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Government and Binding Theory dictates that the case features of noun phrases are assigned structurally under government. On this basis the claim by Ibn Mada' al-Qurtubi, in The Refutation of the Grammarians, that case is assigned solely by the language user on strictly semantic grounds, is rejected; also untenable, however, is the position of traditional Arab grammarians that case can, in some contexts, be assigned by "concealed" governors, as the Projection and Structure-Preserving Principles require that material having semantic content be visible at all levels of representation.

Government and Binding principles are adequate to account for case-assignment in the issues raised by Ibn Mada'; they cannot, however, offer a clear solution to the apparent violation of Principle C of the Binding Theory found in some examples of bab al-tanazul, the category of "contention in government".
1. INTRODUCTION AND ANALYSIS

1.1 Prefatory

This dissertation is a technical translation of Al-Radd 'ala al-Nuḥā (The Refutation of the Grammarians), a treatise by Ibn Maṣāʿī al-Qurtubi, a 12th-century Andalusi legist in the service of the Muwaḥḥid regime. The work, compiled and edited by Shawqi Ḥayf, is a statement of the author's arguments against certain theoretical bases of traditional grammatical analysis in Arabic which he regards as unnecessary contrivance and needless complication, chief among these being the theory of the governor (العامل).

The theory, whose origins are attributed to the first of the great Basran grammarians, Khalīl ibn Ṣaḥm, requires that nouns and verbs receive their case and mood endings, respectively, by the operation of lexical and abstract governors. The theory was adopted, with some variation, by the majority of grammarians of both the Basran and Kufan schools, and is accepted as a basic principle by Sibawaih in his great Al-Kitāb, in which inflectional vowel endings are explained as being caused by governors. The boldness of Ibn Maṣāʿī's defiance in rejecting
the theory is evident in his characterization of Sibawaih's explanations of the operation of governors as "patently false."\(^1\)

In a general preamble to his attack on the theory of the governor, Ibn Maḍā' sets the overall tone for what is to follow with the philosophical observation that the governor posited by grammarians

...either acts by will, as do the animals, or by its nature, as fire burns and water chills, and...there is no agent other than God among the people of truth, so that the acts of man and the rest of the animals are the acts of God Almighty, as are the acts of water and fire and of everything else that acts; this has been made clear in due course. As for the grammatical governors, no reasonable person has supported them, either in their meanings or in their words, since they do not act by will or by nature.\(^2\)

In the discussion to follow, the governors or, more precisely, the case- and mood-assigners posited by the early Arab grammarians are divided into three types: lexical (النطلي) or those that are overtly represented in sentences, such as verbs and prepositions; semantic or abstract (معنوي), referring specifically to the assignment of nominative case to the sub-

---

\(^1\)Ibn Maḍā', The Refutation of the Grammarians, p. 77.

\(^2\)Ibn Maḍā', op. cit., p. 78.
ject in an equational sentence by *ibtidaː*; or "the quality of being a subject"; and concealed (مضمر). In the majority of cases, these last cannot appear in a given structure; they must be concealed, and include verbs, as exemplified in *bab al-isht-ighāl,* which are considered by the grammarians to be the assigners of accusative case to sentence-initial nouns, or complementizers, as in the case of the causative *fāː*, assigning subjunctive mood to imperfect-tense verbs.

In considering Ibn Maḍāʾ's bases and motivations for the position which he takes, in the thesis of his *Refutation,* against the widely-accepted theory of the governor, it is important to note that it is this last class, the necessarily-concealed governors, which receives the bulk of his attention, and to which he most forcefully objects. This is evident in his own concise overview of his position:

And these concealed things, whose appearance is not permissible, must either be absent in word but present in meaning in the mind of the speaker, or absent from the mind just as the words referring to them are absent from the expression. And if they have no existence in the mind and none in the words referring to them in speech, then what is it that governs the accusative/subjunctive? What is concealed? The attrib-

3*The category of occupation*, so named because the governing (i.e., case-assigning) force of the verb is considered to be absorbed, or occupied, by a pronominal object.
uting of government to something non-existent is, in any case, absurd. And if it be said that the meanings of the removed words are present in the mind of the speaker, that the utterance is completed by them, and that they are part of the speech existing in the mind, referred to by words, except that the words referring to them have been removed for the sake of brevity, just as they have been removed in cases where it is permissible for them to appear, also for the sake of brevity, then it must follow that the utterance is defective and incomplete except by their presence, since they are a part of it, and that we have added to the words of speakers that which they have not said. And we have no justification for this other than the assertion that every accusative/subjunctive must have a lexical governor. 4

It is on the basis of this core position, that concealment of governors is invalid, that Ibn Maḏāʾ attempts to construct his argument nullifying the theory of the governor. We will see, however, that he does not merely reject specific syntactic elements, whether these be governors or governees, posited by the grammarians in their analysis of various phenomena; rather, it is the general notion of concealment itself as a basis for grammatical analysis which he seeks to eliminate.

The motivational roots of Ibn Maḏāʾs position are revealed in the course of an examination of his own religious and political background: he was, as mentioned above, a judicial figure

in the state of the Andalusi Muwaḥḥids, who were of such a strong "Zāhiri (literalist) tendency that they ordered the burning of the books of the four established schools of jurisprudence on the grounds that the authors had strayed too far from the true sources of law, the Quran and the hadith (prophetic traditions), in their attempt to establish the secondary and tertiary causes by which these sources would be interpreted and applied in various legal cases. Like others adhering to "Zahiri principles, the Muwaḥḥids regarded literal interpretation of the original sources, free from extrapolation through cause or analogy, to be the only valid means by which believers could receive proper guidance.

Shawqī Ḍayf, after referring, in his own introduction to Ibn Mada' al-Qurtubī's work, to this burning of the books of the four schools of jurisprudence by order of the Muwaḥḥid ruler Yaʿqūb, goes on to say:

So Ibn Maḏāʾ al-Qurtubī, the chief judge in Yaʿqūb's state, followed his example in composing *The Refutation of the Grammarians*, desiring with it to send back to the East the grammar of the East, or, more accurately, to refute some of the principles of this grammar, and to rid it of its plethora of digression and interpretation in accordance with the practice of his sovereign, Yaʿqūb; for like him, Ibn Maḏāʾ admired the methods of the Zāhiris, and thus proceeded
to attempt to apply it to grammar. He began by refuting the theory of the governor, which had caused the grammarians to become excessive in their positing of implied syntactic elements which led to the failure to adhere to the literal meaning of the āyas of the Quran, upon whose literal meaning the proponents of the method of literal interpretation relied. He also borrowed from them the concept of negation of causes and analogies in fīqāḥ, and called for its extension to the realm of grammar that the latter might be purged of everything impeding its apprehension by reason and understanding."

It seems clear that Ibn Madaʿī, in his study of grammar, applied the same Žāhīri principle by which he interpreted the law: just as the Quran and hadīth are the only valid sources of law, containing all the necessary bases for analysis and judgement in a legal case, in like manner the sentences representing actual usage in the Arabic language, with their various syntactic components, provide the only valid basis for the formulation of grammatical analysis. In the Žāhīri view, analytical recourse cannot be had to any element which is concealed or derived through implication or analogy, for the reason that such an element simply cannot exist. Applied to grammar, this principle would thus dictate a-priori exclusion of the existing analytical basis not only of bāb al-ishtīqāl, mentioned above,

---

but also of several other grammatical phenomena to be discussed in the following sections whose traditional interpretation similarly relied on the positing of concealed syntactic elements.

1.2 Purpose and Goals

Though the following translation renders the text of The Refutation of the Grammarians in its entirety, it must be emphasized that the discussion in the sections to follow is not intended to represent an exhaustive critique or analysis of the work. The overall aim, in these sections, is to identify the points of conflict between the respective theoretical positions of Ibn Maḏāʾ and those held by the mostly-Basran representatives of the traditional school of Arabic grammar, with respect to specific issues of syntactic analysis.

Certain issues raised by Ibn Maḏāʾ, such as those of secondary and tertiary causes in section 2.6 of the translation, will thus be outside the scope of the syntactic analysis to follow, and are not included in the discussion. Even in these areas, however, the author's consistent overall theme, which is
the call for simplification through elimination of what he regards as the unnecessary, will be evident.

However consistent his theme, though, the same characterization cannot be made with respect to Ibn Maḍā'ī's arguments; the reader will, no doubt, note various instances of ambiguity and inconsistency of reasoning in the course of the translation. For example, in section 2.2, the author attempts to justify his claim that the theory of the governor is invalid with the following observation:

As for notion that some utterances cause others, it is vain both intellectually and in terms of divine revelation, and is not supported by any reasonable person for reasons whose mention would take long where the goal is brevity. Among them is the condition that the agent be present when it performs the act indicated by its verb; however, inflection does not occur (in nouns and verbs) until after the absence of the governor, so that زيد is not made accusative after " in our expression (verily, Zayd) until after the passing of ".

It is a rather startling claim that towering figures in the development of Arabic grammar, such as Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad and Sibawaih, who established the theory of the governor as an essential analytical basis, are not "reasonable"; more importantly, the analogy between the pairs verb-subject and lexical governor-governor is not valid. First, the grammarians, while
correctly (on the basis of theta theory) claiming that all verbs must be associated with subjects, make no claim that all governors must be associated with *lexical* governors (i.e., utterances that "cause others"); second, the sophistry displayed here confirms nothing other than the unremarkable conclusion that human speech is realized one word at a time. It is arbitrary to claim that only a word's governing quality ceases when it is succeeded by another word; rather, on the basis of Ibn Maqā's premise, it follows that any vestige of the word, including semantic content, also vanishes along with the word, from which it could be concluded that stringing words together to make sentences is impossible due to each word's passage into non-existence as soon as the next is uttered!

In section 2.2.4 the issue of subjects of participles is discussed, specifically the case in which a participle follows a noun identifying the subject (in subject-verb order) to which subject a post-verbal noun is then conjoined. According to the grammarians, the subject of the participle must follow the participle, in the form of a concealed pronoun, and cannot be replaced by the initial noun; they also consider it impossible for the following noun to be conjoined to this concealed sub-
ject. Rather, it must be conjoined with a visible pronoun which emphasizes, but does not replace, the post-verbal subject, which must remain concealed. Ibn Maḍāʾ counters that such concealment is entirely unnecessary, since the pre-verbal noun adequately identifies the subject. He then adds:

Even if it be granted that, as the grammarians say, this visible pronoun is for emphasis of the other concealed and intended pronoun not indicated by an utterance... nonetheless one may say: this pronoun is concealed only in case of its conjunction, and not otherwise, and if there is no conjunction then there is no concealment...

Having rejected the necessity for any concealment of subjects, he then allows that concealment may be considered to take place in this one context, when in fact, on the basis of his argument, it should be even less necessary here than otherwise: the subject is not only clearly identified by the pre-verbal noun, but is also subsequently emphasized by means of the visible pronoun!

Another example of such inconsistency, this time with regard to governors, is found in section 2.3.1, with reference to bāb al-tanāzūː.⁶

---

⁶"The category of contention in government": in such sentences, two verbs typically "contend for" a single governor.
Among these chapters is that of two agents and two direct objects, each of which acts by its agent as does the other, and things of this nature. This is the interpretation of Sibawaih, and I do not disagree with the grammarians except in saying "I connected with" (تَلَكَتِ) instead of "I made to govern" (أَعَمَلْتِ).

Here, Ibn Maḍā's rejection of the theory of the governor consists of nothing more than the substitution of one word for another. Though, at the end of the section, he complains of the complication and difficulty involved in applying to this particular construction verbs which take three direct objects, he refutes nothing; instead, he declares his preference for the method of the Kufans over that of the Basrans in this regard, while his "connection" has exactly the same function and result as the grammarians' "government".

There are other such examples; it should not be inferred from these, however, that Ibn Maḍā's arguments are entirely without merit. Specifically, he raises credible objections that the actual appearance of the grammarians' "concealed" governors in sentences would result either in ungrammatical expressions, as in بَابُ الْإِسْتِحْقَالِ, or in changes to the speaker's intended meaning, as in the vocative as well as in the contorted structures of conjunction posited in the the course
of the grammarians' analysis of the causative fa'. In the context of a syntactic analysis, however, such problems must be approached primarily on the basis of structure, without the exclusive reliance advocated by Ibn Ma'dā' on semantics, i.e., the speaker's intended meaning.

Before turning to this structural analysis, however, we must examine one further aspect of the basis for Ibn Ma'dā's arguments, one whose relevance far outweighs that of any other, for it concerns the crucial foundational element of the author's rejection of the theory of the governor.

If there is neither government nor governors, what is it, then, according to Ibn Ma'dā', which assigns case or mood? The author addresses this question very directly in section 2.2:

Abu al-Fath ibn al-Jinni and others have made declarations in opposition to this (theory), with Abu al-Fath saying in his Al-Khaṣṣā'is, after a discussion of lexical and semantic governors: "As for the truth and essence of the matter, the governor of the nominative/indicative, the accusative/subjunctive, the genitive, and the jussive, is the speaker himself and nothing else."

The words "the speaker himself" occur more than once in the text in reference to what is, in the author's view, the actual assigner of case or mood. While the implications of such a claim
for sentence structure are discussed below, here it is the original context of the quote that is relevant. It occurs, in *Al-Khaṣā'īs*, immediately after the following passage:

...Likewise you consider the phenomenon of agents and objects by saying: "I put this in the nominative case, because it is the agent, and that in the accusative case, because it is the object"; thus this is an abstract, and not a lexical, consideration. Do you not see that if you say *daraba sa'idun ja'far-an* (*Sa'id [NOM] struck Ja'far [ACC]*) , that *daraba* (he struck) itself governs nothing? By saying *daraba* you have nothing more than the sound of the *dād*, the *rā'*, and the *bā* on the pattern *fa'ala* which is a sound; and sounds are among the things to which action (i.e., government) cannot be attributed.

The grammarians refer to lexical and abstract governors to show you that some governors occur accompanied by sound, as in *marartu bi zayd-in* (I passed by Zayd [GEN]) and *layta 'amran gā'imun* (would that 'Amr [ACC] were standing), while others occur devoid of any accompanying sound, such as subject's being nominative by *ibtidā'*, and the verb's being indicative by occurring in the place of a noun.\(^7\)

The earlier quote, taken out of the context of the entire passage, does seem to indicate sharp variance with the prevailing notions of the operation of governors, and that ibn Jinni is in fact rejecting the notion that words govern other words. In context, however, his intended meaning becomes clear: instead of rejecting the entire notion of government, he seems rather to

---

reach the philosophical conclusion that language, in all its syntactic as well as semantic aspects, is ultimately the expression of a mental process: government cannot exist outside the mind of the speaker, because language itself has no independent existence outside of the minds of its users. From this he concludes that all government is necessarily mentally-generated by "the speaker himself", whether a particular governor is syntactically realized, like verbs, or abstract, like \( \text{ibtidā́} \).

Whatever the position one takes in a debate over whether syntactic government is fundamentally a property of the words of a language, or is instead a function of the mind of the speaker using the words, the fact remains that Jinni agreed with the grammarians of Basra on many views: that \( \text{ibtidā́} \) is the governor of the subject, that the preceding verb is the governor of the direct object, and that the subjunctive after \( \text{ḥatta, fā', and wāw} \) is by a necessarily-concealed \( \text{an} \). Such views as these, acknowledging various forms of both visible and implied governors, cannot be attributed to someone who rejects entirely the theory of the governor; rather, it is evident that Ibn Maṣā'ī adopted an extreme, and hence inaccurate, interpretation of Ibn

---

Jinni's statement attributing all government to the "speaker himself".

1.3 Traditional vs. Structural Government

Before proceeding to the specific grammatical issues in question, we begin with a comparison of the concept of government, or case-assignment, as understood by early Arab grammarians, with that found in modern syntactic theory.

That the theory of the governor has indeed become an established, well-accepted principle within Arabic grammar can be seen through perusal of modern as well as older works; for example, Jāmi' u al-Durūs al-'Arabiyya, originally published in 1912, contains a section, concluding the work's third and final section, titled "The Governor, the Governee, and Government", from which the following excerpts are illustrative:

When words are arranged in sentences, there are those which have an effect on what follows them; thus they may make it (the following word) nominative, accusative, or genitive...

The governor is that which causes the nominative, accusative, genitive, and jussive (case/mood endings)....
The governee is that whose (case/mood) ending changes... by the effect of the governor on it...

Government... is the effect resulting from the action of the governor...

These excerpts are representative of what may be termed the traditional approach with respect to government in Arabic, and are contrasted with government as defined within Government and Binding (GB) Theory.

Government and Binding Theory, as will be shown, is characterized by attention to and analysis of structural, and hierarchical, relationships among elements comprising a sentence; such emphasis appears to be largely absent from the traditional theory, by which, in an Arabic sentence such as

(1) qara'a al-waladu al-jaridata

the boy [NOM] read the newspaper [ACC]

the governing nature of the verb is seen abstractly as bringing about the nominative-case marking in the subject NP as well as the accusative-case marking in the object NP; that is, there are two governees and one governor, the former being the two case-

---

marked nouns and the latter, the verb, between which a relationship is specified. This is not a structural analysis; it is, rather, an analysis based on the verb's presumably-inherent function of assigning case, an abstract notion which is concretely realized, or reflected, in the respective vowel-endings of the subject and the object.

Such abstract analysis of case-assignment appears, in fact, to bear a close resemblance to the logic-based analysis used, in modern linguistic theory, to determine the argument structure of a sentence or proposition. Examining example (1) above in terms of its argument structure, we find that the verb, gara'a (he read) is a two-place predicate; that is, it is associated with two arguments (the nominative- and accusative-case NP's), for which the formal notation is:

\[
(2) \quad A (bn)
\]

where \( A = "read", b = "the boy", and n = "the newspaper" \)

Thus the argument structure of (1) reveals that two arguments

---

10 The references made here to argument structure and theta theory are based on the exposition by L. Haegemann in her Introduction to Government and Binding Theory (1995), to which the reader is referred.
are involved, but does not reveal their respective functions. To determine this, we must proceed to an analysis of the relationship of each argument to the predicate, an analysis provided in linguistics by theta theory. Because this theory extends beyond the analysis of argument structure, which merely reveals that a given predicate is associated with a certain number of arguments, to establish the specific functions (thematic or theta roles) assigned to a given set of arguments, the specific relationship of each argument can be identified. For example, the predicate in (1) assigns the role of AGENT to the subject NP the boy, and that of PATIENT to the direct-object NP the newspaper. The predicate, in this case the verb read, theta-marks its arguments with their respective roles, as depicted in the thematic or theta grid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) read: verb</th>
<th>AGENT NP</th>
<th>PATIENT NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>newspaper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theta grid not only shows that the verbal predicate read is associated with two NP arguments, but also indicates, through
theta-marking, the relationship of each argument with the predicate. There seems to be a close correlation between theta-marking and the traditional view of case assignment in Arabic; that is, a theta grid for a given predicate, if augmented to indicate case- as well as theta-role-assignment, would suffice to provide, in a predictable manner, all the necessary information for appropriate case-assignment in a proposition:

(4) gara'a (read): verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT NP</th>
<th>PATIENT NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

boy newspaper

Thus in addition to, and corresponding with, its indication of theta marking, the grid could also predict a predicate's case marking of its various arguments, with case marking serving as an overt reflex corresponding to abstract theta marking.

Such analysis is not, as was stated earlier, structurally based; theta-marking, like traditional Arabic case-assignment theory, is abstract. In the former, a predicate is shown to have the property of assigning thematic roles to its arguments,
while in the latter, a verb is said to have an analogous property of assigning case to those same arguments. Such abstract proposals cannot account for sentence structure; theta-marking, for example, cannot in and of itself explain why the following sentence is ungrammatical:

(5) *I him saw.

Here, a two-place predicate, saw, is associated with two arguments, correctly case marked, to which it assigns the thematic roles of AGENT and PATIENT; yet the sentence remains unaccept-able. Similarly, the following Arabic example is ungrammatical, in spite of the presence of a governing verb and two appropriately-case-marked governees:

(6) *al-jarīdata al-waladu qara‘a

the newspaper [ACC] the boy [NOM] read

Clearly, the mere requirement that a traditional-sense governor be associated with appropriate governees is not sufficient for the construction of acceptable sentences; the examples above
demonstrate that the governor and governees must also be associated in a particular way to the exclusion of other ways. That is, structural considerations, such as word-order, are also relevant, and an approach which includes such considerations is called for.

