, it must go into the genitive by annexation - مَالُ زَيْدٍ أَكْثَرُ مَالٍ, 'the wealth of Zaid is the greatest wealth', provided, of course, that the elative has not got another annective complement, for then it goes into the accusative -

حال زيد أكثر الناس مالاً, 'the wealth of Zaid is a greater wealth than that of other people'. The specificative which is not transposed is as in امتلأ الإناء ماءً, 'the vase is full of water'. This construction occurs only rarely".⁽⁵⁾

Ibn Hishām then goes on to state that "both the accidental qualicative and the specificative can be used to corroborate, and not only to define a manner of being or a substance.

An example of the former is ولا تمثوا في الأرض مفسدين, 'do not be evil in the earth by causing disorder', or

ثم ولّيتهم مدبرين, 'then you turned your backs, fugitives'.

Examples of the specificative used thus are

إنّ عدّة الشهور عند الله اثنا عشر شهراً, 'the number of months, with God, is indeed twelve months' or

والتغلبيتون بنس الفحل فحلهم فحلاً وأُمّهم زلاً، منطيقاً, 'and the Taghlibites, race of a wicked stallion, sad stallion; and the mother, pads herself to enlarge her meagre buttocks'.

However, Sībawayh forbade the construction نِصَمَ الرجلُ رجلاً زيداً,

'what a splendid fellow is Zaid in respect to men', in the way that فحلاً has been translated above as an accidental qualicative corroborative, but numerous citations authorise this construction, and it is useless to reduce this expression into another. Moreover, the use of the specificative with نِصَمَ and بَنَسَ (the verbs of praise and blame) is more frequent than that with the accidental qualicative".⁽⁶⁾

(5) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.263f.

(6) Ibid, op. cit., p.269.

On the question of **تَمْيِيز**, even Ibn Mālik does no more than just tell us how it works, without giving the reasons as to why the accusative should be used. (We have seen before that the grammarians whom we have quoted have all failed to explain the reasons for the use of some type of accusative). "The specificative, **التَمْيِيز**. This is a noun containing the sense of **مِنْ**, explicative and indefinite. It is governed in the accusative as a specificative by that to which it serves as elucidation, as **تَفْيِيزٌ بَرًّا**, 'a measure of wheat', **خَبِيرٌ اَرْضًا**, 'a span of earth', **مَنْوَانٌ عَلًا وَتَمْرًا**, 'two pounds of honey and dates'. Put it in the genitive after these words and those which resemble them when you use them as antecedents of annexation, e.g. **مَدٌّ حَنْطَةٌ غَدًا**, 'a measure of corn is a food'. The accusative is necessary after the antecedent of annexation, if this is like **مَلَأَ الْاَرْضَ ذَهَبًا**, 'the fulness of the earth with gold'. Make the noun, logically the verbal subject, to be governed in the accusative by **أَفْضَلُ**, acting as a superlative, e.g. **أَنْتَ أَعْلَى مَنَرًا**, 'you are the highest in position'. After any admirative expression, use this specificative, e.g. **أَكْرَمَ بَابِي بِكَ أَبَا**, "Abu Bakr, what a noble father". If you wish, put in the genitive with **مِنْ** the specificative other than that of number and that which is logically a verbal subject, as in **طَبِّ نَفْسًا تَفِدُ**, 'be calm, you will get advantage from it'.

"(Instead of using the accusative to express the

specificative term one can set this forth by the preposition

ف followed by the genitive, with the exception, however, of two sorts of specificatives: (i) that which has numerals as an antecedent, as ثلاثون رجلاً, 'thirty men', ثلاث عشرة نساء, 'thirteen women'; and (ii) those which contain the sense of a regent, like طاب نفك, which is equivalent to طابت نفسك, 'your soul was good').

"Put at the front the thing governing the specificative, whatever it may be, and the entirely conjugable verb is itself very rarely preceded.

"(Here is an example of the inversion authorised by Ibn Mālik, in the construction of the specificative term and of its antecedent,

ضيّعتُ نفسي في ابعادي الاملا وما اروعيتُ وشيئاً رأيتُ اشملا,

'I have lost myself, chasing hope far from me, and I am not corrected of this fault, although age has whitened my head')".⁽⁷⁾

Al-Zajjājī reaffirms this stipulation that the indefinite nouns which perform the function of تمييز must not precede the thing they specify.⁽⁸⁾

This question of the permissibility of the precedence of تمييز found not only the Kufans holding contrary opinions to the Basrans, but even caused disagreement within the Kufans' own ranks. "The Kufans disagree amongst themselves about the permissibility of the precedence of تمييز when the thing acting on it is a conjugable verb, as in

(7) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 356f.

(8) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.245.

نصب زيدا عرقا, 'Zaid poured with sweat,
تفقا الكبش شحما, 'the ram became fatty'. Some say it is
permissible, as do two Basrans, Abū 'Uthmān al-Māzinī and
Abū al-'Abbās al-Mubarrad. The majority of the Basrans say
it is not permissible.

"Kufans:- The proof is based on tradition and analogy.
As for tradition they quote

اتنهجر سلمى بالفراق حببتها وما كان نفيا بالفراق تطيب,
'does Salmā, by separation, forsake her lover, and she herself
was not pleased about it?' Their proof is that the
accusative of نفا is a تمييز, and it precedes the thing
acting on it, namely تطيب, because the virtual meaning
is وما كان الشأن والحديث تطيب سلمى نفيا, 'and not with an
affair or conversation Salmā would please herself'. This
proves the permissibility of precedence.

"As for analogy, because the عامل is a conjugable verb,
then the thing acted upon may precede it as with the rest of
conjugable verbs: when the verb is conjugable, as in
ضرب زيدا عمرا, 'Zaid hit 'Amr', the thing acted upon may
come first as in عمرا ضرب زيدا. Also, people allow a
حال to come before the thing acting upon it, when this is
a conjugable verb, as in راكباً جاء زيدا, "Zaid came
riding'.

"Basrans:- It may not precede the thing acting upon
it, because it is the فاعل in meaning, and thus when one
says تفقا الكبش شحما and نصب زيدا عرقا, the منصوب is the

عرق , and the متفق is the شحم : and thus, if one had said حن زيد غلاماً ودابةً , "Zaid was fine in respect of servants and beasts of burden", there can be no part for it in the verb from the point of view of meaning, but the فاعل in meaning is غلام and دابة . And when this is the فاعل in meaning, it may not precede it as if it were the verb actually in the letter.

"As for the Kufans' statement about حال coming first in جاء زيد ركباً , where ركباً is a فاعل in meaning and yet it comes first, the Basrans say the difference between the two is obvious; this is because when one says جاء زيد ركباً , and زيد is the فاعل in both letter and meaning, and when the verb makes up for its فاعل from the point of view of letter and meaning, then ركباً becomes in place of the specified (المفعول المختص) مفعول on account of the verb making up for its فاعل in every respect, and thus it may come first just like the مفعول in عمراً ضرب زيد : this is different from the case in respect to تمييز . But, when one says تفقأ الكبش شحمًا , or حن زيد غلاماً , or تصبب زيد عرقاً , زيد is not the فاعل in meaning; the فاعل in meaning is rather عرق and شحم ; and غلاماً and شحمًا and عرقاً are not in place of the مفعول in this respect, because the verb makes up for its فاعل in letter and not in meaning, and so it may not come first as may the حال . (Perhaps a few words of explanation from the writer might help to elucidate this rather

complicated argument: in the *حال* sentence, *زيد* is a full *فاعل*, and so the *راكباً* is reduced to a *مفعول*, and may come first; but in the *تمييز* sentence, *زيد* is not a full *فاعل*, and so the *تمييز* cannot be reduced to a *مفعول* as it is partly the *فاعل*).

"In reply to the Kufans' quotation of a line of poetry the Basrans say this should read *وما كان نفسي بالفراق تطيب*, 'and I myself was not pleased by departure'. In this reading there can be no argument. Even if the Kufans' reading were correct, the Basrans' explanation is that *نفساً* would be accusative after a supposed verb, as if it had been *أعنى نفساً*, and not accusative as a *تمييز*. And even if the Kufans were right, this comes in poetry so rarely as to be the exception to the rule, and this is no grounds for argument.

"Then in reply to the Kufans' statement about it being a conjugable verb, and so its *مفعول* may come first as with other conjugable verbs, the Basrans say: the difference between the two is obvious: because the *منصوب* in *زيدٌ ضربٌ* is a *منصوب* in letter and in meaning; but as for the *منصوب* in *تصبَّتْ زيدٌ عرقاً*, even if it is not a *فاعل* in letter, at least it is one in meaning: the difference is thus obvious. (In other words, *عرقاً* is actually partly a *مفعول* / *منصوب*, and is not a full *فاعل*).

"As for their argument about the *حال* coming before the *عامل*, this is really no argument at all, because they

neither profess this nor believe in its soundness, so how can they draw proof from something in whose soundness they do not believe. As for their statement that "analogy decrees the permissibility of *عامل* preceding its *حال* . This is contingent on putting the *مضمون* before the *مظهر*", we (the Basrans) say: analogy decrees the permissibility of the *تصيير* preceding the thing acting on it, except that it is not acceptable to us as a proof, and this is because the *تصيير* in meaning is the *فاعل* , and the *فاعل* may not precede the verb as we have shown: and if they can use the permissibility of precedence as a proof, so can we; we have shown where they are wrong and we are right".(9)

As was mentioned a little earlier, the numbers from 11 to 99 fall under the general heading of *تصيير* . "The noun following the numbers from 11 to 99 goes into the accusative singular as a *تصيير* . Also, with the exception of 12 (which follows the normal rules for the dual), the numbers from 11 to 99 end in an unnūnated fathā, regardless of their case".(10) Chaim Rabin adds this interesting little point about the numbers from 3 to 10. "Numerals from 3 to 10, when employed as appositions with suffix-pronouns appended, were in the Hijaz in the accusative, in the Tamim in the case of the nouns to which they belonged, e.g. *أَتَوْنِي ثَلَاثَتَهُنَّ*,

(9) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.493f.

(10) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.138.

'they came to me, the three of them', in Tamim, ثلاثتهم. No instances of this seem to occur in the Koran. The Arab philologists analysed the Hijazi accusative, in accordance with their system, as a حال. We should rather take it as an attributive accusative".⁽¹¹⁾

A further sub-division of تبيين is the word following كم. Sībawayh has this to say: " كم. This has two uses, (a) an interrogative particle, or (b) a حبر with the meaning of رَبِّ, 'many a ...', acting as a فاعل, a ظرف, or a مفعول.

"As an interrogative; كم لك درهمًا, or كم درهمًا لك, 'how many dirhams have you?' كم governs the accusative. It can be used in every instance when it is fit to use عشرون, 'twenty', and when عشرون cannot be used, neither can كم, for عشرون is a nūnated number, and كم too is nūnated. It is followed by the accusative singular. In the sentence كم غيرَ مثله لك, 'how many have you apart from him like him?', غير is accusative on account of كم, and مثل is accusative as the latter's epithet".⁽¹²⁾

This view is confirmed by Al-Zajjājī. " كم. This can be used either (a) interrogatively, or (b) numerically

(11) Chaim Rabin, op. cit., p.168.

(12) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.291.

as a **حبر** . (a), as an interrogative particle:-

كم رجلا عندك, 'how many men are there with you?'.
 Here **كم** is in the nominative as the **رجلا** , **ابتداء** .
 is in the accusative as **تصيير** , and **عندك** is the **حبر** .

On the other hand, in the sentence **كم غلاما ملكت**, 'how many slaves do you possess?', **كم** is in the accusative being acted upon by **ملك** , However, when **كم** is used interrogatively, the noun following it is always in the accusative, unless acted upon by some **حرف** , when the genitive may be used, - **كم درهما اشتريت ثوبك**, 'for how many dirhams did you buy your cloak?', or

كم درهم اشتريت ثوبك . The sense, in this latter case, is slightly different, and so **كم** should really always be followed by the accusative to give it its true meaning.

(b), numerically as a **حبر** . In this case it is followed by the genitive. (It is therefore irrelevant). However, both the accusative and the nominative may be used in certain cases. In the interrogative, it should be noted that, if the noun after **كم** is definite, then it is put into the nominative - **كم مالك**, 'how much is your wealth?',

كم غلمانك, 'how many are your slaves?'. (13)

كم also provided a point over which the Kufans and Basrans found themselves at variance. "The Kufans say that when a **ظرف** or a word demanding the genitive intervenes between **كم** in the **حبر** and the noun, the noun governed is

(13) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.145.

in the genitive, such as **كَمْ عِنْدَكَ رَجُلٍ**, 'how many men you have', **كَمْ فِي الدَّارِ غُلَامٍ**, 'how many slaves there are in the house'. The Basrans say the genitive is not allowed, and the word must be accusative.

"Kufans:- The genitive can be proved by tradition and analogy. As for tradition, there is the poetry

كَمْ بِجُودٍ مُقْرِفٍ نَالَ الْعُلَى وَشَرِيفٍ نُجْلُهُ قَدْ وَضَعَهُ

'how many a muqrif has obtained glory because of his generosity and how many a noble one has been humbled by his avarice', where **مُقْرِفٍ** is genitive after being separated.

There is also the line

كَمْ فِي بَنِي بَكْرٍ بَنٍ سَعْدٍ سَيِّدٍ صَنَحُمُ الدَّاسِيعَةُ سَاجِدٍ نَفَّاعٍ

'how many masters in the clan of Bakr son of Sa'ad are useful, noble and generous'. As for analogy, the genitive is used

after **كَمْ** in the **حَبَرٍ** by the virtual meaning of **مِنْ**, because

when one says **كَمْ رَجُلٍ أَكْرَمْتُ**, 'how many men I have

honoured', or **كَمْ امْرَأَةٍ أَهْنَيْتَ**, 'how many women did you

insult', the virtual meaning is **كَمْ مِنْ رَجُلٍ أَكْرَمْتُ** and

كَمْ مِنْ امْرَأَةٍ أَهْنَيْتَ. This proves that the meaning

necessitates this virtual meaning and this is the virtual

meaning with the existence of the intervention, just as it

is without it.

"They say: "it is not permissible to say that in this case it is in place of a number which makes accusative what follows it, such as **ثَلَاثُونَ**, 'thirty', etc." : we (the Kufans) say: if it were in place of such a number which

makes accusative what follows it, then it must not be permissible to have something intervening between it and the thing acted upon - one may not say *ثلاثون عندك رجلاً*, 'there are thirty men with you'.

"Basrans:- The genitive is not permissible because *كم* is the word acting on what is followed by the genitive, because it is in place of a number annexed to what is after it; (this wording seems complicated, and may possibly be illogical here, as we shall shortly see that when this point is next raised, the wording - and indeed the statement itself - is altered). And if a *ظرف* or a word governing the genitive were to intervene, then the *إضانة* would be annulled. Because intervention between the *جَار* and the *مَجْرُور* is not allowed normally; and it is turned into the accusative on account of the prevention of having anything intervene between them. In the words of the poet,

كم نالني منهم فضلاً على عديمٍ إذ لا أكادُ من الإقتار أحتملُ,
'how much favour did I gain from them, while I could not possibly bear poverty'. The virtual meaning is *كم فضل*, except that when *نالني منهم* interposes, *فضلاً* is made accusative, escaping from the intervention between the *جَار* and the *مَجْرُور*. Another poet said

تَوُومُ سِنَانَا وكم دُونَهُ مِنَ الْأَرْضِ مُحدَوْدِبًا غَارُهَا,
'you visit Sinān and how near to him is that hump-backed lowland'. The virtual meaning is

وكم مُحدَوْدِبٍ غَارُهَا دُونَهُ مِنَ الْأَرْضِ, except that

when something intervened, **محدوداً** was made accusative, even if no **إستفهام** were intended, but it intervened between the **جاء** and the **مجرور** ; and it is turned into the accusative because **كم** is in place of a number which makes accusative what comes after it; and the accusative does not prevent something intervening as the genitive does, because intervention between the **ناصب** and the **منصوب** is quite permissible, contrary to intervention between the **جاء** and the **مجرور** .

