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This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.
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**Transliteration Scheme**

The Library of Congress transliteration system (LC) has been applied throughout the thesis.

1- **Consonants**
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<th>Arabic</th>
<th>LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>ط</td>
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<td>B</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>ع</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>Dh</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>ي</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2- **Diphthongs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ذي</td>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>aw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3- **Vowels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic vowels</th>
<th>short</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Arabic vowels</th>
<th>short</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>أ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ع</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>ו</td>
<td>ü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>ي</td>
<td>ي</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4- **other:**

- **ال** (for article)
- **ال** (for article preceded by word ending with a vowel)
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The verbal sentence is the most important structure in Arabic, as it combines the event and different tenses of the action. In addition, ʿAlī al-Jārim (1953: 347) claims that the verbal sentence is the basic expression in Arabic. It has two fundamental elements, namely the predicate and subject or the verb and agent and their relationship within the structure of the sentence. Classical Arabic grammarians, however, analysed the verb and agent elements separately, as they concentrated on the issue of the operator and operated (qādiyyat al-ʿāmil wa-l-māʾūl), obscuring the relationship between the predicate and the subject. While not denying the importance of the issue of operator and operated, I believe that there should be a balance between this issue and other matters that exhibit the characteristics of the verbal sentence syntactically and semantically.

1.1 The scope of the study:

This study is limited to discussing the structure of the verbal sentence in Written Arabic by examining its main elements i.e. the verb and the agent. The researcher attempts to avoid the inflection theory because from the beginning of Arabic grammar compilation, many studies have already focused on this theory. This study combines the syntactic and semantic analysis in the process of analysing the basic elements of the verbal sentence. It discusses the issues that relate to this structure, evaluating the views of classical grammarians and those of modern linguists where they examine the early grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure. It will demonstrate that Arabic grammar does not rely on inflection marks only, but that the function of every word plays a major role within the structure. It entails an examination of aspect and tense in the verbal sentence, features which were not discussed by classical grammarians in depth. Written Arabic here refers to Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic. Classical Arabic is
the language of the Qurʾān, Hadīth, pre-Islamic and post-Islamic literature etc, whereas Modern Standard Arabic is the language generally used in the media (TV, radio), newspapers, official reports, business or personal letters and formal speeches, and of course in literary and non-literary works.

1.2. **The aims of the study:**

The first objective of this research is to study the most important structure in Arabic, the verbal sentence, and to consolidate the syntactic issues which relate directly to the verbal sentence system in an attempt to remedy this deficiency and to fill a significant research gap. To date, as far as I am aware, there is no comprehensive or complete research which focuses on the verbal sentence system because the majority of researchers focus on the government tools, inflection and morphological analysis. I should note here that issues related to the verbal sentence tend to be scattered across separate chapters in Classical Arabic grammarians’ books. This research attempts to study both the verb and the agent - the fundamental elements of the verbal sentence – and their relationship. The second objective of this research is to present areas of controversy and agreement among grammarians and their points of view as regards this structure and to examine and investigate these views. With regard to the third objective, it is not my intention to conduct a comparative analysis of the Arabic verbal sentence and the English sentence. I present, however, more essential comparative features between their structures. Both languages require two fundamental elements to complete their structure: a verb and a noun. Therefore, this study has drawn on the general characteristics, similarities and differences between the two sentence structures. Finally, it is also the aim of this research to clarify and exemplify characteristics learners need to recognise in their study of the deep structure of the verbal sentence.

1.3. **The significance of the research:**
The verbal sentence is considered as one of most important structures because it is the only structure that can combine the event and a different tense for the action. To the best of my knowledge, this research is the first to discuss syntactic issues of the verbal sentence as the Early Arabic grammarians analysed it and how modern Arabic grammarians understand it. This study sheds light on the verbal sentence structure and the issues related to it that have not been hitherto addressed, and presents important views that could solve some of the inquiries raised by Modern Arabic linguists in this field. In addition, this study could be used as guide to enable native speakers and Arabic learners to understand the deep structure of the verbal sentence and to identify grammarians' strategies and weaknesses in addressing these issues.

