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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 ُنَصْبَةُ 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

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 rules 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 Sibawayh 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

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 Sibawayh 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 philologers 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 Abü 1-Aswad al-Du'alî (d. 69 A.H., aged 85), a man who fought for 'Ali at the battle of Šiffîn, and a mediocre poet ... (The Spanish lexicographer Abu Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusain al-Zadaidi) begins (his "Tabaqāt al-Naḥawiyyīn wa l-Lughawiyyīn) with an account of Abu 1-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 1-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.
The d'être for Arabic linguistic studies was religion—it is significant that Abū l-Aswad is stated to have been a qāri', 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 accidence, 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 nunciation 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-Khali (d. 786/7) is founded on fact. The vowel signs of this system are simply the corresponding vowel-letters: in the case of qamma 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 ١.

"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

to provide an answer: did the Arabs really think deeply about their system of grammatical analysis, or did they go only for the طواف، 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 "الكتاب", 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-Kisāʾī, 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-Jumal 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 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 جار الله, "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 Imam 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'ubiyya tendencies. (The bolder spirits among the Shu'ubites, not content with claiming an equal position, argued that the Arabs were absolutely inferior to the Persians and other peoples. The Shu'ubites 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 Malik, 1203/4-1274. Ibn Malik was considered a great philologist, whose reputation almost overshadowed that
of Sibawayh. 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 XX Arabiya — 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

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

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: -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-a-u(ni) &gt; -au(ni)</td>
<td>-ā(na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a-i(ni) &gt; -ai(ni)</td>
<td>-ā(na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a-a(ni) &gt; -ā(ni)</td>
<td>-ā(na)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the feminine the system is somewhat different: -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>-at-u</td>
<td>-at-a-u(ni) &gt; -atau(ni)</td>
<td>-āt-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>-at-i</td>
<td>-at-a-i(ni) &gt; -atai(ni)</td>
<td>-āt-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>-at-a</td>
<td>-at-a-a(ni) &gt; -atā(ni)</td>
<td>-āt-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the origins of these different cases, and how did they come to have this system of vowelling? 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.
(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 ﺑِﻴﺘَا 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 ﺔ 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 `Lo as an indefinite affix in Arabic in the so-called ل.., i.e. ما appended to an indefinite noun with a vague, often intensifying force; e.g. تَلَعَتْ ما, "give us some book (or other)", or تَلَعَتْ لَعْبًا ما, "some (small) quantity", or تَلَعَتْ لَمْرًا 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 لِمْ، يَمِّهُ، حَتَّى مَ، عَلَى مَ, shortened into (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.
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.

the most marked representative of a new manner in Semitic:
certain liberties, certain uncertainties, certain indetermina-
tions 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 'Arabiya, 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 "Arabiya". (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, 'Arabiya. Recherches sur l'histoire de la langue
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 'Arabiya 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 'Arabiya 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 'Arabiya in its purity. This process of preserving the purity was helped by the rising classes of non-Arab Muslims (mawāli) 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) Jahiz, "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 ثَقَّلَ أَلْكَافُبُ, "he read the book". When the noun is indefinite the final letter is nūnated, and the nūnation is appended to an alif,
as in "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 "God made a decree"; there is one exception to this rule - the word "thing", takes an alif, as in "I did not see anything"; and (b) when the final letter is a tā marbūta, the feminine ending, as in "I saw a ship". The above rules apply only to those words which are fully declined. Certain words by their nature are 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 nunciation, 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 "İna", as in "I met the scribes", and the feminine accusative is "ätin" when indefinite, as in "I saw some maid-servants", and "äti" when definite, as in "I saw the maid-servants".
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 لَفْظُ , This is the noun of the verb لَفْظُ , meaning "to eject" or "to disgorge (something from the mouth)". Hence the word لَفْظُ 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، فَعْلُ , from the verb فَعَلُ meaning "to do (something)", and this is the thing which actually carries out some action. There is secondly the noun، مَنْطَقَةٌ . The actual meaning of the word مَنْطَقَةٌ , 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-Nunāwīy, the مَنْطَقَةٌ 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 لَعَنُّ , "to be high, be raised", because the مَنْطَقَةٌ 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 يُحَرَّفُ, 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 يُحَرَّفُ 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 صحبة, derived from the verb صحَّ , "to speak to", from which we also get صحّة meaning "a word". صحّة 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
fals that which begins with the particle ْنِرَأْ , even though ْنِرَأْ 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 ْفِضْلِي. There is firstly the ْفِضْلِي , 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 ْفِضْلِي may also be translated as the "subject", but it is used only of the group of words of the ْفِضْلِي family, which, in Western termination, take a predicate, and not an object, and words of the ْنِرَأْ family, which closely resemble ْنِرَأْ , and also take a predicate. The second term derived from ْفِضْلِي is the ْمَفْضُولِي, 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 ْفِضْلِي we have the terms ْمَتْبَدَأْ and ْخَبْرُ. The word ْمَتْبَدَأْ is the participle of the verb ْنِرَأْ , "to begin with, to make to be first". The
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 َكَبُرُ. 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 َكَبُرُ, the predicate of the nominative attributive verb َكَانَ and the like.

Arabic has only three cases. The term for the nominative is َرَفَعُ, which is the infinitive of the verb َرَفَعُ, "to raise", elevate". َرَفَعُ 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 َسَمَّى. The genitive is called the َبَعْرُ, from the verb َبَعْرُ, "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 َكَسِّي. Finally, the accusative, َضَبُّ, the case with which this work is concerned which has the vowel َضِبَّ. There are several meanings to the verb َضَبَّ. Some of these are "to set up, to set up as
a mark/sign", or نصب, "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 نصب, 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 نصب 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 نصب. In

(1) From a letter from Mr. N.E. Collinge, Lecturer in Classics in the Durham Colleges.
the sentence "he wrote/pronounced the (final) letter with ", the explanation given is that the word 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 is making something accurate or perfect. The verb presumably falls on the and completes its action.

All these things together give us a language, with the grammar of which we are concerned. The word for grammar is from the verb meaning "to go towards". means "he followed the same course", and hence may be translated as "manner, intention", or even "system". The "Lisān al-‘Arab" tells us that the word 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 the regent. It was stated earlier that this work is concerned with trying to establish why the
accusative should be used, and the ُعَامِلَ is of the utmost importance in this respect. The word itself is the active participle of the verb ُعَامِلُ, 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 ُعَامِلَ, "the regent". In a sentence of normal arrangement, the first word is usually thought not to be subject to ُعَامِلَ - i.e. the powers of influence of the ُعَامِلَ. The word affected by the ُعَامِلَ is known as its مَضْمُولٍ. We will see much more of the influence of the ُعَامِلَ 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 externals: conclusions will be given at the end.

The most obvious use of the accusative is as the direct object of the verb, or the، so we shall deal with this first. The immediate question is why it should be called the مفعولٌ بِهِ: we have already seen the word مفعولٌ explained, but why مفعولٌ? Obviously some word other than just مفعولٌ was needed to distinguish this from the other types of accusative bearing the name of مفعولٌ. مفعولٌ is essentially the preposition of the agent, whereas the object is something to or upon which something is done - one might almost call it مفعولٌ عليه. As SIbawayh was the first to use this terminology (as far as is known), can we detect in the use of the Persian particle بِ - as we have seen, SIbawayh 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 بِ: (this is not to be confused with ۰۱).

About the direct object SIbawayh says: "
"Abdullah hit Zaid". 'يَلَّاَهَنَّ يُذَلِّ.plot' is made accusative since it is as the action of the verb passes on and affects it. It is acted upon by the direct action (فعل ) 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:-  ضرَبَتُ زِيدٍا, "I hit Zaid". (3)

Al-Zamakhsharī further adds of the مفعول مب: "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)

(2) Ibn Hishām, La Pluie de Rosée, Trans. Goguyer, Leyden, 1887.
(3) Ibid., p.218.
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 نابع, such as ضرب زيد مصرًا, "Zaid hit 'Amr". Some say that the ملّ is the regent. Hishām ibn Mu‘awiya (d. 824/5) says that in the sentence ظنت زيدا تانيًا, "I thought Zaid was standing", زيدا is made accusative by the ملّ, and ظنت by the ظن. The Basrans, however, state that the verb alone acts on both the ملّ and the مفعول.

"Kufans: We say that the thing acting on an accusative مفعول is both the فعل and the نابع, because there cannot be a مفعول except after a فعل and a نابع, be it actually expressed (لاقطة), or understood (تقرير): since the فعل and the نابع are in place of the one thing ...... And when the فعل and the نابع 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 (المفعول). And since something can legally come between them, this proves that it is not along the regent: the regent is the فعل and the نابع."
"Basrans:— The regent which makes the مفعول accusative is the فعال by itself without the فاعل: this is because we agree on the fact that the فعال 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 فعال 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 ِنَّ! It is agreed by both sides that one may say مَعَ الدَّارُ زَيَّدًا, "Zaid is in the house", or رَبّيُّ لَدَيْنَا إِنَّا إِنَّا, "we have fetters". The noun is made accusative by ِنَّ! , 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

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:-

"I saw Zaid and spoke to 'Amr",

"I saw Zaid and passed by 'Abdullah",

"I met Quais and took Bakr's father", and "I met Khālid 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:-

"He introduces whom He wishes into His mercy, and as for the unjust, He has prepared for them a painful chastisement", or "I was your brother, and as for Zaid, I was his brother as well". When the object precedes the verb one can say "I hit Zaid", regarding Zaid as
a صبدأ and therefore nominative. If one adds a further clause, "I hit Zaid and freed Hasan", or صبدأ صبدأ, one can regard حن in the nominative as a second صبدأ, or حن in the accusative as referring back to the صبدأ of حن. When one regards the noun as a صبدأ, then the verb and reflexive pronoun form the صبدأ. 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:-

"hit Zaid", "hit Khalid's father", "as for 'Amr, buy him a cloak", "as for Bakr, do not pass by him." (7)

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

صبدأ ضربت، صبدأ ضربت, "I hit Zaid", which really is صبدأ صبدأ ضربت, except that one does not put it in and lets the تفسير suffice. Likewise one says صبدأ "I met Zaid's brother", and صبدأ "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-Zamakhshari, 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 رأيتُ عبدَ الله وَزِيدًا صرِحَ به, "I saw 'Abdullah and passed by Zaid", or (b) when the noun falls after a particle of interrogation, as لم تَعْبَدَنِه صَرِيح, "did you hit 'Abdullah"."(9) It seems rather paradoxical that al-Zamakhsharī should quote Sibawayh, 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 السَّاءَ شَرَطَتْ السَّاءَ, "I drank the water", or السَّاءَ شَرَطَتْ السَّاءَ. 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.
"Zaid got up, and I honoured Muhammad". We see that the second part of his statement agrees entirely with Sibawayh.

Ibn Hishām, writing some centuries later, agrees with, and enlarges upon, the statements of his predecessors: "In the expressions 'I hit Zaid', 'I hit Zaid's brother', and 'I passed by Zaid', one can put 'Zaid' in the nominative, considering it as an independent noun with what follows it as its object; 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) 'I hit Zaid', on account of the trend of order, prohibition or request, (ii) 'He made blessings for you', on account of concordance, and (iii) 'have we examined a single man amongst us?' or 'I have not seen Zaid', on account of the habitual use of the verb here. The accusative is necessary in cases like 'if you meet Zaid, honour him', and '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, and . The nominative is necessary in cases like 'I went out, and there was 'Amr beating Zaid', on account of the impossibility

of using a verb, since the regent can act only on a nominal proposition. Both accidents of flexion are equally applicable in "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 to a preceding noun, i.e. 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, is put into the nominative to make a second nominal proposition. If, however, one regards it as verbal, 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 "I hit Zaid": "Kufans: - is made accusative by the influence of the verb falling on the . Basrans: - it is accusative by the action of the understood verb and its virtual sense is , "I hit Zaid I hit him. "Kufans: - The refers back to , and as the is accusative, then so is . They give in support of their theory the examples , "I honoured your father Zaid", and , "I hit your brother ‘Amr".

"Basrans:— The Kufans' argument is false. In the sentence يدأ , أكرست إباك يدأ is a بدل and this is quite permissible because it follows the thing of which it is the بدل: بدل; بدل منه ; and this is quite permissible because it follows the thing of which it is the بدل: بدل; بدل منه ; and thus it cannot be a بدل. The regent in the بدل is not the regent in the بدل: بدل منه is in the virtual sense of the repetition in the بدل . The proof of this is its manifestation ( ) in the بدل: بدل منه ; just like its manifestation in the بدل: بدل منه . In this case the regent of the بدل is not the regent of the بدل.

Yet it is to Ibn Malik, with the aid of De Sacy's commentary 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 prevents 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 إن and حينما .

"(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 mediately on a pronoun placed behind the verb, and which relates to a preceding noun. This is what happens, for example, if, instead of saying ُأَذْهَبَ بِصَمْرٍ إِذَا يُهَبُّ، "hit Zaid", and ُأَذْهَبَ بِصَمْرٍ إِذَا يُهَبُّ, "bring 'Amr", one says ُأَذْهَبَ بِصَمْرٍ إِذَا يُهَبُّ, ُأَذْهَبَ بِصَمْرٍ إِذَا يُهَبُّ. 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 ُعَلِمْتُ ما ضَرَّ، "I did not hit Zaid", and ُعَلِمْتُ ما ضَرَّ, "I speak to 'Amr", putting the nouns in the nominative, because the negative adverb ُعَلِمْتُ ما ضَرَّ, and the adverb of affirmation ُعَلِمْتُ ما ضَرَّ 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 ُعَلِمْتُ ما ضَرَّ and ُعَلِمْتُ ما ضَرَّ. It is also the same if, between the displaced noun and the verb, there is a particle of interrogation, like
or of condition, like ٌ، ٌ، etc., or of affirmation, like ُ، or of negation like ا، or of excitation, like ُ، 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), one must understand a command, a prohibition, or a vow, دعاء، سبب، or امر. Thus one must say "honour Zaid", زيداً ارحبه, "do not kill 'Amr", اللهُ عبدك ارحمه, "oh God have pity on your servant". In saying, 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, إسنّى، the negations ا and ُ، and the particle ْجاج. In all these cases the accusative must be preferred to the nominative. It is then suitable to say أريد أتلقن، "have you killed Zaid?"; ما عمرو لقيناه، "we have not met 'Amr", حين طلحة تلقاه خلص عليه, "wherever you meet Taḥāa greet him". It is also good to remark that if, in the cases which concern it, one uses for interrogation the particle ُ، 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, 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, "Zaid came and I made 'Amr go out", "I met Bishr and I saw Khālid".

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

"If the adjoined noun follows a verb acting as a 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 "Zaid died", that is to say, of those propositions which one calls . If after having said one adds "and God conserved 'Amr, one can say at will ."

"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 "I hit Zaid", "Amr came and I made 'Amr go out".
or be it mediately by the intermediary of a preposition, as in "I brought Zaid". The same syntax has place if the grammatical action of the verb, instead of being influenced on the pronoun, be it mediately or immediately, is exercised on the antecedent of a relationship of annexation, of which this pronoun is the complement, as in "I hit Zaid's brother", and "I brought Zaid's servant". The word which separates the verb and the pronoun is called . Finally, it has place if the verb exercises its grammatical action on a word completely strange, to the preceding noun, and to the word to which is attached the pronoun which serves as a link, the word which one calls . This presents three different types, but which all have in common the fact that the serves the function of , while the word serves the function of . An example of the first sort is , "Zaid, I hit a servant who was serving him": The word is , the word is ; it is a of the category called . An example of the second sort is , "Zaid, I hit Fāṭima and his brother": the word is , the word is ; it is a of the category called . An example of the third sort is , "Zaid, I hit 'Amr his brother":
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 - we see that in Arabic, as in other languages, one verb is capable of taking two objects.

Sībawayh says of this: "The which through the medium of a verb governs two objects:-

"'Abdullah gave Zaid a dirham, or

"Moses chose for his people seventy men". Some verbs may take two objects, or have a preposition before the second:-

"I acquainted him with Zaid": or, "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:-

"'Abdullah thought Zaid was Bakr"; and "I think Zaid is eloquent". (14)

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


(14) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.16, 18 and 61.
that of the words which put both the 

in the accusative: these words are "to think", "to know", "to suppose", "to assert", "to find", and "to know". If they are placed at the end of a sentence their influence is preferably revoked: one can say either ٰ، "I thought Zaid was wise", or preferably ٰ،. If the verb comes in the middle either construction may be used: ٰ، or ٰ،. However, if these verbs are followed by the negative particles ٰ، or ٰ، or ٰ،, or by ٰ، 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 ٰ، 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, ٰ، and ٰ. On account of the action which verbs of this category exercise on these two terms, the first is called ٰ،, and the second

(15) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.171.
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: "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: "he found you wandering", "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: "the one who killed you by force").

One also finds verbs with three objects: "Some verbs take three objects, none of which can be omitted without the other two; "God informed Zaid that 'Amr was better than you".

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 Malik, op. cit., lines 200f.
(17) Reckendorf, Arabische Syntax, Heidelberg, 1921, p.89.
(18) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.19.
triple accusatives: "they hit him painfully on the cheek", "we are selling it to you". 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 substitution. An example of this is "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 subject or its

Bravmann has quite a good deal to say on this theme. He deals with two types of substitution, the substitution of the part for the whole, and 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 examplified by the following instance: "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

(19) Reckendorf, op. cit., p.90.
(20) Sibawayh, 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 (ضرَّتُ زيدًاء ظَهرَो، "he hit Zaid on his (or: the) back", literally, "he hit Zaid, his back (or: the back)").; or, سلأمد زيدًاء ثوبَو, "he robbed Zaid of his garment", literally, "he robbed Zaid, his garment" ..... These constructions ... are derived from a basic type like ضربتُ زيدٍ ظَهرَ, "Zaid, I hit his back", i.e. the variant with Isolated Natural Subject of the simple construction ضربتُ ظَهرَ زيدً, "I hit Zaid's back".