Such an approach is available within GB theory; because this theory is a generative approach, it provides phrase structure rules by which sentences of a given language are generated through application of underlying syntactic principles. The hierarchical arrangement of words into phrases and of phrases into sentences provides for a structural analysis of the relationships among sentence components. In GB theory, accusative case is assigned to NPs under the structural relation of govern ment; verbs and prepositions are heads of verbal and prepositional phrases, and govern, thereby assigning objective case to, their NP complements. The relation of governor to complement is defined in terms of dominance and m-command:
In the diagram, V, a verb, governs its NP complement in that the structure fulfills two requirements: first, neither V nor NP dominates each other; that is, from neither element can a line be traced in the structure from one to the other in a downward-only direction (in contrast, the projection of V, V', does dominate both V and NP). Second, V and NP are in a relation of mutual m-command, meaning that every maximal projection (here, VP) which dominates V, also dominates NP, and that no additional maximal projection intervenes as a barrier between V and NP, as illustrated below:

\[\text{\textsuperscript{11}Haegeman, op. cit., p. 85.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}Haegeman, op. cit., p. 137.}\]
The Arabic sentence in (1) can be similarly analyzed, with the proper government, and hence case-assignment, relationship in force:\(^{13}\)

13 According to the VP-internal hypothesis discussed by Koopman and Sportiche in "The Position of Subjects" (1991), the more common VSO order in Arabic results from the verb's post-D-structure movement to a higher position. In the D-structure example shown here, in which the verb's government of the object NP is shown, the transformation resulting in gara's al-waladu al-jaridatu has not yet taken place.
In both cases, the object NP is able to receive structural accusative case under government by the verb. Let us examine the structure of the ungrammatical examples (5) and (6), repeated below in (10) and (11), respectively:
Both Arabic and English exhibit subject-verb-object (SVO) word order.
order; according to GB theory, government of internal (i.e., object) arguments occurs from left to right in SVO languages. Thus while saw does m-command him in (10), it does so from right to left, and government, and thus proper case-assignment, cannot occur. This is also the case in (11).

1.4 Overview of Syntactic Issues

With the analytical tools provided by GB theory, we may now proceed with an analysis of the various syntactic issues raised by Ibn Maḍā'.

In general, we can concur with Ibn Maḍā' that the concealed or removed governors posited in the various examples by the grammarians are invalid; not, however, on the basis of Ibn Maḍā' s assertion that such governors are unnecessary for semantic reasons, but rather on the basis that concealed syntactic elements are excluded within GB theory. Specifically, we refer to the Projection Principle, which requires that lexical information be syntactically represented at all levels. In other words, the components of a sentence are simply required to be present in the sentence.

---

14Haegeman, op. cit., p. 55.
On the other hand, we also reject Ibn Maḏāʾ’s claim that the case-assigner is the "speaker himself": we have seen that such an approach, based on semantics alone, cannot account for sentence structure; additionally, our theoretical approach requires that case be assigned within a specific structural relationship.

The syntactic issues raised by Ibn Maḏāʾ can be broken down into the general categories of objective-case assignment, non-lexical representation of nominative-case governees, and mood-assignment.

In the first category is the vocative, discussed in section 2.2.1 of the text, which does appear initially to present a problem with regard to case assignment; specifically, with respect to the question of why the NP should sometimes have nominative case marking, and sometimes accusative. In Arabic grammar, however, the relevant NP in a vocative construction is considered always to be assigned accusative case; in those instances where the NP does not show accusative-case marking, the vowel-endings are considered "fixed" (مثبت), and not true case endings.  

low two possibilities for the assignment of accusative case to the NP: either by means of a concealed verb meaning "I call", or by the vocative particle itself, the latter "containing the meaning of" the same verb. Ibn Maḍā', of course, argues against the existence of such a concealed verb, noting that, in this case, it would result in changing the meaning of the vocative construction to that of a simple declarative sentence. We may concur with Ibn Maḍā' in this rejection of a hidden verb, having already mentioned that the theory discounts the possibility of hidden or removed governors; additionally, by adopting the position that the vocative particle is itself the case assigner, we can readily apply GB principles to show the relevant case assignment under government:

\[ (12) \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VOC} \\
\mid \\
\text{VOC} \\
\mid \\
\text{VOC} \\
\text{ya}^\circ \\
\text{abda-llah}
\end{array}
\]

\[ \text{oh Abdullah!} \]

\[ ^{16}\text{Ibid.} \]
Also in this category of objective case-assignment is the issue of government of objects of prepositions, raised in section 2.2.3. Ibn Maḏāʾ notes that, according to the grammarians, a verb or participle, whether visible or concealed, is required in order to govern the prepositional object. We examine the structure of a sentence containing both a verb and a prepositional phrase:

(13)

\[
\text{The man stood in the garden.}
\]

According to this structure, the preposition, \textit{in}, is the governor of the NP \textit{the garden}; it is a governing head, and m-
commands the complement NP. While V also m-commands the same NP, it is nonetheless prevented from governing it by the fact that another maximal projection, PP (prepositional phrase) intervenes between V and NP. This condition on government has also been formulated in terms of *minimality*: where two potential governors exist in a structure, the closer of the two to the complement takes priority.\(^{17}\) Minimality is formulated upon the notion of mutual *c-command*, referring to the first branching node (here, \(P'\)) dominating a given set of constituents.\(^{18}\) Thus in (13), where \(P\) and NP c-command each other, \(P\) is the only available governor of NP. V is ruled out because, while it also c-commands NP, the reverse is not true: the first branching node \((P')\) dominating NP does not dominate V.

On this basis we are able to reject, with ibn Maḏāʾ, the grammarians' requirement of a verb or participle to serve as the governor of the NP; such a verb, even if present in a sentence, would be prevented both by the definition of government as well as by the Minimality condition, from being the governor of the NP complement of a prepositional phrase.

---

\(^{17}\)Haegeman, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

\(^{18}\)Ibid.
The remaining issue of objective case-assignment, found in section 2.4, is **Bāb al-ishtighāl**, which is analyzed in depth in the following sections.

Proceeding to the category of mood assignment, we find, in section 2.5, two related issues: those of subjunctive-mood assignment after causative fa' and wāw of accompaniment. These particles, in sentences in which a following imperfect verb is placed in the subjunctive mood, are considered by the grammarians to be themselves followed by a concealed complementizer, an, which actually assigns subjunctive mood to the verb. Discounting once again the concealed governor of the grammarians, as well as Ibn Maqā'ī's protestations that semantics alone can account for the correct mood assignment, we interpret the issue from the GB standpoint.

The structural analysis used in the case-assignment issues above does not provide the solution here, since the theory precludes the notion that a governor (the subjunctive verb) can itself be governed; that is, mood, unlike case, cannot be assigned under government. The solution is found, instead, if we consider the causative fa' and wāw of accompaniment themselves to be complementizers, like an, and lexically distinct from the
conjunctive versions of these particles. In GB theory, matrix verbs are considered idiosyncratically to select complementizer-phrase (CP) complements with various features;¹⁹ for example, the English verb think selects a CP complement having a [+finite] inflectional feature in the embedded IP, in which the complementizer that is optional:

(14) a. I think [\text{that} [\text{he went home}]].  
b. I think [\text{[he went home]}].

The verb expect, on the other hand, selects a CP complement whose IP bears the feature [-finite], again with an optional complementizer:

(15) a. I expect [\text{for} [\text{him to go home}]].  
b. I expect [\text{[him to go home]}].

Thus causative fā', as a complementizer, can be assumed to be selected by the matrix verb tadrusu (you study) in (16) below, in a CP complement with the feature [+subjunctive] in the embed-

ded IP, in the same manner that the supposedly-concealed complementizer ḥan, with its [+subjunctive] IP, would be selected by yajibu (it is necessary) in (17):

(16) ma tadrusu [ṣfa [rtaḥfaẓa]]
   (You do not study, thus you do not learn [SUBJ])

(17) yajibu [ṣan [rtaqra'a al-kitāba]
   (It is necessary that you read [SUBJ] the book)

The same analysis applies to sentences exhibiting subjunctive mood after the wāw of accompaniment.

In the category of non-lexically represented nominative-case governees, we again find a pair of related issues: concealed subjects in participles and verbs, found in sections 2.2.4 and 2.2.5, respectively. In general, the phenomenon is adequately explained as an instantiation of the pro-drop parameter: in Arabic, a pro-drop language, the null subject, pro, is licensed under government by the functional head INFL, and its content is recovered by means of the rich verbal inflection.  

---

---

Haegeman, op. cit., p. 457.
The issue raised by the grammarians, in section 2.2.4, as a basis for their requirement that participles and verbs have following, as opposed to preceding subjects, occurs when a verbal subject is conjoined with a following noun; in these cases the verbal subject must appear as an independent pronoun following the verb, the pre-verbal NP being insufficient to identify the subject:

(18) *zaydun dāribun wa bakrun ʿamran

(Zayd, pro, and Bakr are striking ʿAmr)

(19) zaydun dāribun huwa wa bakrun ʿamran

(Zayd, he, and Bakr are striking ʿAmr)

A GB solution can be derived from considering the type of sentence involved as well as an important aspect of pro. As the translation of (19) reveals, Zayd, which is coindexed with the verbal subject he, is topicalized; this in itself tends to lend emphasis, and thus a certain degree of stress, to the following coreferential pronoun. It is this stress which thus excludes pro as an acceptable subject in (18), since the null or exple-
tive pronoun cannot occur in contexts where emphasis is re-
quired, being uniformly replaced by an overtly-expressed pro-
noun, as in (19). Thus it is the nature and requirements of
pro, as opposed to the grammarians' seemingly arbitrary re-
requirement that a canonically-post-verbal subject be visible
when conjoined, that dictates the appearance of the pronoun in
(19). Additionally, the theory stipulates that it is only the
pre-verbal subject, in the form of pro, that is covertly real-
ized, and not the post-verbal subject posited by the grammari-
ans. Where the subject precedes the verb, in SVO order, it
replaces pro as the governee of INFL. From this, the conclusion
can be drawn that ibn Maḏaʿ is correct in refuting the gram-
marians' claim that a concealed or null subject must always
follow a given verb; again, however, the purpose here is to
attempt a theoretical explanation of the phenomenon based on
syntactic analysis, in contrast with ibn Maḏaʿ's sweeping rejec-
tion of the grammarians' position merely on the aforementioned
basis that no concealment is necessary, in this case because, he
explains, the subject is readily identifiable from the number-
and gender-inflection of the verb itself.

\[21\] Haegeman, op. cit., p. 452.
Also in this category is the issue of contention in government (bāb al-tanāzu'). We do not undertake a thorough analysis of the phenomenon here, for the reason that the problems it raises are beyond the scope of the analytical approach to be developed in the following sections. Syntactic theory in general does not claim to account for linguistic phenomena beyond the level of the sentence, while evidence of suprasentential qualities is apparent in examples of bāb al-tanāzu'. A comparison of the following sentences serves to illustrate this:

(20) \( \text{(pro)} \) ḍaraba-ni wa ḍarabtu zaydan,\ni

He struck me, and I struck Zayd, (i.e., Zayd struck me, and I struck him)

(21) * \( \text{(pro)} \) makatha fi bayti zaydin,\ni

He stayed in the home of Zayd,\

In (20), a representative example of contention in government, the subject of ḍaraba (he struck) is coreferential with the NP object of ḍarabtu (I struck); indeed, in sentences of this type, they cannot be otherwise. According to the literal translation
of the sentence, a Binding Theory violation has occurred, and should render the sentence ungrammatical.

Briefly, Binding Theory deals with the interpretation of an NP in its binding domain or governing category, the minimum domain containing the NP, its governor, and an available subject.\(^2\) Principle A of the theory requires that a reflexive pronoun be bound by a coreferential antecedent within its governing category:\(^3\)

(22) a. I excused myself.

b. *I asked [him to excuse myself].

In (22a), myself is bound in the domain containing the reflexive, its governor (excused), and the subject I. I cannot bind myself in (22b), however; it is outside the minimum domain of myself, within which him, the subject of the infinitival phrase, is the only available subject, and the sentence is unacceptable due to its violation of Principle A.

---

\(^2\) Haegeman, op. cit., p. 215.

\(^3\) Haegeman, op. cit., p. 205.
Principle B deals with pronouns, requiring that they be free, or unbound, within their governing categories, though they may be bound from outside this domain:  

\[(23) \text{a. } *I_1 \text{ excused } me_1.\]
\[b. \text{ } I_1 \text{ asked } [\text{him to excuse } me_1].\]

Finally, Principle C deals with referential expressions, or r-expressions. An r-expression, unlike a pronoun or a reflexive, selects a unique referent from the universe of discourse\(^24\) and can never be bound by an antecedent, inside or outside a governing category:\(^25\)

\[(24) \text{a. } *He_1 \text{ excused } John_1.\]
\[b. *He_1 \text{ asked } [\text{me to excuse } John_1].\]

Returning to (20), we find that the r-expression Zavd is bound by the initial verbal subject, he. A Principle-C violation is

\(^{24}\) Haegeman, op. cit., p. 225.
\(^{25}\) Haegeman, op. cit., p. 204.
\(^{26}\) Haegeman, op. cit., p. 227.
expected, yet the sentence remains, in Arabic, perfectly acceptable. This is not the case in (21), however; here, the same Principle-C violation rendering the English version unacceptable also results in the ill-formedness of the Arabic sentence. It appears that the insertion of the conjunction *wa* (and) between the two sentences somehow results in the permissibility of coindexation with the *r*-expression in (20); clearly, further study of the structure of sentence-conjunction in Arabic will be required in order to determine the specific mechanism overriding Principle C of the Binding Theory in such cases.

In all the issues dealt with so far, with the exception of *bāb al-tanāzu*[^1], we have been able to apply GB principles to offer structurally-based solutions to problems which had not hitherto been satisfactorily dealt with either by traditional analysis or by the semantics-based approach of Ibn Maṣā`. We now turn to *bāb al-ishtiqāl* which is, as we shall see, a complex issue, and one that, like *bāb al-tanāzu*, raises problems for GB theory.

1.5 The Phenomenon of Verbal Occupation (Left-Dislocation)

In turning to the syntactic analysis of the category of
occupation, one must immediately note that, even in the simplest examples, the case of the fronted NP may be either nominative or accusative, with the nominative preferred:

(25) Zaydun akramta-hu (Zayd[ NOM], you honored him [ACC])
(26) Zaydan akramta-hu (Zayd [ACC], you honored him [ACC])

(25), in which the fronted noun is nominative, is not an example of ishtiqāl; the traditional analysis holds that the nominative NP is a subject, and that the following verbal sentence (you honored him) is itself the predicate of the larger sentence beginning with the noun. (26), in which the fronted noun is accusative, comprises the simplest example of ishtiqāl, in which a concealed verb is assumed to be necessary in order to assign accusative case to the noun, the case-assigning force of the following, visible verb being absorbed, or "occupied", by the attached clitic pronoun which is coreferential with the noun. As ibn Madaʿ notes, this supposedly-concealed

---

27 This is a result of the grammarians' acknowledgement that a structure in which no concealed governor is required, is preferable to one in which such a governor is necessary. There are other situations in which one case is preferable to the other, as well as those in which one of the two cases is required. These will be discussed below.
verb, considered to be identical to the visible one, cannot appear in the sentence, as its presence would result in ungrammaticality:

(27) *akramta Zaydan akramta-hu

(You honored Zayd₁ [ACC], you honored him₁)

A possible structural representation of (27), the underlying form of (26) according to the grammarians, is shown:

(28)

[Diagram]

you honored Zayd₁ [ACC], you honored him₁

Assuming that this represents the D-structure of the sentence
in question, the level at which basic argument-relations are established, then can (26) represent S-structure? According to GB theory, this is not possible. The theory does allow for structural transformations, such as movement of constituents between D- and S-structure, but not for the elimination of constituents. We have already cited the Projection Principle, which requires that lexical information be syntactically represented; in addition, the Structure-Preserving Principle requires that this same lexical information be retained in transformations between the two levels of representation. In WH-movement, for example, an NP is moved from its case-assignment position at D-structure to a fronted position at S-structure. Thus the D-structure representation of

(29) Which book did you read?

would be as follows:

28 Haegeman, op. cit., p. 304.

29 Haegeman, op. cit., p. 337.
At D-structure, the NP [which book] receives its required case- and theta-marking; the post-movement S-structure shows that the moved NP has left a trace, with which it is coindexed, in its original site:
As these examples show, all elements present at D-structure remain present at S-structure, as required. Structure is preserved, which would not be the case if a verb were to be eliminated between D- and S-structure.

Because constituents may not be removed between D- and S-structure, the concealed, case-assigning verb posited by the grammarians is effectively ruled out. But since, in GB theory, case must be structurally assigned, ibn Mada’i’s assertion that the initial NP somehow receives its case from the "speaker
himself" is likewise untenable.

We have seen how the theory provides for movement of wh-phrases from case-assignment positions to sentence-initial positions; is such a movement-based analysis possible for bāb al-ishtighāl?

Haegeman, in dealing with this very topic, describes the phenomenon as left dislocation, and gives the following example:

(32) [I, Simenon, [I, I don't like him.]]

Except for the lack of overt case-marking on the fronted NP, this example demonstrates essentially the same features as found in (26). Haegemann explores the possibility that such a structure results from movement, and that the D-structure would be

(33) [I, I don't like Simenon].

By a "movement and copying" process, the NP Simenon then moves

---

to a position adjoined to IP, with a corresponding pronominal copy, in this case him, inserted in the site vacated by the NP:

(34)

Simenon, I don't like him,

Such an approach would appear to solve the case-assignment problem which prompted the Arab grammarians to posit a concealed governor for the sentence-initial NP: accusative case is assigned by the verb under government at D-structure. Haege-mann immediately points to a problem with such a movement-based

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
analysis, however. She cites the following example:32

(35) Simenon₁, [₁₁'I always wonder [₇₇'when [₁₁'I discovered him₁]]].

Even with the assumption that such a sentence is grammatical with left-dislocation, other types of movement from Simenon's base-generated D-structure position, for example wh-movement, would result in an ungrammatical structure:

(36) *Whom₁ [₁₁'do you always wonder [₇₇'when [₁₁'you discovered t₁]]]?

Here, whom is the same distance from its D-structure position, indicated by its coindexed trace, as Simenon is from its assumed D-structure position in the previous example. According to bounding theory, however, which determines the syntactic boundaries within which an element can be moved, such movement of whom results in a violation of the subiacency condition: a moved element cannot cross more than one bounding node, these being,

32Ibid.
In English, IP and NP. In (36), whom has been moved across two such IP nodes, hence the ill-formedness of the sentence. According to Haegemann, since (35) is grammatical, it is not subject to subjacency restrictions, and thus cannot be the result of movement of Simenon from the site occupied by him.

1.5.1 Base-Generation and Movement

In his 1977 work, "On Wh- Movement", Chomsky notes that transformation, i.e., movement, cannot produce the structure "as for this book" in a sentence like:

(37) As for this book, [I think [CP [I you should read it]].

Examples such as this led him to propose that left-dislocated elements be regarded as base-generated in their positions, rather than moved to them. While this interpretation avoids the problem of subjacency violation by avoiding movement trans-

---

33 Haegeman, op. cit., p. 402.
formations, it leaves remaining the problem of overt case assignment in the Arabic examples.

The solution of somehow positing a chain-relationship between the pre-posed NP and the governed pronoun is certainly an attractive one; however, deriving the chain through movement has been shown to have the potential for subjacency violations. Can chains be conceived as arising from a process other than movement?

According to Rizzi (1986), the movement-based, or derivational interpretation of chains, is not the only possible view. Using examples from Italian, he demonstrates that, as mere records of movement, chains may be well-formed in terms of the requirements of the theta-criterion while nonetheless giving rise to ill-formed sentences. For example, in the passive sentence,

(38) *Gianni, [\(\psi_{\text{si}, e \text{ stato affidato t', t'}}\)]

Gianni was entrusted to himself

theta-theory dictates the formation, by movement, of the chains \(<\text{Gianni, t'}>\) and \(<\text{si, t'}>\). As Rizzi explains, however, the formation of either of these chains would result in the "skip-
ping" of an intermediate binder (si, and t', respectively), to which the ill-formedness of the sentence is attributed.37

Based on such considerations, Rizzi argues for the representational view of chains, by which chains are, according to Haegemann, "read off from S-structure, and do not necessarily represent the derivational history of the constituent."38 This interpretation is compatible with Chomsky's no-movement view of the left-dislocation phenomenon, and appears to offer an analysis which would also account for the overt case-marking of the fronted NP in the Arabic example (26). For reasons given above, a chain such as ⟨zayd, -hu⟩ cannot be formed by movement without the potential for subjacency violations. By Rizzi's interpretation, however, no movement is needed in order to form the chain, and the overt accusative case-marking of zaydan can thus be accounted for by its coindexation with -hu, the latter receiving both the chain's case marking and its theta-role.