"In reply to the Kufans' statement when they quoted **كم بجود مقرر نال الصلى**, the Basrans make two points. First, the correct reading is **مقرر** , with the nominative as an **ابتداء** , and what comes after it is the **خبر** - i.e. **نال الصلى** . Second, this occurs only rarely in poetry, and it is therefore not really an argument at all.

"Then in reply to the Kufans' statement that "**كم** has the meaning of **من** , whether there be anything intervening or not", the Basrans say they cannot agree that the word is made genitive by the virtual meaning of **من** , because the actual regent (**العامل**) is **كم** . Because with the Basrans it is in place of a number to which what follows it is annexed. Some of the Companions regard it as being in place of **زب** , 'many a ...', and make the word following it genitive: but what proves that they were wrong is that a word demanding the genitive (**حرف الجر**) may not act with suppression; but it it may act in a few instances in contrast to the root, when

it is suppressed in exchange and as a بدل .

"Then in reply to the Kufans' assertion that "if it were in place of a number taking the accusative then it would not be permissible to have anything intervene between it and its مفعول", the Basrans say it is quite permissible to have something intervene between كم and the thing it specifies, as distinct from ثلاثون, etc., because كم prevents being declined which ثلاثون does not. This is made a substitute for what it prevents. (In other words, because كم does not decline, it makes up for this deficiency by being able to act with something intervening between it and its مفعول). Thus ثلاثون may act on a word and the meaning is ذهب ثلاثون, 'thirty went'; or it may be acted upon itself, as in the saying أعطيت ثلاثين, 'I gave thirty'. But this is not the case with كم : when كم prevents being declined, it has a kind of declension which ثلاثون has not; and so they are equal. But in poetry ثلاثون may be separated from the thing it specifies,

عَلَى أَنَّنِي بَعْدَ مَا قَدْ مَضَى ثَلَاثُونَ لِلرَّجُلِ حَوْكًا كَمِيكًا
يُذَكِّرُنِيكَ حَنِينُ الْعَجُولِ وَنَوْحُ الْحَمَامَةِ تَدْعُو قَهْدِيلًا

'but after thirty whole years have passed (since) the departure, the yearning (like that of her who was bereft of her baby) and the cooing of the dove began to remind me about you'". (14)

Sībawayh gives examples of other words which act in the same way as **كَمْ**. "Other words act in the same way as **كَمْ** acts in **إِسْتَفْهَام**. **كَذَا وَكَذَا دِرْهَمًا**, 'so-and-so- many dirhams', **كَأَيِّن رَجُلًا قَدْ رَأَيْتَ**, 'how many men have you seen', or **كَأَيِّن قَدْ أَتَانِي رَجُلًا**, 'how many a man came to me'. The meaning of **كَأَيِّن** is the same as **زَيْتٌ**. Other words of quantity act in the same way:- **مَا فِي السَّمَاءِ مَوْضِعُ كَفِّ سَحَابًا**, 'what is in the sky is the place of a handful of clouds', or **لِي مِثْلُهُ عَبْدًا**, 'I have the same number of slaves as he has'. These accusatives stand in place of **مِنْ** plus the genitive: **لِي مِثْلُهُ مِنَ الْعَبِيدِ** or **مَا فِي السَّمَاءِ مَوْضِعُ كَفِّ مِنَ السَّحَابِ**. In these examples, the **مِثْل** is in place of **عِشْرُونَ** (which is the model for **كَمْ**) and the **مَجْرُور** (the **هَـ** or **وَاو** appended after the **مِثْل**) takes the place of the nūnation. When one says **لِي مِثْلُهُ**, one makes it vague, just as when one says **لِي عِشْرُونَ**, 'I have twenty', one makes vague the species: and when one says **دِرْهَمًا**, one defines the species, and it is made known of what species the number is. Likewise, **مِثْلُهُ** is vague: but when one adds **عَبْدًا**, one makes clear of what species the likeness is". (15)

CONCLUSIONS.

We see from the arguments of the grammarians that **تَمْيِيز** is closely related to **حَال**, and it is therefore not surprising that the accusative of **تَمْيِيز** should be governed in the same way as the accusative of **حَال**. The basic facts

about تمييز are that it should be an indefinite noun, containing the meaning of من , which indicates the meaning of what is before it in general. It is this meaning of من which distinguishes it from حال , which has the meaning of في , 'in the state of'. It must not, however, be confused with the لا لنفي الجنس , which also has the meaning of من , because the من (understood) of negation is an essential part of the proposition, whereas the من of تمييز is not - it describes a complete proposition. We see from what the grammarians say - and especially from the arguments of the Kufans and the Basrans - that the عامل governing the accusative is the main verb of the sentence. Certain types of تمييز constructions must originally have had من - e.g., the original of عنوان من على was probably عنوان على , while others must originally have been إضافة constructions - e.g. the original of طابت نفى زيد طاب was probably طابت نفى زيد , and the original of غرست الارض شجرة was probably غرست شجرة الارض . They later became تمييز constructions with the accusative. The accusative is therefore governed by the influence of the main verb, via an understood من , or via a number or something similar. The main verb may have to be understood - e.g. in a sentence such as املك عندى مثقال ذهباً , one should understand the verb املك - but it nevertheless wields its influence upon the specificative. Turning to كم , we find that the grammarians mostly agree that كم may be used whenever a number such as

تلا ثون may. The Kufans, however, say that كى may not be separated from its noun, and still govern the accusative: but again the Basrans are able to refute this argument, saying that something may intervene between the ناصب and the منصوب. The Basrans view would appear to be the stronger, since the influence may still surely pass to the noun, no matter where it may be in the sentence.

This type of construction occurs also in Hebrew,⁽¹⁶⁾ where a second accusative sometimes more closely determines the nearer object by indicating the part or member specially affected by the action, such as "for thou hast smitten all mine enemies (as to) the cheek bone". In Ethiopic⁽¹⁷⁾ determinations of measure are expressed in the accusative, as "it rose fifteen cubits", and "he is too short ("too late") by fifty days". Finally, in Accadian⁽¹⁸⁾ there also exists an accusative of respect and state, such as "he is similar share-wise".

(16) Gesenius, op. cit., p.372.

(17) Dillman - Bezold, op. cit., p.432.

(18) Von Soden, op. cit., p.200.

THE VERB KĀNA - "TO BE" - AND ITS SISTERS

We have already had mention of كان under the heading of حال , but let us now examine this verb, and its sister verbs, in their own right. Unlike the Indo-European languages, in which the predicate agrees in case with the subject - we must, in this instance, of necessity use Western terminology - Arabic regards the verb "to be", and its sister verbs, such as "to become" etc. as taking its خبر - or what we would call the predicate - in the accusative.

Sībawayh says simply: "Verbs in which the اسم الفاعل and the اسم المفعول are the same thing, and yet the verb is transitive and governs the accusative:- كان , "to be", صار , "to become", ما دام , "to continue", أَصْبَحَ , "to become", and لَيْسَ , "to not be" (as distinct from "not to be")."⁽¹⁾

Al-Zajjājī, however, is a little more explicit. "Words which have the اسم in the nominative and the خبر in the accusative, كان , أَصْبَحَ , أَمْسَى , لَيْسَ , and صار , etc. The خبر , since it is fully declined, can follow, precede, or come between its اسم and its حرف . However, the خبر need not be a noun - it can be a verb or an adverb -

كان زيدٌ قلم , 'Zaid got up', or كان زيدٌ في الدار , 'Zaid was in the house'.⁽²⁾ Dealing with a slightly more complicated

(1) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.21.

(2) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.53.

aspect of these verbs, he goes on to say: "One says
 كان زيدٌ أبوه منطلقاً, 'Zaid's father was eloquent', but
 كان زيدٌ منطلقاً أبوه. In the first example, زيد is the اسم
 of كان, and أبوه is nominative since it is the مبتدأ,
 and منطلق is its خبر, and the whole sentence is the
 خبر of كان. However, in the second example, when the
 خبر comes first, it is in the accusative since it then becomes
 the خبر of كان. Even in the latter example, if the أبوه is
 dual or plural, منطلقاً still remains in the singular -

كان الزيدون منطلقاً آباؤهم, 'the Zaid's fathers were eloquent'.
 There is another point of view, however. If one regards

منطلق as the خبر of أبوه, it then goes into the nominative,
 and agrees in number also - كان زيدٌ منطلقٌ أبوه, or

كان الزيدون منطلقون آباؤهم. On this same theme, one can say

كان زيدٌ وجهه حسنًا 'Zaid's face was good-looking'; you
 make زيد the اسم of كان, and وجه is its بدل, and حسن
 is the خبر of كان, and the virtual meaning is كان زيدٌ حسنًا.
 If you wish you can say كان زيدٌ وجهه حسنًا, as an ابتداء.

and a خبر. If the اسم of كان - or some equivalent verb -
 precedes كان, then it is nominative being a مبتدأ, and كان
 becomes its خبر, and its اسم is contained in it; كان زيدٌ قائماً,
 'Zaid was standing',

الزيدون كانوا قائمين, 'the Zaid's were
 standing' In a sentence containing كان etc., when one noun
 is definite and the other indefinite, then the definite noun is

the *اسم*, and the indefinite the *خبر* : *كان زيداً منطلقاً*, 'Zaid was eloquent'. But if both nouns are definite, either can be the *اسم* and either can be the *خبر*; *كان زيداً أخاك*, or *كان الراكب عبدالله*, 'Zaid was your brother', or *كان عبدالله الراكب*, 'Abdullah was the rider'

Likewise with two indefinite nouns, one can regard the second - and this applies only where there is superiority or disadvantage - as the *خبر* of *كان*, or as an epithet of the first noun; *كان احدٌ مجترياً عليك*, 'some one was running towards you', or *ما كان فيها احدٌ خيراً منك*, 'there was no one among them better than you'.... Just as the accusative is retained after

كان when negative, so it is retained after a double negative; *ما كان زيدٌ إلا عالمًا*, 'Zaid was not intelligent', 'Zaid was nothing but intelligent'".⁽³⁾ Al-Zajjājī also

adds this of *ليس* : "Since *ليس* is regarded as stronger than *ما*, its *خبر* is in the accusative regardless of its position in the sentence, and regardless of a double negation;

ليس قائماً زيدٌ, 'Zaid was not standing', and *ليس قائماً زيدٌ إلا قائماً*, 'Zaid was nothing but standing'".⁽⁴⁾

The accusative is used even after a suppressed part of *كان*. Sibawayh says: *هذا بُشراً طيبٌ منه رطباً*, 'these are dry dates, but fresh dates are more delicious'. The accusative is used after an understood suppressed part of *كان*, whether

(3) Ibid., p.55.

(4) Ibid., p.120.

it be *ماضٍ*, past or *مستقبل*, present. One can also say *هَذَا التَّمَرُ الطَّيْبُ مِنْهُ الْبُتْرُ*, 'these are fresh dates but dry dates are better'. The words can be regarded as a *حال*. Likewise, *مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ خَيْرٍ مَا يَكُونُ خَيْرٌ مِنْكَ مَا نَكُونُ*, 'I passed by a man better than you and we'. In such an example the words after *مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ* are all governed in the same way as in the earlier example. One may also use the nominative and say *خَيْرُ أَمْوَالِهِ خَيْرٌ مِنْكَ*, as if one meant *مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ خَيْرٍ مَا يَكُونُ خَيْرٌ مِنْكَ*, 'the goodness of his affairs is better than you'..... As for *عَبْدُ اللَّهِ أَحْسَنُ مَا يَكُونُ قَائِمًا*, 'Abdullah is better when he is standing', only the accusative can be used. Likewise *عَبْدُ اللَّهِ أَحْسَنُ مَا يَكُونُ يَوْمَ الْجُمُعَةِ*, 'Abdullah is a very good orator especially on Friday', or *عَبْدُ اللَّهِ أَطْيَبُ مَا تَكُونُ شَهْرَيْنِ رَيْبِ*, 'Abdullah is as good as you can be in the two months of spring', as if one had inserted *نِي* before *يَوْمَ* and *شَهْرَيْنِ*. One may also say *أَعْطَيْتُهُ دِرْهَمًا أَوْ دَرَاهِمَانِ أَكْثَرَ مَا أُعْطَيْتُهُ*, 'I gave him a dirham or two dirhams was the most I gave him', or one may say *أَكْثَرَ دَرَاهِمَيْنِ*, or one may also make *أَكْثَرَ* accusative, as a *حال*, in which the act of giving occurs". (5)

Ibn Mālik and De Sacy sum up *كَانَ* thus: "Words of the family. *كَانَ* governs in the nominative the independent noun which is its *اسم*, and makes its *خبر* accusative, e.g., *كَانَ سَيِّدًا عَمْرٌ*, 'Umar was a lord'. (Ibn Mālik then lists the words which are similar to *كَانَ*). The *خبر* may occur in the middle with all these words except *دَامَ*. The regent

(5) Sībawayh, op. cit. p.199.

(عامل) may not be followed by an expression governed by the *حبر* unless it be a limitative complement or a preposition: and also the pronoun as the noun of an incomplete verb, if it presents some expression in which one can see what has been clearly forbidden.

"(The term which serves as complement or rule to the verbal adjective serving as the *حبر* of *كان*, and other similar verbs, must never be placed immediately after these verbs; one must not say *أَصْبَحَ طَعَامَكَ زَيْدٌ أَكَلًا*, 'Zaid was eating your food': however, some grammarians allow this inversion. If the complement of the *حبر* is not a direct complement, but is only a circumstantial complement of time or place, the inversion is permitted; one can then rightly say *كان عندك زيدٌ قائمًا*, 'Zaid is standing near you', and *كان في المسجد عمرٌ معتكفًا*, 'Umar was praying in the mosque'. If there arises some case where the inversion forbidden by the preceding rule seems to have place, one eludes the rule, pretending that there is between *كان* and the word which immediately follows it the pronoun called the *ضمير الشأن*, pronoun of state)".⁽⁶⁾

At the conclusion of the section on *حال*, the writer mentioned that Bravmann had something to say about the accusative after *كان*, and referred it back to this section. "In contrast to an old opinion, current until today with some philosophical authors, modern grammatical science starts from the

(6) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 143f.

supposition that for a nominal sentence to be formed there is no need for a 'copula', i.e. a link between the subject and predicate, and that the copulative verb 'to be' (in the Arabic terminology the so-called *كان الناقصة*, the 'incomplete' *kāna*) has to be conceived as a development of the 'verbum existentiae', (*كان التامة*, the 'complete' *kāna*). In the Semitic languages the simple type of the nominal sentence without copula is quite common.