"As against this, both Indo-European and Semitic scholars are apt to regard these constructions (as ضربتُ زيدًاء ظَهرَ) 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 زيدٍ ظَهرَ to the construction ضربتُ ظَهرَ زيدً: "The essence of this construction and how it differs from ضربتُ ظَهرَ زيدً، "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 "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 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 accusa-
tive (or nominative, respectively) designating the thing:

(و)*ـ "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",

*ـ ـ، 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 ـ. "The ـ in passive verbs:-
ـ ـُـُّـُـُا, "'Abdullah was clothed with the cloak",
or
َـُـُـُـُا, "'Abdullah was given the money".
The words ــ ــ and ــ ــ are made as they are
direct objects acted upon by the transitiveness of the ـ
which takes the place of the ـ. (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: "سیرَ بزید يومان ۷رَکشَین" (Zaid travelled for two days over two parasangs); when يومان takes the place of the فَرْسَكَین, and فَاصل is in the نصب since it is adverbial, or one can regard it as a صفة. Alternatively one can say سیرَ بزید يومان ۷رَکشَکان, when exactly the same explanation of cases is applicable. One can further make both words accusative, and say (23). "سیرَ بزید يومان ۷رَکشَین"

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 صفة. Random examples are جَحَاجُ إلى شْرَب ماءٍ, "I passed by Zaid", صرْرَت بِزید, "he needed a drink of water", أَفَازَ الجَئِزَ على المَدِينَة, "the army attacked the town", and رَغِبَ الكاذِب فِي الحسنَة, "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. "ضَرِبتُ وضَرِبتُ زیدَ, "I hit Zaid and he hit me", or ضَرِبتُ وضَرِبتُ زیدَ, "I hit Zaid". 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, "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:

"I hit Zaid and he hit me", or "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:

"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, "I honoured Zaid and he honoured me", the Kufans say the action of the first verb is preferable,

(24) Sibawayh, op. cit., p.37.
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--

"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 "and since the clan of Laylā have moved, I hear the raven croaking their separation"; the first verb wields the influence, and thus makes accusative. If it were the second verb which governed it, it must be nominative.

"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--
"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 likewise, "Lo, read my book": the second verb wields the influence, for if the first one had done so, it would be as if the first had done so, it would be "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, with accusative and the showing of the pronoun in 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: "I became coarse in his chest and Zaid’s": and the influence of the preposition 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 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: (1) If the second wielded influence the virtual meaning would be "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 -

"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 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 , the person addressed. God said -

"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 knows
that the second may enter into the ruling of the first. Likewise, "God is free from obligation to the idolators and (so is) his messenger", and the mention of the first suffices for the mention of the second to the knowledge of the first.

"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 is corroborated, or . Sibawayh says: "I saw most of your people", or "I saw the Banu Zaid, a third of them". The second noun or adjective stands as for the first. The sentence can be even more compound: "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) Sibawayh, 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 الاستمرار). Sibawayh says: "Interrogatives.
When the noun follows a particle of interrogation, and precedes
the verb, it is put into the accusative, as in "did you hit Zaid?", "did you kill 'Amr's brother?", "did you buy a garment for 'Amr?"
This is permissible if there is no reflexive pronoun
attached to the verb. Such sentences have the sense of
excitation 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. "did you hit 'Abdullah?", "did you pass by Zaid?", "did you kill 'Amr's brother?", "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,
"I did not notice whether I met 'Abdullah's brother or 'Amr's." (29)
Al-Zajjājī corroborates this view of Sibawayh's: "The
noun following a verb of question is put into the nominative
provided it is not followed by a verb:
(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 - acts upon the noun and makes it accusative: "I have learned whether you hit Zaid or 'Amr". (30)

Extending the idea of interrogation SIBawayh says:

"إِخْبَار وإِسْتِفْهَام", informing and interrogation.

"what are you doing but journeying?", or "what are you doing but striking blows?"

This is as if the sentence were actually "ماْاْتْ أَوْلَدْتُ فَعَلْتُ", or "ماْاْتْ أَوْلَدْتُ الفَعَلْ", only the verb has been suppressed in these cases, as in the cases of and .

One may reduce these sentences still further to "إِخْبَار إِسْتِفْهَام", or "إِنْ زِيدْتُ حُمْرًا حُمْرًا". Coming to we have "أَجْلَوْسَا", "are you standing, so-and-so?", or "أَجْلَوْسَا جَلْوَسَا", "are you sitting down?"; as in other cases the verb is suppressed, the sentence being in full "أَتَقْمُجْيَامًا يَا خُلّدَنَّ", or "أَجْلَوْسَا جَلْوَسَا". The accusative is the جَلْوَسَا of the suppressed verb". (31)

CONCLUSIONS

After seeing what the grammarians had to say about the

(30) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.298.
(31) SIBawayh, op. cit., p.168.
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 نفعل, 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 نفعل 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 تهدي ضريح, "I hit Zaid", the o refers back to the زيد, and makes it accusative as a بدل. If this is the case, how then is the accusative governed when there is no ضمير الاسم, the pronoun which refers back, as if the sentence were زيد ضريح? We see that al-Zajjājī allows either the accusative or the nominative, even when there is a ضمير الساكن, so either the argument about the بدل, 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 بدل - 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 زيد, in زيد صبتد, is a صبتد, and what follows is its حبر. 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 Mālik shows when dealing with the عامل, 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 صبتد 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 "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 ٌ. 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 ٍ صبّدة 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 one 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 ٍ صبّدة to the ٍ.
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 Sibawayh - 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), Dillmann-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


(33) Gesenius. (Kautzsch) op. cit., p. 366.
(35) Von Soden, op. cit., p. 198.
(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.

NIDĀ' - THE VOCATIVE

We come now to a further use of the "مُهَوَّل" 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 "نَادَاء" - is none other than a direct object. It is in fact an extension of the use of the accusative after a suppressed verb.

"نَادَاء" , 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 'oh 'Abdullah', 'يا عبد الله', 'oh our brother', 'يا رجل صالٰح', 'oh honest man'. So with prepositions, 'هو تَبَكَ', 'he is before you', 'هو بعدك', 'he is after you', as distinct from simply بعدك, قبلك. One finds this accusative in the - إضافة - type construction. In the sentence "يا زيد الطويل" , 'oh tall Zaid', the word "الطويل" 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 زيد نفت', 'oh Zaid himself', or "يا تميم كُلْبٌ" , 'oh Tamim, all of them', these words are accusative as in "يا زيد ذا الجُمَّة" , 'oh Zaid, with the luxurious hair'. As for the "مُصَنَّع" as an epithet, it can only be accusative". (1)

(1) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.303.
It was, however, one of Sibawayh'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 أدعُ عبد اللَّه, 'I call 'Abdullah', is أدعُ عبد اللَّه, 'I call 'Abdullah', in which the verb has been suppressed and replaced by يا. However, this only goes into the accusative if it fulfils one of three conditions: (i) when it has an annexed complement, يا رسول اللَّه, '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 يا حسنُ، 'oh the one praised for his work', يا حسنًا وجهًا, 'oh the one with the handsome face'; (b) which it governs in the accusative, as يا طالما جبلًا, 'oh the one climbing a mountain'; (c) or which it governs in the genitive by means of some preposition dependent on it as يا حبيبًا بالعبء، 'oh friend to slaves', يا رفيقًا بالعبء، 'oh better than Zaid'; (d) or which was joined to it before the vocation, as يا ثلاثين والثلاثين، '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 يا رجُلًا خُذِّي بيدٍ، 'some man, take my hand'. (The simple definite vocative takes a nominative ending, as يا زيد، 'oh Zaid', يا رجُل، '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 qualicative, corroborative, expositive, or finally has جً and is joined in a series, this second concordering 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 qualicative, as يا زيد الظريف, 'oh noble Zaid'; (b) a corroborative, as يا جميع أجمعين or يا تيمن أجمعين, 'oh Tamīm, all of you'. (c) an expositive, as يا سعيد كرر or يا عافر كرر, 'oh happy sermon'; or (d) joined in a series, as يا زيد والضحاك or يا زيد، 'oh Zaid and the laughing one', or يا زيد، احسن الوجه, 'oh handsome faced Zaid'. If the concording noun is annexed, but has not got جً, it can go only into the accusative: - يا زيد صاحب عمر, 'oh Zaid, friend of 'Umar', or يا زيد، اب عبد الله, 'oh Zaid, father of 'Abdullah'.

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

"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 جً with ا, followed by the genitive.
The particle ج, with fatha, is dependent, according to Ibn Jiniyy (941-1002) on the ل, on account of the verbal sense contained in the latter: or, according to Ibn al-Sā‘īgh, Ibn Usfūr, and even Sībawayh, it is dependent on an understood verb.

"Ibn Qurūf, on the other hand, says it is expletive, and depends on nothing at all. An example of this imploration is: ﷲ ﷤، ﷲ، ﷮ ﷤، ﷲ، ﷮، ﷲ，“The two particles of deploring، وا and يا، may be followed by the noun deplored with a suffixed alif، as وا ﷲ، or يا، and وا ﷲ، 'woe to the Commander of the Faithful'، or alternatively by the ordinary rules of the vocative، as وا ﷲ، وا ل. The suffixed alif may also be followed by an unwovelled وا ل، ل، وا ﷲ،أدا س، L، وا ﷲ،أدا ﷲ، أو ﷲ،WA، ل، وا ﷲ،أدا ﷲ،أدا ﷲ،. This usage occurs only at a pause: if the phrase runs on، the وا، must be omitted (except by poetic licence).

(2) Ibn Hishām، op. cit.، p.218f.
Al-Zamakhshari corroborates these words in considerably less: he says: "النصب باللازم اضماره" that which is made accusative by the action of something which must be hidden. This comprises the case of address. When one says "يا عبد الله", 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 inflexibilised vocative, and which is annexed without having "أ", e.g. "أزيده ذا الكيل". '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 "أ", 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 دamma must necessarily be put in the accusative

(3) Al-Zamakhshari, op. cit., p.21.
if it fulfils certain conditions: (i) that it must in no way be of the nature of appositives called مَعْطَفْ نَقْطٍ, conjunctive of order, or بِدَلِ, permutative; (ii) that it should be in a relationship of annexation, مَضْانِ; and (iii) that it should in no way be affected by the article، although furthermore it can be determined by the word which acts as its complement. Thus one must say "بِيْا زِيدَ صَاحِبُ السَّلَمّ, 'oh Zaid, friend of learning'; but if one says "بِيْا زِيدَ الْكَنْوَة, 'oh Zaid with the handsome face', one can pronounce it or عَلَى الْكَنْوَة.

"In expressions like سَعَدَ سَعَدَ الْوُلُو, '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 compellative سَعَد in the accusative, in conformity with the general rule, because it is مَضْانِ; as for the first سَعَد, if one puts it in the nominative, or rather if one makes an indeclinable of it by giving it دَامْمَة as a final vowel، it is because it is مَضْانِ; if one puts it in the accusative, it is because one supposes that it governs the complement of annexation الْوُلُو, 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, ٌسَمَّى السَّبْدَةٍ, when definite and singular, is declinable and is without nunciation. Al-Farrā' (d. 822) says it is indeclinable with ُجَمَّامَةٍ, with neither ُعَلَّامِلْ nor ُفَصُولْ. The Basrans say it is indeclinable with ُجَمَّامَةٍ, but its actual case should be the نصب because it is a ُفَصُولْ.

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 مُضَانُ; and we do not make it accusative, so that it does not resemble what does not decline. We make it nominative without nunciation, in order to differentiate between it and what is made nominative by a sound agent (بِرَافع صَحِيحٍ). As for the مُضَانُ, we make it accusative because we have found it most commonly ُفَصُولٌ, and we use the accusative because it is more commonly used than any other case.

"As for Al-Farrā', he says:- the root in ُيَا زِيدًا نُنَدُّا, as with ُنُتِبَّ, lamentation (which will be dealt with immediately after ُنَدَا), and the noun is between two long sounds - the ُيَا and the ُلَا; and the noun is neither a ُفَعَّالٍ,
nor a مظان ان, nor a مفعول: and when they commonly make do with the first sound (يا) only, they suppress the second, and put a َدَاء on the end of the noun, resembling َدَاء; 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 مظان ان, and is implied with it, as in

"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 مظان ان were in place of the مظان ان, then the نَن of the plural must drop out, as in وا قَنُونَا, 'you broken by age!'. To this the Kufans reply: we do not allow نَن of the plural which has two letters, nor do we allow نَن of نَن with the suppression of the نَن, 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 , like يا عِبَّد عَسَّرُ, '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 يا عِبَّد عَسَّرُ, with َدَاء, because its root is يا عِبَّد عَسَّرُ; we say that this is not possible in the annexed on account of its length, contrary to the singular, and thus the difference between them is clear. As for the مظان ان, it must have a فَتْحَة because the second noun takes the place of the alif of نَن, as in يا زيدان, and
the dāl in یا زیداء has fatha, and the fatha remains in مضموم یا زیداء, and the مضموم here is in place of the المنصوب, and the المنصوب is in place of the صندوب; 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 منصوب is the inadmissibility 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 ركباً 'oh Zaid riding'; and what proves that it is in place of the منصوب, even if it be singular, is that one may put its epithet in the accusative, as in يا زيد الظريف 'oh intelligent Zaid', just as one may put its epithet in the nominative as in يا زيد نوع.

"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) الكتاب, addressing a second person, (ii) التصريف, definition, and (iii) التضرر, singularity. Some say it must be indeclinable because it occurs just as does the اسم الكتاب, because the root in يا اياك يا زيد or اسم الكتاب يا انت; because the thing addressed (the منادي), when it is a second person, can dispense with the mention of its اسم, and employ the اسم الكتاب, such as يا انت يا اياك or اسم الكتاب. And when the اسم الكتاب occurs just as does the اسم الكتاب,
it must be indeclinable, and must be indeclinable in ُيّمّا for two reasons: (i) it is not free to be indeclinable with either a ُتّافّا or a ُكّسّرّا or a ُيّمّا: it is wrong to be constructed with a ُتّافّا, 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 مثّاا to itself: and as it is wrong to be constructed with either ُتّافّا or kasra, this specifies it to be constructed with ُيّمّا: and (ii) it is constructed with ُيّمّا in order to make a difference between it and the ُضّاّ, because if it were ُضّاّ to itself it would have kasra, and if it were ُضّاّ to something else it would be in the ُنّصّ: and so it is constructed with ُيّمّا in order not to be confused with the ُضّاّ, because it does not introduce the مثّاا.

"The Basrans also say it is in place of a ُنّصّ because it is a مفعّل: because the virtual meaning in ِبّا لّيّد is ِبّا لّيّد ُطرفّا ِبّا لّيّد, 'I call Zaid', or ِبّا لّيّد ُطرفّا ِبّا لّيّد; and when ِبّا لّيّد takes the place of ِبّا لّيّد it also wields its influence. What proves that it takes its place is twofold: (i) َّمّالّا (I) "deflection"; the name given to the inclination of "a" towards "أ, أ, i".
that یا 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 یا takes the place of ، and that the regent of the اسم المنادي is understood ، besides یا ، besides اسم المنادي.

"What proves that it is in the place of a اسم is that one says with the epithet ، in the accusative, in conformity with the position اسم (the possessed noun) ، just as one says ، in the nominative, in conformity with the actual letter. Likewise one says اسم or اسم ("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 اسم , and this is the root of every اسم; and for this, if there is no sign expressed to decline any word as a singular word concerning اسم , they اسم (the possessed noun) اسم , they اسم (will stay at the actual origin) in the accusative.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "the اسم 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 صرفُ or نصبُ or مضارعُ ماضِيُّ without a نون؟ The Basrans also say: How can you make it nominative with no نون؟ And as for the Kufans' statement that "there should be a difference between it and what is made nominative by a رفع", the Basrans' reply is: This is false: the only thing which goes into the nominative without نون and yet is sound as far as إعراب is concerned is an indeclinable noun. Then their statement "we make the 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-Farraj', that "the root in ندا, ٌ in that one should say ٌ ٌ, 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 مضارع, and when they suppress it they construct the word with دامَة, just as when the مضارع is suppressed in من بعد and in and ٌ", we (the Basrans) say: This is annulled by the which is مضارع, such as
this needs by way of sound what the singular needs, and one would have to say  يا عبد عصرو, with damma, because its root is  يا عبد عصرو. And as for the statement that "it is not permissible in  الساندي 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  لذا between either the length of nouns or their shortness; thus if one addressed a man whose name was  اسماندان or  شربان, then it would still be necessary to use damma, even though there are more letters than in  يا عبد عصرو. 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  الساندي, this is false also; for when one says  يا خير مزတ, 'oh better than Zaid', when it is singular and specified, then it is not free as to whether the  نصب 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 خير مزد, 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  لف at the end of a word with a genuine accusative:  خير 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  الساندي in place of the
is that, if this were the case, then the pün of the plural would have to be dropped from something like 

\( l.2 \). Then as for their statement "we do not allow the plural which has a two-letter ending, nor do we allow the with the suppression of the pün, nor with the retention of the pün", the Basrans say: This is incumbent upon you when you make take the place of you allow, even if you are prevented from saying, and yet both of them are plural words. As for "the singular is in place of the; 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 \( \text{منصرب} \) by a verb is that one cannot have \( \text{حال} \) with it", the Basrans say: We do not agree that the prevention of \( \text{حال} \) accompanying it is on account of the \( \text{حال} \), but on account of the opposition of the meaning of the sentence: this is because, if we said 

\( \text{يا زيد} \), with the meaning of \( \text{حال} \), then the virtual meaning would be that the \( \text{ندا} \) is in the state of riding, and that if he (Zaid) were not riding there would be no \( \text{ندا} \), and this is absurd; because the \( \text{ندا} \) occurred in his saying 

\( \text{يا زيد} \), and if he is not riding, this does not prevent him
from having called Zaid by his statement ِزايده, and this does not occur in other speech form. Thus, if one had said ِضربه ِزايده ِركابا, 'I hit Zaid riding', and did not find him riding, one cannot strike him. Abu al-'Abbás 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 ِزايده ِركابا at all. We call you in this state, and we refrain from calling you (when you are) walking; because when one says ِزايده 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 ِزايده 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 ِزايده is like my saying ِدعى ِزايده, and it is as if I had said ِدعا ِحالا ِحقا. And he said: "I do not see any objection to saying ِزايده ِركابا on account of this; so stick to analogy".

"As for "what proves that it is in place of the ِمصانى even if it is singular is your putting its epithet in the accusative, such as ِزايده ِالشريف, just as its epithet may be put in the nominative, such as ِزايذه ِالشريف", we (the Basrans) say: we do not agree that the epithet is put in the accusative, because the singular is in place of the ِمصانى; indeed its being in the accusative is because the thing described (الموضوع), 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 مِن دون غيرك, "no one besides you came to me", with the nominative, just as one may with the genitive, as in ما لكم من غيره, '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 (تنبيه) and encouragement (إعراء). "Whoever puts anyone on guard makes to be governed in the accusative expressions analogous to إيَّاك والخَرَ، 'beware of evil', by a regent necessarily understood. Apply this rule to إيَّاك without adjunction. In any other warning ellipsis of the verb is not necessary, if it is not with either adjunction or repetition, e.g., الضيهم الضيهم يا ذا الاري, 'the lion, the lion, the voyager of the night'.