A problem for this explanation arises, however, in view of another type of left-dislocation in Arabic, in which there is a discrepancy between the case-marking of the fronted NP and the

37Ibid.

38Haegeman, op. cit., p. 351.
case actually assigned to the pronoun clitic. In the example previously cited, the accusative case-marking of the NP matched the accusative case assigned to the clitic; this is not the case, however, in a sentence such as:

(39) zaydan$_{1}$ marar-ta bi-hi$_{1}$

Zayd$_{1}$ [ACC], you passed by him$_{1}$ [GEN]

Here, the fronted NP has overt accusative-case marking, but would be, according to the analysis developed thus far, co-indexed in a chain with a clitic pronoun to which genitive case is assigned by the pronoun bi$_{-}$; indeed, it is not possible for the fronted NP to take overt genitive-case marking to match the case assigned to the pronoun clitic:

(40) *zaydin$_{1}$ marar-ta bi-hi$_{1}$

Zayd$_{1}$ [GEN], you passed by him$_{1}$.

The problem which this phenomenon poses for the proposed chain interpretation is clear: by definition, chains receive case through only one member, and it is difficult to see how this can be so when each member of a chain is assigned a different
It is useful at this point to note that German data show a marked difference in the treatment of the sentence-initial NP in this regard. Ross\textsuperscript{39} gives the following examples:

(41) Den Professor, sie lobten ihn

The professor \textsubscript{ACC}, they praised him

This sentence presents a close parallel to sentence (26) above, in which the accusative case of the left-dislocated NP matches that of the direct object pronoun. The contrast appears in sentences with dative case objects in German, corresponding to one of the uses of the genitive case in Arabic:

(42) Dem/*Den Professor, sie schmeichelten ihm

[The professor \textsubscript{DAT/*ACC}, they flattered him]

As shown, the initial NP must take dative case to match the object pronoun in the lower clause, in sharp contrast with the

Arabic example (40) above, in which the NP cannot take the genitive case of the clitic. One possible explanation would be that, since Arabic pronoun clitics, unlike full nouns, exhibit case syncretism with regard to the accusative and genitive cases, having a single object form for both, this case syncretism would also apply to fronted NP's whenever the latter are subject to left dislocation. Thus what appears as overt accusative-case marking on the fronted NP could be explained as a sort of general topical objective-case marking, agreeing abstractly with the genitive or accusative case assigned to a given clitic.

Another possible explanation might be sought from Chomsky's 1977 formulation of the base-generation rule for formation of topicalization/left-dislocation:  

(43) \[ S'' \rightarrow \text{Top } S' \]

According to this rule, Arabic sentences such as (26) and (39) above would have the following tree-structures:

---

(44)

Zaydan pro_{1} ḍarab-ta_{1} - hu

Zayd_{i} [ACC] you, struck him_{i}
In the tree diagrams, the newer designation CP has been substituted for $S'$; $S''$ represents a further maximal projection, XP, with TOP in its specifier position. Chomsky's view of left dislocation was derived from properties exhibited by English sentences, in which problems of overt case-marking do not occur. Hence he does not speak of chains, but rather says:

...The proposal is that in the TOPIC position there is a base-generated structure and that the associated
Chomsky's view receives support from Guglielmo Cinque, who presents arguments against a movement-analysis of left dislocation (though not of topicalization, which he argues is, at least in Italian, a separate phenomenon). Among Cinque's arguments is a demonstration that left-dislocation cannot involve wh-type movement, as exhibited in the topicalization example below, since such movement would result in an operator in Spec, CP by which the empty category, as a variable, must be bound; hence the clitic, which cannot bind the variable, is not allowed:

\[ (46) \ [\text{Gianni}, [\text{CP}_{1} [\text{IP}_{1} ([*(lo_{1}) \text{vedro e}_{1} \text{domani}])]]]. \]

\[ \text{Gianni}, (*\text{him}_{1}) \text{ I will see e}_{1} \text{ tomorrow} \]

In contrast, the left-dislocation version of the same sentence is ungrammatical without the clitic, serving to show that,

---

41 Chomsky, op. cit., p. 94.

42 Guglielmo Cinque, *Types of A'-Dependencies*, p. 72.

43 In topicalization, there is no object pronoun corresponding to the initial NP, as in *This book, I have read it.*
since no empty category can take the place of the clitic, there is no operator, and therefore no movement by the sentence-initial NP:

(47) Gianni₁, *(lo₁) vedro (*e₁) domani.

Gianni₁, *(him₁) I will see (*e₁) tomorrow.

Thus, on Cinque's view, left-dislocation cannot be an instantiation of wh-type movement of the sentence-initial NP, which must therefore be base-generated in the TOPIC position.

According to this non-movement interpretation, then, the coreferentiality of the NP and the pronoun is essentially a matter of semantic identification, and not a result of requirements of Theta Theory or Case Theory on chain formation. If we are not dealing with a chain, however, then the question remains of how, in the Arabic examples, the fronted NP acquires its case-marking.

1.5.2 Case Assignment: the GB Approach

Within GB theory, accusative/objective case must be assigned under government by a c- or m-commanding head, and diagrams (44)
and (45) make clear the fact that no such head is available; both potential governors, I and V, are blocked from government of TOPIC by intervening barriers in the form of maximal projections (IP and VP, respectively). If case assignment under government were to be posited as the source of the accusative case marking in Arabic TOPIC, then clearly the definition of government would have to be modified to exempt a governing head from the effect of intervening barriers in Arabic sentences exhibiting left-dislocation.

The best candidate for such a specially-governing head would be V; in uniformly assigning accusative case, it could be said to account for the accusative case-marking of TOPIC even in those instances where the subsequent referring pronoun is assigned genitive case by a preposition.

Admittedly, such a proposed modification to the definition of government has a strong ad-hoc flavor, and makes assumptions (such as that a single head can govern simultaneously in two directions) which represent far-ranging departures from established elements of the theory. On the other hand, it does, along with the previous discussion of representational chains, suggest a solution based on modern theory to a problem which gener-
ations of Arab grammarians and philologists dealt with by mak-
ing other assumptions (involving "hidden" or "removed" case-as-
signers) which the theory rejects outright.

For the GB model, clearly a different TOPIC structure would
be required, one in which a governing head would not be blocked
by intervening barriers. Such a head becomes available if an
additional maximal projection, TOPP (Topic-Phrase), is as-
sumed, having a functional head TOP and a Specifier position,
such that the left-dislocated NP occupies Spec, TOPP. This is
in contrast with the structures shown in (44) and (45), in which
the initial NP, labeled TOP, occupied Spec, XP. With TOP as a
functional head, the NP can be governed without any maximal-
projection barriers:
GB theory, then, appears to be able to account for the overt object-case marking on left-dislocated nouns in Arabic according to its own principles, even without the acceptance of representational chains. But what of those instances in which the initial NP is in the nominative case? As mentioned earlier, the examples given thus far fall within the category in which the nominative is actually preferable to the accusative, though the latter is permissible. There are other situations in which the initial NP can only be in the nominative case, while the
coindexed pronoun remains in either the accusative or the genitive case. One of these occurs when a conditional particle interposes between the noun and the rest of the sentence:

(49) Zayd₁ [NOM]/*[ACC] in akramta-hu₁, akrama-ka
    Zayd₁, if you₁ honor him₁, he₁ will honor you₁,

Such phenomena as these require further modification of the GB model developed above, for (49) makes clear that the functional head TOP would have to be able to assign either accusative or nominative case under structural government, while the theory lacks any provision by which a governing head may assign more than one case.

Leaving aside for the moment those situations in which a given initial NP may take either case, we focus first on the sentence type exemplified by (49), in which the intervention of a particle between the initial NP and the verb requires nominative-case marking on the NP.

We have made passing mention above of government by INFL, the functional head consisting of a verb's various inflectional features. In GB theory, INFL (I) governs, and assigns nomina-
tive case to, the internal, or subject, argument of a verb. This
government occurs from right to left on the basis of m-command,
and is also known as head-specifier government, in contrast
with the head-complement government by verbs and prepositions
of NP objects:

\[ (50) \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{SPEC} \\
\text{I}_P \\
\text{I} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{V}_P \\
\text{V} \\
N_P \\
\text{John} \\
\text{studies} \\
\text{Latin} \\
\end{array} \]

The solution proposed, in sentences in which the initial nomi-
native-case NP is followed by \textit{in}, or either of the other two
particles occurring in this type of construction, the interroga-
tive \textit{hal} and the negative \textit{ma}, is that nominative case is as-
signed under government to the initial NP in an analogous manner
to that in which it is assigned by INFL: from right to left, in a
head-specifier construction. We designate the governing func-
tional head in these constructions as CP-TOP:

(51)

\[
\text{CP-Top}^p \quad \text{CP-Top}^p \quad \text{CP-Top}^p \quad \text{CP-Top}^p \quad \text{CP-Top}^p
\]

\[\text{SPEC} \quad \text{SPEC} \quad \text{SPEC} \quad \text{SPEC} \quad \text{SPEC}\]

\[\text{C} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{C}\]

\[\text{IP} \quad \text{IP} \quad \text{IP} \quad \text{IP} \quad \text{IP}\]

\[\text{V} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{V}\]

\[\text{NP}^p \quad \text{NP}^p \quad \text{NP}^p \quad \text{NP}^p \quad \text{NP}^p\]

zaydun hal (pro) darabta hu

Zayd, [NOM] did you, strike him,?

Next, we turn to the construction in which the initial NP must be in the accusative case. Such a construction occurs when the order of the initial NP and the particle, shown in the example above, is reversed, so that the particle precedes the NP. These initial-position particles include hal and in, as above, and also the particle of encouragement, halla, which adds a
meaning akin to "why don't you...".

The solution in this situation is relatively simple: we simply keep the relevant particles in COMP, from which position they complement-govern the NP in the accusative case, eliminating the need for any additional governing head. The NP occupies a position adjoined to IP; this is desirable in that it is not wholly within the maximal projection IP, which thus does not constitute a barrier to structural government:

(52)
There is a further situation in which the initial NP must take nominative-case, and that is when it is preceded by either the idha of surprise or the circumstantial wāw, as distinguished from the conditional particle idha and the conjunctive wāw, respectively.

These particles, which we also designate as complementizers, must be able to assign nominative case, though not in the same manner as previously shown for CP-TOP: because of their relative position to the initial NP, they cannot govern in a head-specifier configuration, but must, rather, do so in the same sisterhood configuration shown for in, hal, and halla. Thus we assume that it is the idiosyncratic property of these particular complementizers to assign nominative case under head-complement government, with the same adjunction structure to IP as seen above:
(53)

\[ \text{kharajtu wa zaydun (pro) tukrimu - hu} \]

I came out as Zayd, [NOM], you were honoring him

(54)

\[ \text{idha al - farasu (pro) tukrimu - hu} \]

...behold, the horseman, you were honoring him.
Finally, there are the situations in which the initial NP may take either nominative or accusative case. These occur in two types of constructions: in the first, examples of which were seen in (25) and (26), the structure is devoid of any of the complementizer particles seen above. The second type involves the placement of the negative particle ّلا between the initial NP and the verb:

(55) zaydun/zaydan, ّلا tuhin-hu.

Zayd [NOM/ACC], don't insult him.

With regard to the first type, we previously suggested that, in the version with the initial NP in accusative case, a functional head TOP was the case assigner, as shown in (48). Because of the fact that this analysis cannot, as noted, account for the alternate nominative case in what is otherwise an identical construction, however, as well as the desirability of accounting for both versions within a single analytical approach, a different solution will now be explored.

We begin with the observation that, in all of the examples examined above, in which either nominative or accusative case
is required to the exclusion of the other, complementizers are present in the structure. In some cases, as in (52)-(54), these complementizers are themselves the assigners of the relevant case to the initial NP, while in (51), a functional head fulfilled the case-assignment role. In the structures now under consideration, however, no complementizer is present; COMP is empty, and thus cannot be the source of case-assignment. Additionally, there is the problem of any posited functional head's inability to assign more than one case feature. Therefore, we propose that in these types of sentences, it is the underspecification of the empty COMP for case which allows for the choice of nominative- or accusative-case initial NPs:
There remains the question of (55); this structure also allows the choice of either case, but involves the negative particle َلا. Initially, this sentence-type appears analogous to (51), in which another negative particle, the complementizer َمَا, occupies a similar position between NP and verb, and in which the obligatory nominative case was accounted for by the functional head CP-TOP. Since the insertion of َلا does not, however, restrict the case of the initial NP to nominative as in (51), the analysis developed so far suggests that in (55), as in (25) and (26), underspecification for case is involved, which we have linked to the absence of any overt element in COMP.

Ouhalla (1991) has included, in his own analysis of Arabic sentence structure, the premise that the two negative particles do not occupy the same syntactic position. Specifically relevant to the discussion at hand is his contention that َلا occupies a lower position than َمَا. He bases this argument on, among other things, the fact that َلا has the function of splitting the tense and agreement components of INFL:

"Jamal Ouhalla, "Verb Movement and Word Order in Arabic", p. 49."
In all three sentences, though the verb is realized as imperfect, the tense is nonetheless different: in (a), it is simple present; in (b), it is future; and in (c), it is past. According to Ouhalla, the tense component of INFL is realized in each case on the negative particle, in the form of the long vowel in (a) and the addition of -n and -m in (b) and (c), respectively, while the agreement component remains with the verb. This is in contrast with the behavior of ma:

(58) a. mā uḥibbu hādha al-sulūk
    I don't like this behavior.

    b. mā tawaqqatū hādha
    I didn't expect this.
In these examples, both the tense and agreement components of INFL are realized on the verb. From this comparison, Ouhalla concludes that la, unlike ma, is located within INFL.

On the basis of Ouhalla's analysis, we conclude that the difference between the behavior of ma and la in left-dislocation arises from the fact that they occupy different positions in the structure: ma occupies COMP, while la, realized within INFL, necessarily occupies a lower position:

(59)

Thus here, as in (25) and (26), COMP is empty, with the same
resulting underspecification for case occurring in the initial NP.

Thus it is possible, within GB theory, to provide a satisfactory explanation for the Arabic phenomenon of ishtighal, this by means of the well-established principle of structural government. It is true that the view proposed here requires the positing of an additional functional head, CP-TOP, for proper case-assignment in certain structures, but this is itself nothing more than a credible application of well-established X-bar principles. In any case, the positing of an additional functional head within established systems of rules seems far preferable to the traditional analysis, relying as it does on "removed" case-assigners which must be ruled out as violations of the Structure-Preserving and Projection Principles, as well as to the alternative put forth by ibn Maḍāʾ which, in positing mere semantic identification as an assigner of accusative case, is even further removed from modern theoretical principles of structural analysis than the theory of the grammarians against which he so forcefully argued.
1.6 Notes on the Translation

Shawqi Dayf, in editing the Arabic text of the following translation, used square brackets for all parenthetical comments, as well as for corrections and insertion of missing words. These comments and corrections will also be found within square brackets in the translation. Thus all such brackets, except where they occur within parentheses, contain material added by Dayf. My own comments, including translations, have been added with parentheses.

I have retained only those footnotes of Dayf which I judged to be relevant to the linguistic discussion. I have added to these my own footnotes, which are identified with my initials.

Reading knowledge of Arabic on the part of the reader is assumed; thus all Arabic verses and sentences cited as examples in the text are rendered in the original language without transliteration, which is used only for individual technical and grammatical terms.
2. THE REFUTATION OF THE GRAMMARIANS

2.1.1 Opening of the Book

Said the sheikh, legist, and most just judge, the learned helper and most assiduous magistrate, Abu al-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-‘Raḥmān ibn Maḍā' al-Lakhmi, may God extend his blessing, and light his spirit with the light of faith, and extend his destined hour, and help him with the knowledge which he bears:

Praise be to God for what he has granted of faith, and knowledge of the language with which he sent down the Qur'an; and peace upon His Prophet who calls us to the House of Delight, and upon his family and companions and those who follow them in good deeds. And I ask God's favor upon the infallible imām, the known mahdi, and upon his two successors: our two Commanders of the Faithful, inheritors of his exalted position. And I pray for our Commander of the Faithful, son of the Commander of the Faithful, who brings their high purposes to the utmost of perfection and completion.

Indeed, that which induced me to write this was the saying of the Prophet, peace be upon him: "religion is advice"; and his saying: "whoever speaks his own view of the book of God has
erred, even if his view be correct"; and his saying: "whoever speaks his own view of the book of God without knowledge, let him take his seat of hellfire"; and his saying: "whoever of you sees what is reprehensible, let him change it with his hands; and if he cannot, then by his tongue; and if he cannot, then by his heart".

And it is incumbent upon the viewer of this book from among those interested in these things, if he be mindful of his religion, and hold knowledge to be that which brings him closer to his Lord, that he look; and if that which we explain be clear to him, he should refer to it, and thank God for it; and if it not be clear, then let him stop in the manner of the pious at the difficulties; and if that which is contrary to it be clear to him, then let him expound what is clear to him by speech or writing.

I have seen that the grammarians - God's mercy be upon them - have proposed the activity of grammar in order to protect the speech of the Arabs from error, and to guard it from change, and they have reached in this the end which they proposed, and achieved the goal which they desired. However, they bound themselves to the unnecessary, and exceeded in it the degree sufficient for what they wanted from it; its paths were diffi-
cult, its structures feeble, and its arguments fell from the level of credibility, to the point where the poet has said:

She gazes with a bewitching, shy glance

Weaker than the argument of a grammarian

However, if it were taken the way of freedom from excess, devoid of imitation and fancy, it would be among the most clearly-proven of sciences, and the most plausible of them when measured and tested, containing only certainty or that which approaches it of speculation.

The adage of this book and the books of the grammarians is like that of men possessed of wealth, having excellent sapphires, superior chrysolites, pure gold, and silver excelling in purity to the utmost degree; but they mixed them with glass so purified that it was thought to be sapphire, and brass worked so that it was taken to be gold, which was of the most splendid appearance, and greatest in nobility of view to the eye, and most numerous, and newest, so that they became most intent upon it and thought they were in greatest need of it. So God granted to them a man to advise them, a discerning critic, and they
showed to him what was with them of those costly and comely treasures, and he said to them: "The Prophet of God, peace be upon him, has said: 'Religion is advice', and I advise you not to acquire and gain, but to desire the compensation and reward of God. This which you have taken to be provisions for times to come, and which you have thought to be security from poverty, is partly wealth and partly the glimmering of a mirage; for the sapphire withstands the test of fire, and increases in quality with the test, while the glass does not withstand and cannot endure the test. The chrysolite melts the eyes of serpents if brought near to them." And he set about arguing with them in this manner, exerting his greatest efforts in it and marshaling his forces, with peculiarities and marvels, to cause certainty to come to them regarding that which holds true to the test and that which lies. And some of them praised and thanked him, doing as he commanded and exchanging that which was harmful and disgraceful for that which aids and delights in times of want, while others scorned his words and continued in their ways, and time tested them severely, and events stung them, and a disaster struck their city. But he who possessed resolve, and acted upon what he knew, was saved from it as a meteor is saved from dark-
ness, while he who shunned and disdained him perished as the
dumb beasts in the desert without pasture or water.

Likewise he who takes from the science of grammar that
which brings him to his desired end, and seeks to replace those
suppositions - which are not like the suppositions in jurispru-
dence, erected by the Revealer, peace be upon him, as a guide for
laws; nor like the suppositions in medicine, which have been
tried and which are, in the main, beneficial against illnesses
and pains - with religious sciences, including those transmit-
ted through hearing as well as those which were witnessed, which
are a shield and guide to paradise; such a one has God helped
with teaching, and guided him to the straight path. As for him
who confines himself solely to knowledge which does not call him
to paradise and which does not protect from hellfire, such as
languages and poetry, the details of grammatical justifica-
tions, and amusing anecdotes, he has made a poor choice, and has
preferred blindness to sight:

For what benefits my brother's eye from the world

If for him the light and the darkness are the same?
There may be one who will say, "Thou, Andalusi who delights in running his horse without competitors, who compares himself to the most thorough enquirer" in intelligence - and what an intelligence! Do you presume to enter the battle without consulting the aged and knowledgeable, and attempt to vie, with your drizzle, with the pouring rain?

The young camel cannot attack the fierce, strong camel even if it be bound with a rope

Are you as it is said:

Like one butting the rock one day for to split it

The mountain goat hurts it not, but weakens his horn

Do you belittle the grammarian of Iraq, when Iraq's superiority over the horizons is like that of the rising sun over the waning moon? You are less significant than a chinch in a fissure, and more hidden than a straw in a brick:

---

An apparent reference to Sibawaih.
If any can hide from the Merciful

Among His creations, it is Banu Asad

The reply will be made to him: If you were blind you could
not rise except with a guide, and would not know the spurious
from the pure; this is not your nest, so leave:

Vacate the road for him who will build by it a lighthouse
and go with Barza[^6] where destiny has forced you
If you are of them who investigate deeply to remove uncertain­ties from a matter, when that is called for, and who rely on the
tales of others in due time, then look, and the dross will be
made plain to you from the pure, and the sickly from the sound.