"The current conception of the nature of the nominal sentence with a copula in Semitic languages is determined by the fact that the noun predicate of this sentence in Arabic... appears in the accusative, which in this use has been considered since De Sacy as an original circumstantial (*حال*) accusative (to be translated by 'as'), a view now generally accepted. A sentence like *كان عبداً شكوراً*, 'he was a grateful servant', where *كان* has the function of a copula, is considered by Brocklemann to have originally meant 'he existed as a grateful servant'.⁽⁷⁾

"(With this Bravmann disagrees). I challenged --- the current conception of the accusative of the noun following

كان as an accusative of *حال* (circumstance). We now have to furnish another explanation of this accusative.

" *كان* as an auxiliary is only one of a group of verbs called by the Oriental grammarians *الأفعال الناقصة*, 'the incomplete verbs' (*كان واخواتها*, *kāna* and its sisters).

(7) Bravmann, op. cit. p.71.

All these verbs are invariably followed by a noun in the accusative, described by the native philologists as **حبر** , 'predicate'. One of these verbs is **صَارَ** , 'to become', as **صار زيدٌ كبيراً** , 'Zaid has become great'. In my opinion the accusative **كبيراً** depending on the verb **صار** can by no means be identified with a circumstantial accusative. The accusative of a noun governed by the verbs of the meaning 'to become' is doubtless identical with the second accusative following verbs of the meaning 'to render' ('to make') . The nature of this second accusative after verbs signifying 'to become' (= 'to be rendered') is entirely different from the accusative of **حال** .

"A **حال** accusative is an adverbial complement added to a complete sentence and not an essential part of the sentence structure. On the contrary, in the case of verbs of the meaning 'to render' and 'to become' the second accusative or the single accusative, respectively, following them is indispensable to the structure of the sentence, and very rightly, therefore, did Oriental grammarians include **صار** 'to become' among **الأفعال الناقصة** , regarding to which they teach **ما لم يأخذن المنصوب مع المرفوع لم يكن كلاماً** , 'as long as they do not take (a noun in) the accusative in addition to (the noun in) the nominative (i.e. the subject) they are not a complete sentence". Reckendorf's and Brockleemann's conception of the accusative after verbs of the meaning

'to become' as an original حال is therefore to be rejected.

"This great difference between the accusative of حال and the second accusative after verbs signifying 'to render' or 'to become' is essentially connected with the difference in the original sentence-types, in which these respective accusatives have developed. While the latter accusative has arisen in nominal clauses with the function of object to a verb of the meaning 'to render', the حال-accusative apparently had its origin in nominal clauses with the function of object to a verb of sensation ... These two different types of verbs, governing the respective original sentences in which the two categories of accusative have originated, determined the great difference between the two kinds of accusative with regard to their syntactic value. We thus see that the accusative after verbs like صار, ارتد, etc., is easily explained by the construction of these verbs themselves and is not the result of an analogy with كان, as Brocklemann assumes".⁽⁸⁾

Under the heading of كان and its sisters mention must be made of the word of negation, لا. Its classification here may seem rather strange, but the view has been expressed that لا is similar to ليس in its function. (While a separate section has been devoted to negation, the word under

(8) Ibid., op. cit., p.79.

examination in that will be لَا , which works in a different way from لَا). Chaim Rabin says: "The Arab grammarians' opinion was that لَا governed the accusative in Hijaz dialect because its function in the nominal clause resembled that of لَيْسَ . Reckendorf saw the reason in its general character as copula and consequent similarity to لَيْسَ . Actually the accusative after لَيْسَ (which is of nominal origin and can serve also as a verbal negation like لَا ...) is not much easier to understand than that after لَا . Whichever negation has the priority, it is certain that the point at which the action of analogy set in was the construction with لَا instead of the accusative. In the Koran, as elsewhere, it is a good deal more frequent than the لَا with the accusative or nominative. The question whether the لَا construction was to be identified with the Hijazi or "Tamimi" لَا exercised the minds of the Arab grammarians a good deal. Sibawayh and Ibn Mālik denied that it had any connection with the construction of لَا with the accusative, while Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī (902 - 987) and Zamakhsharī held that only those who use لَا with the accusative could also use it with لَيْسَ . The latter view was held by Baidāwī. The discussion was on a purely theoretical level".⁽⁹⁾

The two grammar schools of Kufa and Basra also took up this point of the influence and the function of لَا . "The

(9) Chaim Rabin, op. cit., p.177.

Kufans say that in the language of the people of the Hijaz, **لَا** does not act upon the **خبر**, but the **خبر** is in the accusative on account of the lack of any letter to put it into the genitive. The Basrans on the other hand say that **لَا** does act on the **خبر**, which is made accusative because of it.

"Kufans:- Analogy shows that **لَا** cannot possibly be a regent; a particle cannot wield influence. Sometimes **لَا** introduces a noun, **لَا زَيْدٌ قَائِمٌ**, 'Zaid is not standing', and sometimes a verb, **لَا يَقُومُ زَيْدٌ**, 'Zaid is not standing', and if it is thus divided between a noun and a verb it cannot exercise influence. The people of the Hijaz let it wield influence because they compare it with **لَيْسَ**, from the point of view of meaning, but this is a poor comparison, since **لَيْسَ** is a verb and **لَا** is a particle, and is thus weaker. Thus the word following cannot be made accusative by **لَا**, and must be accusative on account of the lack of a particle demanding the genitive.

"Basrans:- **لَا** is similar to **لَيْسَ** and must therefore work in the same way. **لَيْسَ** has a **رفع** and a **نصب**, and **لَا** must have the same. The reasons for this likeness are twofold: (i) both introduce a **مبتدأ** and a **خبر**, and (ii) **لَا** negates what is in the **حال**, just as **لَيْسَ** does. The strongest comparison is that **لَا** can take **بِ** before the **خبر**, just as **لَيْسَ** can. Thus since **لَا** resembles **لَيْسَ** so strongly, it must work in the same way, with the **اسم** in the nominative and the **خبر** in the accusative.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "**لَا** cannot

exercise influence", the Basrans quote the Koran showing that it can and does:-

ما هذا بشراً , 'this is not a man', or
ما هُنَّ أُمّهَاتِهِمْ , 'they are not their mothers'. The

Basrans also refute the Kufans' assertion that the accusative is used because a particle demanding the genitive is omitted.

They give examples to show that, when a particle demanding the genitive is omitted, it is not the accusative which is used:-

كفى بالله شهيداً , 'God is a sufficient witness', or
كفى بالله نصيراً , 'God is a sufficient helper', become
كفى الله نصيراً or كفى الله شهيداً , with the
nominative".(10)

The two grammar schools take their argument further still in connection with the sentence طعامك ما زيد أكلك , 'Zaid is not eating your food'. "The Kufans allow this, but the Basrans do not. Abū l-'Abbās, a Kufan, says sometimes it is allowed, sometimes it is not. If ما means لا or لَمْ , then putting it (the noun) first is allowed. If, however, the ما is in reply to an oath, such as والله ما زيد بأكل طعامك , 'by God, Zaid is not eating your food', and stands in place of the customary لا , then one may not put the noun first.

"Kufans:- As ما is in place of لَمْ , لَنْ , and لا , and as these particles may be preceded by the thing affected, such as لا يضرب زيدا , 'do not hit Zaid', or لا تكرم أمراً , 'do not honour 'Amr', then likewise it also may be preceded by the noun.

(10) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.107f.

"Basrans:- The meaning of لا is negation, and the noun and the verb follow it, and it resembles an interrogative particle. An interrogative particle does not act on what follows it when this comes before it: thus, neither does لا .

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that " لا is in place of لم , لن , and لا , " the Basrans do not agree. لا is followed by both an اسم and a فعل , but لم and لن are followed only by a فعل . لا , on the other hand, may be followed both by an اسم and a فعل , but it is a declinable particle - one says جئت بلا شيء⁽¹¹⁾, 'you came with nothing'.

CONCLUSIONS

There is little which can be added to what has been said about كان and its sister verbs. It must be emphasized yet again that the Arabs looked at their grammar in an approach entirely different from ours. To us in the West, it seems obvious that the predicate of verbs of this nature should be in the same case as the subject. We may also feel tempted to ask why the Arabs, who we have seen in previously mentioned usages brought into their arguments the fact that sometimes the مبتدأ has the same meaning as the خبر , did not realise that they had exactly the same situation here, and did not therefore use the same case for both. However, it is thanks to the reasoning of Bravmann that we have an acceptable theory

(11) Ibid, p.111f.

to say why the accusative should be used - the noun being considered identical with the second accusative after verbs of the meaning "to render", and hence "to be rendered".

Over the question of ما , it appears that this particle has the verbal force of ليس , and hence is followed by the accusative.

In Ethiopic⁽¹²⁾ verbs of the meaning "to be" and "to become" have a nominative and an accusative, and Dillman and Bezold give a theory identical with that of Bravmann, so it would perhaps not be amiss to quote them verbatim. "...all Passives of Verbs which have two Accusatives in the Active, take the Accusative of one of the two Objects of the Active Stem, e.g. "to be taught" ("to learn") with Accusative of the Object.

"The employment of the Accusative with these Passives explains also the peculiarity, found both in Ethiopic and Arabic, according to which verbs of Being, Becoming and Remaining take the Predicate in the Accusative, in respect that the idea of "having been made something" or "being made something" is always present in these verbs".⁽¹³⁾

(12) Dillman - Bezold, op. cit., p.440.

(13) Ibid., p.440.

"INNA" AND ITS SISTERS

From **كَانَ** and its sisters, we now move on to **إِنَّ** and its sisters. These two types of words are very similar, in that both take a nominative and an accusative. With **كَانَ**, as we have seen, the **إِسْم** goes into the nominative, and the **خَبَر** goes into the accusative. With **إِنَّ**, this rule is reversed - the **إِسْم** goes into the accusative, and the **خَبَر** into the nominative.

Ibn Hishām simply has this to say: "The rule about the **مبتدأ** and the **خبر** is that normally both go into the nominative:- **زَيْدٌ قَائِمٌ**, 'Zaid is standing'. However, three regents break this rule:- (i) Those which put the former in the **رفع** and the latter in the **نصب**, such as **كَانَ** and its family; (ii) Those which put the former in the **نصب** and the latter in the **رفع**, such as **إِنَّ** and its analogous words; (iii) Those which put both parts in the **نصب**, -words of the family of **ظَنَّ** (1).

Al-Zajjājī, however, is a little more explicit, and gives the reason why the two different cases are used.

"Words which make the **إِسْم** accusative, and the **خبر** nominative;

لَعَلَّ, 'perhaps', **لَيْتَ**, 'would that', **كَيْتَ**, 'but', **أَنَّ**, **إِنَّ**, etc.

إِنَّ زَيْدًا مَنْطِقٌ, 'Zaid is indeed eloquent',

لَعَلَّ أَخَاكَ شَاحِصٌ, 'perhaps your brother is appearing in view', **لَيْتَ بَكْرًا قَادِمٌ**, 'would that Bakr had come'. This

is because the particles are regarded as verbs, and are

(1) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.135.

therefore thought to work in the same way as verbs. The main difference, however, is that these particles do not conjugate or decline - they are *غير متصرف*. Also, the three relevant words must come in the order of (i) particle, (ii) accusative, and (iii) nominative. However, if the *خبر* of the particle is a word which takes the genitive, it can then be interposed:- *إِنَّ عِنْدَكَ زَيْدًا*, 'Zaid is with you',

إِنَّ أَمَّاكَ بَكْرًا, 'perhaps he will be pardoned', *لَعَلَّ لَهُ عَذْرًا*, 'Bakr is in front of you' ... Should there be another epithet as well as the genitive, this may be nominative or accusative -

إِنَّ فِي الدَّارِ بَكْرًا قَائِمًا or *قَائِمًا*, 'Bakr is standing in the house'.

قَائِمًا can be regarded as the *حال* as a *خبر*, construction. This additional epithet is there to help complete the sense. However, if the sense is not complete without this extra word, then this word must go into the nominative, since *حال* can be used only when the sense is already complete.

"The *خبر* can be any part of speech:- *ظَرَفٌ*, as *إِنَّ زَيْدًا فِي الدَّارِ*, 'Zaid is in the house'; *فِعْلٌ*, as *إِنَّ مُحَمَّدًا يَرْكَبُ*, 'Abdullah went out', or *إِنَّ أَخَاكَ مَالُهُ كَثِيرٌ*, 'Muhammad is riding'; or *تَوْكِيدٌ* (or *بَدَلٌ*), as *إِنَّ زَيْدًا قَائِمًا وَعَمْرُو*, 'your brother's wealth is considerable' Should there be

two nouns in the *خبر*, the second may be accusative or nominative, *إِنَّ زَيْدًا قَائِمًا وَعَمْرُو* or *وَعَمْرُو قَائِمًا*, 'both Zaid and 'Amr. are standing'. *عَمْرُو* can be regarded as being in apposition to

زَيْدًا, *عَمْرُو* can be regarded as being in apposition to the understood pronoun in *قَائِمًا*, or that it is acting as *توكيد*

to this pronoun - إِنْ زَيْدًا قَائِمٌ هُوَ وَعَمْرُو A second alternative is to put the second noun in apposition to the position of إِنْ before its appearance in the sentence. Thus it can serve as either صِبْطًا or خَبْر without altering the sense at all. Thus it becomes equivalent to saying خَيْلًا, or خَيْلٌ وَلَا زَيْدٌ جَبَانٌ, 'Zaid is neither a coward nor a miser'. خَيْلٌ is in apposition to جَبَانٌ, خَيْلٌ is in the accusative, in apposition to the position of the بِ.... The third alternative is that عَمْرُو is put in the nominative as a صِبْطًا, but the خَبْر is omitted, since it is clear from what has gone before what it would be -

(2). "إِنْ زَيْدًا قَائِمٌ وَعَمْرُو (قَائِمٌ)"

Al-Yāzījī sums up what the earlier part of Al-Zajjājī says when he states:- لَكِنَّ, كَأَنَّ, أَنَّ and its sisters, إِنْ and its sisters, لَعَلَّ, كَيْتَ. These words are known as those resembling verbs. They act in the inverse way to the action of كَانَ - they make the اسْم accusative, and the خَبْر nominative:

لَعَلَّ اللَّهَ غَافِرٌ, إِنْ زَيْدًا قَائِمٌ, 'Zaid is standing', 'perhaps God is forgiving'. As for أَنَّ, it must have a regent empowering over it, بَلَّغْنِي أَنَّ زَيْدًا قَادِمٌ, 'I heard (lit., it reached me) that Zaid was coming'. However, a

ظَرْفٌ may interpose between the particle and its خَبْر, such as فِي الدَّارِ زَيْدًا or عِنْدَكَ, 'Zaid is with you', or 'in the house'". (3)

(2) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.64f.

(3) Al-Yāzījī, op. cit., p.185.

Sibawayh, as we have seen already, can furnish plenty of examples for the topics he discusses, but he is not particularly helpful when we want to know why such-and-such a syntactical point works in the way in which it does. His information on **إِنْ** and its sister words is no exception.

"The 5 words which act like verbs:- **كَانَ**, **لَصِقَ**, **لَبِثَ**, **لَكُنْ**, **إِنْ**.