(By which is here the direct complement, of the verb, one must understand, the accusative governed by a verb necessarily understood. The author wishes to say that the words إياك, إياك, etc., when they are not followed by another word which is joined to them by a conjunction, as in the example إياك والخنجر, 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 إياكم من الخنجر, 'beware of evil', and إياكم من الخنجر, 'beware of tyranny', etc. But if, instead of إياك, 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', المخاطر منه, one can, as one wishes, show the verb which acts as an antecedent, or not show it. Thus one can say رأسي, or simply رأسك, 'turn your head', and likewise أخرز الرسحة, or simply أخرز الريشة, 'beware of the lion'.

'This faculty of showing the verb ceases, however, with the conjunction: e.g., if one says رأسك والخانق, 'move your head and (mind) the wall': and also with repetition, as in the example given by Ibn Malik, and in this, الامسدة الامسدة, '(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 "يا" in all the cases when it is treated". (6)

The subject of "غفر" 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 علىك, عندك, دونك, may be preceded by the thing affected, such as بكر دزنك, عصرا عندك, زياد علىك. The Basrans say the thing affected may not precede the word of غفر.

"Kufans:-- The proof is to be found in tradition and analogy. As for tradition there is the Koran, كتاب الله عليكم, 'there is for you the book of God': the word كتاب is made accusative by عليكم. One also has "يا أيها الناس, دلوى دولى, إني رأيت الناس كحمداً ما., 'oh water-drawer, behold my bucket. Verily, I have seen people praising you', where دولي is in the position of an accusative after دولك. As for analogy--these words stand in place of a verb. Thus when one says علىك زياد, it is the same as زياد عندك, 'stick to Zaid', or زياد, "take ‘Amr", or زياد, "take Bakr'. If one had said زياد, الماء زياد, or زياد, عصرا تناول, or زياد, "take Bakr", it would be quite permissible in these cases to put the مفصل first: and so

(6) Ibn Malik, 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 محمد عليكم كتاب الله، the Basrans say: This is no argument at all, since محمد عليكم is not accusative on account of at all. It is accusative because it is a مصدر, and the regent acting upon it is a conjectured verb, the conjecture being محمد عليكم كتاب الله, 'He wrote the book of God for you'. It would originally have been كتاب الله كتاب محمد عليكم, 'God wrote a book for you', but then the مصدر became مصدر محمد الله (فاعل الله), as in:-
'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 is a conjectured verb which would really be 'God did a job of work', only the verb has been omitted, and has taken place.

"As for the Kufans' statement about the line يَا اِبْنَاهَا الْمَلَائُكَةُ دُلْوَى دُونَا, the Basrans say that their argument is wrong in two respects: first, دُلْوَى is not in place of an accusative, but it is in place of a nominative as the of a conjectured, which should be : and second, even if it were in place of an accusative, it would not be accusative on account of دُونَا, but on account of the virtual meaning (تَقْدِير) of a verb, i.e., دُونَا, and 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 نداً, works in exactly the same way as نداً. "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. واَسْتَنْخَفَرَ, بَنُّرُ زَمْزَمَ, '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 nunciation of the complement, this being a conjunctive or something else.

'(It is in the nature of things that the صندوب, 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 سَنَم or لَم one associates with it ideas which define it and specify it in a precise manner, one can then make a صندوب of it. This is what happens in the following example

واَسْتَنْخَفَرَ, بَنُّرُ 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 نواً requires the suppression of the nunciation 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, صلة, as in the example

واَمَنَخَفَرَ بَنُرُ زَمْزَمَا, or something different, as in 'oh Muhammad', واَنَبَّأَ خَلَى, 'oh
Sibawayh tells us a little more. "The word following the ٥ of lamentation may have a long alif after it: َوَ زِيداءٍ, 'oh Zaid'. This long alif makes into a fathā 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, 'oh my slave', etc., becomes ُوا زِيداءٍ. Al-Khalil, however, says one can say ُوا غلُصي. (However, when one does not use the long alif one puts simply ُو زِيد, when there is no possession, and ُو زِيد when there is, or ُو زِيد).

Another example of the optional alif with an accusative is ُوا إِنْقَطَاطٌ ظَرَأٍ, 'oh you breaking my back', or ُوا إِنْقَطَاطٌ ظَرَأٍ. (9)

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

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

(8) Ibn Malik, op. cit., lines 601f.
(9) Sibawayh, op. cit., p.321.
adjective, as in 'oh intelligent Zaid'.

The Basrans say this is not allowed.

"Kufans:— We are agreed that the sign of ندبة may follow the مضانٍ إليه as in '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 مضانٍ إليه is in place of the مضانٍ إليه, so the sign of the ندبة may follow the صفة."

"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 theمضانٍ إليه and so thus it may follow the صفة', is as follows: We do not agree, because the مضانٍ إليه is not complete without the mention of the موصوف, in contrast to the state of affairs with the صفة موصوف for the صفة is complete without the mention of the موصوف. Thus if one simply said عبد نيد in the saying عبد نيد, 'servant of Zaid', or عبد غلام عمراه, غلام عمراه, 'servant of 'Amr', the one word would not be complete without the مضانٍ إليه. But if one just said نيد in the saying هنا زيد الظرفٍ, 'this is the
intelligent Zaid', the would be complete without the mention of the ; 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 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 apppellative is essentially verbal in action, such as "I mean" or "I call", and that therefore the 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

(10) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.224f.
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 منادي was a direct object,
but even so their reasoning is weak and negative. Their
strongest point against the منادي 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 ِ،
and the use of the accusative epithet with the nominative
noun.

In connection with this explanation there is one impor-
tant 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, 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 

\begin{align*}
\end{align*}

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, and exception.

About 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 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 نَدْبَة, the suffixing of the sign of نَبَة 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 مفعول, since the verb emanates from it.

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) قصدت 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) كلّ, "all", and بعض, "some", annexed to the infinitive:- فلا تسيروا كلّ الميل, "do not incline fully", and فلم تقرَّل علينا باصن النافذة, "and if you forge out upon us some reports";

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

(c) the nouns of instrument:- ضربت سوطاً أو عصاً أو مفرعةً, "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 ضربت ضرباً, "I hit him

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: "I hit him two blows;" or by some form of manner "I hit him an unfair blow," lit., "I hit him the blow of one acting wrongfully". Everything which indicates the fills the place of it, and the resultant effected accusative is like the accusative in "I sat down a sitting", or "I struck him three blows", or "I sat down squatting".\(^{(2)}\)

A western author, Sterling, sub-divides the absolute object into different categories: "The absolute object, \(^{(2)}\)Al-Yaziji, Fasl al-Khitab fi Usul Lughat al-‘Arab. Beirut, 1887, p.192.

\(^{(2)}\)is the plural of مفعول .
striking Zaid severely, (c) زيد ناضِلْ فَصَلَّ، Zaid is very accomplished.

"The absolute object is of two kinds: 1) "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 قتَلْتُ شَتَّمًا, I assuredly killed him:

2) "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 رُكَّبَ ركضًا ركضًا، he ran swiftly, خُطوتُ خطوتيينـ، I squatted, جلَّتُ جلوستا مستقيماً, 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 أَصَبُ، "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. سُرَّتُ جَيْرَيْنَ جَيْرَيْنَ دَنِى رَضَى, "I walked twice, the sort of walk of him who goes right".

"(The noun of action serving the function of the noun of action is governed in the accusative, be it by the noun of action itself, like "your striking Zaid a blow surprised me", that is to say, أنَّ ضربَتَ رُبَّدُ، or by the verb, as قامَ قيامًا, "he got up a getting up", or by the verbal adjective, like انتَ جالسًا جلوسًا, "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 ضربهَ ضربًا ضربًا، "I struck him a painful blow", or to indicate the number, as ضربتَ ضربتينَ، "I struck him two blows", and ضربتَ ضربةً واحدةً، "I struck him one blow").

"The noun which it designates can very well be governed in its place, e.g. كلَّ الجُدُرُ، "use all your efforts", and أضرعَ الابكَالِ، "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 "to snatch", which is like "snatch". From that which expresses co-ordination as in "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 for ", "I hear your orders and am disposed to obey them", and , "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 "I owe him a thousand, (I make) a confession"; and the second, like "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 - "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

"Zaid is making a journey", instead of

"you are making a journey", or

and likewise "I admit that", instead of

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,

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,

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.

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 "confession", only expresses, in another form, the thought already stated by "I owe him etc."
the second example, "you are like my son, certainly in very truth"; this addition حَقّا صَرْحَا 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 عَامَّ قُدُمَ, "(you have come) the best coming", with قُلْصَت omitted, or فِضْبَ التَّحِيل عَلَى الْجُرْح, "(you are as angry) as a horse against the bit", with تَفْضِب omitted; (ii) That in which the verb is never shown, and that which has no verb whatsoever, as عَمِلُ, "thank(you)", or عَمِلَ عَمَّ, "wonderful": one does not say أَشْكَرُ عَمَّ, or أَشْكَرُ عَمَّ, or تَوَلَّ, or تَوَلَّ, or تَوَلَّ, or وَبَكَّ, or وَبَكَّ, or وَبَكَّ, or وَبَكَّ, or وَبَكَّ, or وَبَكَّ, or وَبَكَّ, or وَبَكَّ, or وَبَكَّ, or 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: - وُلَدْ, "hello!", وَبِدَا, "hard luck", (lit. "may he be far off"). Such words as these are made

(4) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 286f.
accusative by the influence of some verb which is not shown". (6)

Sibawayh expands this idea just a little further: "Verbal nouns which go into the accusative by the influence of some suppressed verb: - مسقاً و رعيناً, "God grant you rain and safety", and خيبةً و ذكرناً, "may God disappoint you and make you smell". These nouns are made accusative when there is some optative sense - one wishes good ( دعا له) or evil ( دعا عليه) - through the sense of some omitted verb, as if one had said in full مصاك الله مسقاً و رعاك الله رعيناً or خيبك الله خيبصه. This is similar to تذكير, warning, in that the nouns act as the بدل 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 مفعول, 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.

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 مفعول 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. In sentences such as مالك واباك, "what have you done with your father?", and لیرت ناقة وفصيلها لتصرفها "if the she-camel were left with her young, it would suck her breasts", the sense is really معه معه and معه معه. The words و او and معه and معه do not alter the sense at all. Also, "the cold came with the hood", is really مع الطيالمة مع الطيالمة مع الطيالمة مع الطيالمة. Sibawayh then goes on to say that in some cases there may be a verb. "In examples such as سا لك وزيدا, there is an understood verb: - "what is your state and your taking Zaid?" Also in ما بزيد واخاه which is the same as ما كان بزيد واخاه, the sense is ما كان واخاه ما كان واخاه "how are Zaid and his brother?"

(1) Sibawayh, op. cit., p.150.
(2) Ibid., p.155.
Al-Zajjājī tells us almost as little as Sībawayh. 

"is their saying جا، البرد والطائفة you make nominative on account of (its being the subject of) the verb, and you make the الطائفة accusative, because you do not mean جا، البرد والطائفة "the hood came", but you mean جا، البرد مع الطائفة "the cold came with the hood", and the has the meaning of The verb which is before it acts on what comes after it and makes it accusative. One also says كنت وحمدا كالأخوين, "Muḥammad and I were like brothers".

"What also falls under the heading of this chapter is their saying ما لك وزيدا, "what have you to do with Zaid?", when the نيد cannot be joined to the كان, and it is made accusative by an understood verb, as if it had been ما لك وملبستك زيدا, "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 جا، جاورت النيل, "I walked and passed near the Nile". (4) Ibn Hishām himself has this to say;

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

(3) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.306f.
accompaniment, and which is preceded by a verb, or a word verbal both in root and in sense: -  وأنت والليل, or 。“I walked by the Nile". The accusative can be called for in cases like: - ُلا بالليل, "do not defend evil when you yourself do it", (b)

"I rose with Zaid", or ُلا بالليل, "I passed by you and Zaid", or (c) it is preferable in cases like ُلا بالليل, "be with Zaid like a brother". It is mediocre in ُلا بالليل, "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 ُلا بالليل must not have the meaning of conjunction ... The مفعول معه is also found after ُلا بالليل of interrogation: as ُلا بالليل, how art thou together with Zaid?, ماذا و إخاك, 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, ُلا بالليل معه. The noun which follows ُلا بالليل is put in the accusative, in the quality of a complement of concomitance, in cases like ُلا بالليل والطريق صميم", "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 ٨, following the most just opinion. Certain Arabs, after interrogative ٨ ٨ or make the accusative to be governed by a verbal derivative of ٨ understood. Adjunction (الصطف), 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 ٨ ٨ and ٨ ٨ followed by ٨, using the accusative, ٨ ٨, "what have you with Zaid?", and ٨ ٨, "how are you with a bowl of soup?": more generally, in this case, one makes ٨ ٨ ٨ ٨ agree with ٨ ٨. Without a doubt, what determines the grammarians to suppose, in this case, that there is suppression of the verb ٨, and that it is this verb which governs ٨ ٨ in the accusative, is that, following their opinion adopted by Ibn Malik, it is it not the ٨, called ٨ ٨, 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 ٨ called ٨ ٨ 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 "I went with Zaid", and "I fed it straw with cold water", because to adopt concordance here, it would be necessary, following the ordinary rules, to say دُفِّنَتْ وَزِيدَ، and مَلَك وَزِيدَ.

Likewise, by reason of the sense, it is impossible to say سَبَرٍ وأَلْفَى، and it is absolutely obligatory to use the accusative. In this other example, "I watered", understood, and virtually understood in وَهُمْ، the words مَفْعُول مَعْهُ would be put in the accusative, be it as مَفْعُول مَعْهُ, or be it as the ruling of the verb مَفْعُول مَعْهُ, "I watered", understood, and virtually understood in وَهُمْ,(7)

The grammarians at whom we have looked have all offered us the same explanation for the uses of the مَفْعُول مَعْهُ. This was the view of the Basrans, but the Kufans offer an alternative explanation. "The Kufans say that the مَفْعُول مَعْهُ is made accusative as a difference (على الخَلَطَةِ), such as إِسْتَوَى السَّمَاءُ وَالْقُبْبَةُ, "the water and the wood reached the same level", or جَا، الْبَرْدُ وَالْطَّيَالَةُ, "the cold came with the hood". The Basrans say it is made accusative by the verb which precedes it and is contained in the وَهُمْ . Al-Zajjāj (d. 922) says it is made accusative by the virtual meaning of a regent, the virtual meaning being ولَبَسَ اِلْقَبْضَةَ, "it was mixed up with the wood", because the verb does not act on the مَفْعُول مَعْهُ, and between the verb and the مَفْعُول مَعْهُ there is the وَهُمْ .

(7) Ibn Malik, op. cit. lines 31ff.
Abū al-Hasan al-Akhfash (d. 835) says that what follows the ulla is made accusative by the accusativeness of and, as in جئت مع, "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 إستوى الامام والخليفة, it is not good to repeat the verb, as in إستوى الامام والخليفة, 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 جاه and نفوذ 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 ulla, and becomes transitive on the noun and makes it accusative, just as أخرجته نديا, "I took Zaid", becomes transitive by the hamza, and خرجته النافق, "I took the food", becomes transitive by the doubling of the letter, and just as خرجته ب, "I brought him", is made transitive by the letter demanding the genitive, except that the ulla does not have any action, because it is originally a conjunction, and as such does not act. But just as in the case of إستتنا, (exception, with which we shall be concerned later) the noun is made accusative by the preceding verb by
the power of 

so here the is made accusative by the preceding verb by the power of the . 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 - because the verb does not act on the because there is a between them, the Basrans say: this is false. Because the verb acts on the 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 by the mediation of the , 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 , the Basrans say: this is a weak theory also, because is a preposition, but the in the examples
not a ظرف and cannot be made accusative as a 

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that the preceding verb 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 ظرف which differentiates between the two meanings, as in ما قام زيد كان عمر، 'it was not Zaid who rose but 'Amr", and ما سرت بزيد كان بكر, 'I did not pass by Zaid but Bakr'. Here, what follows دين 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 دين, the second noun differs from the first, as with د in قام زيد لا عمر, 'Zaid rose, not 'Amr", and سرت بزيد لا عمر, '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 مه, the Basrans say: the verb can be made transitive by the strength of the والو, 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 noun. The two main points which must be emphasised first are that the \( \text{\` } \) does not alter the sense at all, and that the accusative is used only in those instances where concordance - making the noun after \( \text{\` } \) 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 \( \text{\` } \) 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 \( \text{\` } \) makes any intransitive verb transitive, but this seems false. Admittedly the intransitive root-form verb \( \text{\` } \), "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 لحاج , "to need", and ُغار علَّ , "to attack", are made transitive by the mediation of a preposition, ُ is not a preposition ( طرف ), but a conjunction ( علَّ ), which, unlike prepositions, is incapable of wielding any influence. We know, then, that the منفعل must be a noun, in the accusative, after the particle ُ with the meaning of علَّ , "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 ٌلو , but of course the ٌلو 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

is an accusative of purpose. It enables one to introduce a final clause without the necessity of using either the subjunctive, or the particle $\text{-}^j$ followed by the genitive, and hence the origin of the title $\text{-}^j$

Ibn Hishâm 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: $\text{تُحَدَّثُ إِبْنُ هِشَامُ، 'I rose to honour you'}. If either of these two conditions cannot be fulfilled the construction takes the form of the preposition $\text{-}^j$". (1)

Al-Zamakhšari reiterates these same conditions: $\text{-}^j$. This is a way of using an accusative rather than a verb, and is a جواب (correlative) to it: $\text{فَعَلْتُ كَذَا صَنَعْتُهُ الْخَرَّ، 'I did so-and-so fearing evil', or ضَرِبْتُهُ تَأْدِيبًا لَّهُ، 'I hit him to correct him'}. There are three conditions attached to this usage: $\text{جَنَّتُ بِكَرَامَةِ الرَّزَازِ، 'I came to}$

(1) Ibn Hishâm, op. cit., p.244.
you for you to honour the visitor', and

'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.