1.4. Research Questions:

This research attempts to answer the following questions:
This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of
1.5. Methodology:

In the first stage, the overall approach is to move from the general to the particular. The best way to study any linguistic issue is to first discuss the whole to which that part belongs; hence, the discussion of the verbal sentence structure requires the study of the parts of speech from which its elements are composed (i.e. the noun and the verb).

I focus on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to the verbs and the agent, mainly because they are the fundamental parts of the verbal sentence. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent.

My inquiry into the verbal sentence has led me to look at and analyse the views of some modern linguists who disagree with the basic rules established by Early and Medieval Arabic grammarians. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. Essential comparative features between the Arabic verbal
sentence and English structure are observed. At the end of the chapters, I include a discussion section in order to focus on important points mentioned. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent.

1.6 Outline of the research:

This thesis is divided into eleven chapters: the present chapter (Chapter One) is the introduction followed by Chapter Two which discusses the views and methods of three Arabic grammar schools of thought, namely Başra, Kûfâ and Baghdad. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure. In addition, the types of sentence and controversy among grammarians with regard to this concept will be discussed.

In the second of the thesis, Chapter Five will focus on transitive and intransitive verbs, discussing their definitions, their characteristics and types of transitive verbs, as well as presenting ways to transform the intransitive to transitive and vice versa. Chapter Six is on the passive voice, examining the ways in which the active verb, whether perfective or imperfective, can be changed to a passive verb. The agent, as the second element of the verbal sentence, is discussed in Chapter Seven, which illustrates the concept of the agent and the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to the agent. Chapter Eight focuses on the deputy agent, explaining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element that takes the place of the agent. This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent.

Inasmuch as the verbal sentence contains two basic elements, the word order of these elements has to be addressed, a subject covered in Chapter
Nine, which is an inquiry into the basic and alternative word orders of the verbal sentence. Chapter Ten is on the concept of the tense and aspect and displays their primary and secondary forms and Chapter Eleven summarises the important contributions of this thesis.
CHAPTER TWO

The Schools of Arabic Grammar

2.1. Introduction:

The history of Classical Arabic grammar is traced back to the Başran and Kūfān schools of thought, both of which merged into the Baghdādīan school which was known as a mixed school. These schools presented different aspects of grammar, with each having its own ways of dealing with the Arabic language and formulating its own rules to save it from changes or distortion; and although they did not differ in their fundamental sources they did sometimes hold particular views on certain issues in Arabic grammar, as can be seen throughout this thesis.

The three schools were associated with a particular region, though this did not mean that all grammarians were born or lived in these regions. In practice they mainly acquired their knowledge of grammar from scholars who had taught in these regions. It is not my intention here to give an in depth discussion of the grammarians' thinking and mention stages of development in the study of Arabic grammar; however, I will give a relatively brief account of the use of the term ‘school’, and the schools’ method of addressing Arabic grammar, in order to provide an overview of the processes involved.

2.2. Adoption of the term ‘school’:

In the early sources, the term ‘school’ is neither found in the writings of those who studied Arabic grammar nor in works in which the history of the Early Arabic grammarians was examined; instead they spoke about the Basran, Kūfān and Baghdādīan approaches or scholars’ thoughts. For example, Abū l-Ṭayyib al-Ḥalabī (d. 351/ 962) in his Marātib al-naḥwiyyīn (The Classification of Grammarians) and al-Zabīdī (d. 379/ 989) in his Tabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn wa-l-lughawiyyīn (The Categories of Grammarians and Linguists) addressed all these schools, and classified the grammarians
of each school according to a specific category; however they did not mention the ‘school’ term. Abū Sa‘īd al-Sīrāfī (d. 368/ 978) wrote with reference to the Başran grammarians, and duly entitled his work *Akhbār al-nahwiyyin al- Başriyyin* (Report on Başran Grammarians). On the other hand, Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 385/ 995) one of the earlier bio-bibliographer provided in his *al-Fihrist* (The Index) information about the Başran grammarians and linguists, and later mentioned some of them by name giving a list of their works and lives; he also did the same sort of thing with the Kūfan and Baghdādian grammarians. Scholars who came after them followed the lines of their predecessors. Hence early scholars did not use the term ‘school’ at all, but instead assigned the grammarians to their various regions (*ahl al-Baṣra, al-Kūfa and Baghdād*), according to their method of thinking. (Figure 1)