These words do not conjugate, but they have the function of verbs, **إِنْ زَيْدًا عَظِيمًا**, 'Zaid is eloquent', **إِنْ زَيْدًا أَخِيكَ**,

'Zaid is your brother', etc. The words are like **كَانَ** in that they have a **رَفْع** and a **نَصْب**. When one says

إِنْ زَيْدًا عَظِيمًا عَظِيمًا, 'intelligent Zaid is eloquent', if one did not mention **عَظِيمًا**, then **عَظِيمًا** would take the place

of the **خَبَر**, as if one had said **كَانَ زَيْدًا عَظِيمًا ذَاهِبًا**,

'intelligent Zaid was going', and then omitted **ذَاهِبًا** to make it **كَانَ زَيْدًا عَظِيمًا**, 'Zaid was intelligent'. This

accusative after **كَانَ** is in place of the first nominative after **إِنْ** and its sisters. A prepositional phrase may

directly follow the particle, **إِنْ فِيهَا زَيْدًا قَائِمًا**, 'Zaid

is standing there'. One may use the nominative on account of the **إِلْغَاءُ** (the action of cessation of dependence or

annulment of circumstantial terms), or one may say **قَائِمًا**

or **إِنْ** after **إِنْ** etc., One

can say **إِنْ**, 'wealth', **إِنْ**, 'a boy', and this can

be extended to **إِنْ غَيْرَهَا أَبَدًا وَشَاءَ**, 'there are camels and

sheep, apart from it', or **إِنْ لَنَا غَيْرَهَا أَبَدًا وَشَاءَ**, 'we

have camels and sheep, apart from it'. The words **إبل** and **شاة** are made accusative in the same way as **فارس** when one says **ما في الناس مثله فارساً**, 'there is no one like him as a horseman' Two nouns after **إن**. One would normally put the second noun into the nominative, **إن زيدا منطلقاً و عمرو**, 'Zaid is eloquent and so is 'Amr', but it may go into the accusative, **إن زيدا منطلقاً وعمراً ظريفاً**, 'Zaid is eloquent and 'Amr is intelligent'. However, when one puts **لا** before the second noun, then the rule applying to usage after **واو** is applied, and one gets either **إن زيدا منطلقاً لا عمرو**, 'Zaid is eloquent, not 'Amr', or **إن زيدا منطلقاً لا عمراً**. The same rules apply to **كأن**, **ليت**, and **لعل**, and one does not get a nominative **ابتداءً** after them:-

ليت زيدا منطلقاً وعمراً, 'would that Zaid were eloquent and 'Amr' ... The accusative **خبر** after the 5 sister words, when what precedes is built on the **ابتداءً**. The meaning is the

same whether it be a **حال**, or whether the noun before it prevents it from being governed by **إن** **هذا عبدالله منطلقاً :- إن**, 'this is 'Abdullah, eloquent', or **إن هذه أمّكم أمةً واحدةً**, 'this is your mother, a unique mother'.

One also says

إن هذا الرجل منطلقاً, 'this man is eloquent', when **منطلقاً** acts in the same way as it does when one says **هذا الرجل منطلقاً**,

'this man is eloquent', except that **الرجل** is a **خبر** to

the accusative (**هذا**) and an epithet to it. Thus it (**منطلقاً**)

is an epithet of the (**هذا**) or of its **خبر** (**الرجل** or **عبدالله**).

It is the same when one says ليت هذا زيد قائماً 'would that this were Zaid standing', or لعل هذا زيد ذاهباً, 'perhaps this is Zaid going'. Another verb may appear in the phrase containing one of these 5 sister words, but still the word governs its accusative:- إن الذي رايت أخاك منطلقاً 'ne whom I saw is your brother, eloquent', or إن كان أفضلهم زيداً, 'the most excellent of them is Zaid'".⁽⁴⁾ Sībawayh gives several more examples of further uses of إن, but they will be omitted, since they are of no real value to our investigations.

Why, then, do these 5 sister words govern the اسم in the accusative and the حبر in the nominative? It is in the search for the reason behind the various usages that the arguments between the Kufans and the Basrans prove invaluable. "The Kufans say that إن and its sisters do not make the حبر nominative as in إن زيداً قائماً, 'Zaid is standing'. The Basrans say these words do make the حبر nominative.

"Kufans:- The اسم is made accusative because these words resemble verbs, and as such they are a branch of a verb. But, being a branch, they are weaker than verbs themselves, and it is fit that they should not act on the حبر, running according to analogy in lowering the branches from the roots. Because if we made it act in the way in which it acts (i.e., in which the verb acts), this would lead to equality between them, and this is not allowed: and thus it must remain in its nominative state before its introduction,

(4) Sībawayh, op.cit., p.279f.

(i.e. the introduction of the particle). And what proves the weakness of its action is that it introduces to the خبر what it introduces to the verb if it begins it. The poet said

لا تتركني فيهم شطيرا ، اني اذن اهلك او اطيرو
 'do not leave me among them (as) a stranger, otherwise I would be perished or flown', and he made (the verbs) accusative on account of اذن , and what also proves this is that if there is a particle intervening between ان and the rest of the sentence, its action is annulled, and it does without it, as in ان بكفل زيد , 'Zaid is your guarantor', as if one had been satisfied with the صفة on account of its weakness. And it has been related that some people say ان بك زيد مأخوذ , 'Zaid is influenced by you' -, and ان does not act on account of its weakness, and this proves what we are saying.

"Basrans:- These words act on the خبر , and this is because their resemblance to verbs is strong. This resemblance is to be found in both letter and meaning - (there are five proofs: the writer will, however, omit them, since it is sufficient for us to accept that these particles do resemble verbs). Because they resemble the verb in these ways they must act in the same way as the verb, and a verb has one thing in the nominative and another in the accusative. So likewise these words must have one thing in the nominative, resembling the فاعل , and the other in the accusative, resembling the مفعول , except that with these words the منصوب precedes the مرفوع ,

because these words are a branch: or because one should realise, by the accusative preceding the nominative, that these words are similar to verbs, but are not verbs in actual fact.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement about the "equality between the root and the branch", the Basrans say this is annulled by the **إِسْمُ الْفَاعِلِ**, which acts like a verb, and has a **مَرْفُوعٌ** and a **مَنْصُوبٌ**, just like a verb; one says:-
زَيْدٌ ضَارِبٌ أَبَاهُ عَمْرًا, 'Zaid's father is hitting 'Amr', just as one says **يَضْرِبُ أَبَاهُ عَمْرًا**, 'his father hits 'Amr'. The **إِسْمُ الْفَاعِلِ** acts even when something interposes between it and what it acts on; so **إِنْ** can be separated:- **إِنْ لَدَيْنَا أَنْكَارٌ**, 'we have fetters', or **إِنْ فِي ذَلِكَ لَآيَةٌ**, 'there is a sign in that'.

"As for their (i.e. the Kufans') statement that "the proof of the weakness of its action is that it introduces to the **خَبَرٌ** what it introduces to the verb if it begins, and they quote **إِنِّي إِذْنًا أَهْلَكَ أَوْ أَطِيرَا**", the Basrans say this is false. The **خَبَرٌ** here has been suppressed, and the verb of which it is the **خَبَرٌ** has been suppressed. Also, the whole clause after **إِنِّي** is here the **خَبَرٌ**. Such words must make the **خَبَرٌ** nominative, just as they make the **إِسْمُ** accusative".⁽⁵⁾

أَنْ and **إِنْ** may sometimes be contracted to **إِنْ** and **أَنْ**.

(5) Ibn al-Anbārī, op.cit., p.115f.

The most common opinion expressed amongst the grammarians is that the particles in question lose their influence when this contraction occurs. Chaim Rabin tells us: "The alleviated forms أَنْ and أَنَّ . In the "alleviated" forms they lose their rection and their أَنَّ will appear not in the accusative, but in the nominative. Some Arabs, however, put the أَنَّ in the accusative with the alleviated forms. Laith asserts that in the usage of Hijaz the accusative could be employed after the alleviated forms ... It is Reckendorf's view that أَنْ and أَنَّ are the earlier forms, from which أَنَّ and أَنَّ developed under certain conditions".⁽⁶⁾

The Basrans supported the view that the contracted forms did, in fact, still wield the influence of the non-contracted particles, and so found themselves involved once again in a grammatical dispute with the Kufans. "The Kufans say that lightened أَنَّ does not make the أَنَّ accusative. The Basrans say it does.

"Kufans:- It does not act because أَنَّ acts because it resembles in letter a passive (we should say "past") verb: it has three radicals, and has fatha. But with the shortened أَنَّ , the resemblance to a verb ceases, and so its action must also be of no use. They also say that أَنَّ is a regent for nouns, but أَنَّ is a regent for verbs. Thus it

(6) Chaim Rabin, op.cit., pp.168 & 171.

is fitting that **إِنْ** cannot act on nouns, just as **لَنْ** cannot act on verbs, as other noun regents do not act on verbs, and other verb regents do not act on nouns.

"Basrans:- They quote a Koranic example, (although according to a reliable text of the Koran the word is **وَلَنْ** , and not **وَأَنْ** , as the Basrans claim:-

وَأَنْ كَلَّا لَيُوفِّيَنَّهُمْ رَبُّكَ أَعْمَالَهُمْ, 'and your Lord will most surely pay back to all their deeds in full'; **كَلَّا** cannot be accusative by the influence of **لَيُوفِّيَنَّهُمْ**, because the **لَام** of an oath prevents what follows it from acting on what has gone before; one cannot say **زَيْدًا لَأَكْرِمَنَّ وَعَمْرًا لَأُضْرِبَنَّ**, 'I will honour Zaid and hit 'Amr'. One can also not say that **إِنْ** has the meaning of **أَلَا** , and **لَمَّا** has the meaning of **إِنَّمَا** ; because one does not get **لَام** with the meaning of **أَلَا** following **إِنْ** with the meaning of **لَا** . Thus in the example quoted, if one regards **لَمَّا** as meaning **أَلَا** , then **كَلَّا** would not be accusative, because what follows **أَلَا** does not act on what precedes it, and this proves their point (i.e. that **كَلَّا** is made accusative by **إِنْ**). Also the Arabs say

أَلَا أَنْ أَخَاكَ ذَاهِبٌ, 'is your brother not going?', using shortened **أَنْ** in place of **أَنَّ** . The appended **كَانَ** is a letter of **تَشْبِيه** (similarity); thus when one says

كَأَنَّ زَيْدًا الْأَسَدَ, 'as if Zaid were the lion', this root is **إِنْ زَيْدًا الْأَسَدَ**, 'Zaid is like the lion', just as when one says **إِنْ زَيْدًا لِقَائِمٌ**, 'Zaid is standing', the real root is

لَا تُنْ زَيْدًا قَائِمٌ. Thus when one uses the accusative with the shortened form, this shows that it (the shortened form) is in place of a verb, of which some of the letters have been suppressed. Also, some people use the shortened form with pronouns:- أَظُنُّ أَنَّكَ قَائِمٌ, is the same as أَظُنُّ أَنَّكَ قَائِمٌ, 'I think that you are standing', or أَظُنُّ أَنَّهُ ذَاهِبٌ, is the same as أَظُنُّ أَنَّهُ ذَاهِبٌ, 'I think that he is going'.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "When one uses the shortened form the resemblance to a verb ceases", the Basrans say this is wrong: اِنْ resembles a verb in several ways, both in letter and in meaning, but اِنْ also resembles a verb with some of its letters suppressed, and thus its action is not useless; one says اِنْ اَلْكَلَامَ, 'remember the speech', or اِنْ الثَّوْبَ, 'variegate the cloth', or اِنْ اَلْأَمْرَ, 'manage the matter', and the action of these shortened verbs is not annulled.

"As for the Kufans' statement that "doubled اِنْ is a regent for nouns, and lightened اِنْ is a regent for verbs", the Basrans say this proof is obviously wrong. If we assert that it is lightened from the doubled, it is then one of the noun regents, but if we cannot say that it is lightened from the doubled, then it is not one of the noun regents. Originally, the lightened اِنْ is not the اِنْ lightened from the doubled, because that lightened one is one of the verb regents, and this one lightened from the doubled is one of the noun regents. And the statement did not coincide with

the original lightened نِ! , but it dealt with نِ! lightened from the doubled, and we have shown the difference between them".(7)

CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that نِ! and its sisters are very similar to the verb نِ in that both types have a nominative and an accusative. The Arabs recognised this similarity, and therefore assumed that نِ! worked in the same way as a verb. The question arises, however, as to why نِ! should have its نِ! in the accusative and its نِ in the nominative. The Basrans' answer to this is that نِ! resembles a verb in action, but is not a verb in fact, and therefore the normal cases are reversed to show this difference. This would seem to be an excuse rather than a reason. The Kufans also have this idea of the particles being like verbs, but being weaker than verbs, and therefore putting the نِ! in the accusative, but leaving the نِ in the nominative. This again seems to be rather a poor excuse for explaining away this use of the accusative. Even if this Kufan view were at all sound - that the particle should govern one noun in the accusative, but should leave the other in the nominative - it seems odd that the particle should pick the نِ! to put into the accusative.

Turning to the instances of there being two nouns in the نِ , the explanations of al-Zajjājī as to why either the

(7) Ibn al-Anbārī, op.cit. p.123f.

nominative or the accusative may be used for the second seem perfectly sound.

With regard to the shortened forms نِ! and نِ' , these words, even though in a shortened form, still resemble verbs so strongly that it seems quite right that they should still exert the influence of verbs, and thus take an accusative.

NEGATION

The penultimate type of accusative which we shall examine is that used after the لا of negation. Sibawayh tells us: "Negation by لا . لا acts on what follows it, and the resultant accusative is unnūnated. The accusative effect on what follows the لا is like the accusative effect after لا . The omission of the nūnation from the word acted upon is necessary because it is established and it is made into the place of one noun, such as خمسة عشر, "fifteen", and this is because it does not make the rest of what is accusative similar to what is not a noun, and is a verb - and it acts only on an indefinite noun. لا and ما act on it in place of an ابتداء . (It is usually used to precede the answer to some question.) لا and ما act in place of an ابتداء , as when one says هل من رجل , "is there a man?", the word is in place of a nominative noun as a مبتدأ , so it is with ما من شيء , "there is no man", and لا رجل , "there is nothing". The proof that لا رجل , "there is no man", is in place of an اسم مبتدأ , and ما من رجل is in place of an اسم مبتدأ is the expression of the people of the Hijaz لا رجل أفضل منك , "there is no man more excellent than you", or ما من رجل أفضل منك , or هل رجل خير منك . Nothing must interpose between the لا and the word it governs (the منفى (1) . We here see Sibawayh trying, not very

(1) Sibawayh, op. cit., p.345.

successfully, to explain something away. He compares it with a verb because it acts only on the indefinite - the restricted use leads to a restriction of nūnation.. Sībawayh then goes on to discuss nūnated nouns after negation, using the examples لا خيراً منه لك , "you have no one better than he", or لا ضارباً زيداً لك , "you have nobody hitting Zaid". "This takes place provided that the nūnation does not come at the end of the noun, and it is as if there should be a letter before the end of the word. However, the end of the word is taken away in نَفَى and نِدَاء , and the result is as above. Because what is after ضارب and خير becomes the end of the nouns, and it is wrong that it should be omitted before the end of the noun has been reached".⁽²⁾ We see here some very confused wording in Sībawayh. He gives us a very weak explanation. In fact, the plain rule is that, if one qualifies the noun in any way, then one keeps the nūnation. When the مَنْفَى has an epithet, Sībawayh says: "This may be nūnated, which is more usual, or unnūnated:- لا غلامَ ظريفاً لك , or لا غلامَ ظريفٍ لك , "you have no intelligent servant". Those who nūnate it do so because they make the noun and the لا into one noun, and they put the accusative epithet in this case in its place, other than the مَنْفَى . As for those who do not nūnate the epithet, they put both the thing described and the epithet in

(2) Ibid., p.350.

the place of one noun. However, when something - e.g. a phrase such as **فيها** - interposes between the noun and the epithet, then the epithet must be nūnated:- **لا رجل اليوم ظريفاً**, "there is no intelligent man to-day", **لا رجل فيها قاعداً**, "there is nobody sitting there". (3)

Al-Zajjājī does little more than give examples of the **لا لنفي الجنس**, the **لا** which denies the whole species. He says:- " **لا** used as a negation is followed by an unnūnated accusative: **لا رجل في الدار**, "there is no one in the house", **لا غلام عندك**, "Zaid has no money", **لا مال لزيد**, "you have no servant". An epithet in agreement can be either definite or indefinite:- **لا ثوب جديد عندك**, "you have no new clothes", **لا غلام عاقل عندك**, "you have no wise servants". If there are two nouns being negated, the second may be nūnated in either the accusative or the nominative:- **لا غلام ولا عبداً لك**, "you have neither servants nor slaves", **لا غلام ولا جارية لك**, "you have neither servants nor neighbours". (4)

Ibn Hishām tells us much the same as Sībawayh and al-Zajjājī in considerably less words: "The rules which apply to **إن** - اسم - in the accusative and **حبر** in the nominative - apply also to

لا under three conditions:- (i) that it denies the whole genus, (ii) that both expressions acted upon by it are

(3) Ibid., p.351.