This is that of which the action of the verb happens to its cause, being a صدر which is identical in time and regent: - خرَجْتُ مِنْهَا صَفَرْتُ عَذَابًا, 'I fled through fear'. If this is not the case, then the genitive is used, following a particle of allegation (explanation) (حَرْزَةٍ التَّمْلِيقِ): -، 'I intended it in order to draw some advantage from it' .... If the noun is preceded by the genitive must be used, صَرَبتُ النَّفَقَةِ, 'I fled through fear of being killed', or لَيْكُونُ, '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, One puts in the accusative, as a complement of motive, the infinitive, if it expresses the reason why, e.g., يُحِدّدْ نَفْرًا وَجَنِينَ, '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 '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:

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, مَعْصُول نَ, if it is made definite by the article or by a complement of annexation, one ordinarily expresses it by means of a preposition, as ضَرَبَهُ لَتَأَدَّبُهُ. If it is indefinite, one ordinarily expresses it by the accusative, as ضَرَبَهُ تَأَدَّبِي لِه. 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 لَبَنَ, and not لَبَنَ.

To what we know already, Sterling adds that the مَعْصُول نَ "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 صَرَبَ خَوْفًا, I fled from fright.

(4) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., Lines 298f.
Here 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 مَعْلُومٍ لِّي, جَنَّ, مَهْرٌ, مَعْلُوبٍ لِّي. Sometimes the is itself the cause of the action, and must then be a noun of action of a verb denoting a mental process; as , the Messiah died from love to us. At other times the verb is the cause of the action and then may be the noun of action of any verb; as 'I beat him to correct him.

If the is made definite by the article, it may be put in the accusative; as , I fled from fear.

Also if in construction it may be put in the accusative; as , I fled fearing slaughter, but it is better to use the preposition".

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 themaýojyo-L-o- that it is the force of the main verb which wields the influence; however, again, of course, the accusative is not a ء م، but is governed indirectly. When one of the three conditions is not fulfilled, the verb can no longer transmit its influence to the م - 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 مضمون نيمي مضمون, 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 ل to describe this مضمون; it obviates the necessity of having to use the preposition "in", ل, to define the place or the time of an action.

Sibawayh sums up its use neatly: "Temporals and locatives; In the sentenceبُوم البسسية الفاك قيمة, 'I meet you on Friday', the temporal noun is in the nominative as it is a سابيدا, and what follows it is built upon it. Likewise with a noun of place, سكانكم تسبّب قيمة, 'I got up in your place'. One can also sayبُوم البسسية أصوم قيمة بيه, 'I fast on Friday', orبُوم البسسية الفاك قيمة, 'I meet you on Friday'. When the temporal is accusative it takes the place of a preposition. The تفاير is a form of تفاير, 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، بوم البسسية الفاك قيمة، is syntactically similar to "Abdullah, I hit him". (1)

Ibn Hishām expands this a little further: "Limitative

(1) Sibawayh, op.cit., p.43.
object; Adverbial accusative. It is this which is subjected to the action of some governing word with the sense of ج و ، in; (a) With nouns of time, such as or صَسَتُ يوْمَ الْكُتْبَةُ or جَينَا، '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 أَمَامُ، 'before', الشُرْطَ، 'above', اليمينُ، 'on the right hand side', and the opposing aspects, as well as those resembling them, such as لَنَّى، عَنْدَ، 'at'. (c) With nouns of measure, like قُرْنَةٌ، 'parasang', جِلْدُ، 'mile'. (d) With those words which are derived from the infinitive of their governing word, like قَسَتُ مَضْصَفَتْ نِيْرٍ، '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 núfūl نُيْفُ used both definitely and indefinitely. Al-Zajjājī explains when each is called for. "Noun of time: This is always in the accusative، اليوم، 'today', سَارِكَ، 'I will ride tomorrow'

كَرَرَ يوْمَ الْكُتْبَةُ، 'he went out on Friday', N.B. كَرّرُ when this refers to a definite specified day it does not take nūnation, and is therefore not مَنْصُرِنُ; however, when it refers to any day it is nūnated, as كَرَرُ يوْمَ الْكُتْبَةُ، 'I went out on Friday morning', but كَرَرُ لَقَيْتُ زِيدًا كَرّرًا

(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 مفعولٌ نِعَيْنَة) it is put in the accusative, as جلَّت عندك, 'he sat near you', نَزَع عند أخيك, 'Zaid is with your brother', and يَرَى سُيك, 'I travelled for a mile', خرَخَا, 'a parasang', مئَالُن, 'two miles'. When moved from its proper place, however, it becomes like any other noun". (3)

Al-Zamakhshari classifies the مفعولٌ نِعَيْنَة into various sub-divisions: "مفعولٌ نِعَيْنَة. 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 راكِين, 'time', البِرْهان, 'the aspects'. (b) Fixed. اليوم, 'today', الدار, (in) the house'. (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 سُرتا ذات صوة, 'we travelled for a while', بكَرْن, 'at daybreak', كبيرا, 'in the morning', ضَحى, 'we travelled in the forenoon'. One also says سُرت على طولٍ, lit., 'it was journeyed a long way', كثيرا, 'much'. Since the accusative is stronger than the nominative one says أتبت به جيداً, 'I brought it in a good condition'; جيداً is an understood حال, and nothing is stronger than حال, and the meaning is

If or one good dirham'. In certain cases, the accusative can be regarded almost as a; 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 "Complement of place, called also limitative; or. The limitative is a noun of time or place to which one regularly attaches the sense of e.g. 'stay here for a while'.

"(In giving for a sign of 'circumstantial terms of time and place', which contain the sense of the preposition 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 'I entered the house', and 'I entered the mosque', without one's being able to say 'I slept in the house', or 'I prayed in the mosque'. It is not in those cases, like that and 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 ُرَسَى, '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', ُعْنَى السَّكَان, indicating a 'special' place, ُمَخْتَصُرُ, although directly opposed by their nature to the 'vague' or 'indefinite' nouns of place, ُمُبْذَلُ, (such as before, behind, above, to the right, etc., or a thousand, a parasang, etc.) can be employed adverbially, as ُفَرَد, is very likely their intimate connection with the 'nouns of action', ُصَنْفُ معْلَم, serving the function of ُمُصْرِف. 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', ُذُهَبَ مَيْقَتْ زَيد, thus one says ُذُهَبَ مَيْقَتْ زَيد, 'I went in the way of Zaid', but one must not say ُأَرْعَى مَيْقَتْ إِبْرَاهِيم, '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 ٍيَوُم: others, on the contrary, are never used except adverbially, like ُتَبَلَّ , 'before', ُتَكَبَّ , '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 ُعَبْرِ of the ِصِبْدَ, such as ُزَيْدَ ُعَامَشَ, '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 ُعَلِّي أَعَامَشَ ُزَيْدَ, 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, 'Zaid settled in front of you', or 'Amr settled behind you'.
Some Basrans say it is made accusative by the virtual meaning of the (present participle), and it really means.

"Kufans: - It is made accusative, as a difference, and that is because the of the in meaning is the ; thus when one says 'Zaid is standing', and 'Amr is eloquent', has in its meaning, and has in its meaning. So when one says does not have in its meaning 'it is Zaid', nor does 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 and is and ; because the preposition is a noun of place or time with the meaning of , '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 'I marvelled at Zaid', or 'I looked at 'Amr'; and if one says or 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 ًا لِامَل or
ٍرَسَر إِسْتَقَرَّ نِّي وَرَأَك or ٍرَسَر إِسْتَقَرَّ نِّي لِامَل is كُسرٍ وَرَأَك.
Then the particle ( َُِّ ) has been suppressed and the verb has been joined to the preposition, and makes it accusative. And the verb, which is لُقًّي, is conjectured with the preposition, just as it was conjectured with the particle ( ِّٔ ) etc.).

"As for the Basrans who say the preposition is made accusative by the virtual meaning of the ًا لِامَل (present participle), they say this is because the virtual meaning of the ًا لِامَل is preferable to the virtual meaning of the verb; because the ًا لِامَل 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 ًا لِامَل.

"In my opinion the first explanation is the right one, and that is because the ًا لِامَل 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 ًا لِامَل. What proves this is the fact that the preposition may be
found as a link with رأيئُ الذى اسمَالك , as in الذى , 'I saw (the person) who (was) in front of you', and
الأئ لوى ورآك , '(the person) who (was) behind you', and a
link can be only a sentence ( ). and if the
conjectured thing were the الفاعل !, then it would be
isolated: because the الفاعل ! 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 ; because the verb with the pronoun can be a
sentence.

"As for the Kufans' statement that "the جهر of the
 مستوى has the same meaning as the مستوى , 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 مستوى , the مستوى also would have to be accusative,
because the مستوى is different from the preposition, just as
the preposition is different from the مستوى . The
difference cannot be imagined as being in one only - it is
in both. One should say عصرًا ورأي ئك and ريدًا اسمَالك . 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 السفوع المطلقة 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 جِ ، "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 يَبْوَرُ الجِسَامَةُ أَلَّا كَذِبَهُ "is like عبدِ الله ضِرْبِهِ , 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 ستَقَرَ! They say that in the course of time, the preposition which should follow ستَقَر! 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 مَفْعُوْلِ بِهِ is similar to the مَفْعُوْلِ بِهِ , but is not, as Sībawayh and the Basrans would have us believe, a genuine مَفْعُوْلِ 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 

Having given this explanation, examination must be made of another of the points made by Sibawayh. He says that in the sentence يُؤْمِنُ الْجَمَاعَةُ أَلَّا يَنْبَأَ سَبْتَا, the nominative is used as a . 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.
\(^{(9)}\) Nüdeke, 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 - حَالٌ - 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 حَالٌ, or state. حَالٌ 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 مَفْعُولٌ. It may show the condition of any part of the main sentence.

حَالٌ. 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 - مَارُ أُخُورُ إِلَّا، جَاهِنَ زَيدٌ. "Zaid came riding", حَالٌ "your brother travelled quickly". حَالٌ 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 حَالٌ : verb as regent - حَالٌ, "Zaid went out quickly", or مَرََا خَرَجَ حَالٌ, خَرَجَ مَرََا حَالٌ; other than verb as regent -
We see that al-Zajjāji states quite definitely that the 
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 
in front of the verb governing it when the subject is 
an obvious noun, as in رَابِبًا جَاءَ زَيْدٌ, "Zaid came riding", 
but it is permissible when the subject is a pronoun, 
, "I came riding". The Basrans say the may precede its governing verb, whether the subject be obvious 
or a pronoun.

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

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

(1) Al-Zajjāji, 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 عصرًا ضرِبَ زِيد. 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 أَلْوَجَّهَ زَيْتُهُ بِحَيَّةٍ مَوْرَكَ "Moses conceived a fear in his mind", and the pronoun in it returns to because even though it be posterior in letter. If it (the pronoun) be posterior in virtual meaning it may precede. Likewise in the sentence-

"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 عَلَّتَهُ هَرَمًا returns to because it ( هَرَمًا ) precedes it in virtual meaning, because the virtual meaning is من يِلْقَ يَوْمًا هَرَمًا عَلَّتَهُ, "he who meets one day Harim in his ordinary way of life", and when 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-Zamakhsharî is not at all committal on this point. This is similar to a ـفعلـ in that it comes at the end of a sentence and serves to explain the state of the ـفاعلـ or the ـفعلـ ـسائلـ; "I hit Zaid standing", or ـليستـ ـمسعدـ, "I met him journeying". The ـفاعلـ bears a resemblance to a verb, and indeed has the meaning of a verb, "this is ـعصرـ eloquent", or ـماـ ـلاـ ـثـانـ, "what is the matter with you standing still?" In the same way, words like ـليستـ, "would that", ـكـانتـ, "perhaps", and ـكـانـ ـثـانـ, "as if", are followed by the accusative on account of their strong resemblance to verbs. The ـ مصدرـ may act as a ـحالـ, ـتمـ خانًا, "stand up standing", as may an adjective, ـليستـ ـكـافـا، "I met him face to face". The ـحالـ itself must be indefinite, and the thing governed by the ـحالـ must be definite. The ـحالـ must be indefinite as it is a second ـخيرـ. Sometimes the verbal noun is used instead as a ـصفةـ (حال itself is actually a ـصفةـ). Instead of saying ـرسلـ ـهاـ مماركين ـمـتركةـ، ـرسلـ ـهاـ المراكـ، "he sent them fighting (the fight)"; and likewise, in the sentence "you acted energetically and capably", instead of ـفعلـ ـخافتـ ـوـطائفـ، one says ـفعلـ ـ?urlـ ـوـطائفـ. Though these words are actually definite, the idea behind them is indefinite. Some nouns also act in the same way as these ـمصادرـ. The thing described by the ـحالـ 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 qualitative is an adjective used accessorially, and replying to the question "How?":

ضربت الله مكنونًا، "I hit the thief pinioned". The accidental qualitative must be indefinite. If it is met in the form of a definite noun, it must be interpreted in translation by an indefinite noun: أدخلوا الأول خالقًا, "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:— (1) definite;

خَحَاطِصًا أبصارهم يَتَخَرَّجُون, "their eyes lowered, they will go out"; (ii) particularised; نُن اربعة أيام سَوَّتُ الْانْتِلَانِ, "in four days exactly ..."; (iii) a general sense وما أَفْلَكُنَا مِنَ فَرْيقٍ بَلَّ هُمَا مَنذَرُون, "we have not destroyed any city except it had warners"; (iv) placed after the accidental qualitative; لَسْيَتْ صُوْحَخًا طَالِبًا يَلْبِّي كَأَنَّ خَلَلٍ, "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 

The accidental qualitative; 

The accidental qualitative is an adjective, used accessorily, governed in the accusative, signifying "in the state of ...", as 

"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 "accessorily"), 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 

a word by which one designates that which is indispensable to the constitution of the proposition. For example, if one says 

"I met 'Amr, (he) being on horseback", 

is a 

and a 

because the words 

would form by themselves a complete proposition. Sometimes, however, the 

or "circumstantial term of state" forms a necessary part of the proposition, either because it takes the place of the enunciative (or 

) as in the example 

"my hitting Zaid standing", of which the sense is 

"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:-

"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 كنيّا etc. were suppressed.

"(The حَالَّ of its nature must be an adjective: it must be put in the accusative: finally, it must contain the value of the words في حَالَّ, "in the state of". It must further express a transitory, accidental state, and not inherent to the thing or person to which it refers. Finally, it must be a "verbal adjective", مَحَالَة. 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. بيع مَدَّا بِذَا بِيذٍ, "sell it, so much a measure, in ready money", and نَفْرُ نَدْرَ الأَرْضِ, "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". حَالَّ 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 جَامِد (which was translated as "primitive"), which is the contrary of مَحَالَة, can serve as a حَالَّ 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 محتوى.

"If the accidental qualicative is made definite for the letter, be sure that it is not (made definite) for the sense, e.g., وَخَذِلَ إِبْتِجَادٍ, "strive alone".

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

"An indefinite infinitive is often used as an accidental qua-licative, e.g. فَبِنَتَتْ رَبِّيُّ طَلَّوْ, "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 لا يَلِفَ اسْرِرُ عَلَى اسْرِيَ مَشْتَهْلاٍ, "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", صاحب الكلام, دُوِّنُ الكلام, or is ordinarily definite, مصيرة: 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 qualicative 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: -

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 طَلُبُ بِكَمْ بِذَكْرَكُمْ حقَّ كَأَنَّكَمْ عَنْدِي serves the function of حال , and yet it is placed before its antecedent, صاحب الحال, which is the affixed pronoun كم , although this antecedent is governed by the preposition عن ).

"Do not allow an accidental qualitative 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", الاضطاح 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", مضان , 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 أَعْجَبَنَا صَدَرُ هَنِيَّةٍ تَائِسَةٌ, "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 "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. "follow the faith of Abraham who is a hanif". It is evident that one could say, with-
out the sense being essentially altered, as in the second case one could say instead of

"If the accidental qualitative is governed by a verb
entirely conjugable, or an adjective which resembles it, it is
permissible to place it at the beginning, as in "at speed he makes off", and "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., "as if", "would that",
"that" (fem.), and it is rare that one finds expressions
like "Sa'id is at Hajar, in residence". The construction
"Zaid all alone is more useful than 'Amr helped", is permissi-
ble and is not weak.

"(It seems natural that the noun which is modified by the
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 لبت, which contain the sense of "I desire", كأن, "as if", which contains the sense of اشبه, "I compare". Finally, this happens only rarely with the prepositions في, "in", عند, "at", and others similar which contain the sense of the verb استقر, "to be in a place". As for adjectives of the form أفضل, 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 Malik. One can likewise say عنصر قاسي أحسن منه قاعدًا, "'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 qualitative 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 Zaid came, laughing, riding": this is what Ibn Malik 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 being put in the dual or plural, because it expresses a modification common to several objects, as in the example 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 modifying a particular object. In this latter case, each modicative term can follow the noun which it modifies, as: "I, riding, met 'Amr, walking": or else the different modicatives can be put back after the different modified terms, as. 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, modifies the pronoun contained in .

"The term which governs the accidental qualitative can be corroborated by it, in cases like, "do not be a transgressor on the earth, causing trouble". If a proposition is corroborated, the governing influence of the
accidental qualitative 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 ذهبت مسرعة, "Amr went quickly": one then calls it مثبتة or موضعية: at other times it serves only to corroborate an idea already set forth, and one then calls it مؤكدة. In this latter case the حلال can corroborate, be it only the antecedent which governs it, as in the example given by Ibn Malik, where the word مثبتة corroborates منصفة; 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., زيده اخوك عطوان, "Zaid (is) your brother (being) affectionate", فذا اكتن بيننا, "this (is) the truth (being) evident". To analyse these propositions one supposes that there is ellipsis of the antecedent which governs the حلال, an antecedent which is معربة, or احدة, "I know it", "I am certain of it".

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

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

"(The 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 . 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 is joined to its antecedent, either by the conjunction , or by a "pronoun of recall/return", , or by these two means together).

"Sometimes the accidental qualitative 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, يَبُنَّ رَجَسَت, "how did you come back?", he can reply, رَبَّنَا , "on horseback", with رَجَسَت, "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: ما خَلَكَ ثَانِيًا, "how are you, standing?", ما لَكَ ثَانِيًا, "what is your brother doing, standing?". The accusative is used in the same way as in هذا عبد الله ثانِيًا, "this is 'Abdullah standing", on account of what is before it. In these sentences there is the meaning of لَمْ تُصَّتَ, "why did you get up?". (6) ... Sentences in which the definite predominates over the indefinite. In the sentence هذا رجلاَن وعَبْدُ اللَّه مُنطَقِين, "these are two men and 'Abdullah, eloquent", منطِقِين is made accusative because there is no way in which it can possibly be an epithet of عبد الله, nor of the dual. It is thus a حال, as if one had said simply هذا عبد الله مُنطِقًِا, "this is 'Abdullah,

(5) Ibn Mālik, op. cit., lines 332f.
eloquent". However, having told us that the word is a حَلَلٌ, Sībawayh then seems to contradict himself when he says afterwards: "However, حَلَلٌ may permissibly be in the nominative". 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 حَلَلٌ, but having the definite article: دُخُلُوا الأَوَّلَ خَالِدًا, "they entered in the order in which they were". This works in the same way as does دُخُلُوا رجلًا رجلًا or دُخُلُوا واحدها فواحدًا, "they came in man by man". One may, however, use the nominative and regard the أَوَّل as a بُدِل referring back to the verb. If however, one makes it a command and says أَدْخُلُوا, "enter", then only the accusative can be used, as there will be no بُدِل, since the words will not have their intended meaning".