2.2 The Author's Call for the Abolition of the Theory of the
Governor

My purpose in this book is to remove from the grammar that
with which the grammarian may dispense, and to call to his
attention that which has been agreed upon in error.

Among this is their assertion that the subjunctive/accusative,
the genitive, and the jussive do not occur except by

[^6]: The mother of one of the poet's rivals.
lexical governors, and that the nominative occurs by lexical and semantic governors. They have conveyed this with an expression giving the false notion that, in ضرب زيد عمرا (Zayd [nominative] struck ʿAmr [accusative]), the nominative in زيد and the accusative in عمرا are caused by ضرب. Do you not see that Sibawaih says, in the beginning of his Al-Kitāb, "I have mentioned eight ending vowels in order to differentiate between that which one of the four (damma, fatha, kasra, and sukūn) enters when it is caused by the governor, these being nothing other than that which can disappear (i.e., changeable), and between that (vowel) upon which the (final) letter is fixed and does not disappear unless something causes that"? It appears from this that the governor has caused the case-endings, and that is patently false.

Abu al-Fath ibn al-Jinni and others have made declarations in opposition to this, with Abu al-Fath saying in his Al-Khasā'is, after a discussion of lexical and semantic governors: "As for the truth and essence of the matter, the governor of the nominative/indicative, the accusative/subjunctive, the genitive, and the jussive, is the speaker himself and nothing else." He emphasized "the speaker" with "himself" in order to remove
doubt, and then added emphasis with the words, "and nothing else". This is the position of the Mu'tazilites. As for the way of the people of truth (orthodox or Sunni Muslims), these sounds occur by the act of God Almighty, but are attributed to man like the rest of his voluntary acts.

As for the notion that some utterances cause others, it is vain both intellectually and in terms of divine revelation, and is not supported by any reasonable person for reasons whose mention would take long where the goal is brevity. Among them is the condition that the agent be present when it performs the act indicated by its verb; however, inflection does not occur (in nouns and verbs) until after the absence of the governor, so that زيد is not made accusative after إن in our expression إن زيد (verily, Zayd) until after the passing of إن.

And if it be asked, "By what does one counter him who believes that the meanings of these words are the governors?", the reply is that the agent, among those who subscribe to it, either acts by will, as do the animals, or by its nature, as fire burns and water chills, and that there is no agent other than God among the people of truth, so that the acts of man and the rest of the animals are the acts of God Almighty, as are the acts of water
and fire and of everything else that acts; this has been made clear in due course. As for the grammatical governors, no reasonable person has supported them, either in their meanings or in their words, since they do not act by will or by nature.

And if it be claimed that what they have said is by way of simile and approximation, since the inflection ascribed to these governors disappears when the governors disappear, and occurs when they occur, likewise the operating causes (الفعل الفاعلة, i.e., secondary and tertiary causes) among those who subscribe to them; the reply is that if their making them governors did not lead them to change the language of the Arabs, to drop it from its level of eloquence to the level of defect and faulty expression, to the assertion of a lack in that which is complete, and to the distortion of meanings from what was originally intended, then they would be forgiven. As for their belief in words being governors leading to what it has led to, the following of them in that is not permissible.

2.2.1 The Objection to the Implication of Removed Governors

Know that, in their scheme, things removed are of three types: that which is removed and without which the sentence is
incomplete, but which is removed due to the hearer's prior knowledge of it, as in your saying to someone whom you see giving to the people: أعط زيدًا (give [to] Zayd), and you remove the intended (imperative), by which the sentence would be complete if it appeared. Likewise in the words of God Almighty, وقيل للذين آتىكمُ ماذا أنزل ربككم قالوا خيرًا (And it was said to them who feared [God], "what did your Lord send down", [and] they said, "good") and يسألون ماذا ينظفون، قال العذر ([When] they ask what they should give, say "forgiveness") in the version of those who read (the last word) in the accusative as well as those who read it in the nominative. This is also the case in His words, إنْ أصْحَبَتْكُمُ دابةً (do not harm the she-camel [ACC] of God, and [do not bar her from] her water [ACC]). The words removed in the Book of God Almighty, due to the knowledge of them on the part of the hearer, are very many, and if they were to appear, the speech would be complete with them, while their removal is more concise and eloquent.

The second (type) is that which is removed while being unnecessary to the utterance; on the contrary, the utterance is complete without them, and their appearance would be a flaw in the speech, as when you say: أريدًا خسرته [Zayd [ACC]], did you,
strike him,?). They say that زيداً is in the accusative by a concealed verb, and that the implication is ضربت زيداً (did you strike Zayd?). This is a claim for which there is no justification other than their assertion that ضربت is among the verbs taking one direct object, this being the suffixed pronoun, so that there must necessarily be something governing زيد in the accusative, either visible or concealed, and as it does not appear, there is no alternative to its being concealed. This is according to the premise that every accusative must have a governor! And I wish I knew what it is that they hold to be concealed in the expression {Zayd [ACC], did you pass by his son [GEN]!}, for one of us may say this without realizing what is concealed! The utterance is complete and clearly understood, and nothing calls for this pretense except a rule: Every accusative must have a governor. And this is the second category.

As for the third category, it is that which is concealed and which, if it were made to appear, would change the utterance from what it had been before, as when we say: يا عبد الله (oh, Abda[ACC]-llah!), with the regimen of all other instances of the vocative when in construct or (unspecified) indefinite,
being the same as that of عبد الله. According to them, عبد الله is accusative by a concealed verb estimated to be أدعو (I call), and these, if they appeared, would change the meaning so that the vocative would become a declarative statement. In like manner the subjunctive by ف and و: the grammarians make the verbs which follow these particles subjunctive by أن, and interpret أن with the verb as the verbal noun, change the verbs occurring before these particles to their verbal nouns, and then conjoin one verbal noun to another by means of these particles; and if they did all that, then the meaning of the original utterance would no longer be intended! You see that if you said: ما تأتينا فتحدثنا, it would have two (possible) meanings: one being ما تأتينا فكيف تحدثنا (you don't come to us, so how can you speak to us?), that is, that speaking does not occur except by the act of coming, and that if the coming does not occur then there is no speaking, just as is said: ما تدرس فتخفظ (you don't study, and thus do not learn), that is, the cause of learning is study, so if there is no study then there is no learning. And the other sense is ما تأتي محدثنا (you don't come to us speaking), that is, you come without talking, and they interpret for both of them: ما يكون منك إتيان محدث (there is on your part no coming or talking),
and this expression does not give either of these two meanings.

And these concealed things, whose appearance is not permissible, must either be absent in word but present in meaning in the mind of the speaker, or absent from the mind just as the words referring to them are absent from the expression. And if they have no existence in the mind and none in the words referring to them in speech, then what is it that governs the accusative? What is concealed? The attributing of government to something non-existent is, in any case, absurd. And if it be said that the meanings of the removed words are present in the mind of the speaker, that the utterance is completed by them, and that they are part of the speech existing in the mind, referred to by words, except that the words referring to them have been removed for the sake of brevity, just as they have been removed in cases where it is permissible for them to appear, also for the sake of brevity, then it must follow that the utterance is defective and incomplete except by their presence, since they are a part of it, and that we have added to the words of speakers that which they have not said. And we have no justification for this other than the assertion that every accusative must have a lexical governor. The invalidation of this has
been completed, while the supposed additions to the words of speakers without grounds for that is a clear error, yet there is no punishment connected with that. As for its extension to the Book of God Almighty, which the false may in no wise approach, and the allegation of additional meanings in it without justification or evidence, other than the assertion that everything which is made accusative is so made by a governor; that the governor is none other than a word, either expressed or concealed but intended, indicating a meaning existing in the mind; such a statement is forbidden to one understanding this. And the prophet of God, peace be upon him, has said: "Whoever speaks his own view of the book of God has erred, even if his view be correct." The import of this tiding is prohibition, and what has been prohibited is forbidden unless there is justification for it. And opinion, so long as it does not rest upon proof, is forbidden. And the prophet of God, peace be upon him, has said: "Whoever speaks of the Quran without knowledge, let him take his seat of hellfire." This is a severe warning, and to do that against which [the prophet of] God has warned, is forbidden. And whoever constructs additions to the Quran in words or meanings by idle supposition, and realizes their idleness, has
spoken of the Quran without knowledge, and the warning is thus
directed to him. And among that which indicates its forbidden
nature is the unanimity of agreement that no word will be added
to the Quran unless its authenticity be agreed upon; and the
addition of meanings is like the addition of words, and even
more (to be guarded against), since meanings are what is actual­
ly intended, while words simply indicate them and exist because
of them.

2.2.2 The Unanimous Agreement of the Grammarians on the Exis­
tence of Governors is not Proof

If it be said that the grammarians - all, without exception
- have agreed in supporting the existence of governors, though
there be some differences, some of them saying that the governor
is in such-and-such, while other say that the governor is not
this, but rather is that, as we shall explain later, if God
wills; the answer is that the agreement of grammarians is not
proof to those who oppose them, for one of the greatest experts
among them, and the foremost among the front rank of their
profession, Abu al-Fath ibn Jinni, has said, in his Al-Khaṣṣāʾīs:

Know that the agreement of those of the two cities
[meaning Basra and Kufa] is proof (only) if your adversary gives you his hand that he is not at variance with what has been determined, and what is taken from it by analogy; and if he does not give you his hand upon this then their agreement is not a pretext for him, as it has not come from him whose command is obeyed in the Quran and the prophetic tradition, that they shall not agree on error, just as the stipulation has come from the prophet of God, peace be upon him, in his words: "My community does not agree on error". Rather, it is knowledge derived from induction in this language, and everyone for whom (the waters) have been parted to reveal a correct cause and a clear path, was [Al-Khalīl" in mind and Abu 'Amr (ibn al-'Alā') in thought]; however, given that which we have seen and whose perpetration we have permitted, we shall not allow him to have the audacity to oppose the community - whose study has been long, and whose discernment has advanced, and of whom the latter has confirmed the former - and the group who do not doubt that God, be He praised and His names made holy, has guided them to this noble knowledge, and shown them the wisdom in respecting and glorifying Him, and caused it to be, through their goodness and pious deeds, a servant to His revealed book, and the words of His sent prophet, and an aid in understanding them, and knowledge of that which man and jinn have been commanded and that which they have been forbidden, only after they have mastered its truth and fully understood it, and not had recourse to the first fleeting idea occurring to them, and to the first of the whims of their thinking. For if he follows this example, and sets about scrutinizing closely every aspect of the situation while casting his glance upon that which God shows him without attempting to defeat those who have gone before, may God's mercy be upon them, and without scorning them in anything regarding it; if he does this, then his sight will be guided, his

47The word in the two manuscripts was ۡمٓۛ; the two names here are taken from Sheikh al-Najjār’s marginal notes in Al-Khaṣṣā'īs.
mind will be encouraged [by success], and he will be a mark of correctness and a sign of success. And Abu 'Uthman 'Amr ibn Baḥr al-Jāḥīz has said: "There is nothing more harmful to the people than the expression, 'the first have left nothing for the last'". Abu 'Uthman al-Māzīnī has said: "If the scholar first says something, then it is incumbent upon the student to follow and side with it, or to justify that which is against it if he finds a way to do that." And al-Ṭa'ī al-Kabīr has said: "He who hears you says, 'how much the first has left for the last!'" And among the things permissible, in spite of the agreement against it since this science was begun until the present time, is that which I have seen in their expression: هذا جَحْرٌ ضَبْبُ خَرب (this is the ruined bur­row of a lizard). For people now say what those who came before have said, that the expression on which they do not disagree and from which they do not de­sist, is an error on the part of the Arabs and an anom­aly which cannot be extended to other things and to which other things cannot be traced back. As for myself, I hold the view that there are in the Quran over a thousand instances of the like of this.

Said the author, may God be pleased with him: Here I stopped the text of his quote, since I quoted it with brevity as my purpose, and did so by way of following one who is accustomed to being followed, for the view of most regarding the Arabs' saying: هذا جَحْرٌ ضَبْبُ خَرب is as he mentioned it. And Abu Fath has chosen it to be by removal of the first term of the construct and the setting of the second term in its place. Also, he said that

---

48The dean of writers of the Abbasid era, died 868 A.D./255 A.H. - P.J.

49A leading Basran grammarian, died around 871 A.D./258 A.H. - P.J.
there are over a thousand places (where its like occurs) in the Quran, and his estimation of the expression is (this is the burrow of a lizard whose burrow is destroyed), with as a modifier to just as is said (this is the horse of an Arab whose horse is in its prime), with as modifier to which is described by it, even though it is an attribute of and is related to it. So , the first construct term and a nominative agent, is removed, and the second term, which is the attached pronoun referring to , is set in its place and, according to him, is (governed in the) nominative by . The pronoun, if it be the agent of an active participle or of those modifiers considered similar to the active participle, is concealed in the modifier according to their view, while the removal of the first construct term and its replacement by the second is common as is the concealment of the (agent) pronoun in the modifier. But it is fitting that one say to Abu al-Fath: the removal of the first construct term is not permissible except in those cases where there precedes knowledge on the part of the person addressed of the intended (meaning) of the word, as in His saying, (Ask the [people of] the village in
which we have been, and [the men of] the caravan which we have accompanied. As for those instances in which knowledge of what has been removed requires much consideration and long thought, the removal is not permissible due to the confusion which would result on the part of those who hear. And this is among the places where the reach required of the hearer is far, the proof being that this expression has been presented to the ears of a group learned and knowledgeable in grammar and language, and they did not know the missing words, since the language would have been poor if the words had appeared; that is, if the Arabs had said, since this would be poor expression in speech, and would be eliminated by the vowel damma on the ب (of خرب). Thus is the speech concise and clear, with this as its basis, and if it is then burdened by that which is imposed by removal (of supposed words) which is not previously understood, then it becomes far-fetched. Then again, it would be clearer if the second term were visible, but as the first term has been removed, the second term is concealed, and escapes comprehension, so that its understanding with this removal and concealment (of supposed words) becomes an impossible burden. Abu al-Fatḥ has deemed permissible the refutation of anyone who
comes forward with supposition which is not strong; even more so may we refute weak suppositions with clear proof which no equitable person would doubt.

If the grammarians assert that they do not mean, in أزيدأ أكرمته (Zayd, did you honor him?) and the like, that (a concealed) زيد أكرمته, by which زيد is made accusative, is intended by the speaker, or that the utterance is lacking without it, but rather that it is something placed and agreed upon by which the pronunciation of the language of the Arabs is achieved, just as the engineer who makes artificial lines - which are objects in reality - in place of lines having length without breadth or depth, and dots - also objects - in place of points which are ends [of lines] and which have neither length nor breadth nor depth, and estimates circles and points in the heavens and thereby achieves the proof for that which he seeks to prove without the substitution of one thing for another harming that which he intends, but rather providing certainty to the learned of that craft with their knowledge of the substitution of this for that; if they say this, then the reply is that grammarians are not like them, for they say that every accusative must have a lexical governor, and if they make these removed words, whose
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appearance is not permissible, absolutely non-existent in word
and intended meaning, the speech being complete without them,
then they have nullified that which they asserted to the effect
that every accusative must have a governor. Also, the en-
gineer's substitution of objects for lines and points is ap­
proximation and a help to the student, while the placement of
these governors has nothing in common with that, but is rather
supposition and imagination.

2.2.3 Objection to the Supposition of Governors Attached to

Objects of Prepositions

Among the hidden words whose appearance is not allowed, and
which follow these same lines, are those which they allege in
connection with prepositional objects which are predicates,
relative clauses, modifiers, or circumstantial clauses such as
زید في الدار (Zayd [is] in the house), رأيت الذي في الدار (I saw the
one [who is] in the house), مررت برجل من قريش (I passed by a man
from Quraysh), and رأي زيد في الدار الهلال في السماء (Zayd, in the
house, saw the moon in the sky). The grammarians allege that the
phrase في الدار (in the house) is connected with a removed word,
and the supposed expression is thus زيد مستقر في الدار (Zayd is
located in the house), the requirement for that being to them that which they have postulated to the effect that prepositional objects, if their prepositions are not superfluous, must have governors, if not visible, as in زيد قائم في الدار (Zayd is standing in the house), then concealed, as in زيد في الدار (Zayd [is] in the house). There is no doubt that all of these represent complete utterances composed of two nouns representing specific things between which there is a relation; this relation is indicated by في (in), and we have no need for anything other than that. Likewise, they say of رأيت الذي في الدار (I saw the one who [is] in the house), that it is estimated to be رأيت الذي استقر في الدار (I saw the one who was located in the house); of كائن من قريش, they suppose من قريش (being from Quraysh); and of رأيت في الدار الهلال في السماء, they suppose في السماء (being in the sky). All of these represent complete speech whose hearer has no need of any addition of كائن (being) or مستقر (is located), and if the governor and government be false then there remains no specious argument for him who alleges this concealment.
2.2.4 Objection to the Supposition of Hidden Pronouns in Participles

Along these lines is that which they allege of the active and passive participles, and of [nouns] derived from and considered similar to the active participles and the like, that there are in them pronouns (governed) by them in the nominative, this being the case if there are no visible nouns governed by these participles, as in (striking), (struck), (striking, intensive), (good), and the like, for they say that they govern the visible noun in expressions like (Zayd, his father is striking 'Amr), and if they govern the visible, then so much the more should they govern the invisible (pronoun), while the governor's making the visible noun nominative has been thoroughly discredited. If ضارب is used to indicate two meanings, those of the act as well as the unspecified agent, and if we say ضارب عمرا زيد (Zayd is striking 'Amr), then ضارب refers to the agent unspecified by name, and زيد refers to his name; thus I wish I knew what calls for the supposition of an additional (pronoun) which, if it appeared, would be superfluous. If it is said: the proof for it is its appearance in some expressions, specifically in conjunc-
tions as in {Zayd}, he, and Bakr are striking "Amr). 50 Likewise, the expression has been heard of the Arabs, مررت بقوم عرب أجمعون (I passed by a group, all of them Arabs), so if there were no nominative pronoun (concealed) in عرب, then could not be in the nominative. 51 If this be said, the reply is: the grammarians say that this pronoun which appears is not the agent of ضارب, for the agent of ضارب is concealed, and this uttered pronoun is to provide emphasis for it; thus بكر is conjoined to the concealed pronoun and not to the visible.

Even if it be granted that, as the grammarians say, this visible pronoun is for emphasis of the other concealed and intended pronoun not indicated by an utterance, and that بكر is conjoined to that one, nonetheless one may say: this pronoun is concealed only in case of its conjunction, and not otherwise, and if there is no conjunction then there is no concealment; by what do you make analogous to the case of conjunction, that of

---

50 The argument of Al-Khalil is that the concealed pronoun cannot be conjoined to another noun; see Shawqi Daif, Al-Madaris al-Nahwiyya, p. 70. - P.J.

51 That is, the nominative case of أجمعون would be accounted for if ti were the predicate of the concealed pronoun in عرب. - P.J.
non-conjunction, making the instance of conjunction in its paucity the basis for others in their multitude? The speaker does not intend the concealed pronoun unless it be in conjunction, and if it is not conjoined, then he does not intend it; is the analogous extension of this to that anything but supposition? And how does supposition confirm anything which is needless and has no benefit to the one who hears it, which the speaker has no need to confirm, and whose confirmation results in faulty expression, since the modifying participle stands both for the modifier and the thing modified which is unspecified by name, while the alleged concealed pronoun is just that, the modified thing unspecified by name? And the fact that these participles, unlike verbs, show no agent pronouns in case of the dual or plural, invalidates the supposition of analogous extension of (pronouns in the case of) conjunction, and this idea of its invalidation is opposed by that idea of its confirmation; thus confirmation is not proof, either conclusive or speculative, while affirming it in people's speech without proof is not permissible. How much less so in the Book of God Almighty, as

52Meaning that these nouns accept concealed pronouns as do verbs, but that they do not take the visible, attached agent suffixes that verbs take; for example, the лин (they [dual] struck) is an agent pronoun, as is the лин (they [fem. plural] strike).
(was seen) with the allegation of additions by supposition, supposition not being knowledge since one supposition opposes another, and the discussion of the warning against that has preceded. Similar to this is that which they cite as proof in the expressions مرت باتاع ورفع كلله، and مرت بتقوم عرب أجمعون (I passed by a lowland, all of it [filled with] fragrant plants); it is understood that عرب (Arab) is a noun used to give a meaning by which it may be distinct from "non-Arab", and if you say مرت بتقوم عرب (I passed by a group of Arabs), the utterance is complete since you have supplied both the modifier and the thing modified. And if you concealed a pronoun in it, no additional meaning would be given. As for their addition of أجمعون (all of them [NOM]), it is an anomaly, and if we grant that it is for emphasis of the (concealed) pronoun, from where is it judged that this pronoun was intended (by the speaker) in the case of emphasis, or in the lack thereof? And if there is no emphasis, then the speaker has no need for it. To attempt analogous extension of this is supposition by which the like of this is not proven, especially in the Book of God Almighty. And if it is said that by this reasoning nothing in the language can be confirmed by supposition, the reply is that those things not
called for by need are not confirmed except by conclusive proof; as for that which is needed, such as the words of the language, they are accepted if we cite reliable authorities even though they be speculative, as well as other things for which need calls.