(4) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.241.

indefinite, and (iii) that the **اسم** comes first and the **خبر** second:- **لا صاحب علم موقوف**, "there is no knowledgeable person hated". There need, however, be no **خبر** :-

لا رجل في الدار, "there is no one in the house"

If the **لا** is repeated - **لا حول ولا قوة** - "There is no might nor strength" - the first noun can be given (i) either fathā, with the second with fathā, or in the accusative, or in the nominative, like the qualificative in **(ظريفاً) لا رجل ظريف**, "there is no intelligent man", or (ii) the nominative, when the second no longer takes the accusative".⁽⁵⁾

Al-Zamakhsharī also likens the **لا لنفى الجنس** construction to **إن**, and therefore the **اسم** is accusative and the **خبر** is nominative. When the thing denied is an **إضافة** - **لا غلام رجل أفضل منه** - "there is no man's servant more excellent than he", or **لا خيراً منه قائم هنا** - **إضافة** - "there is no one better than he standing here", or

لا حافظاً القرآن عندك "you have no one learning the Koran by heart" - and if it is singular, then it takes fathā, and the **خبر** is in the nominative:- **لا رجل أفضل منك**, "there is no one more excellent than you". When the noun is qualified, there are two methods of use: (i) the adjective, like the noun, takes fathā, **لا رجل ظريف فيها**, "there is no

(5) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., pp.167 and 169.

wise man there", or (ii) the adjective is declined as if indefinite in its form or state, *لا رجلَ طريفاً فيها* or *لا ظريفَ*. If the *لا* is repeated, the nominative is permissible. If something interposes between the *لا* and the noun - such as a prepositional phrase - or the noun is definite, the nominative is compulsory:- *لا فيها رجلٌ ولا امرأةٌ* "there is neither man nor woman there", and *لا زيدٌ فيها ولا عمرو* "there is neither Zaid nor 'Amr there".⁽⁶⁾

None of the grammarians so far has really told us why the accusative is used after the *لا* *لِنَفْيِ الْجِنْسِ*. Even Ibn Mālik does no more than repeat the rules we have seen already.

" *لا* which denies the species. Give to *لا* the ruling of

لَا : with the indefinite noun, whether this particle occurs singly or is repeated. Make it govern in the accusative an annexed noun or its analogous type, and put the *خبر* in the nominative. Make a compound by means of the noun which has no complement, making it inflexible in "a":- *لا حولَ ولا قوَّةَ* "neither power nor force" ...

As for the second, put it in the nominative, in the accusative, or in composition: but if the first is in the nominative, do not use the accusative. To a noun without complement, qualificative of an inflexible noun which it immediately follows, give "a" or the accusative, or the nominative, and you will be correct. But if it does not follow it immediately or if it has a complement, do not make

(6) Al-Zamakhsharī, op. cit., p.40.

it inflexible: put it in the accusative or choose the nominative. Submit the adjoined noun without the repetition of لا to the rule which has been attributed to the separate qualificative. Give to لا , accompanied by the interrogative hamza, that which it would demand without the interrogation.

"(One must note (i) that the influence of لا , in the cases with which it is concerned, does not entirely resemble that of لا! , since, in its most frequent application, the noun which proves this influence cannot take the nūnation, and is rather, to use the language of the grammarians, صَبِيءٌ عَلَى الْفَتْحِ, "indeclinable in fathā", than منصوب : (ii) that when the negative adverb لا is repeated, its influence is no more than facultative. (In connection with the annexed noun):- One must understand by مضارع المضاف a word. which, without being in a relationship of annexation, as in this example:-

لا طالب علم محرومٌ, "no seeker after knowledge is forbidden", nevertheless has a complement, necessary for the integrity of the sense: it is thus that one must say in the accusative

لا طالماً جبلاً ظاهراً, "no one climbing a mountain appears",

لا خيراً من زيد هاهنا, "no one better than Zaid is here",

لا قبيحاً وجهه محبوبٌ, "no one whose face is ugly is loved".

The خبر must be placed only after the noun which serves as subject and which proves the influence of لا and must be put in the nominative".(7)

(7) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 197f.

One further small incidental point which the writer might make in connection with لا is that it is possible to regard it as working in the same way as كَيْسَرٌ, whence one says not لا أَحَدٌ أَفْضَلُ مِنْكَ, "there is no one more excellent than you", as we have seen, but لا أَحَدٌ أَفْضَلُ مِنْكَ⁽⁸⁾.

We have still not discovered why the accusative should be used in the type of negation under discussion. However, the arguments of the Kufans and Basrans help to rectify this.

"The Kufans say that an indefinite singular noun negated by لا is declinable, and is made accusative by the لا, as in لا رَجُلًا فِي الدَّارِ, "there is no one in the house". The Basrans say it is indeclinable in fatḥa.

"Kufans:- We say it is made accusative by the لا because it uses it (لا) instead of a verb: the virtual meaning in لا أَجِدُ رَجُلًا فِي الدَّارِ is really لا رَجُلًا فِي الدَّارِ, "I do not find any man in the house". And they make do with لا instead of the عامل, just as when one says

وَأِنْ لَا تَقُمْ فَلَا أَقُومُ, "if you get up then I will get up, and if not then (I will) not", it is really وَأِنْ لَا تَقُمْ فَلَا أَقُومُ, "if you do not get up then I will not get up". And when they make لا suffice instead of the عامل, they make the indefinite accusative on account of it, and they take away the nūnation as they do with an إِضَافَةٌ. Some say it is made accusative by لا because لا has the meaning of غَيْرٌ, as in زَيْدٌ لَا عَاقِلٌ وَلَا جَاهِلٌ, "Zaid is neither intelligent

(8) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.356.

nor ignorant", namely **زيد غير عاقل وغير جاهل**. They make it accusative to distinguish **لا** with the meaning of **ليس** from **لا** with the meaning of **غير**. Others say they make it govern the accusative because when they make an indefinite follow it - or in the state of an indefinite in that its **خبر** comes before it - they make the indefinite accusative without nūnation. Some of the grammarians say it is made accusative since **لا** governs the accusative because it is the contradictory to **إن**: because **لا** is for negation, and **إن** is for affirmation, and they use a thing according to its opposite, just as they use it according to its like; except that **لا**, when it is a branch of **إن** in the **عمل**, and **إن** makes the word accusative with nūnation, **لا** makes it accusative without nūnation, in order to separate the branch from the root: because the branches always separate from the positions of the roots.

"Basrans:- We say it is indeclinable in fatha because the root in the sentence **لا رجل في الدار** is really **لا من رجل في الدار**, "there is no man in the house", because it is the answer to **هل من رجل في الدار**, "is there a man in the house?". And when one suppresses **من** from the sentence and constructs it with **لا**, one includes the meaning of the word (**من**) and it must be indeclinable: it is indeclinable in a vowel because it was capable of flexion before the indeclinability, and it is indeclinable in fatha because it is the lightest vowel.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "the word is made accusative because ۛ suffices as a verb", the Basrans say this is a lone claim in need of proof: if it be as the Kufans say, then the word in the accusative must be nūnated.

"Then in reply to the Kufans' statement that "the nūnation is suppressed as it is with an إِضَافَةٌ", the Basrans say that if this were sound, then surely it must be consistent in all the nūnated singular nouns which allow an إِضَافَةٌ : and if they say that this applies in this instance only, and in no other instances, this proves the error of the Kufans' way of thinking.

"In reply to the Kufans' assertion that "the accusative is used because ۛ has the meaning of لَيْسَ and غَيْرِ", the Basrans say why, when it has the meaning of لَيْسَ, must it govern the accusative? Why not use the nominative as analogy dictates, and as the poet says:-

لَيْسَ بِرَاحٍ , or سَنُ صَدَّعَنُ بِرَاحِهَا فَأَنَا ابْنُ قَيْسٍ لَا بَرَّاحُ
 "he who turned (his back upon) its fires (I can take his place),
 I am the son of Qais (who) never leave the place".

"And as for the Kufans' statement that "they make it govern the accusative because when they make the indefinite follow it, and what is in the state of the indefinite in that its حَبْر precedes it, they make the indefinite accusative on account of this", the Basrans say, why? What is the relating factor between it and the نَصْبُ ? If it were as the Kufans say a declinable accusative, then one must insert the nūnation

and not suppress it: because there is nothing to stop a declinable word from declension: and when the nūnation is prevented from being there, this proves that it is not a declinable accusative. This is also the answer to those who say it is made accusative by ۷ because it is the contradictory to ۸! : it must, if this were the case, be nūnated.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "when ۷ is a branch of ۸! in action, and ۸! makes accusative with the nūnation, you make the accusative after ۷ without nūnation. in order to separate the branch from the position of the root", the Basrans say this is false, because the nūnation is not caused by the action of ۸! , but it is an integral part of the noun in its root. And as the action of ۸! , which is the root, does not cause the nūnation, then there is no point in suppressing it with ۷ , which is only a branch: and ۷ can be seen to be weaker than ۸! on four points:- (i) ۸! acts on both the definite and the indefinite, whereas ۷ acts only on the indefinite, (ii) ۸! is not constructed with the noun either on account of its strength or on account of its weakness, (iii) ۸! still acts on the noun even with something interposing between, either a preposition or a particle taking the genitive, whereas ۷ does not act with any such interposition, (iv) ۸! may act on both an اسم and a خبر , but ۷ acts only on an اسم without a خبر ". (9)

(9) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., pp.225f.

CONCLUSIONS

Several points emerge from the views of the Arab grammarians about the usage of the **لَا لِنَفْيِ الْجِنْسِ**. All the grammarians state that the noun denied must be indefinite. If we are to believe the explanation offered by the grammarians, **لَا** works under the same rules as does **لَا تِلْكَ**, but this does not seem possible. If this were the Arabs' view, then why is **لَا** allowed to act only on an indefinite, when **لَا تِلْكَ** may act on either a definite or an indefinite? The grammarians tried to argue away this difference between **لَا** and **لَا تِلْكَ**, but they do not seem to have been very successful - they were again giving excuses rather than reasons.

If this most common view of the grammarians does not really seem satisfactory, what alternative explanation can be offered? It appears that the accusative is yet a further use of the direct object after some understood verb, such as **وَجَدَ**, "to find", or some verb of similar meaning - this is the view put forward by the Kufans. A sentence such as **لَا رَجُلَ فِي الدَّارِ** would be in full **لَا أَجِدُ رَجُلًا فِي الدَّارِ**, "I do not find any man in the house". The next problem facing us is why the accusative should have a definite ending. One thing is certain - the meaning is indefinite. This is obvious from a common sense point of view, and the grammarians all say that the noun, before being denied, must be indefinite. We have further proof of this if we add an epithet to the noun -

لَا رَجُلَ ظَرِيفًا : we see that the epithet is indefinite

in order to agree with the meaning of the negated noun, rather than to agree with it in the letter. Also, under certain conditions the word negated may have the indefinite termination, as in لا ضاربًا زيدًا لك, or لا طالعًا جبك ظاهر.

It would appear that once again we are faced with an anomaly - the word is indefinite in meaning, and one would think it should be indefinite in letter all the time. The grammarians of Kufa and Basra tried to explain the unnūnated ending, but they give the impression of trying to explain this anomaly away - their reasoning is again of a negative nature, with one side trying to refute the arguments of the other without being able to offer a sound alternative explanation.

ISTITHNĀ' - EXCEPTION

The last type of accusative with which we shall deal is that used in exceptive clauses. In Arabic grammar the rules for exception, or إِسْتِثْنَاءٌ, are rather complicated, so let us see first of all what Sībawayh - who can usually give us ample rules, but very little explanation about why they work - has to say. " إِسْتِثْنَاءٌ. The word of exception is

إِلَّا. Generally, the word governed by إِلَّا does not change from the state it was in before إِلَّا was appended, and is a

بدل. 'no one came to me except Zaid', or مَا أَتَانِي إِلَّا زَيْدٌ, 'I met no one but Zaid', or مَا لَقِيتُ إِلَّا زَيْدًا, 'I passed no one except Zaid'. But in

certain cases the accusative must be used:-

مَا ضَرَبْتُ أَحَدًا يَقُولُ ذَلِكَ إِلَّا زَيْدًا, 'I did not hit anyone who says that except Zaid'. The accusative must be used since in this case one wishes to make a نَحْبَر, predicate, by the incidence of the verb. (The إِلَّا زَيْدًا goes back to the ضَرَبْتُ, and is accusative after this, and not after the يَقُولُ. Were it referring to يَقُولُ then it would be nominative)

It is reported that some Arabs use the accusative all the time, even when the word is a بدل:- مَا مَرَرْتُ بِأَحَدٍ إِلَّا زَيْدًا, 'I did not pass by anyone but Zaid', or مَا أَتَانِي أَحَدٌ إِلَّا زَيْدًا, 'no one came except Zaid', or مَا رَأَيْتُ أَحَدًا إِلَّا زَيْدًا, 'I did not see anyone except Zaid'. The accusative is used because the latter is not made a بدل of the first, but it

is cut off from what acts on the first. The proof of this is that it answers to the meaning of **ولكن زيداً**, 'but Zaid', or **لا أعني زيداً**, 'I do not mean Zaid', and what precedes it acts upon it just as **درهم** acts on **عشرون** when one says **عشرون درهماً**, 'twenty dirhams' ... (Sometimes, with the people of the Hijaz,) the accusative is chosen because the second noun is not of the same sort as the first:-

ما فيها أحدٌ إلا حمارٌ, 'there is nobody there except an ass'.