A further branch of حَلَلٌ is the accusative after لَا, "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 لَا عَلَمًا فَعَالِمٌ, "as to knowledge, he is knowledgeable"; or لَا عَلَمًا خَلَفَ عَلَمَ عِنْدَهُ, "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:

\[
\text{"as for killing, I am no killer".}
\]

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

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

\[
\text{"as for being knowledgeable, he is knowledgeable". Here all dialects have accusative.}
\]

Sibawayh cites one example with a substantive:

\[
\text{"as for being a sincere friend, he is not a sincere friend". The same applies - in spite of the participial pattern of to }
\]

\[
\text{"as for being a tax-gatherer, no". The adjectival character is stronger in }
\]

\[
\text{"as for one who returns from battle, his booty is fine". One could, however, take the accusative as circumstantial: "as for when he returns ..."}
\]

"Sibawayh analyses these accusatives variously as and 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 extraposed word. Thus the prototype of is
Sībawayh uses this criterion himself when he rejects "as for servants, he is the possessor of servants", on the ground that one cannot say *اَمَّا عَبْدٍ عِبَّدَ عُبْدٍ*. Later philologists abandoned the elaborate classification of Sībawayh. (10)

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

"Kufans:- The proof that the *حال* 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 *صَلَبَانَ رجلاً*, "they (two) hit a man", or *صَلَبَانَ رجلاً*, "they (two) hit some men". This is not permissible with *كان* , for one cannot say *كانَانَ قانَٰثاً*, "they (two) were standing (sing.)", or *كانَانَ قانَٰثاً*, "they (two) were standing (pl.)". What also proves this is that one can express in another way the transitive verb, as in *ضربت لبيد*, "I hit Zaid", and one says *فصلت لبيد*, "I so-and-soed

Zaid"; but one does not say in the case of  كنت أخاك, "I was your brother",  فعلت بأختيك. 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 حال in meaning, without the حال, and with كان this is preferable, because it is better to say كان زيداً في حالٍ كذا, "Zaid was in such-and-such a state", just as, in the case of ظنت زيداً فاضلاً, "I thought Zaid was standing", it is better to say ظنت زيداً في حالٍ 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 زيداً اخاك, "Zaid was your brother", and ظنت عمراً علماً, "I thought 'Amr was your servant", and حال cannot be definite". We (the Kufans) say: this is permissible because علماً اخاك and علماً are in the place of the حال, as in ضربت زيداً سوطاً, "I hit Zaid with a whip", where سوطاً is accusative as a verbal noun ( مصدر here represents the absolute object, for it is الصفر المطلق which is used to denote the noun of instrument), even if the instrument for its taking the place of the مصدر were ضربة: the same is the case here: just as the حال is definite as in أرسلها المركب, "he sent them fighting", or طبَّت وجهك, "you pursued it with
zeal". These examples prove what the Kufans claim.

"Basrans:- The accusative is the accusative of the متعمول, and not of the حال, because both (كان وكان) govern a pronoun, as in ""we are they, and if they are not they, then who are they?" Likewise one says اين, "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 الحال, and so they must be in the accusative as a متعمول 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 متعمول كان is the فعل in meaning, and thus the dual cannot be the singular or the plural: because the متعمول كان is the فعل in meaning because it introduces the خبر, and the سبتدأ stands in place of the خبر in place of the متعمول: and, as the متعمول is the same in meaning, as in زيدٌ قال، "Zaid is standing", so must the متعمول be the same in meaning as the فعل. On account of this, there are prevented in 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 حقٌ) having regard to both an event and time, and the متعمول in it is a proper فعل, and the متعمول is
a proper  مَصْفُول : but كَانِ is not a proper verb; it has regard to time apart from event, and is thus called a verb of meaning ( خَالِل سَرَفُونِي ) : the resembles the and the resembles the مَصْفُول : and so the is known as the نَصْرِي and the مَصْفُول as the نَصْرِي.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement: "It is better to say كَانِ زِيدًا نَحْلًا كَذَا ، and in the case of كَانِ زِيدًا نَحْلًا كَذَا ظَنَنْتْ رَسْلًا نَحْلًا كَذَا ظَنَنَتْ رَسْلًا نَحْلًا كَذَا , and this proves that the accusative is the accusative of حَال, the Basrans say: certainly this would prove a حَال when all the conditions of حَال were present, but this is not so; because one of the conditions of حَال is that it should come after a complete clause, and this is not found with the defective كَانِ, ( كَانِ الْنَّازِقَةِ ) in which the difference lies; nor is it found in the second مَصْفُول after ظَنَنَتْ , 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 حَال ) is that it must be indefinite, and much of what stands as the حَبْر of كَانِ , or as the second object of ظَنَنَتْ is definite: if it were a حَال , it would have to be indefinite, and as it is sometimes definite, it cannot be a حَال .

"Then in reply to the Kufans' statement: "This is permissible because the definite stands in the place of the حَال , just as the instrument stands in the place of the مصدر in the saying ضَرِّبْ زِيدًا مَصْبُوقًا , "I hit Zaid with
a whip," the Basrans say: the difference between the two is obvious. It is right that مل should be made accusative as a مص، 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 أرسلها القرآن، and طلبها جهدك، and رجع عوده على بدنه, "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 أرسلها القرآن، the virtual meaning is أرسلها تصرف المرك، "he sent them to fight the fight", using with the meaning of إعترض; and has been put in the place of إعترض. As the Koran says, وإله أنتكم من الأرض نباتًا, "God made you to grow out of the earth as plants"; then تصرف was suppressed, and it is a sentence in the place of the حال، and the مص was used to indicate this; just as we say إنسا أنت سير، "you are journeying", or تسير سير، طلبها جهدك، و طافتك, as if it were
"you sought it as you strived your striving", and then was suppressed, and it is a sentence in the place of the حَالُ, and the مصدر was used to indicate this. Likewise with the virtual meaning in رجُعُ عَرَبَةٌ عَلَى بَدْنِهِ. Some grammarians say that عَرَبَةٌ is made accusative by رجُع, and it is accusative as مصدر, and not as مصدر, because رجُع can be transitive, as in فِى رَجُعَ اللَّهُ إِلَى طَفْلِهِ مَنْهَمَ "if God returns you to a party of them". However, the majority agree with the former explanation; and they put these مصدر 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 جَاهِرٌ are rare exceptions, and should not be used for analogy". (11)

Bravmann, in his study of syntax, mentions this accusative after كَانُ. As he disagrees with the theory that it is a حَالٌ, his views will be omitted until we examine كَانُ 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

grammarians agree that J is used in answer to the question "how?"; it may be of two types, either a single word, or a sentence. Indeed, any J may be replaced by a proposition, either verbal or nominal. The second important point is that J must come only with a complete proposition - the proposition must still make sense if the J is removed. The grammarians also agree that J 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 J is the direct object of some suppressed verb - this view is corroborated by the Hebrew usage - such as א' or א. This view is supported by Bravmann, as we shall see when dealing with ע, who regards the J accusative as apparently having its origin in nominal clauses with the function of object to a verb of sensation. As such, the J would be simply another use of the direct object. The second explanation, which the majority of the grammarians seem to favour, is that the J which governs the J 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 J 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 J, the grammarians seem to allow this; it is quite possible for
the influence of the verb to reach the حالت, even if the حالت does precede the main verb.

Finally, we turn to the question of حالت being the explanation of the accusative afterديم and the second object after ظل. 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 ofديم, 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.
TAMYIZ - SPECIFICATION

Closely related to حال is Specification, or specification. Like حال, it adds to the meaning of a sentence. Al-Yāzījī tells us: " Specification. 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: " is the primitive noun which explains what would otherwise have been indefinite: this indefiniteness has respect either to ذات, substance, or رابطه, relation.

1. تمهيد النسبة limits or defines the predicate; as

كريم زيد مولدًا, Zaid is honourable in respect to birth,
ما كرم زيداً جلالًا, how noble a man is Zaid,
يربى أكثر من عمره أثرب, Zaid has more relatives than 'Amr.

2. تمهید العباد explains what is indefinite in respect to number, weight, measure, quantity, similarity, dissimilarity or area; as

ل عشرون ناقة, he has twenty she-camels,
خربت رطل زيداً وصاعاً تسمى وميلين أرصاً, I bought a rotał of butter and a saa of what, and two miles of land,
هالله وصافها طيبة وصلها رازًا, 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. The may be put in construction with the, and the may be put in the genitive by; as, یہاں خالق خضّمیہ; یہاں خالق خضّمیہ, I have a shekel of silver, گرُسْنا ارضیہ من الخجر, we planted the land with trees, لِئے خاتمہ من ذهب, I have a ring of gold". (2)

Let us now return to al-Yāzījī for a slightly more detailed explanation of its uses; "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 - ی‌کِرْمُۃَ مُتْفَقہٰ ذْهِبًا, 'I have a weight of gold', (ii) or a measure - یُکْرِمْتُ صَافیٰ سَرّا, 'I bought two sa‘a of dates', (iii) or a number - یُکْرِمْتُ عَشْرین دَرْهَمًا, '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 - یکُرْمِیْتُ تَدْرِیا, 'Zaid was good in his soul', or یکُرْمِیْتُ تَدْرِیا, 'Zaid was good in his soul', or طَابَ زید مَنْمَنَ, (ii) or from the (the thing/person to which it is done) - یکُرْمِیْتُ تَدْرِیا, 'I extolled the shaykh in respect to wealth', or یکُرْمِیْتُ تَدْرِیا, 'I extolled the shaykh in respect to wealth', or طَابَ نَفْسِ زید; (iii) or from the - یکُرْمِیْتُ تَدْرِیا, 'Zaid is greater than you in respect to

(2) Sterling, op. cit., p.196.
wealth', or 'النهر الأزرق من المالك'. Specification is also used after nouns of number from 11 to 99: 'ثلث عشر رجل', 'ثلاث عشرة إمرأة', 'ثلاث عشرة إمرأة', 'ثلاث عشرة إمرأة', or 'اثنا عشر عبد'. The writer will in fact be dealing with the numbers in more detail just a little later.

Al-Zamakhshari tells us that within the category of "come verbal nouns and participles acting like verbs: 'الإنسان المبتسم', 'الجبل المبتسم', 'الشمس المبتسم', but 'الهواة المبتسم', 'الطرق المبتسم', 'الخمر المبتسم', 'الفراولة المبتسم', 'البرتقال المبتسم'. The specificative does not go into the accusative when singular unless it is complete: four things make it complete: (i) nunciation, (ii) the nün of the dual, (iii) the nün of the plural, and (iv) إطاظة. These are further divided into two groups: بئر, comprising i and ii, and لزنم, comprising iii and iv. With one can choose to have either or لزنم, or رطلق شكل زينة - تسبيز إطاظة, 'a rothl of oil'. With لزنم the nün is retained, and must be followed by سل عسل - تسبيز عشرون درفيد, 'fulness of honey', or عشرون دريف, 'twenty dirhams'". (4)

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

(3) Al-Yāzījī, op. cit., p.205.
(4) Al-Zamakhsharī, op. cit., p.35.
say on the numbers and كم, although he will be returning to these points later. "The specificative, تسير. 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, مقدار, a term which applies to three things, dimensions, جبة, 'a measure of palm'; capacity, صالح تسرا, 'a sā'a of dates'; weight, صنوان عسل, 'two pounds of honey': (ii) Numbers, like واحد عشر درهمًا, 'eleven dirhams'. The rule for the numbers is the same from 11 to 99. كم occurs under this heading, but in a different way. When used as an interrogative كم takes its specificative in the accusative singular - كم دازا بنيت, 'how many houses have you built?'. If, however, كم is used as an apostrophe, its specificative is always in the genitive, and it may be plural - كم عبير سلكت, 'how many slaves you have.' If the interrogative كم is itself governed by a genitive, then its specificative also may be in the genitive - بكم درفم إستريت, 'for how many dirhams did you buy (it)?'. In this case, the word governing the specificative is سى understood, but not the annexation, contrary to the opinion of Zajjāj. (iii) Words indicating parity - ونْوَحُ جَنَّتَنَا سَلَامًا إِنّا أُمَتَّنَا إِبْلًا.
an equal number of times to him, we have an equal number of camels'. (iv) Words indicating disparity -

إن لنا غيرها أبلد وشانه, '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

واختتم الرأس خيباً, 'my head shines with white hairs',

where the original construction was اختتم خيب الرأس. (ii) That which is transposed from the object, as in

وخرجنا الأرضي عيوناً, 'we made the earth give vent into fountains',

where the original was خرجنا عيون الأرض. (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 to something which is different from the specificative -

zel-zel أكتر سلك علوماً, lit., 'Zaid is greater than you in respect to knowledge', where the original was علم أكتر زيد. 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 -

مال أكتر زيد المال, 'the wealth of Zaid is the greatest wealth', provided, of course, that the elative has not got another annexive complement, for then it goes into the accusative -
'the wealth of Zaid is a greater wealth than that of other people'. The specificative which is not transposed is as in 'the vase is full of water'. This construction occurs only rarely". (5)

Ibn Hishām then goes on to state that "both the accidental qualitative 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 'do not be evil in the earth by causing disorder', or 'then you turned your backs, fugitives'.

Examples of the specificative used thus are

'‘the number of months, with God, is indeed twelve months' or

'and the Taghlibites, race of a wicked stallion, sad stallion; and the mother, pads herself to enlarge her meagre buttocks'.

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

(5) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.263f.
On the question of 

even Ibn Malik 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, \textit{التمييز}. This is a noun containing the sense of \textit{من}, explicative and indefinite. It is governed in the accusative as a specificative by that to which it serves as elucidation, as  

\textit{أنا لن عن مدة مدة} 'a span of earth',  
\textit{ مدة} 'a measure of wheat',  
\textit{مدة من دون من دون} '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.  

\textit{ما بال غدا} 'a measure of corn is a food'.  

The accusative is necessary after the antecedent of annexation, if this is like  

\textit{ملأ الأرض ذهب} 'the fulness of the earth with gold'.  

Make the noun, logically the verbal subject, to be governed in the accusative by \textit{أحسن}, acting as a superlative, e.g.  

\textit{أنت أعلى من ترك} 'you are the highest in position'.  

After any admirative expression, use this specificative, e.g.  

\textit{أكرم بك ابا} "Abu Bakr, what a noble father".  

If you wish, put in the genitive with \textit{من} the specificative other than that of number and that which is logically a verbal subject, as in  

\textit{طاب نفثا تقد} '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 followed by the genitive, with the exception, however, of two sorts of specificatives: (i) that which has numerals as an antecedent, as ثلاثون رجل, 'thirty men', ثلاث عشة نوة, 'thirteen women'; and (ii) those which contain the sense of a regent, like طب نفسك, which is equivalent to طاب 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 Malik, in the construction of the specificative term and of its antecedent,

ضَعْتُ نفسي أبادته الاطلل وأروعته وخيالي راسي إستملا
'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 تَمِيِّز 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 Malik, op. cit., lines 356f.
(8) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.245.
Zaid poured with sweat, the ram became fatty. Some say it is permissible, as do two Basrans, Abū ‘Uthmān al-Māzīnī 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:

‘does Salmā, by separation, forsake her lover, and she herself was not pleased about it?’ Their proof is that the accusative of is a تسپ، and it precedes the thing acting on it, namely تطیب، because the virtual meaning is 'and not with an affair or conversation Salmā would please herself'. This proves the permissibility of precedence.

"As for analogy, because the فعل 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 نزد عمرā, 'Zaid hit ‘Amr', the thing acted upon may come first as in عصرًا ضرب نزد. Also, people allow a حال to come before the thing acting upon it, when this is a conjugable verb, as in راكبا جاء نزد, "Zaid came riding'.

"Basrans:— It may not precede the thing acting upon it, because it is the فعل in meaning, and thus when one says تففقا الكذب خمسا and تصتيب نزد عرفنا, the is the
and the is the  nàng and thus, if one had said "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 in meaning is ‘. And when this is the in meaning, it may not precede it as if it were the verb actually in the letter.

"As for the Kufans' statement about coming first in where is a in meaning and yet it comes first, the Basrans say the difference between the two is obvious; this is because when one says and is the in both letter and meaning, and when the verb makes up for its from the point of view of letter and meaning, then becomes in place of the specified (the مفعول المختص) on account of the verb making up for its in every respect, and thus it may come first just like the in: this is different from the case in respect to . But, when one says or , or , or , or is not the in meaning; the in meaning is rather and ; and and are not in place of the in this respect, because the verb makes up for its in letter and not in meaning, and so it may not come first as may the . (Perhaps a few words of explanation from the writer might help to elucidate this rather
complicated argument: in the sentence, زید is a full حالت, and so the رابط is reduced to a مفعول, and may come first; but in the sentence, زید is not a full حالت, and so the سبیل cannot be reduced to a مفعول as it is partly the حالت.

"In reply to the Kufans' quotation of a line of poetry the Basrans say this should read "وكان نفسي بالفراء 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 نفسي would be accusative after a supposed verb, as if it had been امانتي, and not accusative as a سبیل. 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 سبوع in ضرب زيد عمران is a مفعول in letter and in meaning; but as for the منصوب in تصيب زيد عرئا, even if it is not a حالت in letter, at least it is one in meaning: the difference is thus obvious. (In other words, عرئا is actually partly a مفعول منصوب حالت , and is not a full حالت).

"As for their argument about the حالت coming before the حالت, 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 حيال preceding its حامل. This is contingent on putting the مظفر before the مظفر", we (the Basrans) say: analogy decrees the permissibility of the كايم preceding the thing acting on it, except that it is not acceptable to us as a proof, and this is because the كايم in meaning is the حامل, and the حامل 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 كايم. "The noun following the numbers from 11 to 99 goes into the accusative singular as a كايم. Also, with the exception of 12 (which follows the normal rules for the dual), the numbers from 11 to 99 end in an unnunated fatḥa, 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., أدود ثلاث تقاسم."