2.2.5 Objection to the Supposition of Concealed Pronouns in Verbs

If it is said: What to you say regarding the like of زيد قام (Zayd stood), since they say that there is in قام an agent pronoun? There is nothing which calls for that except the statement of the grammarians that the agent does not precede, and that the verb must have an agent. This statement of theirs cannot be other than either certain or supposed, and if supposed then the issue is (the same as) that of the alleged pronoun in the active participle; and if it is certain, then this concealment is correct. But there must precede the discussion of this some preparatory remarks which will help the inquirer with that whose exposition is intended, which is that indications are of two types: lexical indications intended by the speaker, such as the noun's indication of its referent and the verb's indication
of action and time; and inherent indications, such as a roof's indication of (the presence of) walls and the transitive verb's indication of direct object and location. As for the verb's indication of its agent, there is disagreement over it among people, some of whom make its indication of the agent like its indication of action and time, and others who make its indication of its agent like that of its direct object. And if one says زيد قام with the verb قام indicating its agent by (the speaker's) intention then there is no need for anything to be concealed, since it would be an addition without any benefit as in the case of the active participle, which was used to refer both to the act and the agent; by this the verb indicates three (things), though its indication of them be inherent and following from its nature.

There are two possibilities here: one is that there is in the mind of the speaker a pronoun, as in the case of (the concealed verb in) زيداً ضربته (Zayd, [accusative], I, struck him), but it is not indicated lexically due to the hearer's knowledge of it; the evidence for this is in the dual قاما (the two of them stood) and يقومان (the two of them are standing) and the plural قاموا (they stood) and يقومون (they are standing), for these end-
ings are pronouns indicated lexically. The second (possibility) is that this and و are signs of the dual and plural (instead of agents), as in أكلوني البراغيث (the fleas ate [masc. plural] me), which some Arabs use with both preceding and following (agent nouns), while most Arabs make the verb follow the agent (in this construction); this is just like the feminine ت, which is necessary when the verb follows the agent except in poetry, such as

وَلَا مَدَّةً وَدَفْت تَوَدَّفَتْهَا وَلَا أَرْضٌ أَنْفَعْلَ إِقْبَالُهَا

(and no rain cloud dropped its rain, while no earth put forth its greenery)

And if it is said: What do you do with the expression أمت لب وأَنْفَعْلَ إِقْبَالُهَا (you stood and I stood), where the prior placement of the agent did not enable them to dispense with its repetition at the end (of each verb)? The reply is that this is evidence; however, the analogical extension of the third person to the second and first is not certain; perhaps in the case of the third person the preceding visible (agent) is sufficient, but is not sufficient in other cases.

53In this verse, of 'Amir ibn Jawal al-Ta'i, the evidence is the removal of the ت from أَنْفَعْل.
And if it is said: What is the correct view regarding the verb's indication of the agent? The reply is that it seems most apparent that the verb's indication of the agent is lexical. Do you not see that you know from the يعلم يَا (he knows), that the agent is third-person masculine, from the أعلم أُنف (I know) that it is first-person singular, from the نون in (we know) that it is first-person plural, and from the تعلم تَأ (you know/she knows) that it is either second-person masculine singular or third-person feminine singular? There is sharing (of the verb form) here, as there is with يعلم and the like between the present and the future. And you know from أكرف (he knew) that the agent is [third-person] masculine singular. In this way there is no (concealed) pronoun since the verb itself indicates it, just as it indicates time, so we have no need for concealment. As for the other view, it appears to entail concealment of the preceding agent.

The grammarians distinguish between concealment and removal, and say (I refer to the astute among them) that the agent is concealed and not removed. And if they mean by "concealed" that which is necessary, and by "removed" that which may be dispensed with, then they are saying: This is accusative by a
concealed verb whose appearance is not permissible. And the verb thus described is necessary, without which the utterance would be incomplete; it is the governor of the accusative, for there is no accusative without a governor. And if by "concealed" they meant nouns, with "removed" applying only to verbs and sentences, and not to nouns, then they are saying, of the expression {the one whom I struck is Zayd}, that the direct object is removed, with the original considered to have been (I struck him). And if the two be distinguished by that which the speaker certainly intended, and that which the speaker is presumed to have intended, then this is a (genuine) distinction; however, the grammarians' usage of these two terms does not match this distinction.

That which one should believe, with an expression like زيد قام, is that the speaker may intend that the agent be repeated at the end (of the verb), or may be content with that (agent) which precedes, this in the case of human speech. As for the speech of the Almighty Creator, one needs to avoid arguing one way or the other since there is no conclusive proof for it, and we have no need to speak either for its confirmation or denial.
2.3. (Preface to Contention in Government)

If it is said: You have nullified (the notion) that there is either governor or governed in speech, so show us how that comes about with the attainment of the goal of grammar; I would reply: I will present this in chapters which will indicate other things as well, and have begun a book which will include all aspects of the grammar. If God decrees its completion, then he who is not hindered by tradition will benefit from it; if not, then he can extend the evidence of the present chapters to other situations.

2.3.1 Contention in Government

Among these chapters is that of two agents and two direct objects, each of which acts by its agent as does the other, and things of this nature. This is the interpretation of Sibawaih, and I do not disagree with the grammarians except in saying "I connected with" (علكت) instead of "I made to govern" (أعملت). The grammarians use "connection" for objects of prepositions, whereas I use it for objects of prepositions as well as agents.

---

54 In Arabic, باب التنازع في العمل, referring with situations where two verbs have the same subject, or where a given noun is the subject of one verb and the object of another. - P.J.
and objects. You say قام وقعد زيد (Zayd stood and sat), and if you connect زيد with the second verb, there will be disagreement among the grammarians. Al-Farrā' does not allow it, while al-Kisā'ī allows it by removal of the (first) agent. Others do allow it with concealment, in which what comes after identifies the concealed pronoun. The evidence for its removal is found in the words of the poet:

وكُلِّنتَ مَدْمَّةً كَانَ مَتَوْسِها جَرِي فُوقَها وَأَسِتْرَمَتُ لَونُ مَدْمَّب

(and a dark, blood-red, as if there lay on her back, and she wore, a golden color)

(The verb جري has no visible agent, so it is either removed or concealed; among the indications of it are His words: حتى توارت بالحجاب (even when [they] were hidden behind the veil), and عبس وتولى أن جاه الأعمى (he frowned and turned away when the blind man came to him). None of these verbs has a visible agent, and as for which of the two views is more correct, my opinion is that it is that of al-Kisā'ī, since others say that the removal of the agent is not permissible because the agent and the verb

---

55This is because connection with the second verb in قام وقعد زيد results in the concealment of the agent in the first, thus causing its concealment before it is mentioned; thus al-Farrā' held that the governor of زيد was the two verbs together.

56That is, of its being removed.
are as one thing, thus inseparable; by this (reasoning), the removal of the verb while leaving the agent is not permissible either, yet they allow it! And among the indications of the correctness of al-Kisā‘i’s view is the verse of ‘Aqlama: ⁵⁷

(Men and dogs lay in wait [3rd masc. sing.] for her in the tree and sought [3rd masc. sing.] her, but she overcame their arrows)

2.3.2 Forms of Contention

If you connected زيد with the first verb you would say, in the dual, قام وقعدا الزيدان ("stood [singular] the two Zayds and sat [dual]"); and in the plural, قام وقعدوا الزيدون ("stood [singular] the Zayds and sat [plural]"). Also, you say مررت ومر بي زيد ("I passed and passed by me Zayd [nominative]") , when connecting with مر, while if you connected it with مررت ومر بي زيد ("I passed and passed by me by Zayd [genitive]"), meaning مررت بزيد ومر. بي (I passed by Zayd and he passed by me); in the dual, مررت ومر. بي بالزيد.ين ("I passed and

⁵⁷The evidence provided by this verse is that the poet did not place agent pronouns in either the first or the second verbs; if he had, they would be مررت ومر. أي واميم. رهابه. لزيم.
passed [dual] by me the two Zayds [genitive]"), and in the plural, ("I passed and passed [plural] by me the Zayds [genitive]"). And you say مر ب ومررت بزيد ("passed by me, and I passed by Zayd [genitive]") when connecting with the second verb, and there is in this the same disagreement that there is in the preceding issue. For with connection to the first verb, مر ب ومررت به زيد (Zayd passed by me and I passed by him), the meaning is مر ب ومررت به زيد ("I struck and struck me Zayd [nominative]") with connection to the second; in the dual, ضربت وضربني زيدا ("I struck and struck me [singular] the two Zayds [nominative]"); and in the plural, ضربت وضربني الزيدين, ("I struck and struck me [singular] the two Zayds [nominative]"). With connection to the first verb, you say ضربت وضربني زيدا ("I struck and struck me Zayd [accusative]"); in the dual, ضربت وضربني الزيدين ("I struck and struck me [dual] the two Zayds [accusative]"), and in the plural, ضربت وضربني الزيدين ("I struck and struck me [plural] the Zayds [accusative]"), God Almighty has said, connecting with the second verb: آتونىآفرع عليه قطرا (bring me molten copper that I might pour it thereon), so that is a direct object of آفرع.
And the poet has said, connecting with the first verb: 58

فردَ على الضْوَاد هُوَى عميدًا
وسُوْشَلَ لَوْ يَبْتَينَ لَنَا السَّوَاءٌ
وَقَدْ شَفَتْهَا بِهَا وَدَرَى عَصْصَوراً
بِهَا يُؤْفِنْدُنَا الْخَرَّدُ الْخُدْدَالاً
(it returned to my heart a strong love,
and was asked, "would that our question were answered";
for we have lived in it for some time, and seen times
when the shy, shapely ones led us)

Al-Farazdiq, connecting with the second, has said:

ولْكَ نَصِنُّنَا لَوْ سَبِيتِ وَسِيْتِي بِنُو عَبْدَ شَمَسٍ مِنْ مَنْافِ حَامِشٍ
(but it would be fair if I were to insult [the tribes]
Banu ʿAbd Shams and Hashim of Manaf, and they were to insult me)

Similarly, ʿUfayl al-Ghanawi has said:

وَكُبْنَا مَدْعَةً كَانَ مَتْوَنُها جَرِيَ فَوْقَها وَأَبْسَعُرتْ لَوْنَ مَدْمَبٍ
(and a dark, blood-red, as if there lay on her back, and she
wore, a golden color)

58 The evidence is in the third line, since he makes the second verb govern; if he had made the latter govern, he would have said: 59 The evidence in the verse is that he made the second verb govern; if he had made the first govern in other than poetry, he would have said: 59 The evidence in the verse is that he made the second verb govern; if he had made the first govern in other than poetry, he would have said: 59 The evidence in the verse is that he made the second verb govern; if he had made the first govern in other than poetry, he would have said:
"Umar ibn Abi al-Rabi‘a, connecting with the first, has said:

إذا هي لم تَتَشَكُّ بعود أراك، فَتَتَشَكُّ فَاستَكَتْ بعَود إِسْحَبَل

(if she did not clean her teeth with a stick of araka, then a stick of ishal would be selected, and she would clean her teeth with it)

And you say ("I gave and gave me Zayd [nominative] a dirham"), and, connecting with the first verb, ("I gave and gave me it Zayd [accusative] a dirham"). You also say ("I thought and thought me it Zayd [nominative] to have left [accusative, singular]"); and, connecting with the first verb, ("I thought and thought me it Zayd [accusative] to have left [accusative, singular]"); in the dual, ("I thought and thought [dual] me to have left [singular, accusative] the two Zayds [accusative] to have left [dual, accusative]"); and in the plural, ("I thought and thought [plural]

60 The evidence in the verse is that, had he made the second verb govern, he would have said فَاستَكَتْ بعود إِسْحَبَل.

61 The author has moved to the discussion of the type of contention occurring with verbs taking two direct objects, and they are ظنن، أعطيت، and the like.
me to have left [singular, accusative] the Zayds [accusative] to have left [plural, accusative]". The meaning is (I thought the Zayds had left and they thought I had left), and the is not made plural since the second objects of these verbs agree with the first. Likewise, it was not made into a pronoun, since the pronoun of the singular cannot refer to the dual. So if you said ظنت وظناني الزيدين شاخصين ("I thought and thought [dual] me them (dual, accusative) the two Zayds [accusative] to have left [dual, accusative]"), and in the plural, ظنت وظناني إيام الزيدتين شاخصين ("I thought and thought [plural] me them [plural, accusative] the Zayds [accusative] to have left [plural, accusative]"). And you say أعلمت وأعلمني زيد عمراً منطلقاً ("I informed and informed [singular] me Zayd [nominative] 'Amr [accusative] leaving [singular, accusative]"), connecting with the second verb; connecting with the first, you say أعلمت وأعلمنه إيام زيداً عمراً منطلقاً ("I informed and informed [singular] me it [singular, accusative] Zayd [accusative] 'Amr [accusative] leaving

\[62\]i.e., to have left, the accusative dual pronoun agreeing with the corresponding active participle. -P.J.
أعلمت وأعلموهم إذاهم الزيدين منطلقين
(I informed and informed [dual] me them\(^63\) [dual, accusative] them [dual, accusative] the two Zayds,
[accusative] the two “Amrs [accusative] leaving [dual, accusative]”); and in the plural,
أعلمت وأعلموهم إذاهم الزيدین العنمین منطلقین
(I informed and informed [plural] me them [plural, accusative] them [plural, accusative] the Zayds [accusative]
the “Amrs [accusative] leaving [plural, accusative]”), with the utterance meaning
المعرین منطلقین وأعلموهم إذاهم أعلمت الزيدین
(I informed the Zayds that the “Amrs were leaving, and they in-
formed me of the same.) My opinion in this and similar matters
is that they are not permissible (forms) since nothing like them
occurs in the speech of the Arabs, and their analogy to verbs
taking one direct object is a strained one due to the difficul-
ties caused by a large number of pronouns in preceding and
following positions.

2.3.3 Branches of Contention

\(^63\)Here, the two dual pronouns refer to the second and third objects, respectively, of
the verb أعلمن, one of a class of verbs taking three direct objects. -P.J.
The branches of this category are many, and among the questions are: do all verbs, conjugable and inconjugable, belong to this category or not? Are nouns and particles like verbs in this category or not? With regard to complements which the grammarians call governed, such as adverbs, circumstantial clauses, accusatives of specification, objects of purpose, absolute objects, and objects of ِ, is their treatment that of direct objects, agents, and prepositional objects, or not? As for verbs taking three direct objects, the answer is no for reasons which we have presented; as for inconjugable verbs like verbs of wonder, the answer is yes; for you say (how good and knowledgeable Zayd is!), connecting *أعلم* with *زيد* and *ما أحسن وأعلم زيدا* by connection with the first. There is nothing objectionable in this except the separation between *حسن* and that which is connected with it, and it is not a verb, even though some grammarians consider it to be such. And if it be said that it does not behave like other verbs in terms of its complements, the answer is that analogical extension from other verbs taking one direct object is permissible because of its ease of facilitation and the listener's prior understanding of it. As for (how nice!), (how excellent!), (how
evil!), and (perhaps), they do not come under this heading because their complements are not subject to the degree of concealment and conversion to pronouns found in this category, and are not separated from these verbs by extraneous elements.

As for كان among them is treated like a verb taking an object, for you say كنت وكان زيد قاضاً (Zayd and I were standing), and كنت وكما زيد قاضاً with as the predicate of كنت. Al-Farazdaq has said:

إني ضمنت لمن أتاني ما كان وأتى فكان وكنت غير غنور
(I guaranteed to one who attacked me whatever he perpetrated or renounced, and he was, as was I, not treacherous)

Similarly in the case of ليس, you say ليس وليس زيد قاضاً (I am not and Zayd is not, standing) and ليس وليس إياد قاضاً. It is better that, with the exception of كان, these usages be discovered through being heard from the Arabs; for كان is widely and loosely used, and its predicate occurs as an attached pronoun, as in the verse of Abu al-Aswad:

---

64 The evidence in the verse is the removal of the predicate of the first كان due to its indication by the second instance of the verb.

65 The evidence in the verse is that the pronominal form of the predicate of كان is attached to it, just as the pronominal direct object of a true verb is so attached, as in ضربته, and the like.
(and even if it [grapes] is not it [wine], or vice-versa, still it [grapes] is the brother of it [wine], nourished by its mother with her milk)

And if it be said: the grammarians did not mention in this category anything but the agent and the direct and pronominal objects, while we have here, according to their methods, many governed items such as verbal nouns, adverbials, circumstantial clauses, objects of purpose, objects of , and accusatives of specification; are these subject to analogical extension from direct objects or not? The answer is that, in the case of the verbal noun, it is clear from their discourse that it does not belong to this category, the reason for that being that the verbal noun is included in order to intensify the verb. Its removal is incompatible with intensification, for if you said (Zayd and I did stand), connecting with the second verb and removing it from the first, then the intensifier would be lost. If the purpose of the verbal noun is the explanation of kind, then it is more like a direct object, as in (I stood in a nice way); with connection to the second verb, (Zayd stood in a nice way); and with connection to the first,
With the adverbial of time, you say (Zayd and I stood on Friday), and by connecting with the first verb, 

قُمْتُ وَقَامَ زَيْدٌ يَوْمَ الْجُمَهَرَةِ

(Zayd and I stood in a good place); by connecting with the first verb, 

قُمْتُ وَقَامَ زَيْدٌ مَكَانًا حَسْنًا

(Zayd and I stood out of reverence for you) ; by connecting with the first verb, 

قُمْتُ وَقَامَ لَكُنَّ كَلِّمَةً إِعْظَامًا

(Zayd is praising and revering ʿAmr), and 

زيَدُ مَادَحَ وَمَعْلُومٌ عَمْرًا، (Zayd is praising and revering ʿAmr), and revering him).
2.3.4 Which of the Two Verbs is More Suited to Connection in Contention?

There is disagreement among the grammarians regarding which of the two verbs is more suited to being connected with the latter noun: the choice of the Basrans is the second due to its proximity to the noun, while the Kufans choose the first because of its precedence.

The method of the Basrans is more credible since it is easier, being nothing more than the removal of what is repeated in the second verb, or its conversion to a pronoun by their method if it is an agent. By connecting with the first verb there is the conversion to pronouns of every complement of the first verb which are then repeated in the second, as well as the delaying of the complements of the first verb to a position after the second. And this principle of proximity has led them to say حَرِّبُ لِيَد (manā`) making it جَحَرُ ضَرِبُ خَرِبِ which refers to the preceding جَحَرِ. 
2.4 The Occupation of the Verb by the Pronominal Object

Among the chapters thought to be difficult for one desiring to explain or understand them, since they involve governor and governed, though I have no motive to deny the governor and the governed, is the chapter dealing with the absorption of (the case-assigning force of) the verb from its object by the objective pronoun, as in زيداً ضربـه (Zayd [ACC], I struck him).

2.4.1 Regimen of the Chapter

I say: every verb preceded by a noun and having a pronominal object referring to the noun, or a pronoun connected to an object, or to a noun in the genitive, or to a particle placing what comes after it in the genitive; that verb cannot be other than either a predicate or a non-predicate. Non-predicates are imperative expressions, expressions of prohibition, and those of incitement and wonder. For imperatives and prohibitions, the preferred choice is the accusative, though the nominative is permissible, as in زيداً اضربـه (Zayd [ACC], [you] strike him), زيداً اضربـ غلامه (Zayd [ACC], [you] strike his boy).

---

\footnote{In Arabic, باب الاشتغال, denoting cases in which a pronoun referring to a sentence-initial accusative "occupies", or absorbs the force of, the verb. - P.J.}
and [you] pass by him [GEN]. The prohibition is like the imperative, as seen in the verse of al-A'isha:

مريرة، ودعنا وإن لام لائم غداً، أم أنت للبين واجم.