Modern scholars, influenced by western thinkers, have contributed substantially to this field, by changing the term from ‘thought’ to ‘school’. The term ‘school’ first appeared in *Tārīkh al-adab al-‘Arabî* (The History of Arabic Literature) by the German scholar Brockelman (1961, II: 124). Modern scholars, such as Shawqī Dayf’s *al-Madāris al-nahwiyya* (The Grammar Schools), and Khadija l-Ḥudyaythi, applying the same title of her work to her predecessor dealt with all the schools of thought; while others were concerned with a specific school, such as in Mahdī l-Makhzūmī’s *Madrasat al-Kūfa wa-manhajuhā fi dirāsat al-lughā wa-l-naḥw* (The Kūfan School: its Methodology of Studying Language and Grammar), and ‘Abd al-Rahlmān al-Sayyid’s *Madrasat al-Baṣra l-nahwiyya nash’atuhā wa-taṭawwuruhā* (The Başran School; its Beginning and Development).
2.3. The classification of Arabic grammar schools:

2.3.1. The Başran school:

It was known that Başran grammar exemplified the principles of Arabic grammar, since the first work to set up general rules for Arabic grammar was Sibawayh’s (d. 180/796) *al-Kitāb* (The Book). The Başran grammarians depended upon several sources for synthesising the grammar (Figure 2):

![The Başran sources](Image)

First, to date there has been no book in Arabic that has received the high level of attention given to the Qurʾān. This is because it is believed to have been saved from distortion, and that it presents a coherent and ideal language. Several studies were undertaken in Başra that focused on the Qurʾānic text and its variant readings,¹ and these studies led to concern for its language because the Qurʾān played a crucial role in developing the Arabic language (Rabin, 1955: 21; Owens, 1990: 5; Versteegh, 1997: 53). Thus classical grammarians regarded the Qurʾān as a first source for creating the rules of Arabic grammar, and looked in depth into its text in order to devise grammatical rules, so that Arabic grammar would conform to Qurʾānic structures.

Secondly, the Başran grammarians relied on ‘poetry’ a great deal; for example, Sibawayh alluded to more than a thousand lines. However, they placed a time limit for poetry that could be relied on, whereby they took examples from pre-Islamic poetry and up to the middle of the second/eighth century (circa 140/757). Such citations came from poets such as al-

---
¹ The variant Qurʾānic readings refer to the different ways of vocalising a word, case markers, form, and so on.
Farazdag (d. 144/761) and Jarîr (d. 144/761) (al-Suyûṭî, 2006: 148; see also al-Sammârî, 1987: 20; al-Ḥudaythî, 2002: 76). Certain trustworthy narrators are considered the main source to provide the grammarians with many poems: Abû ʿAmrû b. al-ʿAlâ (d. 159/775), al-Mufaḍḍal al-Ḍabbî (d. 178/794) and al-ʿAṣmaʾî (d. 216/831), took examples from the Bedouins and poets themselves (cf. al-Zâbîdî, 1997: 106).

**Fourthly**, grammarians based their thought on a system called grammatical analogy (*al-qiyâs*). This system is based mainly on the usage in which the grammarians acknowledged the difference and similarity between two things (Versteegh, 1977: 111; Owens, 1990: 2; Sûsûr, 1985: 188). Thus, Classical Arabic grammarians looked into examples from the Qurʾân and spoken Arabic, whether poetry or prose, and then formulated rules in order to create an Arabic grammar on which all Arabic users have since come to rely. They focused on the relationship between the primary (*al-maqîs ʿalayh*) and the secondary (*al-maqîs*) in terms of meaning and form or one of them (ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, 1995: 129). The Başran grammarians depended a great deal on this source from the earliest period, where it appears in Sibawayh’s *al-Kitâb* (Turzî, 1969: 121; Agius, 1984: 163-64; al-Zâbîdî, 1997: 19).