As the latter noun cannot possibly be conceived of as a بدل of the first, it is borne by the meaning of **ولكن**, 'but', and is acted upon by what precedes it, like the action of

درهم on **عشرون**. The Banū Tamīm, however say

إلا.... ليس فيها : لا أحد فيها إلا حمارٌ with the meaning of **ولكن** :-

or **فلو كانت قرية آمنه فنفعها إيمانها إلا قوم يونس** 'and wherefore was there not a town which should believe so that their belief should have profited them

but the people of Jonah'.... (Examples of usage) in which the thing excepted can be only in the accusative. This is

because it is excluded from what one inserts in it apart from it itself, and it is acted upon by what precedes it, as **عشرون** acts on **درهم** when one says **عشرون درهماً** : e.g.,

أتاني القوم إلا أباك, 'the people came except your father', or **مررت بالقوم إلا أباك**, 'I passed by the people except your father', or **القوم فيها إلا أباك**, 'the people are there

except your father'. **أب** is made accusative since it does not enter into the thing that what precedes it enters into, and it is not an adjective. The regent is what precedes it, just as **درهم** is not an adjective of **عشرون**, nor borne on what it bears, and it acts on it. **أب** is prevented from being a **بدل** of **القوم** by the fact that if one said **اتانے إلا أبوك**, 'they came except your father', it would be absurd".⁽¹⁾ If, however, the sentence began with the negative **ما**, it would then be quite all right, and the nominative could be used. According to Sībawayh, it can not be a **بدل** as one cannot use one without the other - unless, of course, the sentence is negative. **إلا أبك** is part of **القوم**, as it is connected with it. It goes into the accusative because it is not contained in what has gone before - i.e. the generality. **أب** is not included because he did not come. The accusative is used after **إلا** if it ceases to be part of what has gone before. Perhaps the writer may explain the terminology, and elucidate a little further. The accusative thing must be a **بدل**, "alternative", and not a **مبدل منه**, "that to which an alternative is made". The limits of **إستثناء** are that, in the negative sentence, it should follow closely after the **ما** of the negative, and one makes a replacement, **بدل**, for it. When the form of the speech is not this, they put it in a form in which the accusative is permissible if one puts the thing

(1) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.359f.

excepted last. Sībawayh continues: "Two things excepted.

When there are two things excepted, the second may be either

accusative or nominative:- $\text{ما لي إلا زيدٌ صدقٌ وعمرٌ}$ or وعمرو

'I have no one who is truthful except Zaid and 'Amr'. The

explanation for the accusative is that it follows the former

word: and for the nominative, it is as if one had said

$\text{ما اتاني إلا زيدٌ إلا عمرٌ}$ Double exceptions:- وعمرو

'no one came but Zaid and but 'Amr'. عمرو may not go into

the nominative as one thing excepted is not the بدل of the

other - one cannot take the first out of its place and

substitute it by the other. (In other words زيد is the بدل

of the generality, but عمرٌ is not the بدل of زيد and

cannot therefore be nominative.) One can, however, make the

first accusative and the second nominative:-

$\text{ما اتاني إلا عمرٌ إلا بشرٌ أحدٌ}$. One can say $\text{ما اتاني إلا زيدٌ إلا عمرو}$

'no one came but 'Amr and but a man', as if one had said

$\text{ما اتاني إلا عمرٌ أحدٌ إلا بشرٌ}$, when بشر is made the بدل of أحد,

only then one puts بشر first, and it becomes like

$\text{إلا غير ... ما لي إلا بشرٌ أحدٌ}$. This has the meaning of

and it follows the course of the word which would normally

follow إلا, since غير is a noun in place of this word:-

$\text{اتاني القوم غير زيد}$, 'the people came except Zaid', or

اتاني غير غير زيد , 'they came except Zaid'

Sometimes لا يكون and ليس act as exceptives:

$\text{اتوني لا يكون زيداً}$ or $\text{اتاني القوم ليس زيداً}$ and عدا act

in the same way. They are verbs, and consequently the

accusative is a direct object".⁽²⁾

Whereas Sībawayh has given the rules for exception in a rather lengthy manner, Al-Zajjājī does so in only very little space, although he fails to give any explanations.

"Exceptives: **إلا** . If what is before **إلا** is affirmative, then what follows it is in the accusative:- **قام القوم إلا زيداً**, 'the people rose except Zaid', **مررت بالناس إلا بكرًا**, 'I passed by the people except Bakr'. If the sentence is negative, then the thing excepted can be either in the case of what went before the **إلا**, or in the accusative:- **إلا عمرو** or **ما قام القوم إلا عمرو**, 'the people did not get up except 'Amr', and **ما مررت بأخوتك إلا عمرو** or **إلا عمرو**, 'I did not pass by your brothers except 'Amr'. If there is no mention at all of the generality, then the thing excepted goes into the case in which the generality would have been. Further, when the thing excepted comes first, it goes into the accusative when the sentence is positive, and into preferably the accusative when the sentence is negative (but the nominative is also permissible):- **ما خرج إلا زيداً أصحابك**, 'none of your friends went out except Zaid' **ما خلا** : these words cause everything behind them to go into the accusative, whether the sentence be positive or negative:- **قام القوم ما خلا زيداً وما خلا عمرو**, 'the people rose except Zaid and except 'Amr', and **ما قام أخوتك لبس بكرًا ولا يكون زيدًا**, 'your brothers did not get up except for Bakr and except for

(2) Ibid., p.372.

Zaid'. إلا أن يكون : this can be followed by the accusative, but the nominative is preferred".(3)

Al-Zamakhsharī divides the various types of exceptive sentences into a number of categories: while this facilitates the understanding of the rules, it does not help us at all in trying to understand why such-and-such a case is used.

"Exception: إستثناء. The word excepted can fall under one of five categories. One category always uses the accusative, and is sub-divided into three sections:

1. (This category deals with positive sentences), (i) where the word is excepted by إلا : جاء القوم إلا زيداً, 'the people came except Zaid', (ii) where the word is excepted by خلا, and (iii) where the word is excepted by ما عدا or ما خلا : these words tend to have the effect of ليس, and hence take the accusative (as they are verbs): جاء عدا زيداً and خلا زيداً:- 'the people came (did not come) except Zaid' and 'except Zaid'. 2. The accusative and بدل are both allowed in this category which deals with negative sentences:- ما جاء أحد إلا زيداً or إلا زيداً, 'no one came except Zaid'. When the thing to which there is an exception is accusative or genitive, one can use بدل if one wishes, but both this and the accusative are permissible. 3. Always genitive (and therefore irrelevant). However, the accusative is just permissible with حاشا. 4. The nominative or genitive after لا سيما. 5. This group concerns the type which

(3) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., pp.230, 238 & 237.

follows the اِغْرَاب (declension) existing before the introduction of the word of exception:- مَا جَانِي إِلَّا زَيْدٌ, 'no one came except Zaid', مَا رَأَيْتُ إِلَّا زَيْدًا, 'I saw no one but Zaid', and مَا صَرَرْتُ إِلَّا بِزَيْدٍ, 'I did not pass by anyone except Zaid' ... غَيْر in exception. The rule applying to غَيْر in its declension is the same as the rule applying to the noun coming after إِلَّا. It makes it accusative in a positive, isolated (i.e., generality not mentioned) sentence, or when it comes first. Both the accusative and جَدَل are allowed in a negative sentence. When the exception also contains an elative, either the nominative or the accusative is permissible:- إِلَّا أَبَاكَ or مَا أَتَانِي أَحَدٌ إِلَّا أَبُوكَ خَيْرٌ مِنْ زَيْدٍ, 'no one came except your father better than Zaid', or إِلَّا عَمْرًا or مَا صَرَرْتُ بِأَحَدٍ إِلَّا عَمِيرٌ خَيْرٌ مِنْ زَيْدٍ, 'I passed by no one but 'Amr better than Zaid'. When two things are excepted, one - either one - goes into the nominative, being thought of as joined to the verb, and the other one is accusative:- مَا أَتَانِي إِلَّا زَيْدٌ إِلَّا عَمْرًا, 'no one came except Zaid and except 'Amr', or (4) مَا أَتَانِي إِلَّا زَيْدٌ إِلَّا عَمْرُو

Ibn Hishām also divides the various types of exceptions into a number of categories, but he also explains why the various cases are employed. "Exception. Under certain conditions exception is carried out by the accusative after

(4) Al-Zamakhsharī, op. cit., p.36f.

some particles, usually **إلا** . Such conditions are :-

1. When the exception is carried out by **إلا** , and this particle is preceded by a complete and affirmative sentence, the accusative is compulsory for the object excepted:-

قام القوم إلا زيداً , 'the people rose except Zaid', and **فشرهوا منه إلا قليلاً منهم** , 'they drank from it except a few of them'.

2. If the sentence preceding the exception is not affirmative, or if there is continuity, two constructions are possible:- (i) In the case of continuity the excepted object can be considered either as agreeing with the object to which it is an exception, and regarded as a permutative - (this is the view of the Basrans) - or, as being joined in a series - (the Kufan view). In the second case it is put in the accusative, following the general rule. By any sentence not affirmative one understands the negative, prohibitive, or interrogative:- negative, e.g.,

ما فعلوه إلا قليل منهم , 'they did not do it except for a few of them', where **قليل** is a permutative agreeing with the **و** of **فعلوه** : prohibitive, e.g., **ولا يلتفت منكم أحد إلا إمرأتك** , 'do not let any one of you mind except your womenfolk', where

إمرأة in the nominative agrees with **أحد** , and in the accusative it is an exception following the general rule: interrogative, e.g., **وسن يقنط من رحمة ربه إلا الضالون** , 'and who despairs of the mercy of his Lord except the sinners?'

Here **الضالون** is regarded as being a permutative of the subject of **يقنط** . (ii) If the exception is discontinued,

the people of the Hijaz demand the accusative:-

ما فيها أحدٌ إلا حمارًا, 'no one is there except an ass', and ما لهم به من علمٍ إلا إيتباع الظن except hypotheses". The Banū Tamim, however, allow either the accusative or a permutative construction with the nominative. If the excepted object precedes the thing from which it is excepted, it must go into the accusative, whether the exception be discontinuous - ما فيها إلا حمارًا أحدٌ, 'there is no one there except an ass' -, or continuous -

ما قام إلا زيدًا القوم, 'the people did not get up except for Zaid'. 3. If the sentence preceding إلا is not complete, signifying that the object to which there is an exception is not expressed, the noun expressed after إلا undergoes the same accident as it would have done if there had been no

ما قام إلا زيدٌ :- إلا, 'they did not get up except for Zaid', (nominative); ما رايتُ إلا زيدًا, 'I did not see anyone except Zaid', (accusative); ما مررتُ إلا بزيدٍ, 'I did not pass by anyone except Zaid', (genitive).

"Other regents which cause exception are of three sorts:

(i) Those which always govern the genitive, (ii) those which always govern the accusative, and (iii) those which govern sometimes the genitive and sometimes the accusative.

(i) Those which govern the genitive are سَوَّى and غَيْرَ .

(These are irrelevant.) (ii) Those which govern only the accusative are four in number:- ما خلا , لا يكون , ليس , and

قاموا ليس زيدًا . ما عدا

قاموا ما عدا زيداً , قاموا ما خلا زيداً , or قاموا لا يكون زيداً .
 The accusative after ليس and لا يكون is a خبر : after
 ما خلا and ما عدا it is a verbal object. (iii) Those which
 govern either the genitive or the accusative are three in
 number:- حاشا , عدا , خلا . They may take either
 case since they are at the same time prepositions and
 passive verbs". (5)

Let us now see what the combination of Ibn Mālik and
 De Sacy have to say about this usage of the accusative.
 "Exception. الإستثناء . That which إلا excepts, being
 complete, is put in the accusative. After a negation or
 something analogous one prefers to make what continues the
 idea to agree. Put in the accusative what discontinues it.

"(The exception is تام (complete) when one expresses both
 the thing excepted, المستثنى , and the generality from which
 one takes the thing excepted, المستثنى منه , as in
 صفرني , 'the people went except Zaid'; it is صفرني
 when this last term is not expressed, as in لم يذهب إلا زيد ,
 'nobody is going except Zaid'. One calls the exception

متصل (this refers to the words 'continues the idea') when
 the thing excepted is understood in the generality from which
 one takes it away: on the contrary one calls it منقطع (this
 refers to 'discontinues it') when the thing taken away is
 foreign to the generality, as in ما مررت بجمل إلا فرساً , 'I did
 not pass by a camel except a horse'. It is not then,

(5) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.271f.

properly speaking, an exception).

"Do not put into the accusative a noun placed before (i.e. a preceding noun), as one sometimes does with negation: but choose the accusative if this circumstance presents itself.

"(The case concerned takes place when one says by inversion ما جاني إلا زيدًا أحد, 'no one came to me except Zaid'. Ibn Mālik observes that, in this circumstance, one can put the noun which expresses the thing excepted in the accusative, or make it agree in case as a permutative, بدل , with the noun which expresses the generality, but that it is better to use the accusative).

"If a term preceding إلا is apt to govern that which is after, it is as if إلا were not there.

"Deprived of influence, إلا serving to strengthen; e.g. لا تسرّ بهم إلا الفتى إلا الصلاة, 'do not pass by either of them except the man except al-'Alā'.

"(The particle of exception إلا can be repeated without having any influence and without indicating a new thing excepted, or, on the contrary, to indicate a new thing excepted. In the first case ... the second إلا exercises no influence and one carries on as if this particle had been omitted. Thus, just as one would say ما سررتُ بهم إلا أخاك زيدًا, 'I did not pass by them except your brother Zaid', one would also say ما سررتُ بهم إلا أخاك إلا زيدًا, 'I did not pass by them

except your brother except Zaid'. It is good to note here that Ibn Mālik has chosen his example badly, for the words *العك* and *الفتى*, being only virtually declined, one can doubt if they represent here the genitive or the accusative).

"If *إلا* is repeated, but not to strengthen, in the case of a vacant influence, let the governing word influence only one of the nouns excepted by *إلا*, without letting it dispense with putting the rest in the accusative. For want of vacancy and with the advancement of the thing excepted, always use the accusative: use the accusative also where there is postponement, but then use one of the excepted nouns in the same way as if the other were not there, e.g.,

لم يفوا إلا امرؤ إلا عليًا, 'they have not kept their word except a man except 'Alī', and their rule, relatively to the sense, is that which governs the first of them.

"(It is here a question of the case where *إلا* is repeated, not only by manner of pleonasm, but as expressing in the event a new exception. One must here make a distinction between the exception which is *مفترن* and that which is *تام*. If it is *مفترن*, one of the words which express the things excepted must be put in the case in which would have been put the *مستثنى منه*, if it had been expressed: the others must prove the influence of *إلا*, that is to say, must be put in the accusative: one will then say *ما ذهب إلا زيد إلا عمرًا إلا محمدًا*, 'no one went except Zaid except

'Amr except Muhammad'. If suffices that one of the nouns which express the things excepted be put in the nominative, without that falling necessarily on the first in the row, which, however, is preferable. If the exception is not *مفترني*, there is a new distinction to be made: for the *مشتني* can be placed before the *مشتني*, as *ما جاء القوم إلا زيدًا إلا بشرًا*, 'the people did not come except Zaid except a man', or after it, as *ما جاء إلا زيدًا إلا بشرًا القوم*. If the latter case takes place, the nouns of the things excepted must all be put in the accusative: one will then say *ما جاء إلا زيدًا إلا عمرًا إلا بشرًا القوم*, 'the people did not come except Zaid except Amr except a man'. If it is the former case which takes place, all the nouns which express the things excepted should be put into the accusative, except one only, which will prove or will not prove the influence of *إلا*, following the rules given above. In the example given above (*لم يفوا إلا امرؤ إلا عليًا*), the exception is not *مفترني*, because the verb *يفوا* contains a pronoun, and is the equivalent of *يفواهم*. Aschmouni* adds that, while it is permitted to make the noun of one of the things excepted (without any regard to the place which each one occupies) agree in case with the *مشتني*, usage, however, gives the preference in this case to the noun placed first. The second part of this verse signifies that, when *إلا* is thus repeated, the exception is either negative or affirmative for all the things excepted, provided that it is negative or affirmative

for the first).