(As for Huraira, bid her farewell early tomorrow morning, even if one should reproach you; or will you be downcast upon her parting?)

This is likewise the case if the imperative occurs with ل, as in زيداً لبضربه عمرو (Zayd [ACC], may 'Amr strike him), and also if أمتاً (as for Zayd [ACC], honor him), and وأمًا عمرًا فلا تتهين (and as for 'Amr [ACC], don't insult him). Expressions of prayer follow the course of the imperative and the prohibition in form, as in اللهم زيداً ارحمه (oh God, Zayd [ACC] be merciful to him), and اللهم عبد الله لا تذهب (and, oh God, Abda [ACC] -llahi, do not torment him). This is also true for زيداً سقياً له وعمراً رعتي له وأمًا الكافر فحدبباً له (Zayd [ACC], [you] give him water, and 'Amr [ACC], [you] feed him; as for the infidel [ACC], [you] give him barrenness), since it is a prayer. Abu al-Aswad al-Du'ali has said:

أميران كانا أخياني كلاهما فكلا جزاه الله عني بما فعل
(each of two princes had taken me as a brother, and each of them [ACC], God rewarded him on my behalf for what he did)

And if you say زيداً فأضربوئه (then Zayd [ACC], [you] strike Zayd), then nothing but the accusative is permissible for زيداً فأضربوئه; the nominative is not permissible on the basis of its being a subject, as is permissible in زيداً فأضربوئه (Zayd [NOM], strike him), but if it is made the predicate of a removed subject then it is permissible, as if one were to say هذا زيداً فأضربوئه (this is Zayd, so strike him). It is not permissible to say زيداً فأضربوئه on the basis of زيد being a subject with فضربوئه its predicate, just as زيد ف눌طق (Zayd [NOM], he is gone) is not permissible. The poet has said:

وقالت خولان فن )->أضربوئهم وآكلرومة الحيَّين خبلوَّ كمًا هيوا

(and [many a] woman said, [the tribe] Khawlan [NOM], you, should marry one of their girls; for the honor of both [her] parents is an unmarried one, just as you have known her)

خولان is the predicate of a removed subject, with the meaning خولان (this is Khawlan). As for His words والساقُ والسارةً فاقطعو أيديهما (and the thieves [NOM], cut off their, hands), and الزائبة والزاني فاجلدوا كل واحد منهما مائة جلدة (the adulteress and the adulterer [NOM], whip each of them, a hundred lashes), Sibawaih
- may God have mercy on him - made them to be subjects, and did not make the imperative verbs to be their predicates; rather, he considered the predicates to be removed, with the meanings في فيما فرض عليهما الزنا والزناة (within prescribed duties) or (within that which has been prescribed are the adulterer and the adultress). Yet it appears that they are subjects, and that their predicates are the two verbs, with the َفُل كُبُرْتُما (the one who steals, cut of his hand), since the meaning of َذِي السَّرَقُ ِفَافَطَعْ يَدَهُ (the one who stole) is َذِي السَّرَقُ (the thief) is not in the same situation as َذِي أُعِشِي َذِي أُعِشِي (Zayd [NOM], he is gone), because زيد does not indicate a meaning of the type whose predicate is caused by it, such as ظُنُبْلُ َذِي السَّرَقُ (the one who stole), and is not in the same situation as ظُنُبْلُ فَافَطَعْ (Zayd [ACC], did you strike him?), and as God has said, َذِي أُعِشِي َذِي أُعِشِي (a human [ACC], one of us [ACC], do we follow him?).
Likewise, (Zaydi [ACC], did you, strike his brother?), (Zaydi [ACC], did you, pass by him [GEN]?), and (Zaydi, did you, pass by his brother [GEN]?). Al-Farazdiq has said:

أعمالة النواضر، أم ريحا، عدلت بفهم طهية والخطابة
(is it [the tribe] Thaliba al-Fawaris or Riyah that you have equated with Tuhayya and Khishab?)

You say "Abda [ACC] -llahi, were you, like him?" and (Zaydi [ACC], are you, not like him?) on the basis that اند كن is and ليس.translate are verbs; I will not consider this correct until it is heard in the speech of the Arabs. You also say ما أدرى أزيداً مررت به أم عمراً (I don't know if Zaydi [ACC] I passed by him or 'Amr), and ما أبالي أعيد الله لقيت أخاه أم عمراً (I don't care whether Abda [ACC] -llahi, you met his brother or Zaydi's).

2.4.2 Ibn Mada's Opinion Regarding the Chapter of Occupation of the Verb

If the pronoun referring to the noun preceding the verb is agentive, then the noun is placed in the nominative since its pronoun is in a nominative position. But there is concealed no
governor of the nominative, nor of the accusative; rather, the speaker places items in the nominative or the accusative in accordance with the usage of the Arabs, as in {Zayd, did he stand?) and the words of God: (say, "God, has He permitted you that or do you invent lies against Him?"). We say that it is sometimes accusative on the basis of being a non-subject, and sometimes nominative by its being a subject, but there is no utility in that. God has said (what think you of [the sperm drop] which you have emitted; is it you who have created it?), with in a nominative position; likewise, (Zayd, did his father strike 'Amr?), (Zayd, was he struck?), and (Zayd, was he taken?) due to the nominative position. This is also true in (Zayd, was his boy passed by?), and 'Adi ibn Zayd has given an example:

أرواح مولع أم بكون أنت فانظر لأي ذاك تصير

(do you take your leave in the evening or in the morning? Look at which of them you will do)

If there refer to the noun two pronouns, one of them in a nominative position and the other in an accusative, or one of them
connected to a nominative and the other to an accusative, as in 
(Appa [ACC] -llah, did his, brother strike his, boy?), you have the choice of making either nominative or accusative: if consideration is given to the nominative position, then the noun is placed in the nominative, and the accusative is regarded as extraneous; if the accusative is emphasized, then the noun is placed in the accusative.

2.4.3 Two Issues of Al-Akhfash

(Said Abu al-Hasan al-Akhfash): you say Zaydi (Zaydi, did no one strike him, but he), with only the accusative in Zaydi, though both the agent and the object refer to Zaydi, since the accusative here is a noun not separated from the verb, and the initial noun corresponds to that which is not separated, because the independent (pronoun) operates like other nouns and is in this position; however, the non-independent pronoun is not like this. Likewise the case of Zaydi (NOM), did he strike no one but him [self], because the

---

67 Akhfash refers here to the fact that the independent pronoun can be replaced by any other noun which is not co-referential with the sentence-initial accusative. Thus he places this example in the same category as a sentence like Zaydi (Zaydi [ACC], did no strike him, but 'Amr).
verb of_Zayd^, if accompanied by a non-independent noun - meaning.
the agent pronoun which is in - does not take _زید_ as an
object. Do you not see that you do not say 'I ضرب أزیداً (Zayd[^ACC], did he[^NOM] strike [him[i]? with the meaning
(زید[^ACC], did he[^NOM] strike himself[^NOM]?), nor أزیداً ضرب نفسه (Zayd[^ACC], did he[^NOM] strike himself[^NOM]?), if you intend that the verb take as
its object ُ, with ُ referring to _زید_ and the verb thus not gov-
erning _زید_?

The author - may God be pleased with him - has said that
this is predicated upon the nominative's being so by virtue of a
hidden verb, likewise in the case of the accusative, so if one
says أزیداً لم يضربه إلا هو (Zayd[^ACC], did no one strike him[^NOM], but
[^NOM]? then the meaning of the hidden portion is _إلا هو_ (did no one strike Zayd[^ACC], but he[^NOM]?), and this is correct, since
the agent is an independent pronoun. And if one made nomina-
tive in agreement with the independent pronoun, and said أزید لم
يضربه إلا هو, then the hidden part would be ألم يضربه إلا زید (did no
one strike him[^NOM], but Zayd[^ACC]?), and this is not permissible, since
the verb of _زید_ cannot have connected with it the attached (accu-
sative) pronoun referring to Zayd. You do not say ما ضربه إلا Zayd (no one struck him, but Zayd) with the pronoun referring to Zayd, and if it be said: Why cannot the meaning be ما ضرب إلا Zayd (Zayd struck no one but him)? The answer is that the proposed meaning would then differ from the actual meaning of the negative construction. For if you made لا to operate on the agent, the meaning would be that no action reaches the object except that of the agent, while the action of the agent may apply to other than the object; on the other hand, if you place لا with the object, you would negate the agent's action upon anything.

68 The solution to the problem posed by Al-Akhfash appears to lie within Binding Theory: the ungrammatical example أريد لم يضرب إلا هو, in which Zayd is marked in the nominative case, can be ruled out by Principle B:

Did (Zayd not strike him) but he?

In contrast, in the grammatical أريد لم يضرب إلا هو, with Zayd in the accusative case, is an example of ishtighal in which, by the analysis developed earlier, the left-dislocated NP occupies Sec, TOP, and not the available subject position of Spec, IP. This leaves pro as the available subject of the governing category of him:

(Zayd did not (pro) strike him) but he?

The solution proposed here is that pro is not specified for referent, because the subject in the VP is the understood but unexpressed (anyone), frequently omitted in exceptive sentences in Arabic. Principle B is thus not violated:

(Zayd, (anyone) strike him) but he? -P.J.

69 An obvious Principle-C violation. -P.J.
other than the object, it being possible for other than the agent to bring the action of the verb upon the object, or for only that agent to do so. And if you said أَرِيدُ لَمْ يَضْرَبِ إِلَّا يَمْهَ (Zayd₁ [NOM], did he₁ strike no one but him₁?) then زيد is nominative and cannot be otherwise, since the hidden meaning becomes أَلَمْ يَضْرَبِ زيد إِلَّا يَمْهَ (did Zayd not strike anyone but him₁?), which is correct. The accusative is not permissible in this instance, just as the nominative is not permissible in the first, for if زيد were made accusative (i.e., زيداً لم يضرب إِلَّا يَمْهَ, the meaning would become أَلَمْ يَضْرَبِ إِلَّا زيداً (did no one strike [anyone] but Zayd?), since the agent pronoun in the visible verb is attached, and that is not permissible: one cannot say ما لم يضرب إِلَّا زيداً ضرب (no one struck [anyone] but Zayd). And it is not permissible to place إِلَّا with the nominative pronoun in order to say إِلَّا هو أَلِمْ يضرب زيداً (did no one strike Zayd₁ but he₁?), since the hidden meaning must be like the meaning of that which actually appears, and this is not the case for reasons given in the discussion of the first question.

All of this is based on the concept of concealment; as for him who sees that the Arabs took meaning into account, and saw difference in words as an indication of difference, and not
agreement, in meaning, he will allow the accusative as well as the nominative in each of the two cases cited since زيد is both agent and object. Thus the nominative is used in consideration of its being an agent, and the accusative in consideration of its being an object. Do you not see that you say أزيد لم يضرب عمرا إلا هو (Zayd, [NOM], has no one struck ʿAmr but he,?), making أزيدا لم يضرب عمرا إلا هو agree with the independent pronoun, and أزيدا لم يضرب عمرا إلا هو إياه (Zayd, [ACC], did no one strike ʿAmr except him,?) also by agreement with the independent pronoun, while it would not be permissible for you to say أزيدا لم يضرب عمرا إلا هو (Zayd, [ACC], did no one strike ʿAmr [ACC] but he,?). And if you assume the existence of a governor, according to their method, then you would have to say ألم يضرب عمرا إلا زيد لم يضربه إلا هو ("did no one but Zayd, strike ʿAmr, no one struck him, but he,?") , a clear piece of evidence that the Arabs concealed no such things.

And you say أخواك ظنتما منطلقين ("your two brothers, [NOM], they, thought them, to have left") there being here two pronouns referring to the two brothers: one nominative and one accusative, both attached; thus you make the first correspond to the
nominative-case noun since, in this category,\textsuperscript{70} the verb having a visible agent pronoun takes as its object the attached pronoun referring to the same noun, as in ظننا أخواك منطلقة ("thought [singular] them, [accusative, dual] your two brothers, [NOM], to have left") if the meaning is ظننا أنفسهما (they thought themselves...), while the verb with a concealed agent does not take as its object the visible agent, as in ظننا أنفسه (Zayd, [ACC], he, thought [himself,] learned) if the meaning is (he thought himself...). The verb with concealed subject does, however, take an attached pronoun as its object, as in أظنني ذاهباً (I consider myself to be going). This is also based on the premise that the placement of the nominative and the accusative in their respective cases occurs by means of a concealed verb, whereas if one disregards such concealment, then both the nominative and the accusative may be used, except that about which their is no disagreement is more reliable than that about which there is disagreement, both in this example as well as in the two preceding. To go on at length regarding these issues - which are

\textsuperscript{70}i.e., the class of verbs, including ظن, which can take a pronominal direct object which is coreferential with the subject; normally, this would be ruled out by Binding Principle B.
based on supposition and not on actual usage, and not needed - is not necessary for one who sees no need to look at anything which is not necessary, while the removal of such issues from the activity of grammar would strengthen and simplify it. In any case, to plunge into issues such as these where they yield correct pronunciation is more worthy than being occupied with things that do not yield it, such as the question: By what is the object made accusative: by the agent, by the verb, or by both?

2.4.4 An Issue of Sibawaih

You say `آنت عبد الله ضربته` ("you, Abdu [NOM] -llah, did you strike him?"), and the preferred usage, according to Sibawaih, is to put `عبد الله` in the nominative case, since there interposes between the interrogative particle and `انت`, the word `أنت` (you); however, you may put it in the accusative if you wish, just as in the case of `زيدا ضربته` (Zayd [ACC], you struck him). Abu al-Ahsan al-Akhfash and Abu al-Abbas ibn Yazid have said that the accusative is preferable, since `أنت` must be in the nominative case by means of a verb if it has a verb coming at the end of the sentence, and the verb by which `أنت` is made nominative must take `عبد الله` as its object, based on the grammarians' prin-
ciple of concealed verbs in this category. But Abu al-‘Abbas Ahmad ibn Walad\(^7\) takes issue with them in support of Sibawaih, saying: the noun occurring before the verb is made nominative or accusative by a concealed verb if the (visible) verb is a complement of it, as in أَزِيدَ أَضْرَبَتِه (Zayd, [ACC], did you, strike him?); if you made it nominative as an equational subject, then ضربته would be its predicate. Likewise in the case of قَامَ قَامُ (Zayd, did he, stand?); if قام were to be made nominative by virtue of its being a subject, then قَامُ would be its predicate. And if you said أَلْتَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ ضَرْبِهِ (أَلْتَ, did you, strike him?), and made nominative as a subject, then ضربته would not be a complement to it; rather, its predicate would be the sentence عَبْدُ اللَّهِ ضَرْبِهِ, which is in the same class with أَزِيدَ أَخْوَاهُ قَامُ (Zayd, is his, brother standing?). And that which he has said in support of Sibawaih, is refuted by that which Sibawaih mentions in his section on active and passive participles which function as verbs in the interrogative, where he says that, in أَزِيدَ أَنتَ ضَرِبَهُ (Zayd, [ACC], are you, the one who strikes him?), زيد is best put in the accusative case, just as in أَزِيدَ أَنتَ تَضَرِبَهُ (Zayd, [ACC], do you, strike him?), if the

\(^7\)The dean of Egyptian grammarians in the beginning of the fourth century, A.H; died 943 A.D./332 A.H.
action of the verb is what is intended with the active participle. And if what ibn Walad said is correct, then زيد would be in the nominative case because, if it is made nominative as a subject, then the sentence consisting of subject and predicate would serve as its predicate. Also, Sibawaih could have said: "I did not reject the placing of زيد in the accusative case because of this (position of ibn Walad); rather, in my view is the subject of a concealed verb, while the concealed verb in this category governs only one item." According to this view, he should not allow أزيداً درهماً أعطيته إياه ("Zayd [ACC], a dirham, made accusative by a (single) concealed verb with the implied meaning of أعطيته إياه (did you give Zayd a dirham?). We maintain that if this is allowable, then so is أزيداً عسراً قام أعلمه إياه إياه ("Zayd [ACC], امئ [ACC] standing, made accusative by a (single) concealed verb with the implied meaning of أعلمه إياه إياه (did you inform Zayd of it?). That is, if the verb can govern two (items), then it can govern three.

2.4.5 Remaining Aspects of the Occupation of Verbs

If the action of the verb is urged by means of لام, آلا,
or َلَا َلَّوۡنَ (Zayd, [ACC], why don’t you honor him?), and similarly with the rest of the particles. On the other hand, if the action is something wondered at, then nothing but the nominative case is permitted, as in َزِيدَ مَا أَحۡسَسْنَهُ (Zayd, [NOM], how good he is!).

If the verb is an equational predicate, then it is either positive, negated, or conditional; if positive, with the preceding noun as its equational subject, then the noun may be either nominative or accusative, though the nominative is preferable, as in َزِيدَا لَقِيته وُزۡيَ لَقِيتَهُ (Zayd, [ACC/NOM], I met him). If the verb is negated by ِلَا or َلَا then the following noun may be in the nominative, though the accusative is preferable, as in the words of the poet:

(َفَلا دَا جَالِلُ مِبِينِه لَجَالِالِهِ وَلَا دَا ضَيِاعَ مِن يَتَرَكُن لِلْخِفَرَ

And a magnificent one, they have not feared him for his magnificence, and one suffering loss, they have not left him to poverty)

Another poet has said,

72 That is, if َلَا and َلَّوۡنَ are used with the meaning of ِلَا, and َلَا as well, all of them having the meaning of blame or impatience for inaction on the part of the one addressed.
(you have boasted of no acquired nobility for [the tribe of] Taim, nor has any noble ancestor, when gathering with others)

Also, you say مَا زِيدَانِ ضْرِبَتِهِ (Zaydî [ACC], I didn't strike himi), provided that مَا is not of the type whose subject is nominative and whose predicate is accusative. ٧٣ And if the verb is conditional, preceded by إنّ, then the noun is accusative, there being disagreement over the permissibility of its being nominative.

The poet has said:

لا تجزعني إن منسناً أملكتهَ، وإذا هلكت، فعند ذلك فافزعي

(do not mourn that I slaughtered a precious animal; but if I perish, then mourn)

There is no preceding of the verb by the noun with any of the conditional particles other than إنّ, except as required in poetry.

If a sentence, in which the noun precedes the verb, is conjoined to another sentence, this one beginning with a verb, then the preferred usage is with the accusative case, though the

٧٣He refers here to the لَّا of the Hejaz which puts its subject in the nominative and its predicate in the accusative.
nominative is permissible, as in (I struck Zayd, and ‘Amr, [ACC], I honored him). God Almighty has said, (He produced therefrom its water and its pasture; and the mountains, He made them firm); also, (He lets enter whom He pleases into His mercy, and the evildoers, He prepares a painful torment for them). This occurs frequently in the Quran, while the poet has said:

أصبحت لا أحمل السلاح ولا أملك رأس البعير إن ضغف
والذئب أخشاه إن مررت به وحدي وخشى الريح والبطر

(I have grown too old to carry armor, or to rein in a camel if it strays; I fear the wolf, if I pass it alone, and fear the wind and the rain)

Here, is conjoined with لا أحمل السلاح.