Many grammarians were reported as belonging to the Başran school. I mention here the most important: ʿAbd Allâh b. Abî Ishâq (d. 117/735); ʿIsâ b. ʿUmar (d. 149/766); al-Khalîlî b. Ahmad (d. 170/786); Yûnûs b. Ḥâbîb (d. 182/798); Yaʿqûb al-Ḥadramî (d. 205/820); and Abû l-Ḥasan al-Aḫfâsh (d. 215/830) (cf. al-Zâbîdî: nd, 33, 45, 51, 53, 54, 74). However, even though they were reported as the experts of the Başran school, none of their works have ever been located. Their contributions can be found in the most important works emanating from the Başran school, i.e., Sibawayh’s *al-Kitâb*, and al-Mubarrîd’s *al-Muqtadab* (The Extemporised), in which the views of such previous grammarians were recorded and extensively

---

2 “A parallel or similar instance, referred to because it helps the process of explanation” (Crystal: 1992, 19); or “a process by which words or morphemes are created or re-created on the model of existing linguistic patterns” (Versteegh et al. 2006, I: 74).
discussed. The works by Sibawayh and al-Mubarrid provide a clear and detailed record of the thinking of the Başran grammarians, and are considered as the most important works during this period, and as such I have chosen them as the basis of my examples and discussions in this thesis.

2.3.2. The Kūfan school:

The Kūfan school followed the Başran school; though, according to most scholars who have studied the methods of these early schools, the inconsistencies between them do not suggest that Kūfan grammar was in any respect different to Başran grammar, but simply that there were some variations in terms of their methods (cf. al-Makhzūmi, 1958: 36 and 327; Dayf, 1968: 5; al-Sāmarrāʿī, 1987: 142; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 24). Moreover, Kūfan grammar was based on Başran grammar, and the early grammarians of the Kūfan school, such as al-Kisāʿī (d. 189/ 803) and al-Farrāʾ (d. 207/ 822), studied the fundamentals of knowledge established by the Başran grammarians (al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 128). The Kūfan school, nonetheless, used some different terms for certain concepts; for example, the Başran school called the genitive case marker ḥarr, while the Kūfan school called it ḥarf (Versteegh, 1993: 9).

By and large, the Kūfan school of thought relied on the sources on which the Başran school had depended, but the Kūfan school differed in the way these sources were dealt with (Figure 3):

![Figure 3: The Kūfan sources](image)

**First,** the Kūfans were more interested in the Qurʾān and its readings than the Başran school; evidence of this appears in the way they dealt with
various rules of grammar. In addition, they borrowed certain terminologies from Qurʾānic commentary which became standard in Arabic grammar (Dayf, 1968: 215; Versteegh, 1993: 174 and 197-98). The study of Arabic grammar through Qurʾānic exegesis arose during this period, as is evident from al-Farrāʾs *Maʿānī l-Qurʾān* (Explanations of The Qurʾān) through which he laid the beginnings of Kūfān reasoning.

**Secondly,** the Kūfān like the Başran grammarians relied on poetry but expanded the time period from pre-Islamic poetry up to the school’s flourishing time in the early fourth/ tenth century. They borrowed from the poets who lived in the city of Kūfa, and also attended the caliphs’ courts (al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 139).

**Fifthly,** some linguists claimed that the Kūfān school applied grammatical analogy (*al-qiyās*) more than the Başrans, who were critical of *al-qiyās* (Dayf, 1968: 6); while others viewed the Kūfans concentrating on the usage of hearing (*samāʾ*) more than *al-qiyās* (cf. Agius, 1984: 164).