(9) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.493f.
'they came to me, the three of them', in Tamim, ِطلاشغم. 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 تسپير is the word following كم. Sibawayh has this to say: "كم. This has two uses, (a) an interrogative particle, or (b) a جر with the meaning of رپ, 'many a ...', acting as a فعل, a ظرف or a مفعول.

"As an interrogative; كم, كم لك درهما, '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 nunnated number, and كم too is nunnated. It is followed by the accusative singular. In the sentence كم نبيرة مثل لك, 'how many have you apart from him like him? ', كم is accusative on account of غير, and مثل is accusative as the latter's epithet". (12)

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

(12) Sibawayh, op. cit., p.291.
as a (a), as an interrogative particle: -

كم رجل عندك, 'how many men are there with you?'.

Here is in the nominative as the ٍ, is in the accusative as ٍ, and is the ٍ. On the other hand, in the sentence ٍ, ٍ is in the accusative being acted upon by ٍ. However, when ٍ is used interrogatively, the noun following it is always in the accusative, unless acted upon by some ٍ, when the genitive may be used, - ٍ, 'for how many dirhams did you buy your cloak?'; or ٍ. The sense, in this latter case, is slightly different, and so ٍ should really always be followed by the accusative to give it its true meaning.

(b), numerically as a ٍ. 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 ٍ is definite, then it is put into the nominative - ٍ, 'how much is your wealth?', ٍ, 'how many are your slaves?!'.

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

---

(13) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.145.
in the genitive, such as "كم عندك رجل", 'how many men you have', and "كم في الدار غلام", '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

`"كم بجود صقرف نال السلا وشريف خله تفر وضعة"'

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

There is also the line

`"كم في بني بكر بن سعد شريف جمع الدسيرة ساجد نفقا"'

'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 كم in the by the virtual meaning of من, because when one says "كم رجل أرمست", 'how many men I have honoured', or "كم إمرة أفترست", 'how many women did you insult', the virtual meaning is كم من رجل أرمست and كم من إمرة أفترست. 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 "ثلاثون", '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 'there are thirty men with you'.

"Basrans:— The genitive is not permissible because it 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 word or a word governing the genitive were to intervene, then the would be annulled. Because intervention between the and the 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,'how much favour did I gain from them, while I could not possibly bear poverty'. The virtual meaning is except that when interposes, is made accusative, escaping from the intervention between the and the . Another poet said 'you visit Sinān and how near to him is that hump-backed lowland'. The virtual meaning is except that
when something intervened, was made accusative, even if no were intended, but it intervened between the and the; and it is turned into the accusative because 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 and the is quite permissible, contrary to intervention between the and the.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement when they quoted , the Basrans make two points. First, the correct reading is with the nominative as an , and what comes after it is the - i.e. . 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 " has the meaning of , whether there be anything intervening or not", the Basrans say they cannot agree that the word is made genitive by the virtual meaning of , because the actual regent ( ) is . 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 , 'many a ...', and make the word following it genitive: but what proves that they were wrong is that a word demanding the genitive ( ) may not act with suppression; but it it may act in a few instances in contrast to the root, when
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 "; 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 مصوص). Thus كم may act on a word and the meaning is ذهب ثلاثون, 'thirty went'; or it may be acted upon itself, as in the saying أعطيك 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 أَنْثى بِفَضْلَـكَ مَضَيْتَ تَلَادَّنَّ لِلْجَآمِرُ حَوَّـلاً كُمِّيكَ، يَذَرْكِهِ، جَنَّٰنُ العَجْـجَو وَثُرْجُ الكَيْبَةُ بَدْعُوْرُ قَدِينًا '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)

(14) Ibn al-Anbārī, op. cit., p.190.
Sibawayh gives examples of other words which act in the same way as كم. "Other words act in the same way as كم acts in 'so-and-so-many dirhams', كم 'how many men have you seen', or كم 'how many a man came to me'. The meaning of كم is the same as كم. Other words of quantity act in the same way: كم 'what is in the sky is the place of a handful of clouds', or كم 'I have the same number of slaves as he has'. These accusatives stand in place of كم or كم plus the genitive: كم or كم. In these examples, the كم is in place of كم (which is the model for كم) and the كم (the كم or كم appended after the كم ) takes the place of the كم. When one says كم , one makes it vague, just as when one says كم , 'I have twenty', one makes vague the species: and when one says كم , one defines the species, and it is made known of what species the number is. Likewise, كم is vague: but when one adds كم , one makes clear of what species the likeness is". (15)

CONCLUSIONS.

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

(15) Sibawayh, op. cit., p.297.
about 

are that it should be an indefinite noun, containing the meaning of 

which indicates the meaning of what is before it in general. It is this meaning of 

which distinguishes it from 

which has the meaning of 

' in the state of'. It must not, however, be confused with the 

which also has the meaning of 

because the (understood) of negation is an essential part of the proposition, whereas the of 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 governing the accusative is the main verb of the sentence. Certain types of constructions must originally have had - e.g., the original of was probably , while others must originally have been constructions - e.g., the original of was probably , and the original of was probably . They later became constructions with the accusative. The accusative is therefore governed by the influence of the main verb, via an understood , or via a number or something similar. The main verb may have to be understood - e.g. in a sentence such as , one should understand the verb but it nevertheless wields its influence upon the specificative.

Turning to , we find that the grammarians mostly agree that may be used whenever a number such as
may. The Kufans, however, say that كم 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 ضم and the ضنصرب. 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, 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 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 there also exists an accusative of respect and state, such as "he is similar share-wise".

(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 حاضر - 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", أصبَح, "to continue", لَبْث, "to become", and لَبَث, "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 اسم حاضر in the accusative, صار, أصبَح, كان, etc. The حاضر, since it is fully declined, can follow, precede, or come between its اسم and its اسم. However, the اسم need not be a noun - it can be a verb or an adverb - كان، 'Zaid got up', or كان زيد في الدار, 'Zaid was in the house'." (2)

(1) Sībawayh, op. cit., p.21.
(2) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.53.
aspect of these verbs, he goes on to say: "One says 'Zaid's father was eloquent', but 'Zaid's face was good-looking'; you make the of and is its and the whole sentence is the of . However, in the second example, when the comes first, it is in the accusative since it then becomes the of . Even in the latter example, if the is dual or plural, still remains in the singular - 'the Zaids' fathers were eloquent'.

There is another point of view, however. If one regards as the of it then goes into the nominative, and agrees in number also - or . On this same theme, one can say 'Zaid's face was good-looking'; you make the of and is its and the virtual meaning is . If you wish you can say as an and a . If the of - or some equivalent verb precedes , then it is nominative being a and becomes its , and its is contained in it; 'Zaid was standing', 'the Zaids were standing'. .... In a sentence containing etc., when one noun is definite and the other indefinite, then the definite noun is
the اسم, and the indefinite the اسم, Zaid was eloquent'. But if both nouns are definite, either can be the اسم, or, 'Zaid was your brother', or, '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 of كن, or as an epithet of the first noun; كن أحد صبرًا عليك, or ما كان نيفها أحد خبر مثله, 'some one was running towards you', or, 'there was no one among them better than you'.... Just as the accusative is retained after كن when negative, so it is retained after a double negative; ما كان زيد إلا عالما, 'Zaid was not intelligent', or, ما كان زيد عالما, 'Zaid was nothing but intelligent'". (3) Al-Zajjaji also adds this of لين: "Since لين is regarded as stronger than ما, its كن is in the accusative regardless of its position in the sentence, and regardless of a double negation; لين زانًا زانًا, 'Zaid was not standing', and لين زانًا زانًا, 'Zaid was nothing but standing"," (4)

The accusative is used even after a suppressed part of كن. Sibawayh says: 'these are dry dates, but fresh dates are more delicious'. The accusative is used after an understood suppressed part of كن, whether

(3) Ibid., p.55.
(4) Ibid., p.120.
it be past or present. One can also say 'these are fresh dates but dry dates are better'. The words can be regarded as a حال. Likewise 'I passed by a man better than you and we'. In such an example the words after مررت برجل خير ما يكون خير منك خير ما تكون, 'the goodness of his affairs is better than you'. As for عبد الله أختب ما يكون تائناً, 'Abdullah is better when he is standing', only the accusative can be used. Likewise عبد الله أختب ما يكون يومن الجمعة, 'Abdullah is a very good orator especially on Friday', or عبد الله أختب ما تكون شهروما ربيعين, 'Abdullah is as good as you can be in the two months of spring', as if one had inserted before and One may also say أعطينه درهما أو درهما أكثر ما أعطينه, 'I gave him a dirham or two dirhams was the most I gave him', or one may say أكثر, or one may also make accusative, as in which the act of giving occurs'.

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

(5) Sibawayh, op. cit. p.199.
may not be followed by an expression governed by the 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 of \(\text{كان} \) \(\text{خبر} \) \(\text{كان} \) \(\text{خبر} \), and other similar verbs, must never be placed immediately after these verbs; one must not say \\
أضحت طعامك ندى آتى, 'Zaid was eating your food': however, some grammarians allow this inversion. If the complement of the \(\text{خبار} \) \(\text{كان} \) \(\text{خبار} \) 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 ندى قائم, 'Zaid is standing near you', and \\
كان في السحFTER عمر معتلكا, '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 \(\text{كان} \) and the word which immediately follows it the pronoun called the \\
ضمير الظان, pronoun of state)." (6)

At the conclusion of the section on \(\text{حال} \), the writer mentioned that Bravmann had something to say about the accusative after \(\text{كان} \), 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 الناقصة، 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 (حَال) accusative (to be translated by 'as'), a view now generally accepted. A sentence like كان عبدًا شكورًا, '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 حَال (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 الأخمال الناقصة, 'the incomplete verbs' (كان وآخواتها, 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 'predicate'. One of these verbs is "become", as "Zaid has become great". In my opinion the accusative 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 the verb "become".

"A 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 'to become' among the accusatives, regarding to which they teach, '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 Brocklemann's conception of the accusative after verbs of the meaning
'to become' as an original  יָלָר is therefore to be rejected.

"This great difference between the accusative of יָלָר 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 יָלָר-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 יָלָר, יָאֹר, etc., is easily explained by the construction of these verbs themselves and is not the result of an analogy with יָלָר, as Brockleman assumes". (8)

Under the heading of יָלָר and its sisters mention must be made of the word of negation, יָלָר. Its classification here may seem rather strange, but the view has been expressed that יָלָר is similar to יָלָר 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 \( \mathcal{J} \), which works in a different way from \( \mathcal{L} \). Chaim Rabin says: "The Arab grammarians' opinion was that \( \mathcal{L} \) governed the accusative in Hijaz dialect because its function in the nominal clause resembled that of \( \mathcal{J} \). Reckendorf saw the reason in its general character as copula and consequent similarity to \( \mathcal{J} \). Actually the accusative after \( \mathcal{J} \) (which is of nominal origin and can serve also as a verbal negation like \( \mathcal{L} \ldots \)) is not much easier to understand than that after \( \mathcal{L} \). Whichever negation has the priority, it is certain that the point at which the action of analogy set in was the construction with \( \mathcal{J} \) instead of the accusative. In the Koran, as elsewhere, it is a good deal more frequent than the \( \mathcal{L} \) with the accusative or nominative. The question whether the \( \mathcal{J} \mathcal{L} \) construction was to be identified with the Hijazi or "Tamimi" \( \mathcal{L} \) exercised the minds of the Arab grammarians a good deal. Sibawayh and Ibn Mālik denied that it had any connection with the construction of \( \mathcal{L} \) with the accusative, while Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī (902–987) and Zamakhsharī held that only those who use \( \mathcal{L} \) with the accusative could also use it with \( \mathcal{J} \). 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 \( \mathcal{L} \). "The

(9) Chaim Rabin, op. cit., p.177.
Kufans say that in the language of the people of the Hijaz, لا does not act upon the ح، but the م 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 لا does act on the ح، which is made accusative because of it.

"Kufans:—Analogy shows that لا cannot possibly be a regent; a particle cannot wield influence. Sometimes لا introduces a noun، ‘Zaid is not standing’، and sometimes a verb، ‘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 ليه، from the point of view of meaning, but this is a poor comparison، since ليه is a verb and لا is a particle، and is thus weaker. Thus the word following cannot be made accusative by لا، and must be accusative on account of the lack of a particle demanding the genitive.

"Basrans:—لا is similar to ليه and must therefore work in the same way. ليه has a رفع and a نصب، and لا must have the same. The reasons for this likeness are twofold: (i) both introduce a مبتدأ and a ح، and (ii) لا negates what is in the حل، just as ليه does. The strongest comparison is that لا can take ح before the ح، just as ليه can. Thus since لا resembles ليه so strongly، it must work in the same way، with the ح in the nominative and the ح in the accusative.

"In reply to the Kufans’ statement that لا cannot
exercise influence", the Basrans quote the Koran showing that it can and does:—

ما هذا وَنَكُنْ أُسْمَهَا يَزِيدُ "this is not a man", or

ما هِيَ أُمُّ أُسْمَهَا زِيدُ "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:

كُلّا بِاللَّهِ مَهَيْدٌ "God is a sufficient witness", or

كُلّا بِاللَّهِ مَهَيْدٌ "God is a sufficient helper", become

كُلّا للَّهِ مَهَيْدٌ or كُلّا للَّهِ مَهَيْدٌ, with the nominative". (10)

The two grammar schools take their argument further still in connection with the sentence طَعَامَكَ مَا زِيدُ َآكُلُ, "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 لَّا or لَمْ, then putting it (the noun) first is allowed. If, however, the ما is in reply to an oath, such as وَاللهُ مَا زِيدُ بَلَلَّ طَعَامَكُ, 'by God, Zaid is not eating your food', and stands in place of the customary لَمْ, then one may not put the noun first.

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

"Basrans:— The meaning of \( \text{룬} \) 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 \( \text{룬} \).

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that " \( \text{룬} \) is in place of \( \text{ں} \), \( \text{و} \), and \( \text{ی} \)," the Basrans do not agree. \( \text{룬} \) is followed by both an \( \text{فعل} \) and a \( \text{فعل} \), but \( \text{ں} \) and \( \text{و} \) are followed only by a \( \text{فعل} \). \( \text{ی} \), on the other hand, may be followed both by an \( \text{فعل} \) and a \( \text{فعل} \), but it is a declinable particle — one says \( \text{جِنَتَ بَلَّ شَكْرَ} \), 'you came with nothing'.

CONCLUSIONS

There is little which can be added to what has been said about \( \text{کان} \) 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 \( \text{حَبَر} \) has the same meaning as the \( \text{حَبَر} \), 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 ل، it appears that this particle has the verbal force of لـ، 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)

(13) Ibid., p.440.
"INNA" AND ITS SISTERS

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

Ibn Hishām simply has this to say: "The rule about the إن and the إن is that normally both go into the nominative: - رزق قالب, 'Zaid is standing'. However, three regents break this rule: - (i) Those which put the former in the إن and the latter in the نْصِب, such as كا and its family; (ii) Those which put the former in the نْصِب and the latter in the إن, such as إن and its analogous words; (iii) Those which put both parts in the نْصِب, -words of the family of ."

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

"Words which make the إن accusative, and the إن nominative; كا, كي, لئن, 'but', 'would that', 'perhaps', 'perhaps your brother is appearing in view', لئن ذهبا منتظف, 'Zaid is indeed eloquent', لئن أراك خاصص, '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 

Also, the three relevant words must come in the order of (i) particle, (ii) accusative, and (iii) nominative. However, if the of the particle is a word which takes the genitive, it can then be interposed: -  

'Zaid is with you', 'perhaps he will be pardoned', 'Bakr is in front of you' ... Should there be another epithet as well as the genitive, this may be nominative or accusative - 

'En al dar bakr, 'Bakr is standing in the house'. can be regarded as the 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 can be used only when the sense is already complete.

"The can be any part of speech: - , as , as , as , 'Abdullah went out', or , 'Muhammad is riding'; or (or or ), as , "your brother's wealth is considerable' .... Should there be two nouns in the , the second may be accusative or nominative, or , 'both Zaid and 'Amr are standing'. can be regarded as being in apposition to or , 'Zaid' can be regarded as being in apposition to the understood pronoun in , or that it is acting as.
to this pronoun - إنَّ زيّدًا ثالثًا هو وعمرو. A second alternative is to put the second noun in apposition to the position of إنَّ before its appearance in the sentence. Thus it can serve as either خبر or مبداً without altering the sense at all. Thus it becomes equivalent to saying خليلُ or سارِدُ جبانِ ولا خليلُ or ‘Zaid is neither a coward nor a miser’. خليلُ is in apposition to جبانِ جبانِ is in the accusative, in apposition to the position of the إنَّ. The third alternative is that عمرو is put in the nominative as a مبداً, but the خبر is omitted, since it is clear from what has gone before what it would be.

(2) “إنَّ زيّدًا ثالثًا وعمرو (ثالوث).


(2) Al-Zajjājī, op. cit., p.64f.
(3) Al-Yāziji, 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 ُّ and its sister words is no exception.