"Except a noun in the genitive with **غَيْر** , declined with the same flexion which one attributes to the noun excepted by **إِلَّا** . With **سِوَاءُ** , **سُورَى** , **سُورَى** , do, following the most just opinion, as one does with **غَيْر** . Except, using the accusative, by means of **عَدَا** , **خَلَا** , **لَيْسَ** , and of **يَكُونُ** preceded by **لَا** . Make the genitive be governed, if you wish, after **خَلَا** and **عَدَا** : after **لَا** , make them govern the accusative, although the genitive is also found".⁽⁶⁾

Why, though, should the accusative be used in some cases, and what is its regent? Again, thanks to the arguments of the grammar schools, we are able to see some of the Arabs' reasoning. "The Kufan school varies in its ideas as to what is the regent acting on the thing excepted in the accusative, such as **قَامَ الْقَوْمُ إِلَّا زَيْدًا** , 'the people rose except for Zaid'. Some say the regent is **إِلَّا** , as do two Basrans, Abū al-‘Abbās and al-Zajjāj. Al-Farrā' and others say **إِلَّا** is a compound of **لَا** + **إِنْ** , then **إِنْ** changed to its light form, and was assimilated with **لَا** , and they made it take an accusative in affirmation, considering it to be like **إِنْ** , and used it in negation as an **عطف** , considering it to be like **لَا** . Al-Kisā'ī (d. 805) says that the thing excepted is made accusative because its interpretation is:-
قَامَ الْقَوْمُ إِلَّا أَنْ زَيْدًا لَمْ يَقُمْ , 'the people rose, except that Zaid did not get up'. He also says that the thing excepted is

(6) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 316f.

made accusative because it resembles the مفعول . The Basrans, on the other hand, say that the thing acting on the thing excepted is the verb, or the meaning of the verb, contained in إلا .

"Kufans:- The proof that إلا is the regent is that إلا stands in the place of اِسْتَنْى , and thus when one says قام القوم إلا زيداً , the meaning is 'the people rose excluding Zaid'. And if one says اِسْتَنْى , then one must use the accusative, and likewise one does so with what takes its place (i.e. the place of the verb اِسْتَنْى). What proves that the preceding verb cannot be the regent acting on the thing excepted and making it accusative is that it is an intransitive verb, and an intransitive verb cannot act on this type of noun. This proves that the regent is إلا .

"Another thing which proves that the verb is not the regent is that, in the sentence القوم إخوانك إلا زيداً , 'the people are your brothers except for Zaid', زيداً is made accusative, yet there is no verb at all.

"Al-Farrā' says it is made accusative by إلا because the root of إلا is لا + اِنَّ , and زيداً is the اسم of اِنَّ , and لا dispenses with the خبر . The interpretation is really اِنَّ زيدا لم يقم , 'Zaid does not get up'. Then اِنَّ became the lightened form, it was assimilated with لا , and they became one word, with two different actions: the action of اِنَّ when the accusative is used in the affirmative: and the

action of لا when it becomes an عطف in the negative, and acts like حتى : it resembles two words - إلى and واو - and acts as they do; the genitive follows when it has the meaning of إلى , and it acts like واو when it is an عطف . It is quite permissible for a verb to follow it just as it is quite permissible for a verb to come after واو . Thus when one says ضربت القوم حتى زيد , 'I hit the people except Zaid', one means حتى إنتهيت إلى زيد , 'until I reached Zaid'. And one says ضربت القوم حتى زيدا when one means حتى ضربت زيدا , 'and I hit Zaid'. إلا takes the place of two words, and thus takes over the action of both of them.

"Basrans:- The regent is the verb, because the verb, even if it be basically an intransitive verb, is strengthened by إلا , and acts transitively on the thing excepted, just as some verbs are made transitive by a particle demanding the genitive, except that إلا does not act, even if it were of transitive effect, as does a particle calling for the genitive; because إلا is a word which introduces a noun and the imperfect tense of the verb, such as ما زيد إلا يقوم , 'Zaid is doing nothing but rising', or ما عمرو إلا يذهب , 'Amr is doing nothing but going', even though it may not introduce the past tense, such as ما زيد إلا قام , or ما عمرو إلا ذهب . And when the particle governs the noun and the verb it does not act on

either of them, but the lack of action does not prove a lack of transitiveness: because hamza and doubling (تَضْعِيفٌ) are transitive, and they are not regents, and this is the same as making the noun accusative in the مَفْعُولٌ مَعَهُ, such as جَاءَ الْبَرْدُ وَالطَّيَالَةُ, or اِسْتَوَى الْمَاءُ وَالْخَشَبَةُ, when the noun is made accusative by the preceding verb and by the strengthening of it by وَافٍ.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "إِلَّا stands in place of اِسْتَتْنَى, and as such acts in the same way as it does", the Basrans say there are several answers to this.

First, this transfers the meanings of words to making them wield action, and to make the meanings of words wield action is not allowed: because one says مَا زَيْدٌ قَائِمًا, 'Zaid is not standing', and this is quite sound. But if one said

نَفَيْتُ زَيْدًا قَائِمًا, 'I denied that Zaid was standing', this would be wrong. This is the case here regarding إِلَّا as meaning اِسْتَتْنَى. Also, one is not allowed to make the meanings of words wield action because particles are used in place of verbs, demanding conciseness and curtailment. And if one makes the meanings of words work, then one returns to the verbs themselves, and one annuls that meaning in conciseness and curtailment.

"Second, if the regent were إِلَّا with the meaning of اِسْتَتْنَى, then the thing excepted could be in no case but the accusative, and the nominative and the genitive would not be

permissible in a negative, such as *ما جازى أحدٌ إلا زيدٌ*, or *ما مررتُ بأحدٍ إلا زيدٌ*. This proves that having the meaning of *استثنى* is not the regent.

"Third, it is annulled by the sentence *قام القوم غير زيدٍ*, where *غير* is in the accusative, and its accusativeness must be either by the virtual meaning of *إلا*, or on its own account, or whether it is made accusative by the verb which is before it. It is false to say it is made accusative by the virtual meaning of *إلا*, because if *إلا* were intended, then the meaning would be false, because the virtual meaning would be *قام القوم إلا غير زيدٍ*, and this is wrong. It is also wrong to say it is accusative on its own account, And so the regent must be the preceding verb, and it is allowed to act even if it is intransitive, because *غير* is vague. Thus if one says *مررتُ برجلٍ غيرك*, 'I passed by a man apart from you', everyone apart from the 2nd person comes under the category of *غير*. And when there is this extreme vagueness it resembles the vague prepositions, such as *خلفَ*, 'behind', *أمامَ*, 'in front of', *وراءَ*, 'beyond, in front', and *تُدَامَ*, 'in front', etc., and just as the intransitive verb becomes transitive on these adverbs without an intermediary, so the same thing happens here (i.e., with *غير*).

"Fourth, why, when one supposes the virtual meaning of *استثنى*, does one make *زيداً* accusative, when, when one

supposes the virtual meaning of **إِصْتَنَفَ** , one makes **زَيْدٌ** nominative?

"Fifth, if one makes **إِلَّا** act with the meaning of **إِصْتَنَفَ** , then the proposition is two sentences, but if one makes the verb act, then the proposition is only one sentence: and it is undoubtedly preferable to have just one sentence rather than two.

"In reply to the Kufans' assertion that "the preceding verb is intransitive and may not be the regent" the Basrans say this verb, even if it is intransitive, is transitive by the power of **إِلَّا** .

"Then in reply to the Kufans' statement that "what proves that the verb is not the regent is the sentence **إِلَّا زَيْدًا** , when **زَيْدًا** is made accusative, and there is no verb there to make it accusative", the Basrans say that the thing which makes it accusative is the verbal meaning in **إِخْوَانُكَ** , because the virtual meaning is

إِلَّا زَيْدًا , 'the people befriend you except Zaid'. Here **إِلَّا** strengthens the conjectured verb and joins it to **زَيْدٌ** and makes it accusative.

"As for the statement of al-Farrā' about" **إِلَّا** being an assimilation of **لَا + إِنَّ** , the Basrans say this is a lone claim in need of proof, and there cannot possibly be any information about it except by revelation and messages, and there is no means of access to these. Thus if it were as he

asserts, then it must not have any action, because when **أَنْ** is lightened to **أَنَّ**, its action is annulled. Likewise with any two words joined together, each loses the law which it had when it stood alone, and in combination they have a new rule. Al-Farrā' states that, even in combination, each of the two particles retains the action it had before being combined. As for its resemblance to **حَتَّى**, this is far-fetched; because **حَتَّى** is one word and not a compound of two words, and has the action of two words in two different states.

"As for the statement of al-Kisā'ī that "the thing excepted is made accusative because the real interpretation is **إِلَّا أَنْ زَيْدًا لَمْ يَقُمْ**", the Basrans say it must either be that the cause of the accusative is **لَمْ** which acts, or **أَنْ**. If one wishes the cause of the accusative to be **لَمْ** which acts, this is annulled by the sentence **قَامَ زَيْدٌ لَا عَمْرُو**, 'Zaid, not 'Amr, got up'. If one wishes **أَنْ** to be the cause of the accusative, then both its **اسم** and its **حبر** are in the virtual meaning of the **اسم**: for it is essential that some regent must be assumed to act on it. Some grammarians state that in the statement of al-Kisā'ī the virtual meaning is in the meaning of the sentence and not in its regent. His statement goes back to the saying of the Basrans.

"As for what is related that "the thing excepted is accusative because it resembles a **مفعول**", this also

clöselly approximates to the saying of the Basrans, because there is no regent necessitating the accusative except the preceding verb".(7)

CONCLUSIONS

استثنى presents us with certain problems. We see that there are two types of exceptive sentences: those which are positive and those which are negative. One also finds a sub-division of these in the sentence in which the thing excepted discontinues the idea of the sentence.

One type we can deal with immediately. In the negative sentence, the grammarians tell us that the thing excepted goes into the case of the generality, or, put another way, the word after لا does not change from the case it had before the لا was appended. However, if the generality is not mentioned, the word excepted goes into the case in which the generality would have been. The Arab grammarians' explanation for this is that the noun excepted is a بدل , or substitute, of the generality, and so goes into the same case. This explanation would appear quite sound, but there is one flaw. When the excepted word precedes the thing from which it is excepted, it cannot be a بدل , as the grammarians did not allow a بدل to precede its مبدل منه . In cases such as this the excepted word always goes into the accusative, whether the sentence be positive or negative. In negative sentences, لا is regarded simply as a particle with no influence.

(7) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.167f.

We encounter some difficulty, however, when we come to the positive sentence which contains an exception. The rule agreed here by the grammarians is that the noun excepted goes into the accusative: it is not part of what precedes it and so cannot be a *بدل*. They say that the regent acting on the accusative is what precedes it. The Kufans and Basrans disagree as to what this regent might be. One Kufan view is that *لا* is a compound of *لا* + *لا*, and so governs in the way in which *لا* does. (It is interesting to note here that the Basrans try to refute this by saying that this cannot be the case, since the shortened form of *لا* - which is thought to be used in *لا* - cannot wield influence, when it was they who stated (as was seen towards the end of the chapter on *لا* and its sisters) that the shortened form could still govern the accusative). If this is the case, why does *لا* govern the accusative when the sentence is positive, and yet allow the nominative or genitive, as well as the accusative, when the sentence is negative? If *لا* is derived from *لا* + *لا*, then it would logically have to govern the same case all the time.

A further Kufan view is that one must understand by *لا* the verb *استثنى* governing a direct object (we are still concerned only with positive sentences). As was mentioned in connection with the *لا* + *لا* interpretation, and as the Basrans point out, if the verb *استثنى* were understood, then the accusative would again have to be used in all instances,

whether the sentence be positive or negative.

The Basrans claim that the word excepted is made accusative by the transitivity of the main verb, which governs an accusative by the force of *إِلا* . But in condemning the Kufans, the Basrans automatically condemn themselves: if the main verb, by the mediation of *إِلا* , governs the noun excepted in the accusative, then it too would have to govern the accusative in all instances, positive or negative.

Having examined the arguments of the Kufans and Basrans, let us now turn to the explanations of the grammarians from whom information has been drawn. They offer two explanations. The first is that one must understand *ولكن* - but if this were so, then surely one must understand *ولكن* in all instances, and so the accusative would be necessitated all the time. The second is that the accusative is used because the thing excepted is not part of what went before, and cannot therefore be a *بـ* , - a view which seems doubtful.

The grammarians then tell us that if the thing excepted discontinues the idea of the sentence, then the thing excepted is accusative as it is different from the generality. This also appears to be a false way of looking at the sentence: just because the word is different, why should it be accusative, and not nominative or genitive?

So far we have seen the flaws in the theories of the Arabs, but we still lack an alternative explanation which is completely sound. What, if any, is the sound alternative?

Several factors give the impression that the usage after the exceptive particle *لا* is yet another example of an anomaly. However, another explanation can be formed, if we examine more closely certain of the points made by the grammarians. One clue can be found when they say that, even in a negative sentence, instead of using the nominative or genitive, where applicable, the noun excepted may always be in the accusative. A second clue is to be found in the other words of exception, some of which are verbs. It seems probable that the noun excepted after *لا* is a further use of the direct object after an understood verb which is contained in *لا* : in this respect the view of the Kufans is quite acceptable, imagining this verb to be *استثنى*, or one of similar meaning, despite the arguments of the Basrans to condemn this theory.

THE DEPTH OF THE ARABS' THOUGHT

Having seen what the grammarians had to say about the different uses of the accusative, an attempt must now be made to establish just how logical was the thought they put into their system of grammatical analysis, and how deeply they explored their language. Did they look only for the ظواهر , the externals, or did they carry out more than a cursory analysis? While this work deals specifically with the accusative, it is necessary to a certain extent to look at the grammar as a whole in trying to answer these questions.

The Arabs were faced with no easy task in analysing their grammar, and this is especially true of their examination of the accusative, which covers such a wide range of uses. But, unfortunately, the impression is given that, in tackling this task, the depth of their thought, while it was considerable, was not very conclusive in a number of cases. It must, however, be stated in the Arabs' defence that they had several awkward problems with which to contend. If we say that the Arabs were not completely convincing in their analysis, we must add that they were certainly no worse than contemporary Western nations. It would be easy to condemn the Arabs in the light of modern grammatical knowledge, but in their age, even though they were poorly equipped to carry it out, their method of analysis was of at least an equal standard with that of other nations. It must in fairness be admitted that, despite their

shortcomings, they did excellent work in the grammatical field. What conclusions can be drawn?