2.3.3. The Baghdādian school:

This school arose when the science of Arabic grammar was well developed, and the majority of its rules had been created. Therefore, the opinions of the school’s grammarians were a mixture of those of the Başran and Kūfān schools, so the Baghdādians acknowledged only what was drawn from well established evidence. Their school started after the period of al-Mubarrīd and Thaʿlab in the early fourth/ tenth century; thus practically all grammarians of this period had their views influenced by those of the previous grammarians. They commented on the Başran and Kūfān views when discussing their own thinking. Dependence on the Ḥadīth in discussing or supporting the rules of Arabic grammar also made its appearance during this period.

Although the grammarians of this school relied on the views of both the other schools, it is possible to divide them into the following groups (Dayf, 1968: 245; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 219-225): a) The first group which, on the
whole, preferred the opinions of the Başran grammarians, such as al-Zajjāj (d. 310/922), Ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 316/928), al-Zajjājī (d. 337/948), and Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1001); b) The second which mostly preferred the views of the Küfan grammarians, for example al-Ḥāmiḍ (d. 305/917) and Abū Bakr al-Anbārī (d. 327/938); c) The third which took on the observations of the Başran and Küfan grammarians equally, such as al-Akhfāsh al-Ṣaghīr (d. 315/927), Ibn Kaysān (d. 320/932), and Nīfṭawayh (d. 323/934).

2.4 Conclusion:

By and large, Başran and Küfan Arabic grammatical thinking are revealed by their fixed system of principle and structure, with Sibawayh and al-Mubarrid epitomising the Başran school, while the Küfan school is exemplified by al-Farrāʾ and Thaʿlab. In addition, there is no difference between the Başran and Küfan schools in terms of the fundamental rules of Arabic grammar; they differed on some issues largely because they differed in terms of the way they applied their methods (al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 94). Although there is some difference between them regarding terminology, it is the understanding of Modern Arabic linguists, that certain terms are synonymous; however, it seems that the Başrans depended on meaning or formal features, whereas the Küfans based their usage on criteria of meaning (Owens, 1990: 150; Versteegh, 1993: 10-11). Furthermore, the Küfan school never presented all its grammatical rules in a complete work, unlike the Basran school, where the Maʿānī l-Qurʿān and Majālis Thaʿlab recorded the thinking of the Küfan school, even though they were unable to expound most of the rules of Arabic grammar. As a result of the difference between the Başran and Küfan schools regarding their methods, controversy appeared over certain rules of Arabic grammar, and subsequently the Baghdādīan school grew by absorbing both schools.
CHAPTER THREE

Literature Review

3.1. Introduction:

Classical grammarians studied the fundamental elements of the verbal sentence (the verb and agent), but they did not study them as a whole structure. This rendered their studies incoherent. In addition, it seems to me that there are no studies that combine the basic issues that relate to the verbal sentence as a whole structure.

This chapter discusses the most important studies of the verbal sentence and will be divided into: a) Classical Arabic works; and b) Modern works (Figure 4).

3.2. Classical Arabic works:

First, to date there has been no book in Arabic that has received the high level of attention given to the Qurʾān. This is because it is believed to have been saved from distortion, and that it presents a coherent and ideal language. Several studies were undertaken in Baṣra that focused on the Qurʾānic text and its variant readings, and these studies led to concern for its language because the Qurʾān played a crucial role in developing the Arabic language (Rabin, 1955: 21; Owens, 1990: 5; Versteegh, 1997: 53). Thus classical grammarians regarded the Qurʾān as a first source for creating the rules of Arabic grammar, and looked in depth into its text in order to devise grammatical rules, so that Arabic grammar would conform to Qurʾānic structures.

Secondly, the Baṣran grammarians relied on ‘poetry’ a great deal; for example, Sībawayh alluded to more than a thousand lines. However, they placed a time limit for poetry that could be relied on, whereby they took

---

3 The variant Qurʾānic readings refer to the different ways of vocalising a word, case markers, form, and so on.
examples from pre-Islamic poetry and up to the middle of the second/eighth century (circa 140/757). Such citations came from poets such as al-Farazdag (d. 144/761) and Jarîr (d. 144/761) (al-Suyûtî, 2006: 148; see also al-Sûmarrâ‘î, 1987: 20; al-Ḥudaythî, 2002: 76). Certain trustworthy narrators are considered the main source to provide the grammarians with many poems: Abû ʿAmrû b. al-ʿAlâ (d. 159/775), al-Mufaḍdal al-Ḍabbî (d. 178/794) and al-ʿAsma‘î (d. 216/831), took examples from the Bedouins and poets themselves (cf. al-Zabîdî, 1997: 106).