If you conjoin (a nominal sentence) with a sentence consisting of a subject and its predicate, the predicate being a verb and its agent, as in (Zayd, I honored him, and Abdullah, I met him), then, according to Sibawaih, the preferred usage is that the noun (beginning the second sentence) be in the nominative case; if, however, it is conjoined to the verbal sentence (i.e., the predicate أكرمه), then
the accusative is preferred. Others, however, disagree with him in this, saying that conjunction (of another sentence) with the sentence consisting of the verb and its agent, is not permissible because the latter sentence is the predicate of the subject (زید), and is thus construed as being in the nominative case, while that which is conjoined with a predicate is itself a predicate, and the conjoined sentence is incapable of being a predicate since it contains no pronoun referring to the subject (زید). The argument of those disagreeing is more credible, since inflectional vowelling is for the purpose of expressing meaning, and we do not say, of something which is preceded by two other things, that it is conjoined with one of them and not the other, or that it is permissible for it to be conjoined with each of them, except to express a meaning. For example, in زید فَاقَمُ أُبُو هُرَمُ وَعُمْرُونَ (Zayd, [NOM], his, father and 'Amr's father are standing), we say that عُمْرُونَ is conjoined with أُبُو هُرَمُ, and cannot be conjoined with فَاقَمُ; for فَاقَمُ is a predicate of زید, while عُمْرُونَ is not; it is, rather, a subject of the predicate فَاقَمُ. Thus may be conjoined with زید, the agents being أُبُو هُرَمُ and أُبُو زید. And if one were to say كرِيمُ زید شِجاعُ وَكَرِيمُ (Zayd is brave and generous), then كرِيمُ would be conjoined with شِجاعُ, and not with زید, since the latter
is a predicate of Zayd, as is Zayd, and Amr, whom I honored, and Amr, whom I struck. One may say, with regard to (Zayd, [NOM], I struck him, and Amr, [ACC], I honored him), that this second sentence may be conjoined with either of the subject or the predicate (of the first sentence), as well as to the sentence consisting of the verb and its agent (ضربته), even though the two sentences are different: one is a predicate of the subject, and the other is not. the larger (second) of the two having no inflectional category according to them (the grammarians), while the smaller (first) has such a category, and what does it avail one to be free to conjoin with either of them? Do you not see that, when we say (Zaydi, I honored himi, and Amri, I insulted himi to exalt himi), there is no disagreement regarding the permissibility of conjoining the sentence عمره أعظامة له أهمنة with the (preceding) subject and predicate, the latter being itself a sentence of verb and agent? If you conjoin the second sentence to the entire preceding one, then the former has no inflectional category, whereas its conjunction with only the preceding predicate causes it to have a category. One may then delete the first (predicate), which is أهمنة, and put in its place the second, giving (Zaydi, Amri, I insulted
him, to exalt him,"), with the ج (capable of) conjoining the second (predicate) to that to which it conjoined the first. Thus every element to which something is conjoined, may be removed, the conjoined element then taking its place, except in anomalies such as وَأَيْن ْفَتَى مِجَالِهَ أَنتُ وَجَارُ هَا (what a son and neighbor of war you are! [i.e., what a great and experienced warrior]); one does not, however, make analogous extensions from anomalies. And just as nothing may be conjoined to a single-word predicate unless it is also a predicate, so likewise is the case of sentence-predicates; there is no difference between them in that both are predicates, and the single-word-predicate is prevented from being conjoined with anything other than another predicate not by virtue of its being a single word, but rather by virtue of its being a predicate.

Ibn Walad has supported Sibawaih - at length - in some matters, most of which are extraneous to the issue, but among those close to it are his statement: "The grammarians are unanimous in allowing you to say مَرَّت بِرِجْل قَامَ أَبُوُهُ, وَقَعَد عَمَّرُ (I passed by a man whose father stood, while ʿAmr sat); for قَام أَبُوُهُ is a sentence

---

74 The anomaly derives from the fact that لَي is normally not placed in construct except with an indefinite noun; here, ʿرجاء, which is definite, is conjoined with the indefinite چت.
in genitive position since it modifies رجل, while وقعد عمرو is conjoined to it but is not genitive by position, since you do not say مرت برجل قعد عمرو (I passed by a man ʿAmr sat), there being in the second sentence no pronoun referring to رجل which could modify it. Likewise, if you said, in زيد يضرب غلامه فيغضب عمرو (Zayd strikes his boy, so ʿAmr becomes angry), that يضرب غلامه is in a nominative position, and that فيغضب عمرو is conjoined to it but not in a nominative position since it contains no pronoun referring to the subject, the reply would be that an analogous relation between the predicate and the modifier is unclear, since their natures are different. Also, one may say that وقعد عمرو is conjoined to the larger preceding sentence, and not to the smaller one; and if one said that the meaning is different from that, that is, that the speaker did not wish to employ two predicates between which there is no connection, but rather wanted that the standing of أبوه should be connected with the sitting of عمرو, which is indicated by the و, as though he were saying كان من أبيه قائم مع قعود عمرو (there was on his father's part standing, with ʿAmr's sitting), so that the second sentence becomes connected with the first, the whole taking on the nature of a single sentence; the reply to this would be that the meaning
of the is to insert the second (verbal sentence) in the place which the first has entered, and Sibawaih has said: "If you say أُزْيدَاءَ ضرِبتُ عمَراً، وضرَبتُ أختاه ("Zayd, [ACC], did you, strike ‘Amr, [ACC], and strike his, brother?"), it means, with the pronoun referring to Zayd, that the utterance is incomplete because there is in عمرو nothing which relates it to the first (word in the sentence), with which it is not connected. Do you not see that if you were to say مررت ب الرجل قائم عمرو وقائم أختوه ("I passed by a man, ‘Amr, was standing, as was his, brother"), it would not be correct because one of them is connected with the first (noun) while the other is not?" Indeed, Sibawaih disallows the first example, in which زيد is accusative by a concealed verb which is indicated by the following verb, because there is no pronoun in the verb referring to زيد; and nouns are not made accusative, according to Sibawaih, by concealed verbs unless the visible indicator is a verb on the condition that we have presented. If you said أُزْيدَاءَ ضرِبتُ عمَراً (Zayd, [ACC], did you, strike ‘Amr, [ACC]), it would not be correct; and if it were said that there is in the second sentence (i.e., ضرَبتُ أختاه in the example above) a pronoun referring to زيد, then the reply would be that the second sentence does not show the pronoun making زيد accusa-
tive; rather, the pronoun indicates a verb which follows what it governs, and the ٰ، according to this view, does not connect the second sentence to the first in a way that causes them to function as a single sentence. There is no difference between the method of Sibawaih and that which has been said here except that Sibawaih conceals the verb. Where it governs the accusative, it governs the accusative; and where it governs the nominative, it governs the nominative; and where a choice is to be made between the two, it is made,75 and if such a view disagreed with his own, he would call attention to the fact.

As for Ibn Walād's example, زيد يضرب غلامه، فيغضب عمرو, it indicates that يغضب is conjoined with يضرب; but due to the striking's being the cause of the anger, the two sentences are connected and assume the nature of protasis and apodosis, so that, even though they are two sentences they function as one. Do you not see that, in saying زيد إن تكرمك عمرو (Zayd, if you, honor him, 'Amr will honor you), you find sufficient the reference of the pronoun in the first sentence, and there is no disagreement regarding the correctness of this. I have exceed-

75 He means to say that Sibawaih permits both the nominative and the accusative, and this being the case, there is no cause for all this disagreement.
ed that which I support and urge in the way of brevity and conciseness in (presenting) this matter, and of (only) that which is absolutely necessary. In the first issue, about which there is dispute, it is sufficient to say that the nominative and the accusative are both acceptable, with the nominative being the preferred usage and the accusative permitted by consensus, except that it is inferior to the nominative. Sibawaih says that the nominative is better from one standpoint, and the accusative from another. And if it be said: why was the support of Sibawaih by the words of God Almighty left out: (the sun and the moon [run their courses] according to a fixed reckoning; and the stemless plants and the trees submit [to His will]; and heaven, He has raised it and set up a measure...)? For is accusative; however, the accusative is preferable if conjoined to a verbal sentence and not to a nominal sentence. Here, it (is conjoined to a predicate, which is and contains no concealed pronoun referring to the subject.

It is for the one who refutes Sibawaih to say that it is

\[\text{\textsuperscript{76}}\] He refers to the example of (in which, as explained above, both nominative and accusative case may be used).
accusative, and conjoined to a nominal sentence, even though the nominative is preferable according to the method of the grammarians, as in the verse: إِنَّا كُنَّا قِبَالًا فِي نُطَاسِ (verily, We have created everything in due measure), in which, for Sibawaih, the nominative is preferable,77 though he has no compelling justification for this.

In this regard active and passive participles, as well as those patterns such as مَفْعُولٌ فَعَّالٌ, and which are transformed as intensive participles, function like verbs; for you say أَرْسَالَةُ أَنتَ ضَرَبَهُ (Zayd, are you, the one who strikes him?), as well as ضَرَبَهُ وَمَعْشُوبَهُ.

And if, after the noun referred to by the accusative pronoun attached to the verb, you insert a conditional sentence, then only the nominative may occur, as in زَيْدٌ إِنْ تَكُرْمَهُ يَكْرُمْكَ (Zayd, if you, honor him, he will honor you). This is also the case with interrogative nouns and particles, as in زَيْدٌ كَمْ مَرَّةٌ لَقَبِيتُهُ؟ (Zayd, how many times did you, meet him?), زَيْدٌ مَنْ ضَرَبَهُ؟ (Zayd, who struck him?), and عَبْدُ اللَّهِ مَا أَصَابَهُ؟ (Abdullah, what befell him?), and where the verb functions as a modifier, as in

77This because Sibawaih prefers the nominative as long as there is nothing which calls for the accusative, as was seen previously in this chapter.
(Zayd, are you a man who honors him?) The poet has said:

أكل عام شمّم تحوّته يتقبّته قوم وتتنجبوه

(are there every year sheep which you have and produce, and which others breed?)

And Zaid al-Khayl has said:

أفي كل عام ماتم تبعثون على مبهر فتوبتبوه وما رضا

(is there every year a wake you hold for a mule-horse which you have given in payment, when the payee was not satisfied?)

The verb (which you have) functions as a modifier of شمّم (sheep), which is a subject having كل عام (every year) as its predicate. This is analogous to removal of the second construct term and its replacement by the first, because كل عام is an adverb of time and these do not occur as predicates of concrete nouns; rather, they occur as predicates of verbal nouns.79 If the verse were read with the noun in the accusative it would be

---

78 The evidence is the placement of شمّم in the nominative because the verb تحوّته functions as a modifier to شمّم and thus does not govern it.

79 That is, the permissibility in certain instances of making an adverbial expression the predicate of a concrete noun, normally not allowed, can be likened to the permissibility of having a second construct-term take the place of the first, as was seen in the example on p. 96. - D.J.
correct, and the verb would have no inflectional category.
Likewise، the verb may be read in the accusative if the verb is not considered as a modifier. The poet Jarir has said:

وَمَا أَدْرِي أَغْيَبُهُمْ تَنَا، وَطَوْلَ الْعَهْدَ أَمْ مَالٍ أَصَابَهُم

(and I do not know if distance and length of time have changed them، or wealth which they have acquired)

The verb أَصَابَهُمْ functions as a modifier and may not be construed otherwise because the poet was ignorant of that which changed them، not knowing whether it was length of distance and time، or wealth which they had acquired. مَالٍ is conjoined with تَنَا، and some would permit placing it in the accusative. Likewise if the verb were in a relative clause، such as أَزْيَدُ الَّذِي رَأِيتُ (Zayd، is he، the one you، saw؟) in which أَزْيَدُ may only be placed in the nominative، as opposed to the case of أَزْيَدُ الْعَاقِلِ ضَرِبِهُ (Zayd، [ACC]، the wise one، [ACC]، did you، strike him؟) in which the verb is neither relative nor modifier. This is true in permutation (البديل) and confirmation (توكيد)؛ as well as in such expressions as أَزْيَدُ أَن تَكْرَمَهُ خَيْرٌ مِنْ أَنْ تَعَذَّبِهُ (Zayd، that you، honor him، is better than that you، insult him)؛ because that which is subjunctive after أَن is part of its relative complement، also in أَنْ تَكْرَمَهُ. Nothing but the nominative may be applied to أَزْيَدُ in
this last because the definite article has the meaning of the relative pronoun, and functions like it.

I have covered in this chapter that which is needed, and that which one may find sufficient; I have added the opinions and the arguments for and against the methods of Sibawaih so that the reader might know that I have learned what others have said, and know what I have proved, without the need to conceal that without which the language is complete, and whose manifestation leads to faulty expression which is not the aim of the speaker. It may occur in the speech of the people; as for its occurrence in the speech of God Almighty, it is forbidden. I ask God's help and grace, having said in this chapter that which is suitable to that which I urge and call for, since I did not put in it that which is preposterous, nor any weak suppositions, nor anything superfluous or unnecessary.

2.5 (Preface to the Discussion of waw and fa')

Among the things they have said is that which was not understood, for they have implied in it that which is contrary to the intention of the speaker: the sections on subjunctive verbs. Of these I mention the ١ and the ٢, in order to call
attention to others, and to make it known that what they imply is not needed in order to present the rules which maintain the language of the Arabs.

2.5.1 The Result Clauses

Indicative verbs following this are in the subjunctive mood if they are the complements of one of eight things: imperatives, negatives, interrogatives, negative imperatives (prohibitions), encouragement, wishes, incitement, and prayer. One says, with the imperative, "أعطني فاشكرك" (Give to me, and I will thank you). Abu Najm has said:

يا ناق سيري عنك فنسحبنا إلى سليمان فنستريحنا

(oh camel, walk a broad gait to Sulayman, then we shall rest)

With the negative imperative, one says "لا يعصي زيد الله فيما بينه" (let Zayd not disobey God, lest He punish him), and God Almighty has said "لا تتناقشوا على الله كذبًا في ستّ نحتكم بذابا" (concert not a lie against God, lest He destroy you by some calamity), and "لا تطعنوا فيه فيحل عليكم غضبي" (and transgress not therein, lest My wrath descend upon you). With the negative, "ما يأتني زيد"
In rāti, in which two interpretations are possible: one is (Zayd does not come to me, so how can I give to him?), that is, that the coming is the cause of the giving, so that if he does not come he will not be given (anything). God Almighty has said (death will not be decreed for them, that they could escape [hell fire] by way of death); one also says (the ignorant one did not believe, so how can he enter Paradise?). Al Farazdiq has said:

(and you are not of Qays, so how can you bark [i.e., boast], nor are you of Tamim in their throats [i.e., ability to boast])

The other interpretation of is (Zayd does not come to us in a state of giving), that is, he comes without giving.86 Al-Farazdiq has said:

(and none among us has stood in our assembly and spoken except that which is favorable)

Al-La'īn al-Munqara has said:

86Given the context, it is likely that the original is a misprint; I have substituted. - P.J.
(and a stranger of Sa’d has not visited a town of Zibriqan’s tribe and been asked about his lineage but that Zibriqan is attributed to be his ancestor.)

One says كأنك لم تأتنا فنحن ذلك (as if you had not come to us, and we could not speak to you), and a man of the Banu Darim has said:

كأنك لم تذبح لأهلك منتجة، فتصبح متلقي بالذات إقبالها

(as if you have not slaughtered for your people a ewe whose hide would then be thrown in the courtyard)

With the interrogative one says أتائنا فنحن ذلك (did you come that we might speak to you?), and the poet has said:

ألم تسأل فتخبرك الرسوم على فرطاج والطلل القديم

(did you not ask, and did thus the traces and old ruins not tell you of Firtaj [place name]?)

With encouragement one says لا تأتينا فنكر مك (why don’t you come, that we might honor you?); with hope, ليت زيدا عندنا فنحن ذلكنا (would that Zayd were with us, that he might speak to us). The reading has also occurred: ودّوا لو تنذّمن، فيدمنون (they wished it to be annointed, and so they annointed), and Muhalhal has said:
(and if Kulaib were resurrected from his grave, it would be said [by him] in Al-Dhana'ib, "what a womanizer [I was]!")

Umayya ibn abi al-Salb has said:

ألا رسول لنا منك في خبرك ما بعد غايتنا من رأس مجرات (is there not among us a messenger who can tell us how far our destination is from where we are?)

With encouragement one says مَلا زرت زيدا في كمك (why don't you visit Zayd, that he might honor you?), and in prayer، اللهم لا تؤخذنا بذنوبنا فهلك (oh God, do not punish us for our sins, lest we perish) and God has said لولا أخرتي إلى أجل قريب فأصدق وأكمن من الصالحين (why didst Thou not grant me respite for a while, that I could give alms and be among the righteous?). The Arabs put the verb after في in the subjunctive even in a positive sentence (i.e., one in which none of the eight conditions mentioned earlier appears), and that is an anomaly not subject to analogical extension, as in the words of the poet:

سأترك منزلي لبني تميم وألحق بالحجاج فاستريحنا (I will leave my house to Bani Tamim, and go to the Hejaz and rest)
Al-A'asha has said:

وَقَضِيتِ لا تَجَوَّلِي عَندَ ذَاكِمۡ، لَكِنَّ سِيَجَزِينَنِي اللَّهُ فَيَعْتَقِبْنَا

(and then you will not reward me for that, but God will reward and compensate me)

Tarafa has said:

لَوْنَا مَضْنَةَ لا يَنْزِلُ الْذَّلِّ، وَسَطْنَا وَيَأْوِي إِلَيْهَا الْمُسْتَجِيرُ فِي مَنْصَبٍ

(we have a high place in whose midst humiliation does not alight, and the one seeking help there will be protected)

2.5.2 The Permissibility of Conjunction and Disjunction with the بَا لَا Introducing Result Clauses

Of these instances in which what follows the بَا لَا is subjunctive, there are those in which conjunction is permissible, with the second verb taking the same inflection as the first verb, which precedes the بَا لَا, with no difference in meaning between the two. In all cases disjunction\(^\text{81}\) from the first verb is permissible, with the verb in the indicative mood by virtue of its being a positive statement, as in فِيُؤْذَرِهِ لا يَشْتَمِعْ الرَّمْرُوْزُ زِيدًا’ (‘Amr does not insult Zayd, for it hurts him). If the second verb were

\(^{81}\)That is, continuation to a new sentence with an implied subject preceding the second verb.
subjective, then the meaning would be (he does not insult [him] in order not to hurt him), the insulting being among the kinds of hurting. With an indicative verb the meaning is one of disjunction, that is, (for it hurts him), while the jussive of conjoined with gives the meaning (for the insulting hurts him), that is, (it is its nature to do that). Al-Nabigha has said:

(and there is still between Tubna and Jasim a grave upon which falls the heavy spring rains, and these cause bright, fragrant plants to grow; I shall follow this with the best which one can say)

The poet did not make a result complement of the preceding clause; instead, it is in disjunction. It would also have been correct, however, for the verb to be subjunctive. An example from another verse:

(did you not ask the deserted Spring campsite, and it spoke not; and will the desolate emptiness tell you?)
You say (I consider him to have insulted me, so I leap upon him) in the case where the leaping has not yet occurred, with the meaning لو شتمني لوثبت عليه (if he were to insult me, I would leap upon him). If the leaping has already occurred then only the indicative is permissible, since this is with the same meaning as أنت قد فعلت فأفعل (have you not already done so? Therefore, so will I). Some of the Harithi have said:

غير أنّنا لم تأتنا ببعدين فنرجح ونكثر التأملا
(except that you have not come to us with certainty, so we will wish and have much hope)

that is, فنحن نرجح (so we will hope).

2.5.3 The of Accompaniment

It may make what follows it subjunctive, though this is not required; with the subjunctive, its meaning is that of مع. Al-Akhtal has said:

لا تنه عن خلق وتأتي مثله عار عليكّ إذا فعلت - عظيم
(do not forbid others' behavior while committing it yourself; great shame upon you if you do)

One says لا تأكل السمك وتشرب اللبن (do not eat fish and drink
milk), that is, لا تجمع بينهما (do not combine the two); with the second verb in the jussive, the activities of both verbs are prohibited; and with the indicative the first would be prohibited and the second made imperative. Al-Jarir has said:

وَلَا تَتَشَمِّمِّ الْمُوْلِي وَتَتَبَلُّغِ أَذَاهُ ّ، ْفَإِذَّكَ إِنْ تَغْفِلْ تَسْتَنْفِهُ وَتَتَجْنَبْ

(do not insult your cousin, badly hurting him; for if you do, you will be considered impudent and savage)

Here, the listener is forbidden the two acts (in the first hemistich). Al-Hati'a has said:

أَلَمْ أَكِّ جَارُكَ وَتَكُونَ بَيْنِي وَبَيْنِكمْ المُوَّدَّةُ وَالإِخَامُ

(have I not been your neighbor, with friendship and brotherliness between us ?)

This is positive in meaning, and thus the second verb should not actually have been put in the subjunctive; lexically, however, the expression is interrogative. Durayd ibn al-Samma has said:

قَتَلَتْ بِعِيدِ اللّهِ خِيرَ لِبَدْاِتِهِ ّ، ذَوْاَباً فَلْمُ أَفْخَرُ بِذَلِكَ وَأَجزََّعُ ّا

([in revenge] for "Abdullah I have killed the best of his peers, Dhu'ab, and for this I have not boasted while grieving)

The meaning is لَمْ أَفْخَرْ بِهْ وَأَنَا جُزِعُ ّ، إِذَا فَخَرَتْ بِهِ غَيْرُ جُزِعٍ (I did not boast of it with grieving; rather, I boasted of it without grieving). With the negative one says لا يسِمْنِي شَيْءٌ وَيَمْجِزُ عَنْكَ (I
am not able to do anything of which you are incapable\footnote{It appears likely that this is a misprint, and that the second part of the sentence should read نجَّي نَسُوًا عليه وَمَا نَعْمَ مَّا. - P.J.}, that is, مع عجزه عنك (with your incapability of doing it). With the imperative, you say إني وآتيك (come to me, and I will come to you), and if you mean the (indirect) imperative (in the second verb) you add the lam, and say: ولآتيك (and let me come to you).