It appears that the Arabs started off by discovering a number of rules about grammar - as was stated in the Introduction, the basic facts were probably gleaned from Greek and Sanscrit influence - and then tried to fill in these rules to agree with what happened in their language. The Arabs revered their language since it was the vehicle for God's revelation, and, as we have seen, they had to find a reason for its syntax, and especially for the seeming imperfections. In finding this reason the grammarians used one of two criteria: taking some question of their grammar, they argued that it was either like something else - in which case it followed the same pattern because it was similar; or else it was different - in which case they argued that it was different in order to be distinguished from something else. The arguments of the grammar schools of Kufa and Basra illustrate both these points admirably. One might say that by using this method the Arab grammarians would appear to be "playing safe", but some of the resultant arguments show that this method has grave deficiencies. Sībawayh, whom the Arabs regard as being the greatest grammarian of their language, himself used this system, although he was not a blind slave to it: he was not satisfied to explain a usage simply by saying that it was commonly used by various peoples. Though

the Arabs regard him as being the great master, and both follow his example and borrow from his work, he appears to have certain faults which were also to be transmitted to his successors. For him there had to be an explanation for everything, and it is for this reason that his explanations are so detailed as to be complicated. Yet it will be noticed that he is comparatively the least quoted of the grammarians whose works have been studied for this thesis, and this may well be because he gave rules to cover the various aspects of the usages, but rarely gave a good explanation as to why a particular matter is used in such-and-such a way. In his effort to explain how everything worked he also had a habit of illustrating by analogy, and finished up by having a false analogy or a non sequitur. Later grammarians adopted this fault to a greater or lesser degree, and sometimes tended to argue round the point. It can also be seen that some of the grammarians - and this is especially noticeable in the arguments and discussions reported by Ibn al-Anbārī - used negative arguing, and when dealing with certain points they tended to give negative excuses rather than positive reasons, trying to explain certain things away. Repeat mention must, however, be made of a point which was made in some of the conclusions on the various uses of the accusative. The Arabs were faced with certain difficulties when they encountered anomalies. In certain instances they possibly recognised that they were in fact faced with anomalies - this can be seen

in the views of the Basrans on the question of the use of the nominative for the singular definite noun addressed (vocative).

Arabic grammar has been analysed using only three cases, and as the grammarians had the external signs of only three cases, they had to make everything fit into one of these cases, and consequently some accusative usages might be accusative simply for the lack of another case. (On this question of the external signs of only three cases, comparison could well be made with Latin, where the same termination may serve to denote two or even three cases: such a comparison might lend weight to the views of those scholars who claim that there might at one time have been other cases in Arabic employing one or other of the three primary vowels). This does not, however, vindicate the Arabs completely, since certain of the uses could obviously have been something else, capable of falling within a three case structure. For instance, *حال* could well have been in apposition to the thing it described, as it is when it is indefinite, and *تسبب* could have remained a genitive, as it obviously was originally, as could the *مفعول له*.

A further point, coupled with the accusative, is the Arabs' mistake in confusing the accusative case with the subjunctive mood. Admittedly, both have the same vowel, but they are far from similar grammatically.

Some of the terminology used raises doubts about the depth of the Arabs' thought. For example, they employ three different

terms to denote the subject - **فاعل** and **مبتدأ** , **اسم** - ;
(the chapter on terminology showed when each was used).

While each is used in a slightly different way, they could surely have used one standard term.

The question of the word **مفعول** is a further example. Why should certain of the uses of the accusative have the title of a **مفعول** , and not others? The Arabs regard all the uses of the accusative as being dependent on a verb, either directly or indirectly, and since a **مفعول** is something affected by a **فعل** , why do they not refer to others of the uses as a **مفعول** ?

Another factor which throws light on the Arabs' way of thinking is this whole question of the verb. We have seen that they are incapable of conceiving of any accusative without there being a verb there somewhere. This leads us to consider again the question of the **عامل** , the regent, and of the power which binds cases together. It seems strange - if not almost paradoxical - that a **بدل** may not precede its **بدل منه** (from the Arab point of view), where the link is what we in the West would regard as being one of the strongest possible - that of apposition: and yet to their way of thinking a verb which is intransitive has the power to govern an accusative, which should perhaps not necessarily be an accusative at all. The Arabs would then argue that it is not really possible for influence to work backwards

through a sentence; but if this is so, how does the verb in a verbal sentence know the gender of the subject?

Further, we see examples of the Arabs allowing alternative cases for some usages - this is most noticeable when they discuss *استثنا* - and this suggests that they had not any conclusive ideas on certain topics. Their arguments that in some usages alternative cases are possible - for example from the Arab viewpoint a preceding direct object may be either nominative or accusative - seem quite sound to their way of thinking; but for them to say of certain usages rather as an afterthought that "such-and-such a case may also be used" would suggest that they were not quite certain themselves.

On the topic of alternative cases a point made in two of the conclusions earlier - the *مفعول به* and the *مفعول فيه* - could well be repeated. Where the object, or the word of time/place comes first, it may be nominative, as a *مبتدأ*. But surely, if, as the grammarians say, when it is accusative it is governed by a verb, then it should be accusative all the time: one cannot imagine the verbal influence to be present only at certain times and not at others. If the Arabs imagined a verbal influence, then they might have been expected to imagine it all the time.

Some of the Arabs are also seen to be badly confused over the question of *كان*, as to whether its *خبر* was a *حال*.

After the rigid rules they laid down for حال , by no stretch of the imagination can the خبر be deemed a حال - as others of the grammarians pointed out. It is the arguments of the Kufans and Basrans especially that give the impression that the Arab grammarians did not all think very shrewdly about their system of analysis, since one party was so easily able to refute the arguments of the other.

It must be admitted, however, that the system formed and used by the Arabs was workable, despite its deficiencies, since it has lasted to the present day, and is still taught to Arab children in schools. Where the Arabs failed mainly was in trying so hard to show some homogeneity by attempting to relate all the uses which had a similar vowel ending. It is in the accusative, owing to its wide range of uses that these deficiencies are brought into clearest relief.

Before we leave the topic of the depth of the Arabs' thought, brief mention may be made of the influence which one grammarian may have had on another, and the similarity of the wording of different authors. The intention in this thesis has not been to quote from the grammarians in chronological order, but to try to build up the picture in each chapter: but even from this it can be seen that the ideas are very similar from one writer to the next. Indeed, one author sometimes quotes his predecessors, so obviously this

influence was quite strong. (In Arabic, to quote one's predecessors was not regarded as a blatant form of plagiarism). Naturally, where two different authors hold differing views there is a difference in wording, but when they agree - as they usually do - the ideas are very similar, and so usually is the basic wording: "basic", because there is obviously a large discrepancy in the amount of treatment given to the various uses of the accusative amongst different authors. Compare - or rather should we say contrast - the 1,000 lines of Ibn Mālik with almost as many pages of Sībawayh. As a broad generalisation one might say that the more any author wrote, the more illustrations he gave: the basic sentences were not affected. Where illustrations are concerned, it is very noticeable that many almost identical examples are given by most of the authors. The grammar schools naturally sought lines of poetry in support of their views, but the main grammarians from whose works the material has been drawn have used the same illustrations - we might almost refer to them as the "stock phrases".

Early in this thesis we traced the development of Classical Arabic from the mother proto-Semitic. It might be well if, as a concluding section, we were to see briefly the course which Arabic has taken up to the present day. Unlike Latin, which became divided into different languages, Arabic

became divided only into different dialects. The changes which have occurred may be divided into three main headings: phonology, vocabulary, and grammar. It is to the changes in grammar that we shall give our attention. These changes are most noticeable in the case endings, where there has been a simplification of what we have seen in the previous pages to be a very elaborate system. All the dialects of colloquial Arabic resemble one another in that practically all final vowels disappear. A final vowel may, however, be used if the following word begins with هَمْزَةُ الرَّصْلِ.

Nunation disappears altogether except in a few isolated adverbial usages, such as حَالًا, "at once", أَحْيَانًا, "sometimes", and تَقْرِيبًا, "approximately". In the dual and sound masculine plural, only the oblique forms are used. For the most part, the object case is denoted only by position, the object following the subject; in modern Arabic this position is very commonly emphasized by placing the subject before the verb and the object after it.

Turning to changes other than those affecting the case endings, we find that the demonstrative pronouns are simplified, shortened or otherwise modified. Also, several of the particles governing the accusative, such as اِنَّ and اِنَّ, are no longer used, and this factor may have contributed towards the gradual disappearance of the accusative.

Thus we see the changes which have taken place, and the

decay which has set in. Much of the decay affects only the spoken language, for the written language is still Classical Arabic. But for the written language - even though it has undergone some changes - there is ever present the supreme model of Arabic par excellence, which through centuries has managed to keep Arabic constant. This supreme model is the Koran, the language of God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABBOTT, N. "Rise of the North Arabic Script". O.I.P., vol. 50, Chicago, 1938.
- ABU ṬAYĪB. "Marātib al-Nahawiyīn". Cairo, 1955.
- IBN AJARUM. "Al-Adjrumieh". Text & trans., Perowne. Cambridge, 1852.
- IBN AL-ANBĀRĪ. "Al-Inṣāf fī Masā'il al-Khilāf". Ed., 'Abd al-Ḥamīd. 1945.
- IBN 'AQĪL. "Sharḥ Ibn 'Aqīl 'ala Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik". Ed., 'Abd al-Ḥamīd. 1960.
- BRAVMANN, M.M. "Studies in Arabic and General Syntax". Le Caire, 1953.
- CARRA DE VAUX. "Les Penseurs de L'Islam". Paris, 1921. Vol. 1.
- CHAIM RABIN. "Ancient West Arabian". London, 1951.
- CHAKRAVARTI, P. "The Linguistic Speculations of the Hindus". Calcutta, 1933.
- CHENERY, T. "The Arabic Language". A Lecture, 1868. Macmillan.
- COLLART, J. "Varron, Grammarien Latin". Paris, 1954.
- DAVIDSON, A.B. "Hebrew Syntax". 3rd edition, Edinburgh, 1902.
- DERENBOURG, H. "Le Livre de Sibawayh". Paris, 1881.
- DE SACY, S. "Alfiyya". Commentary, Paris, 1833.
- DILLMAN, A. & BEZOLD, C. "Ethiopic Grammar". London, 1907.
- ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM. Brill, Leyden, 1913.
- FLEISCH, H. "Introduction a l'étude des Langues Semitiques". Paris, 1947.
- FÜCK, J. "'Arabīya. Recherches sur l'histoire de la langue et du style arabe". Tr. C. Denizeau, Paris 1955.
- GESENIUS (KAUTZSCH). "Hebrew Grammar". 2nd English edition. Oxford, 1910.

- GRAY, L.H. "Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics".
New York, 1934.
- ‘ABD AL-LATĪF HAMZA. "Al-Harakāt al-Fikrīya fī Miṣr
fī l-‘Asrain al-Ayyubi wa’l-Mamlūki
al-Awwal". Cairo, 1947.
- HAYWOOD, J.A. "Arabic Lexicography". Leiden, 1960.
- HAYWOOD, J.A. "A new Arabic Grammar". London, 1962.
- HIRSCHFELD, H. "Literary History of Jewish Grammarians and
Lexicographers". Oxford, 1926.
- IBN HISHĀM. "Qaṭr al-Nadā’". - "La Pluie de Rosée". Trans.,
Goguyer. Leiden, 1887.
- HOWELL, M.S. "Grammar of the Classical Arabic Language".
Allahabad, 1883.
- HUART, C. "Arabic Literature". London, 1903.
- AL-IBRASHI. "Lughat al-‘Arab wa kaifa Nanhaḍ biha".
Cairo, 1947.
- AL-JAUHARI. "Tāj al-Lugha wa Siḥah al-‘Arabiyya". Bulāk
ed..1292 A.H.
- JEFFREY, A. "Materials for the History of the Text of the
Our ān" Leiden, 1937.
- JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY. Vol. 60, 1940.
- IBN KHALDUN. "The Muqadimmah". Trans., Rosenthal.
London, 1958. Vol. 3.
- IBN KHALLIKAN. "Biographical Dictionary". Trans. De Slane.
Paris, 1843.
- SIDDIQ ḤAṢAN KHAN. "Al-Bulgha fī Usūl al-Lugha".
Iṣṭanbul, 1296.
- IBN MADĀ AL-KURTUBI. "Kitāb al-Radd ‘ala al-Nuḥāt".
Cairo, 1947.
- LANE, E.W. "Arabic - English Lexicon". New York, 1955/56.
- MACHUEL, L. "Vocabulaire des Principaux Termes Techniques
de la Grammaire Arabe". Tunis, 1908.

- IBN MĀLIK. "Alfiyya". Trans., Goguyer. Beirut, 1888.
- IBN MANZUR. "Lisān al-‘Arab". Beirut, 1955.
- MEILLET. "Les Langues du Monde".
- NASIF ALI AL-NAJDI. "Sībawayh, Imām al-Nuhā". Cairo, 1953.
- AL-NASHSHAR. "Al-Mantiq al-Sūrī mundhu Aristū".
Alexandria, 1955.
- NICHOLSON, R.A. "A Literary History of the Arabs".
Cambridge, 1953.
- NÖLDEKE, T. "Syriac Grammar", Tr. Crichton, London, 1904.
- O'LEARY, DE L. "Comparative Grammar of the Semitic
Languages". London, 1923.
- O'LEARY, DE L. "How Greek Science passed to the Arabs".
London, 1948.
- ORIENTALIA. N.S. Vol. 27, 1958.
- AL-QIFTĪ. "Inbāh al-Ruwāt ‘ala Anbah al-Nuḥāt". Ed., Muḥ
Abu l-Faḍl Ibrahīm. 1950.
- RECKENDORF, H. "Arabische Syntax". Heidelberg, 1921.
- ROBINS, R.H. "Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory
in Europe". London, 1951.
- SĪBAWAYH. "Kitāb". Būlak edition, 1316.
- SMYTH, H.W. "Greek Grammar". Cambridge, 1956.
- STERLING, R. "A Grammar of the Arabic Language". London,
1904.
- AL-SUYUTI. "Bughyat al-Wu'āh fī Tabaqāt al-Lughawiyīn
wa'l-Nuhāh". Cairo, 1326 A.H.,
- AL-SUYUTI. "Al-Muzhir fī ‘Ulūm al-Lugha". ?
- AL-TAUHIDI. "Al-Muqabasāt". Ed., Ḥasan al-Sandūbī. 1929.
- VARRO. "De Lingua Latina". Trans., Collart. Paris, 1954.
- VON SODEN, W. "Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik".
Rome, 1952.

WRIGHT, W. "Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages".
Cambridge, 1890.

NASIF AL-YĀZIJĪ. "Faṣl al-Khitāb fī Usūl Lughat al-‘Arab".
Beirut, 1887.

JURJI ZAIDAN. "Al-Falsafat al-Lughawiyya wa'l-Alfāz
al-‘Arabiyya". Ed., Murad Kamil, 195?

AL-ZAJJĀJĪ. "Al-Jumal". Mohammed ben Cheneb. Paris, 1957.

AL-ZAMAKHSHARĪ. "Al-Mufaṣṣal". Alexandria, 1291. A.H.