"The 5 words which act like verbs: ُّ. These words do not conjugate, but they have the function of verbs, ُّ, ُّ, ُّ, 'Zaid is eloquent', ُّ, 'Zaid is your brother', etc. The words are like ُّ in that they have a رفع and a نصب. When one says ُّ, 'intelligent Zaid is eloquent', if one did not mention , then would take the place of the , as if one had said ُّ, 'intelligent Zaid was going', and then omitted ُّ to make it ُّ, 'Zaid was intelligent'. This accusative after ُّ is in place of the first nominative after ُّ and its sisters. A prepositional phrase may directly follow the particle, ُّ, 'Zaid is standing there'. One may use the nominative on account of the ُّ (the action of cessation of dependence or annulment of circumstantial terms), or one may say ُّ or ُّ after ُّ etc., One can say ُّ, 'wealth', ُّ, 'a boy', and this can be extended to ُّ, 'there are camels and sheep, apart from it', or ُّ, 'we
have camels and sheep, apart from it'. The words بِلْ! and
خَالْصٍ are made accusative in the same way as كَأَنَّ فَارْسٍ when one
says مَايْ الناسِ مثلُ فَارْسٍ 'there is no one like him as a
horseman' .... Two nouns after كَأَنَّ. One would normally
put the second noun into the nominative، كَأَنَّ زَيْدًا صِنَّافِلٌ وَعَسْرُو
Zaid is eloquent and so is 'Amr', but it may go into the
accusative، كَأَنَّ زَيْدًا صِنَّافِلٌ وَعَسْرُو
Zaid is eloquent and
'Amr is intelligent'. However, when one puts كَأَنَّ before
the second noun, then the rule applying to usage after كَأَنَّ is applied, and one gets either
كَأَنَّ زَيْدًا صِنَّافِلٌ وَعَسْرٍ، لَيْتِ زَيْدًا مُؤَكَّرٌ
Zaid is eloquent, not 'Amr', or كَأَنَّ زَيْدًا صِنَّافِلٌ وَعَسْرٍ، لَيْتِ زَيْدًا مُؤَكَّرٌ
Zaid is eloquent and
'Amr is intelligent'. The same rules apply to لَيْتِ، كَأَنَّ، لَيْتِ، and
one does not get a nominative كَأَنَّ after them:
لَيْتِ زَيْدًا صِنَّافِلٌ وَعَسْرُو
would that Zaid were eloquent and
'Amr' ... The accusative لَيْتِ after the 5 sister words, when
what precedes is built on the لَيْتِ كَأَنَّ. The meaning is the
same whether it be a حَال لَيْتِ، or whether the noun before it
prevents it from being governed by كَأَنَّ:
كَأَنَّ هَذَا عِبْدُ اللَّهِ صِنَّافِلٌ - كَأَنَّ هَذَا عِبْدُ اللَّهِ صِنَّافِلٌ
'this is 'Abdullah, eloquent', or كَأَنَّ هَذَا عِبْدُ اللَّهِ صِنَّافِلٌ
'this is your mother, a unique mother'. One also says
مَايْ الْرَجُلِ صِنَّافِلٌ، كَأَنَّ هَذَا الْرَجُلِ صِنَّافِلٌ، كَأَنَّ هَذَا الْرَجُلِ صِنَّافِلٌ
'this man is eloquent', when acts
in the same way as it does when one says هَذَا الْرَجُلِ صِنَّافِلٌ
'this man is eloquent', except that كَأَنَّ هَذَا الْرَجُلِ صِنَّافِلٌ is a جَبَرٌ to
the accusative ( هَذَا) and an epithet to it. Thus it ( هَذَا) is an epithet of the رَبِّ الْحَمْرَاءِ الرَّجُلِ ( جَبَرٌ) الرَّجُلِ ( هَذَا) كَأَنَّ هَذَا الْرَجُلِ صِنَّافِلٌ.
It is the same when one says  ليت هذا زيد تانيًا would that this were Zaid standing', or لعل هذا زيد دأبًا, '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 اخاك ضالٍ whom I saw is your brother, eloquent', or إن كان أفضلهم زيد, 'the most excellent of them is Zaid". (4) Sibawayh 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 1211- in the accusative and the 121 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 121 nominative as in إن زيدا تانيم, 'Zaid is standing'. The Basrans say these words do make the 121 nominative.

"Kufans:— The 121 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 121, 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) Sibawayh, 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 verb what it introduces to the verb if it begins it. The poet said '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 إِلَّا إِذنْ, and what also proves this is that if there is a particle intervening between إنْ بِذِلْكَ لَكُلُّ زَيْدٍ and the rest of the sentence, its action is annulled, and it does without it, as in إنْ بِذِلْكَ لَكُلُّ زَيْدٍ 'Zaid is your guarantor', as if one had been satisfied with the on account of its weakness. And it has been related that some people say إنْ بِذِلْكَ لَكُلُّ زَيْدٍ مَأْخُوذِ 'Zaid is influenced by you', and إنْ بِذِلْكَ لَكُلُّ زَيْدٍ does not act on account of its weakness, and this proves what we are saying.

"Basrans:- These words act on the , 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 , and the other in the accusative, resembling the , except that with these words the precedes the .
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 إسم الفاعل, which acts like a verb, and has a منصوب and a صرف، just like a verb; one says: - 'Zaid's father is hitting 'Amr', just as one says يضرب أبو عصرا، 'his father hits 'Amr'. The اسم الفاعل acts even when something interposes between it and what it acts on; so إن إن can be separated: - إن لدينا أنّا إنّ, 'we have fetters', or إن إن زذكر ذلك لئيةً, '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 الخبر what it introduces to the verb if it begins, and they quote إن إن إنّ إن إتِ إتِ إتِ إتِ إتِ هذه" , the Basrans say this is false. The الخبر here has been suppressed, and the verb of which it is the الخبر has been suppressed. Also, the whole clause after إن إن is here the الخبر. Such words must make the nominative, just as they make the اسم accusative". (5)

and إن and إن may sometimes be contracted to إن.

(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 ٣٠ and ٤٠. In the "alleviated" forms they lose their rection and their ١٢ will appear not in the accusative, but in the nominative. Some Arabs, however, put the ١ 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 ٣٠ and ٤٠ are the earlier forms, from which ٣٠ and ٤٠ 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 ٣٠ does not make the ١ accusative. The Basrans say it does.

"Kufans:-- It does not act because ٣٠ acts because it resembles in letter a passive (we should say "past") verb: it has three radicals, and has fatha. But with the shortened ٣٠ the resemblance to a verb ceases, and so its action must also be of no use. They also say that ٣٠ is a regent for nouns, but ٣٠ is a regent for verbs. Thus it

is fitting that ۳۱ cannot act on nouns, just as ۰۱ 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 وَأَنُّ, and not وَأَنُّ, as the Basrans claim—

وَأَنُّ، 'and your Lord will most surely pay back to all their deeds in full'; ۸۲ cannot be accusative by the influence of لُم، because the لُم of an oath prevents what follows it from acting on what has gone before; one cannot say زَيَّدُ لَأَكْرَسُ وَعْرَا لَأَضْرِبَتْ، 'I will honour Zaid and hit 'Amr'. One can also not say that ۸۲ has the meaning of لَم, and ۸۲ has the meaning of لَم; because one does not get لَم with the meaning of لَم following ۰۱ with the meaning of لَم. Thus in the example quoted, if one regards لَم as meaning لَم, then لَم would not be accusative, because what follows لَم does not act on what precedes it, and this proves their point (i.e. that لَم is made accusative by ۰۱ ). Also the Arabs say

۰۱ أَنِّهُ عَاكِدُ ذَالِكُ، 'is your brother not going?', using shortened أَنِّهُ in place of أَنِّهُ. The appended كَانِ is a letter of تَشَيَّه (similarity); thus when one says

۰۱ كَانَ نَزَّلَ اَلْإِرْسَالُ، 'as if Zaid were the lion', this root is ۰۱ كَانَ نَزَّلَ اَلْإِرْسَالُ, 'Zaid is like the lion', just as when one says ۰۱ كَانَ نَزَّلَ اَلْإِرْسَالُ, 'Zaid is standing', the real root is
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: أظن أنك تائم، is the same as أظن أنك تائم، 'I think that you are standing', or أَحَبُّ أنَّهَ داهِفٌ, is the same as أَحَبُّ أنَّهَ داهِفٌ, '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: إن resembles a verb in several ways, both in letter and in meaning, but إن also resembles a verb with some of its letters suppressed, and thus its action is not useless; one says ع الكلم, 'remember the speech', or شَيْء الفَرْب, 'variegate the cloth', or ل الأَمْرِ, 'manage the matter', and the action of these shortened verbs is not annulled.

"As for the Kufans' statement that "doubled إن is a regent for nouns, and lightened إن 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 إن is not the إن 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 \( \text{ذ!} \), but it dealt with \( \text{ذ!} \)
lighted from the doubled, and we have shown the difference
between them". (7)

CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that \( \text{ذ!} \) and its sisters are very similar
to the verb \( \text{ذ} \) in that both types have a nominative and an
accusative. The Arabs recognised this similarity, and
therefore assumed that \( \text{ذ!} \) worked in the same way as a verb.
The question arises, however, as to why \( \text{ذ!} \) should have
its \( \text{ذ} \) in the accusative and its \( \text{ذ} \) in the nominative.
The Basrans' answer to this is that \( \text{ذ!} \) 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 \( \text{ذ} \) in the accusative,
but leaving the \( \text{ذ} \) 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 \( \text{ذ} \) to put into the accusative.

Turning to the instances of there being two nouns in the
\( \text{ذ!} \), the explanations of al-Zajjājī as to why either the

nominative or the accusative may be used for the second seem perfectly sound.

With regard to the shortened forms ἵσται and ἱστεῖ, 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 ل of negation. Sibawayh tells us: "Negation by ل acts on what follows it, and the resultant accusative is unnūnated. The accusative effect on what follows the ل is like the accusative effect after إن. 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. ل and ما act on it in place of an إبتدأ. (It is usually used to precede the answer to some question.) ل and ما act in place of an إبتدأ, 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 س مس رجل "there is no man", and "there is nothing". The proof that ل "there is no man", is in place of an "there is no man" is in place of an مبتدأ is the expression of the people of the Hijaz ل "there is no man more excellent than you", or ما س رجل أفضَّل منك, or هل رجل خير منك, ما رجل أفضَّل منك. Nothing must interpose between the ل and the word it governs (the مبتدأ)."

(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 حیرا منّه دك, "you have no one better than he", or

لا ضاربًا زيدًا الله, "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 ندًا and شن, and the result is as above. Because what is after حیر and ضارب 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 ضرّيق has an epithet, Sībawayh says: "This may be nūnated, which is more usual, or un-nūnated: لا غلام ظریق لك or لا غلام ظریقًا 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 ضرّ. 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 

نَاحِيَةَ - interposes between the noun and the epithet, then the epithet must be nunated: 

لا رجلّ اليوم ظريفًا،

"there is no intelligent man to-day", 

لا رجلّ نِسّاجٌ قاعدًا,

"there is nobody sitting there". 

(3)

Al-Zajjājī does little more than give examples of the which denies the whole species. He says:

لا فِالَمَ عندك، لا غَلَامَ عندك، "there is no intelligent man to-day", لا جَلَامَ عندك ، "There is nobody sitting there".

"there is no one in the house", لا مالَ لزيتٍ، "Zaid has no money", لا غلامَ عائلَ عندك، "you have no servant". An epithet in agreement can be either definite or indefinite: 

لا تُوبِ حِيدٍ عندك، "you have no new clothes", لا غلامَ عائلَ عندك، "you have no wise servants".

If there are two nouns being negated, the second may be nunated in either the accusative or the nominative: 

لا غلامَ ولا عبديَّات لاك، "you have neither servants nor slaves", لا غلامَ ولا جاريةَ لاك, "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 

إِنْ - إنَّ - إنَّ عِبَدَةٌ لاك in the accusative and 

خِبَر in the nominative - apply also to 

لَ under three conditions: (i) that it denies the whole genus, (ii) that both expressions acted upon by it are

(3) Ibid., p.351.

indefinite, and (iii) that the comes first and the second: - "there is no knowledgeable person hated". There need, however, be no - خبر لا صاحب علم معلوم م، "there is no one in the house" .... 
If the is repeated "There is no might nor strength" - the first noun can be given (i) either fatḥa, with the second with fatḥa, or in the accusative, or in the nominative, like the qualicative in "there is no intelligent man", or (ii) the nominative, when the second no longer takes the accusative". (5)

Al-Zamakhshari also likens the construction to - لَلَّنْفَي الْكَنَّى. This is similar to - إنّ، and therefore the is accusative and the is nominative. When the thing denied is an - إضاحة، "there is no man's servant more excellent than he", or - لا صاحب، "there is no truthful man to be found" - or is similar to an - إضاحة، "there is no one better than he standing here", or - يأَهَلُّ الْقُرْآنِ عَنْدَك "you have no one learning the Koran by heart" - and if it is singular, then it takes fatḥa, and the is in the nominative: - لا رجل أُنْفَضَلَْ مَنْك، "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 fatḥa, - لا رجل ظريف فيها "there is no
wise man there", or (ii) the adjective is declined as if indefinite in its form or state, \( \text{لا رجل طيرًا نيرًا} \), or (iii) the adjective is declined as if indefinite in its form or state, \( \text{لا خيرًا رجلًا ولا إمرأة} \). If the \( \text{لا} \) is repeated, the nominative is permissible. If something interposes between the \( \text{لا} \) and the noun - such as a prepositional phrase - or the noun is definite, the nominative is compulsory: - "there is neither man nor woman there", and "there is neither Zaid nor 'Amr there".

None of the grammarians so far has really told us why the accusative is used after the \( \text{لا لائق الكائن} \). Even Ibn Mālik does no more than repeat the rules we have seen already.

"\( \text{لا} \) which denies the species. Give to \( \text{لا} \) the ruling of \( \text{lān} \) : 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 in the nominative. Make a compound by means of the noun which has no complement, making it inflexible in "\( \text{لا حول ولا قوة} \), "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, qualicative of an inflexible noun which it immediately follows, give "\( \text{ا} \)" 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-Zamakhšarī, op. cit., p.40.
it inflexible: put it in the accusative or choose the nominative. Submit the adjoined noun without the repetition of ل to the rule which has been attributed to the separate qualicative. Give to ل, accompanied by the interrogative hamza, that which it would demand without the interrogation.

"(One must note (i) that the influence of ل, in the cases with which it is concerned, does not entirely resemble that of ن, since, in its most frequent application, the noun which proves this influence cannot take the nunation, and is rather, to use the language of the grammarians, مصرب على الفتحة, "indeclinable in fatha", than منصرف: (ii) that when the negative adverb ل is repeated, its influence is no more than facultative. (In connection with the annexed noun): One must understand by مضارع المضارع a word which, without being in a relationship of annexation, as in this example:-

لا طالب علم محرم, "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 طالما جبلت ظاهر, "no one climbing a mountain appears", لا تلبث من زيد هائنا, "no one better than Zaid is here", لا تبيبح وجهه صحبه, "no one whose face is ugly is loved".

The الخبر must be placed only after the noun which serves as subject and which proves the influence of ل 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 لَا is that it is possible to regard it as working in the same way as لَا أَحَدُ أَفْضَلُ مِنْكَ, whence one says not لَا أَحَدُ أَفْضَلُ مِنْكَ "there is no one more excellent than you", as we have seen, but لَا أَحَدُ 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 لَا is declinable, and is made accusative by the لَا, as in لَا رجلٌ في الدار, "there is no one in the house". The Basrans say it is indeclinable in fatha. "Kufans:-- We say it is made accusative by the لَا because it uses it (لَا) instead of a verb: the virtual meaning in لَا أَحَدُ رجلٌ في الدار is really لَا رجلٌ في الدار, "I do not find any man in the house". And they make do with لَا instead of the عامل, just as when one says إنْ تَسْتَقْفَيْنِ، فإنْ لَا فلا، "if you get up then I will get up, and if not then (I will) not", it is really وإنْ لَا تَقْفُنَ، أَقْرَؤُمْ "if you do not get up then I will not get up". And when they make لَا suffice instead of the عامل, they make the indefinite accusative on account of it, and they take away the نِعْمَة as they do with an إطَاءة. Some say it is made accusative by لَا because لَا has the meaning of غير, as in زيد لَا عائل ولا جاحل, "Zaid is neither intelligent

(8) Sibawayh, op. cit., p.356.
nor ignorant", namely زبد غير عاقل وغير جاهل. They make it accusative to distinguish َبُعِيْن with the meaning of خبر from َبُعِيْن with the meaning of خبر. 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 نون. Some of the grammarians say it is made accusative since َبُعِيْن governs the accusative because it is the contradictory to َبُعِيْن: because َبُعِيْن is for negation, and َبُعِيْن is for affirmation, and they use a thing according to its opposite, just as they use it according to its like; except that َبُعِيْن, when it is a branch of َبُعِيْن in the جمع, and َبُعِيْن makes the word accusative with نون, َبُعِيْن makes it accusative without نون, 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 فالدة because the root in the sentence َبُعِيْن في الدار is really لا 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 َبُعِيْن, 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 فالدة because it is the lightest vowel.
"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "the word is made accusative because 
\( \exists \) 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 nunated.

"Then in reply to the Kufans' statement that "the nunation is suppressed as it is with an \( \text{إضافة} \)", the Basrans say that if this were sound, then surely it must be consistent in all the nunated singular nouns which allow an \( \text{إضافة} \) 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 \( \exists \) has the meaning of \( \text{لي} \) \( \text{غير} \) \( \text{فقط} \) ", the Basrans say why, when it has the meaning of \( \text{لي} \) \( \text{فقط} \), must it govern the accusative? Why not use the nominative as analogy dictates, and as the poet says?:-

\[ \text{ليين براح} \text{ } \text{سُنَ صَدَعُنَ يِبَرُّانَ} \text{ } \text{فَانَا أَبَنَ قَيْسَ} \text{ } \text{زُرَرْحُ} \]

"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 \( \text{حي} \) precedes it, they make the indefinite accusative on account of this", the Basrans say, why? What is the relating factor between it and the \( \text{نصب} \)? If it were as the Kufans say a declinable accusative, then one must insert the nunation
and not suppress it: because there is nothing to stop a declinable word from declension: and when the nūnātion 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 ِّ because it is the contradictory to ُّ: it must, if this were the case, be nūnated.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that "when ِّ is a branch of ُّ in action, and ُّ makes accusative with the nūnātion, you make the accusative after ِّ without nūnātion. in order to separate the branch from the position of the root", the Basrans say this is false, because the nūnātion is not caused by the action of ُّ, but it is an integral part of the noun in its root. And as the action of ُّ, which is the root, does not cause the nūnātion, then there is no point in suppressing it with ِّ, which is only a branch: and ِّ can be seen to be weaker than ُّ on four points: (i) ُّ acts on both the definite and the indefinite, whereas ِّ acts only on the indefinite, (ii) ُّ is not constructed with the noun either on account of its strength or on account of its weakness, (iii) ُّ still acts on the noun even with something interposing between, either a preposition or a particle taking the genitive, whereas ِّ does not act with any such interposition, (iv) ُّ may act on both an ّٰ and a ّٰ, but ِّ acts only on an ّٰ without a ّٰ." (9)

CONCLUSIONS

Several points emerge from the views of the Arab grammarians about the usage of the لَّ نَفَّذِي الْكُنْسِ. All the grammarians state that the noun denied must be indefinite. If we are to believe the explanation offered by the grammarians, لَّ works under the same rules as does لَّ أَفْذِي, but this does not seem possible. If this were the Arabs' view, then why is لَّ allowed to act only on an indefinite, when لَّ أَفْذِي may act on either a definite or an indefinite? The grammarians tried to argue away this difference between لَّ and لَّ أَفْذِي, 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 لَّ أَفْذِي, "to find", or some verb of similar meaning - this is the view put forward by the Kufans. A sentence such as لَّ رَجُلُ نَ نِ الدَّارِ لَّ أَفْذِي رَجُلُ نِ 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 - لَّ رَجُلُ 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 \( \text{د طالما جبل} \) or \( \text{د صاربا} \). 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.
ISTITHNÄ - 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 إستثناء، are rather complicated, so let us see first of all what Sibawayh - who can usually give us ample rules, but very little explanation about why they work - has to say. إستثناء. The word of exception is إلا. Generally, the word governed by إلا does not change from the state it was in before إلا was appended, and is a مأ: 'no one came to me except Zaid', or ما لقيت إلا زيد 'I met no one but Zaid', or ما مررت إلا زيد 'I passed no one except Zaid'. But in certain cases the accusative must be used:

ما ضربت أحدًا يقول ذلак إلا زيدا
'I did not hit anyone who says that except Zaid'. The accusative must be used since in this case one wishes to make a حسر, predicate, by the incidence of the verb. (The goes back to the and is accusative after this, and not after the . Were it referring to then it would be nominative) ....