God has said وما علم الله الذين جاهدوا منكم وعلم الصابرين (while God has not yet caused to be known those of you that strive hard in His cause and has not yet caused to be known the steadfast), and some have read it وعلم الصابرين، with the jussive. God has also said ولا تثبسو الحق بالباطل وتكتبوا الحق وأنتم تعلمون (confound not truth with falsehood, nor hide the truth deliberately [i.e., while knowing]), in which one may make تَكَبِّرُونَ to be in conjunction (with the previous verb); He has also said يا ليتنا شرداً ولا نكذب بِنَبِيٍّ لَا يَاتِرَبَتْ وَمَكْوَنَ (would that we might be sent back; we would not now reject the signs of our Lord and we would be [believers]), with the latter two verbs being read in either the indicative or the subjunctive; the indicative denotes either conjunction (with a preceding indicative) or disjunction. Al-Ala'ash has said:
(I said, "you call, and I will call; for it is with a louder voice that two call")

Also with the subjunctive he has said:

(he wearing of a woolen cloak, while I am happy, is preferable to me to the wearing of revealing finery)

In this verse is subjunctive by means of a concealed, as if he were saying (the wearing, and that I am happy), that is, (my happiness). Al-A`sha has said:

(there was, during a year of my residence, the fulfillment of [my] desires, while another was bored)

This reading is according to those who see as a subject (اسم) of . Ka`ab ah-Ghanawi has said:

(and I will not say the thing which does not benefit me, and

---

83 The point here is that the verb is subjunctive after , in conjunction with a noun, not with a verb; thus there is nothing to justify the placement of the verb in the subjunctive.

84 Some have read the second hemistich: (which case the verse provides no evidence for the construction in question.
at which my companion becomes angry)

Both the indicative and the subjunctive are possible in

with the indicative, it is included in the relative clause in conjunction with 

whereas the subjunctive causes the conjunction to be with as was the case with

There has been disagreement with Sibawaih in this. It is clear that it is of the same character as the expression 

(Zayd is not standing while is sitting), that is, 

(with 's sitting). When one says 

(release me, and I shall not return), the meaning is that one commands oneself to do the latter, thus there is disjunction, of which a similar example comes from Qays ibn Zuhair:

 فلا يدعني قومي صريحا لحرمة، كن كنت منتولا و وسلم عامر

(my people would not call me pure, born of a free woman, if I were killed while lived)

2.6 The Call for Abolition of Secondary and Tertiary Causes

Among that which must be dropped from the grammar are the secondary and tertiary causes, such as are given when, for example, one asks regarding (Zayd stood): "Why is it vowelled with damma?", and the answer is given: "Because it
is the agent, and every agent is vowelled with ādāma." The questioner then asks, "Why is the agent vowelled with ādāma?" The correct response would be: "Because the Arabs pronounced it thus." This is affirmed by induction from repeated examples in the language, and there is no difference between this and knowing that something is forbidden by the (religious) texts; there is no need to derive a cause for the purpose of transferring the judgement to other matters, and then having one ask, "Why is it forbidden?" The answer is not required of the jurist. And if you answer the questioner by saying that it is to show the difference between the agent and the object, and he is not satisfied and asks: "Why was the situation not reversed, with nasb on the agent and rafᶜ on the object?"; we would answer him saying the reason is that the agents are few in number, there being only one agent for each verb, while the objects are many; thus the heavier (more difficult to pronounce), which is the rafᶜ, was assigned to the agent, while the lighter, which is the nasb, was assigned to the object because the agent is one while the objects are many. In this way that which they consider more difficult to pronounce will occur less frequently in their speech while that which they consider easier will occur more frequent-
ly. This does not increase our knowledge regarding the vowel-
ling of the agent with $\text{raf}^c$, for if we were ignorant of it this
ignorance would not hurt us; this because we accept the correct-
ness of vowel ling the agent with $\text{raf}^c$, which is all that we
require, and which is clear from repeated examples which impart
knowledge.

2.6.1 Types of Secondary Causes

These secondary causes are of three types: one about which
there is no dispute, one about which there is substantial agree-
ment, and one about whose invalidity there is no disagreement.
These types are found in the books of the grammarians.

The difference between primary and secondary causes is
that knowledge of the former imparts knowledge regarding the
(correct) pronunciation of the Arabic language, knowledge which
is gained at a glance; secondary causes are those which can be
dispensed with in this regard, and which tell us nothing other
than that the Arabs are a clever people! And that in several
places.

An example of that regarding which there is no disagreement
is the statement that whenever two consecutive unvowelled
consonants occur in *wasla*, where one of them is not a weak letter, then one of them must be vowelled, this whether the occurrence is in one word or two, as in أَكْرَمُ الْقُومَ (honor the tribe) and the words of God Almighty: قَمّ الليل (arise tonight) and وَذَكَرْ اسم ربّك (and remember the name of your Lord). One also says مَدّ ٌ, يمدّ, and مَدّ; the final letter of the imperative takes sukūn, as in اضْرِبِ, but the two letters ﺪ occur consecutively, the first of which takes sukūn, so that the second must be vowelled to prevent the two letters with sukūn from occurring together. If it were possible to pronounce the two consecutive unvowelled letters in *wasla* then it would be done.

You say مَرْ... يا قَتِي (go, my boy); as for أَكْرَمُ الْقُومَ and the like, there is no other possibility than to vowel them. To the question, "Why did you vowel the مَ of أَكْرَمُ when it is a command?", the reply is that two unvowelled consonants occur together, the second of which is the ل of the definite article, and anytime two unvowelled consonants occur together in this manner one of them must become vowelled. And if it be asked, "Why were they not left unvowelled?", the answer would be that it is not possible for one to pronounce them when both are unvowelled. This is conclusive, and is also a secondary cause.
Likewise the statement that any verb beginning with one of
the four attached letters which is followed by an unvowelled
consonant, forms its imperative by removal of the attached
letter which is then replaced by the چ of wasla. If it were
asked, "Why does the چ attach to it?", the answer would be that it
is an imperative verb from which the prefixed letter has been
removed, and whenever such a letter is removed from an impera­tive verb it must be replaced by the چ of wasla. And if it were
asked, "Why was the (resulting) first letter not left as it
was?", the answer would be that it is not possible to begin an
utterance with an unvowelled letter, which is a secondary
cause.

The case of میعان میعان and the like is similar, for it is
said: their original forms are میوان میوان and میوان، respectively,
evidence for which comes from the fact that their respective
roots are و و and و و، in which the first radical) of the
verb is و، while their respective plural forms are میوان and
میوان، with the diminutive forms میوان and میوان. Thus the

85 He refers to the imperfect verb, to which the letters چ, چ, چ, and چ are prefixed.
86 That is, left unvowelled.
has been changed to ٣ due to its being unvowelled, while that which precedes takes kasra, because every ٣ which is unvowelled and is preceded by kasra changes to ٣. And if it were asked, "Why was it changed to ٣, and not left as it was?", the answer is that the change of the letters is easier to the tongue; this is a cause whose derivation is clear, yet it can be dispensed with nevertheless.

An example of an unclear cause is the statement that any verb whose first letter is one of the four (prefixed letters) is inflected due to its similarity to nouns. It would be sufficient in this regard to say that every verb whose first letter is one of these four, and to which is affixed neither the feminine nor either of the emphatic letters ٌ, is inflected. And if it be asked, "Why is ٍ inflected?", the answer is that it is a verb whose first letter is one of the prefixed four and to which none of the feminine, light (energetic), or emphatic letters ٌ are attached, and every verb of this description is inflected. And if it be asked, "Why did the Arabs regard as inflected that which is as described?", the answer is that these verbs are similar to nouns in that they are applicable both to the present
and the future; that is, they are general in application, just as indefinite nouns like "رجل" (a man) are general in reference. And if one wanted them to refer to specific things, then one adds to them the definite article ال, which abrogates their generality. Likewise in the case of verbs beginning with one of the four prefixed letters; if one wanted to specify one of the two times (i.e., present or future) one would prefix to the verb س or سوف. Thus the one (i.e., the indefinite noun) has a general reference which is made specific by the prefixing of letters, which is also true of the other (i.e., the imperfect verb), and it is because of this similarity that the verb is considered inflected.

The verb is further similar to the noun in that the emphatic ل may be prefixed to it, for one says إنْ زيداً لقائم (verily, Zayd is standing) and إنْ زيداً ليلهمم (verily, Zayd stands). It is also said that the noun is inflected because it is of one form, while its functions are numerous: it may be subject, object, or in construct, and thus inflection is needed to indicate clearly these various functions. As for the verb, if its meaning changes then its form also changes, which makes inflection unnecessary. Thus it would have no inflection were it not for its
similarity to nouns mentioned above.

It is said that the cause which necessitates inflection in nouns is also present in verbs, and that is that, if we were to say ضرب زيد عمرو ("struck Zayd [nominative] "Amr [nominative]") or ضرب زيداً عمراً ("struck Zayd [accusative] "Amr [accusative]"), we could not distinguish the agent of the verb from its object; likewise if we were to say لا يضرب
الاً زيد عمراً, the negative statement would not be distinguishable from the negative imperative were it not for the final vowels on the verb. This is also true in لا تأكل السمك وتشرب اللبن (do not eat fish and drink milk), for without the indicative, jussive, or subjunctive marking, it would not be possible to determine whether the prohibition applied to the two acts separately or together, or whether the first act was prohibited while the second was commanded. So just as nouns have different functions, so, too, do verbs: they may be negative, positive, prohibited, imperative, conditional, resultative, predicated, or interrogative, thus their need for inflection is like that of nouns. Also, one thing is not made an analogical extension of another unless its regimen is unknown, while that of which it is made an extension is of known regimen, with the cause necessitating the regimen in
the original also present in the secondary.

2.6.2 The Call for Abolition of Analogical Extension

The Arabs being a clever people, how could they consider one thing to be similar to another, and govern it by the same regimen, when the cause of the regimen in the original thing is not found in the secondary? If one of the grammarians were to do this he would be thought ignorant, and his views would not be accepted; so why have they attributed to the Arabs that for which some of them would consider others to be ignorant? The reference here is to the fact that they do not consider one thing to be analogous to another, governing it according to the regimen of the latter, unless the cause of the regimen in the original thing is also found in the secondary. Yet they have done this in positing a similarity between nouns and verbs, and in terms of case-assignment, between 'ع and its sisters and transitive verbs. As for the similarity posited between diptote nouns and verbs, it is more plausible since they maintain that diptote nouns resemble verbs in being secondary, just as verbs are considered secondary to nouns. If there are in a noun two
causes (for lack of triptote inflection),\textsuperscript{87} or a single cause taking the place of two causes, then each of the two contributes to making the noun secondary (to the triliteral, which is considered the original form), prevented from the same things from which the verb is prevented: kasra and nunation. The causes preventing full inflection are definiteness, foreign origin, certain adjectival forms, feminine gender, mixed structure, conversion (العدل), certain plural patterns, verb patterns, and the ان- ending which resembles the feminine #\_ ending.\textsuperscript{88} This because the definite is secondary to the indefinite, foreign-derived words are a [secondary] branch in the speech of the Arabs, the adjective follows the modified noun, the feminine is secondary to the masculine, compound words are secondary to individual words, converted words are secondary to their sources, the plural is secondary to the singular, and the ان- ending on masculine nouns makes them similar to the feminine. As for

\textsuperscript{87}The grammarians have based the lack of full (triptote) inflection in nouns on two types of causes, one being semantic and the other morphological. The semantic cause is based on proper names and certain adjectival forms, such as فعالا, while the morphological cause includes such features as feminine gender, foreign origin, and the ان- ending. A noun may be prevented from triptote inflection by two causes: in حمارة, for example, both feminine gender and adjectival-form causes are present.

\textsuperscript{88}Meaning that the ending in, say, حمامة is similar to the ending of حمارة not only in terms of the vowelling of the ending itself, but also in that both are preceded by an unwovelled letter which is itself preceded by a short vowel.
the verbal forms (used as proper nouns), they are clear. The grammarians' explanation for the dropping of nunation from verbs is their relative difficulty of pronunciation, which in turn is due to the fact that nouns are more frequently used than verbs, and the thing which the tongue encounters most frequently becomes easier to pronounce, while if it is infrequent then it becomes difficult. And these (diptote) nouns are less frequently used than other nouns, so they become more difficult to pronounce and are thus prevented from the same things from which the verb is prevented: nunation and, accordingly, kasra as final vowel.

There is no need for any of this other than knowledge of those causes directly associated with the nouns' lack of full inflection; anything else is superfluous, and this even when the situation is clear to the understanding; how much more is it so when the justifications are weak? For it represents the assertion that the Arabs intended these interpretations, for which there is no evidence; They simply recognized the lack of nunation and vowelling with kasra; these are properties of verbs, and were it not for similarities to verbs then that which drops from verbs would not drop from these nouns.
It has been said that there is found among nouns that which is greater in similarity to verbs than these non-fully-inflected (diptote) nouns, and yet which is fully inflected, as in إقامة (he stood a [manner of] standing) and the like; for إقامة is feminine and the verb is derived from it; it and the verb refer to the same thing in terms of action, and it shares—according to the grammarians—the case-assignment property of the verb. It emphasizes the action of the verb, and that which emphasizes follows the thing emphasized, just as the adjective follows the noun it modifies. Thus it includes the features of feminine gender, emphasis, case assignment, and evidence of derivation. And while it may lack the (feminine) ت as in the case of قايم, it nonetheless shares a further property of verbs in that it is not made dual or plural.

2.6.3 Examples of False Causes

An example of that which is clearly false is the statement of Muhammad ibn Yazid [Al-Mubarrad] that the letter ن, the agent pronoun of the feminine plural, is vowelled because that which precedes it takes sukūn, as in ضربْن (they [fem. plural] struck) and يضربْ (they [fem. plural] strike); of the preceding letter,
he stated that it takes sukūn in order to avoid the occurrence of four consecutive vowelled letters, the verb and agent being as one unit. Thus he makes the sukūn of the letter preceding the ن the result of the vowel on the ن, and makes the vowel on the ن the result of the sukūn of the previous letter. In this manner the cause of one phenomenon is itself caused by the same phenomenon, which is patently false. I could provide many other examples if time permitted.

The late Al-A‘lām,89 in spite of his knowledge of grammar, was a staunch proponent of these secondary causes who felt that if he could derive some principle from them he would have gained something of value. Similarly our late colleague, the jurist Abu al-Qāsim al-Suhayli, was enamored of these secondary causes in his own fashion, devising a number of them and believing this to be perfection in his craft and perspicacity in it.

We do not ask, about the ج of جعُنْ, the ع of ععُنْ, and the ب of بترًنْ, why this one is vowelled with fathā, that one with damma, and the third with kasra; likewise, we do not ask "why?" about the nominative marking on زيد. If it were said that

has a changeable ending, then it can be said that زيد has a changeable beginning: in the diminutive it takes دامما, and in the plural, on pattern فَتَحَاء, it takes فَثَاء.

If it were said that nouns have some functions in which they are vowelled with دامما, others in which they are vowelled with فَثَاء, and still others in which they take كَسْرَة, then it would also be said that if these functions are understood from the primary causes; the دامما by virtue of the functions of agent, subject, predicate, or passive-verb object; the فَثَاء by virtue of the object function; and the كَسْرَة by virtue of the construct function; if these are understood from the primary causes, then the final letters are like the initial letters with are vowelled with دامما in some situations, with فَثَاء in others, and with كَسْرَة in still others: كَسْرَة for the singular, فَثَاء for the plural, and دامما for the diminutive.

2.7 The Call to Abolish Non-Practical Drills

Among the things that should be dropped from the grammar are such exercises as "make from this pattern an example of that", as in the grammarians' exercise, "make from بِعَض an example on pattern فَعَل", so that one says بَعْض; its original form is
and the was changed to due to the damma on the preceding letter for ease of pronunciation. Likewise the Arabs say موْسَر, the original form of موْسَر is موْسَن, since it is the active participle of the verb أَيْتَن, whose ف is the letter ي, so the ف of the active participle should also be ي, just as the active participle of مَكْرِم أَكَرِم; the ف of the verb, which is ك, is also the ف of the active participle. This is the case with active participles of all sound verbs; with them the ف is the same letter as the ف of the verb, as is also the case of the و and the ل (second and third radicals, respectively). You say, as the plural of موْسَر, موْسَر, and for the diminutive, موْسَر. That is, the disappearance of the cause of the ي's replacement by و, which is its taking sukun while the preceding letter is vowelled with damma, results in reversion to the letter's original form. Those who say بَيْعَ, بَيْعَ, بَيْعَ, and بَيْعَ, the respective plurals of بَيْعَ, بَيْعَ, بَيْعَ, and بَيْعَ, as well as of the masculine forms, since is made plural on the pattern as in حَمْراءُ فَعَلْا فَعَلْا, and حَمْراءُ فَعَلْا, شَفْرَاءُ شَفْرَاءُ, and شَفْرَاءُ شَفْرَاءُ. By analogical extension one should say غَبَّاء, غَبَّاء, غَبَّاء, and غَبَّاء, but they changed the initial vowel to
kasra in order to avoid changing the ی to ی. As to the question of which of the two views is correct, each has some basis. Those who would change the ی to ی argue that, since بُعْد is singular, it is more proper for it to follow the pattern of موسَر and the like than it would be for it to take (vowels based on) a plural pattern. Also, we find that it is more common for the letter to follow the preceding vowel than it is for the vowel to conform to the following letter; for example, one says ميُزَان ميِعَاد, changing the letter to match the preceding vowel instead of changing the kasra to دَامَّة or فَاتَة, to preserve the letter و. The situation is the same with words having و in the فِلْسَة position, as in يِسْقُل إِيْجَل and يِسْقُل إِيْجَل (in each of which the original initial radical is و), as well as رَيَاض and ثُيَاب, whose original forms are رَوَاض and ثُوَاب, respectively; the و has been changed to ی due to the kasra-vowelling of the preceding letter, among other factors. The same thing occurs in قَامِ قِيَامِ صَيامِ and قَامِ قِيَامِ صَيامِ, with the respective original forms قَامِ قِيَامِ صَيامِ and قَامِ قِيَامِ صَيامِ, the و having been changed to ی due to the kasra on the preceding letter. We see it also in دُعُبي غُسلي and all other passive verbs whose final letter is و or ی, as well as in the active participle of verbs.
with final \( \text{و} \), as in رأيت غازيا (I saw a conqueror), and in قيل and سين of the standard language. In all of these the letter changes according to the preceding vowel.

The basis of those who say بج is the analogical extension from بدخ, in which the change of دامما to كسرة is preferable to changing the ي to و since the former is easier to pronounce and thus prevails over the و.

Just as the latter follows the former, so the former also follows the latter, as in the diminutive of شيخ, which has the form ظهير; it also occurs as ظهير, with كسرة on the ش due to the following ي. The same phenomenon occurs in the imperatives of triliteral verbs having دامما on the second letter; the vowel on the واسلة is made دامما accordingly, as in الأوسم, and the like. If the second letter were not vowelled with دامما, then the vowel on the واسلة would be كسرة, as it is with verbs having كسرة or فتحة on their second letters.

Another example is found in the words ابنهم وامرأة and (in which the vowel on the penultimate letter changes to match the case ending); on the whole, however, the number of places in which the latter follows the former is much greater in the language of the Arabs than those in which the former follows the
latter, while the change from ِ to ی is more common than that from ی to ى, and such forms as ٍکِل and ٍبِع are considered preferable to َکُل and َبُل, respectively.

These transformations occur in three categories: one, in which the choice of letters follows from the preceding vowel without exception; another, in which the vowel changes according to the following letter without exception; and a third, in which either of the two processes may occur, though the former (in which the vowel conforms to the following letter) is more prevalent; thus one would be more likely to encounter the speech mode of those who say ُبَع.

This is all in regard to a single issue; how would the situation be if this phenomenon were extended, with long argument and much exaggeration for which there is no need and which results in little benefit? People are unable to remember how to use the correct, standard language; how much less they must be able to remember these superfluous suppositions!

2.8 The Call for Abolition of Everything Which is Not Conducive to Correct Speech

Among that which must be dropped from the grammar is the
arguing over that which is not instructive in terms of speech, such as the grammarians' argument over the cause of the *damma*-vowelling of the agent, of the *fatha*-vowelling of the object, and over all other matters involving secondary causes and others. These things, such as their disagreement over that which puts the agent in the nominative case, or the object in the accusative case, do not give guidance in correct speech; some of them argue that it is the verb that assigns the case, others argue that it is the agent, and still others maintain that it is the two combined. On the whole, these non-beneficial arguments should be removed from the grammar.

Thanks be to God, who is worthy of praise, for the completion of this work, and His peace be upon Muhammad His prophet and servant, and His grace.
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