**Thirdly,** the Başran grammarians went out to the Bedouins of Najd, Tuhâma, al-Ḥijâz and others found near the city of Başra, to listen to the narratives recounted by these people and then to write down what they had heard. In addition, they documented accounts and anecdotes from the tribes of Quraysh, Qays, Tamîm, Asad, Hudhayl and some of the Kinâna and Ṭayy until 150/767; however, Quraysh was considered the most eloquent speech because it was distant from foreigners influence (al-Suyûtî, 2006: 101-4; see also ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, 1995: 103-4; Agius, 1984: 124; al-Hudaythî, 2002: 75).

**Fourthly,** grammarians based their thought on a system called grammatical analogy (*al-qiyās*). This system is based mainly on the usage in which the grammarians acknowledged the difference and similarity between two things (Versteegh, 1977: 111; Owens, 1990: 2; Sûsûr, 1985: 188). Thus, Classical Arabic grammarians looked into examples from the Qurʾān and spoken Arabic, whether poetry or prose, and then formulated rules in order to create an Arabic grammar on which all Arabic users have since come to rely. They focused on the relationship between the primary

---

4 According to Majmaʾ al-lughâ l-ʿArabiyya (1934, I. 202), the Arabic language was modeled, until the second/eighth century, after the way people spoke in urban areas but as the language of the city became corrupt with non-Arabic usages the grammarians sought another model of correct speech, that of the Bedouins in the Arabian Peninsula because of its purity. This was true until the fourth/tenth century; after that there are no agreement as to whether the Bedouins or the urbanised areas were the right model for Classical Arabic.

5 “A parallel or similar instance, referred to because it helps the process of explanation” (Crystal: 1992, 19); or "a process by which words or morphemes are created or re-created on the model of existing linguistic patterns" (Versteegh *et al.* 2006, I: 74).
(al-maqṣīs ‘alayh) and the secondary (al-maqīs) in terms of meaning and form or one of them (‘Abd al-‘Azīz, 1995: 129). The Başran grammarians depended a great deal on this source from the earliest period, where it appears in Sibawayh’s al-Kītāb (Turzī, 1969: 121; Agius, 1984: 163-64; al-Zabīdī, 1997: 19).

The Başran grammarians did not rely on the Ḥadīth (the sayings and deeds of the Prophet), claiming that the Ḥadīth had not been passed on in the original words spoken by the Prophet Muḥammad. They argued that, the narrators had focused on the meaning of what the Prophet was saying rather than taking his form of expression into account; hence they did not report the Prophet’s exact utterances. The Başran grammarians also believed that the majority of narrators of Ḥadīth were not Arabic speakers of the Arabian Peninsula. Thus, they could not take the Ḥadīth as supporting evidence for their grammatical/ syntactic rules (al-Makhzuṃı, 1958: 52; Dayf, 1968: 19; al-Sāmarrā’ī, 1987: 26; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 77). According to Abū l-Ḥasan al-Dā’ī (d. 680/1281), the first grammarian to rely on Ḥadīth for supporting grammatical rules was Ibn Khurūf (d. 609/1212) (al-Sāmarrā’ī, 1987: 27; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 77). Abū Ḥayān (d. 745/1344) observed somewhat later that Ibn Mālik (d. 672/1273) had also depended a great deal on Ḥadīth; possibly he was the first of the grammarians to use Ḥadīth as a main source for establishing grammatical rules (ibid)⁶.