It is reported that some Arabs use the accusative all the time, even when the word is a

ما حسرت بأخذ إلا زيدا - بدل 'I did not pass by anyone but Zaid', or ما أتاني أحد إلا زيدا 'no one came except Zaid', or ما رأيت أحد إلا زيدا '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 'but Zaid', or 'I do not mean Zaid', and what precedes it acts upon it just as when one says '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:—

'there is nobody there except an ass'.

As the latter noun cannot possibly be conceived of as a part of the first, it is borne by the meaning of 'but', and is acted upon by what precedes it, like the action of 'the people came except your father'; or 'I passed by the people except your father'; or 'the people are there

بِدْلَهَا اِلَّا جُسَارًا 'there is nobody there except an ass'.

The Banū Tamīm, however say

لَا اِلَّا جُسَارًا لا احدُ فيها إلا جُسَارًا 'there is nobody there except an ass'.

with the meaning of 

وَلَكَنَّ فَلُوْ كَانَتْ تَرَيَّةً آمَنتُنَّ فَنَفْقَعْنَاهَا إِسْبَاغُهَا إِنّي قَوْمِ يُوسُفَ '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 when one says 'the people came except your father'; or 'I passed by the people except your father'; or 'the people are there
except your father'. 

ٌُ 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 ٌٌٌُ is not an adjective of \( \text{\ṣurūt} \), nor borne on what it bears, and it acts on it. ٌُ is prevented from being a بدأ of the القرم by the fact that if one said '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 بدأ as one cannot use one without the other - unless, of course, the sentence is negative. إلا ابتدأ is part of the القرم, 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. إلا 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 بدأ, "alternative", and not a فصل 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, بدأ, 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: '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

ما اتاني إلا زيد، إلا عمر، 'no one came but Zaid and but 'Amr'. One may not go into the nominative as one thing excepted is not the ™ of the other - one cannot take the first out of its place and substitute it by the other. (In other words ™ is the ™ of the generality, but ™ is not the ™ of ™ and cannot therefore be nominative.) One can, however, make the first accusative and the second nominative:

ما اتاني إلا عمر، إلا بي، One can say 'no one came but 'Amr and but a man', as if one had said

ما اتاني إلا عمر، 'the people came except Zaid', or

ما اتاني إلا عمر، 'they came except Zaid' ....

Sometimes ™ and ™ act as exceptives:

لا يكون ليا، اتاني القوم لين، 'and act in the same way. They are verbs, and consequently the
accusative is a direct object". (2)

Whereas Sibawayh 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: إِلَّا. If what is before إِلَّا is affirmative, then what follows it is in the accusative:

'The people rose except Zaid', '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 إِلَّا, or in the accusative:

'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):

'the people rose except Zaid and except 'Amr', and 'your brothers did not get up except for Bakr and except for

(2) Ibid., p. 372.
Zaid', this can be followed by the accusative, but the nominative is preferred. (3)

Al-Zamakhshari 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 لانَّا الزيدّا : إلا الاقتناء العلامة لانَّا الزيدّا : إلا الاقتناء "the people came except Zaid", (ii) where the word is excepted by خلا, and (iii) where the word is excepted by ما خلا or ما عدا or these words tend to have the effect of ليس, and hence take the accusative (as they are verbs): ما جاء : خلا الزيدّا or خلا الزيدّا - '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 : خلا الزيدّا or خلا الزيدّا - '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 بدل.

4. The nominative or genitive after لا ميا. 5. This group concerns the type which

follows the (declension) existing before the introduction of the word of exception: 'no one came except Zaid', 'I saw no one but Zaid', and 'I did not pass by anyone except Zaid'. The rule applying to in its declension is the same as the rule applying to the noun coming after . It makes it accusative in a positive, isolated (i.e., generality not mentioned) sentence, or when it comes first. Both the accusative and are allowed in a negative sentence. When the exception also contains an elative, either the nominative or the accusative is permissible: 'no one came except your father better than Zaid', or '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: 'no one came except Zaid and except 'Amr', or

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-Zamakhshari, 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: -

"لَا يُذْهَبُوْنَ الا ذِيْنَ" (the people rose except Zaid), and

"لَا يُذْهَبُوْنَ الا ذِيْنَ" (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.,

"لا يُدْعُو الا ذِيْنَ" (they did not do it except for a few of them), where ذِيْنَ is a permutative agreeing with the of فُسُلَوْهُ: prohibitive, e.g.,

"لا يُتَّقَبِلَ سَنَمَانَ الا إِمَارَّةَ" (do not let any one of you mind except your womenfolk), where إِمَارَّةَ in the nominative agrees with احد, and in the accusative it is an exception following the general rule:

interrogative, e.g., "وَسَيُّ يَقْنُطُ مَنْ رَحْمَةً الا الصالِحُونَ" (who despairs of the mercy of his Lord except the sinners?)

Here الصالِحُون is regarded as being a permutative of the subject of يَقْنُط. (ii) If the exception is discontinued,
the people of the Hijaz demand the accusative:—

'no one is there except an ass', and

ما نَيْبَهُ إِلَّا حَسَارَة

'have no knowledge of it 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 نَيْبَهُ إِلَّا حَسَارَة

'there is no one there except an ass' —, or continuous —

ما نَيْبَهُ إِلَّا زَيْد

'the people did not get up except for Zaid'.

If the sentence preceding إِلَّا is not complete, signifying that the object to which there is an exception is not expressed, the noun expressed after إِلَّا undergoes the same accidence as it would have done if there had been no

ما نَيْبَهُ إِلَّا زَيْد

'they did not get up except for Zaid', (nominative);

ما رَيْسَ إِلَّا زَيْد

'I did not see anyone except Zaid', (accusative);

ما صَرَطَ إِلَّا بَرْيَة

'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

سَمّى غَيْرَ. (These are irrelevant.) (ii) Those which govern only the accusative are four in number:

ما خَلَلَ إِلَّا يُوْمَانَ لَيْسَ

'they rose except for Zaid', or
The accusative after *and* is a verbal object. (iii) Those which govern either the genitive or the accusative are three in number: *and* *Ha* and *Ha* *and* *Ha*. 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. *الإِسْتِنَا* . That which *إِلَّا* 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 *ثَامُن* (complete) when one expresses both the thing excepted, *المِستَنِئ*، and the generality from which one takes the thing excepted, *المِستَنِئ* من, as in *مَفْتَنُمْ ذَهَبَ الْقُومُ إِلَى زَيْدَ*, 'the people went except Zaid'; it is when this last term is not expressed, as in *لمْ يَذْهَبْ إِلَى زَيْدَ*, 'nobody is going except Zaid'. One calls the exception *سَتَسْطِيلُ* (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 *مَنْقَطُع* (this refers to 'discontinues it') when the thing taken away is foreign to the generality, as in *لَمْ يَمْرُ حَصْلِ إِلَّا نَفْسَكَ*, 'I did not pass by a camel except a horse'. It is not then,

(5) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., p.27lf.
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 جاءني إلا زياد أحد, 'no one came to me except Zaid'. Ibn Malik 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, بدله, 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 服務 to strengthen; e.g. إلا تسرز بهم إلا الفتى إلا الصلال، do not pass by either of them except the man except al-'Ala'.

"(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 سرت بهم إلا اخاك زيادا، 'I did not pass by them except your brother Zaid', one would also say ما سرت بهم إلا اخاك إلا زيادا، 'I did not pass by them
except your brother except Zaid'. It is good to note here that Ibn Malik has chosen his example badly, for the words واللakah and اللفت, being only virtually declined, one can doubt if they represent here the genitive or the accusative).

"If إلإ 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 إلإ, 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.,

للمتعمرون إلإ عليا، 'they have not kept their word except a man except 'Ali', and their rule, relatively to the sense, is that which governs the first of them.

"(It is here a question of the case where إلإ 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 منصبتة and that which is تأتم . If it is منصبتة, one of the words which express the things excepted must be put in the case in which would have been put the منصبتة, if it had been expressed: the others must prove the influence of إلإ, that is to say, must be put in the accusative: one will then say

ما ذلقو إلإ زيدا إلإ عمر إلإ محسنًا, '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 there is a new distinction to be made: for the can be placed before the , as , 'the people did not come except Zaid except a man', or after it, as . If the latter case takes place, the nouns of the things excepted must all be put in the accusative: one will then say , '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 , following the rules given above. In the example given above , the exception is not , because the verb contains a pronoun, and is the equivalent of . 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 , usage, however, gives the preference in this case to the noun placed first. The second part of this verse signifies that, when is thus repeated, the exception is either negative or affirmative for all the things excepted, provided that it is negative or affirmative Unidentifiable.
for the first).

"Except a noun in the genitive with ُخير, declined with the same flexion which one attributes to the noun excepted by ُلا. With سُئلَة, سُؤَيْنَة, سُؤَّيْنَة, do, following the most just opinion, as one does with ُغير. Except, using the accusative, by means of ُلِسْ, and of ُيِكْرَن preceded by ُلا. Make the genitive be governed, if you wish, after ُلِس: after ُسَا, 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 ُتَأَمَّ الْقُومَ ُلِا زَيْدًا, 'the people rose except for Zaid'. Some say the regent is ُلا, as do two Basrans, Abū al-'Abbās and al-Zajjāj. Al-Farrā' and others say ُلا is a compound of ُلا + ُإِنَّ, then ُإِنَّ changed to its light form, and was assimilated with ُلا, and they made it take an accusative in affirmation, considering it to be like ُإِنَّ, and used it in negation as an ُعَطْف, considering it to be like ُلا. Al-Kisā'I (d. 805) says that the thing excepted is made accusative because its interpretation is:

ُتَأَمَّ الْقُومَ ُلِا أَنَّ زَيْدًا ُلَمْ يَقْمُ, '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 إنا.

"Kufans: - The proof that إنا is the regent is that it stands in the place of إستثني، and thus when one says تام القوم إستثني، the meaning is تام القوم إستثني زياداً, 'the people rose excluding Zaid'. And if one says إستثني, then one must use the accusative, and likewise one does so with what takes its place (i.e. the place of the verb إستثني). 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 إنا.

"Another thing which proves that the verb is not the regent is that, in the sentence القوم إخوانك إنا زياداً, 'the people are your brothers except for Zaid', إنا زياداً is made accusative, yet there is no verb at all.

"Al-Farrā' says it is made accusative by إنا because the root of إنا is زياداً, إنا, and لا + إن is the root of تمم, and ل dispenses with the حكم. The interpretation is really إن زياداً لم يقم, 'Zaid does not get up'. Then إن became the lightened form, it was assimilated with ل, and they became one word, with two different actions: the action of إن when the accusative is used in the affirmative: and the
action of \( \text{لا} \) when it becomes an \( \text{ماعن} \) in the negative, and acts like \( \text{حتى} \) \( \text{لا} \) : it resembles two words - \( \text{لا} \) and \( \text{ماعن} \) - and acts as they do; the genitive follows when it has the meaning of \( \text{لا} \), and it acts like \( \text{ماعن} \) when it is an \( \text{ماعن} \). It is quite permissible for a verb to follow it just as it is quite permissible for a verb to come after \( \text{ماعن} \). Thus when one says 'I hit the people except Zaid', one means 'until I reached Zaid'. And one says when one means 'and I hit Zaid'. \( \text{لا} \) 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 \( \text{لا} \), and acts transitively on the thing excepted, just as some verbs are made transitive by a particle demanding the genitive, except that \( \text{لا} \) does not act, even if it were of transitive effect, as does a particle calling for the genitive; because \( \text{لا} \) is a word which introduces a noun and the imperfect tense of the verb, such as \( \text{ما زيد إلا يقوم} \), 'Zaid is doing nothing but rising', or \( \text{ما عسرو إلا يذهب} \), 'Amr is doing nothing but going', even though it may not introduce the past tense, such as \( \text{ما عسرو إلا ذهب} \) or \( \text{ما زيد إلا تمام} \). 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 (لَعْنَصَّ) are transitive, and they are not regents, and this is the same as making the noun accusative in the مَفْسُول مَعَهُ, such as جَاَلَ الْبِرَِّ وَالْطَايَالَةُ or إِسْتَثْنَىُ الْمَلَأُ وَالْخُبَثُ, when the noun is made accusative by the preceding verb and by the strengthening of it by وَأَوِ.

"In reply to the Kufans' statement that " إِسْتَثْنَىَ stands in place of إِسْتَثْنَىَ, 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 رَدَى تَأَسَّنَأَ, 'Zaid is not standing', and this is quite sound. But if one said مَا رَدَى تَأَسَّنَأَ, with the meaning of تَأَسَّنَأَ, 'I denied that Zaid was standing', this would be wrong. This is the case here regarding إِسْتَثْنَىَ إِلَّا as meaning إِسْتَثْنَىَ. 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 إِسْتَثْنَىَ, 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 مَ جَانِى أَحَدُ 'نَ لِا يَدُوْ ' or مَا مَرَّ بِذَٰلِكَ إِلَّا يَدُوْ. This proves that having the meaning of إِسْتِثْنَى is not the regent.

"Third, it is annulled by the sentence قَامُ الْقُومُ ثُمَّ غَيْرُ يَدُوْ, where غَيْرُ is in the accusative, and its accusativeness must be either by the virtual meaning of إِلَّا, 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 إِلَّا, because if إِلَّا were intended, then the meaning would be false, because the virtual meaning would be قَامُ الْقُومُ إِلَّا غَيْرُ يَدُوْ, 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 غَيْرُ is vague. Thus if one says مَرَّ بِذَٰلِكَ غَيْرُكِ, 'I passed by a man apart from you', everyone apart from the 2nd person comes under the category of غَيْرُ. And when there is this extreme vagueness it resembles the vague prepositions, such as خِلْقٍ 'behind', أَهْمَمْ 'in front of', وُرَّتْ, 'beyond, in front', and تَقَامُ '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 غَيْرُ).

"Fourth, why, when one supposes the virtual meaning of إِسْتِثْنَى, does one make يَدُوْ accusative, when, when one
supposes the virtual meaning of زيد یامتنع, one makes nominative?

"Fifth, if one makes الإل تَيَّّبَ act with the meaning of إستَنْتِجَ, 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 الإل.

"Then in reply to the Kufans' statement that "what proves that the verb is not the regent is the sentence الفِنْم إِخْوَانَك إِلّا زِيدا, when زيدا 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 إخوانك, because the virtual meaning is الفِنْم يِصَادْفُونك إِلّا زِيدا.

"As for the statement of al-Farrā' about " إلإ being an assimilation of لِي إن " , 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 ٌ! is lightened to ٌ! 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-Farra' states that, even in combination, each of the two particles retains the action it had before being combined. As for its resemblance to حقي, this is far-fetched; because حقي 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 إلا أن َّ يَبَّأَر لا يُضَرَ", the Basrans say it must either be that the cause of the accusative is َّ which acts, or َّ. If one wishes the cause of the accusative to be َّ which acts, this is annulled by the sentence َّلا َّ عَسْرُوم, 'Zaid, not 'Amr, got up'. If one wishes َّ to be the cause of the accusative, then both its ُّ and its ِّ are in the virtual meaning of the ُّ: 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 َّ مَفْعُول", this also
closely approximates to the saying of the Basrans, because there is no regent necessitating the accusative except the preceding verb". (7)

CONCLUSIONS

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 does not change from the case it had before the 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 , 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 , as the grammarians did not allow a to precede its . In cases such as this the excepted word always goes into the accusative, whether the sentence be positive or negative. In negative sentences, 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 بدلا. 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 فلا is a compound of جأ + و, and so governs in the way in which جأ 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 جأ which is thought to be used in فلا - cannot wield influence, when it was they who stated (as was seen towards the end of the chapter on جأ and its sisters) that the shortened form could still govern the accusative). If this is the case, why does فلا 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 فلا is derived from جأ + و, then it would logically have to govern the same case all the time.

A further Kufan view is that one must understand by فلا the verb جىنف لسنتف governing a direct object (we are still concerned only with positive sentences). As was mentioned in connection with the جأ + و interpretation, and as the Basrans point out, if the verb جىنف لسنتف 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 إلا. But in condemning the Kufans, the Basrans automatically condemn themselves: if the main verb, by the mediation of إلا, 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 وُلُكْن but if this were so, then surely one must understand وُلُكْن 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 بدل, - 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 $\mathfrak{g}$ 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 $\mathfrak{g}$ is a further use of the direct object after an understood verb which is contained in $\mathfrak{g}$: in this respect the view of the Kufans is quite acceptable, imagining this verb to be $\mathfrak{g}$, 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 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. Sibawayh, 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, حَلَل could well have been in apposition to the thing it described, as it is when it is indefinite, and َتَسْبِیْز could have remained a genitive, as it obviously was originally, as could the ُصَنْعَلْنَ. 

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 — ِبَنَيْنُ — and ٌمُبَحَّرَ.

While each is used in a slightly different way, they could surely have used one standard term.

The question of the word ِبَنَيْنُ is a further example. Why should certain of the uses of the accusative have the title of a ِبَنَيْنُ, 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 ِبَنَيْنُ is something affected by a ِبَنَيْنُ, why do they not refer to others of the uses as a ِبَنَيْنُ?

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 ِعَامِل, the regent, and of the power which binds cases together. It seems strange — if not almost paradoxical — that a ِبَدَل may not precede its ِصِبْدَل ِفَنَى (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 إِنَّهُ - 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 مُفْصُولٌ بَ - and the مُفْصُولٌ نِ  - could well be repeated. Where the object, or the word of time/place comes first, it may be nominative, as a ضَبْتُ . 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 كَانُ, as to whether its خَبُر was a حال.
After the rigid rules they laid down for، by no stretch of the imagination can the، be deemed a، 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 حَسَّةَ الْوَسْلِ. Nunation disappears altogether except in a few isolated adverbial usages, such as أَحْيَاً, حَالًا, "at once", أَحْيَاً, "sometimes", and تقَرِيبًا, "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 َنِّ and َنِّ, 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.
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