Many grammarians were reported as belonging to the Başran school. I mention here the most important: ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Ishāq (d. 117/735); ‘Isā b. ‘Umar (d. 149/766); al-Khalīl b. Aḥmad (d. 170/786); Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (d. 182/798); Ya’qūb al-Ḥadrāmī (d. 205/820); and Abū l-Ḥasan al-Akhfash (d. 215/830) (cf. al-Zabīdī: nd, 33, 45, 51, 53, 54, 74). However, even though they were reported as the experts of the Basran school, none of their works have ever been located. Their contributions can be found in the most

---

important works emanating from the Baṣran school, i.e., Sibawayh's *al-Kitāb*, and al-Mubarrid’s *al-Muqtaḍab* (The Extemporised), in which the views of such previous grammarians were recorded and extensively discussed. The works by Sibawayh and al-Mubarrid provide a clear and detailed record of the thinking of the Baṣran grammarians, and are considered as the most important works during this period, and as such I have chosen them as the basis of my examples and discussions in this thesis.

The Kūfan school followed the Baṣran school; though, according to most scholars who have studied the methods of these early schools, the inconsistencies between them do not suggest that Kūfan grammar was in any respect different to Baṣran grammar, but simply that there were some variations in terms of their methods (cf. al-Makhzūmī, 1958: 36 and 327; Dāyf, 1968: 5; al-Sāmarrā‘ī, 1987: 142; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 24). Moreover, Kūfan grammar was based on Baṣran grammar, and the early grammarians of the Kūfan school, such as al-Kisā‘ī (d. 189/803) and al-Farrā‘ (d. 207/822), studied the fundamentals of knowledge established by the Baṣran grammarians (al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 128). The Kūfan school, nonetheless, used some different terms for certain concepts; for example, the Baṣran school called the genitive case marker *jarr*, while the Kūfan school called it *khafḍ* (Versteegh, 1993: 9).

First, the Kūfans were more interested in the Qurʾān and its readings than the Baṣran school; evidence of this appears in the way they dealt with various rules of grammar. In addition, they borrowed certain terminologies from Qurʾānic commentary which became standard in Arabic grammar (Dāyf, 1968: 215; Versteegh, 1993: 174 and 197-98). The study of Arabic grammar through Qurʾānic exegesis arose during this period, as is evident from al-Farrā‘’s *Ma‘ānī l-Qurʾān* (Explanations of The Qurʾān) through which he laid the beginnings of Kūfan reasoning.

Secondly, the Kūfan like the Baṣran grammarians relied on poetry but expanded the time period from pre-Islamic poetry up to the school’s
flourishing time in the early fourth/tenth century. They borrowed from the poets who lived in the city of Kūfa, and also attended the caliphs' courts (al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 139).

**Thirdly,** the Kūfans went to meet the Bedouins of al-Ḥijāz, Najd, and Tuhāma, and the tribes of Tamīm, Asad and Nizār who lived near Kūfa (al-Makhzūmī, 1958: 330-331; Abū ʾl-Makārim, 1973: 36; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 139). They excelled in narration, which they took from the nomads as well as from urban populations, whereas the Başran grammarians had focused only on the Bedouins, believing that the urban dwellers had to deal with foreign people through trade, and that their languages were compromised by this mixing with non-Arabs.

**Fourthly,** the Kūfan grammarians based themselves on the Başran school, by attending to the discussions presented by their grammarians and what they had to say about one another. A main leading teacher of the Başran school reported that al-Farrāʾ, when he slept, put Sibawayh’s manuscript under his pillow as an indication of his respect to Sibawayh’s *al-Kitāb* (al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 141; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 138).

**Fifthly,** some linguists claimed that the Kūfan school applied grammatical analogy (*al-qiyās*) more than the Başrans, who were critical of *al-qiyās* (Daṭīf, 1968: 6); while others viewed the Kūfans concentrating on the usage of hearing (*samāʾ*) more than *al-qiyās* (cf. Agius, 1984: 164).

Many grammarians belonged to the Kūfan school, including, for instance, Muʿādh al-Harrāʾ (d. 187/803), al-Kisāʾī, al-Farrāʾ and Thaʿlab (d. 291/903) (cf. al-Zabīdī: nd, 125, 130, 133, 150). The broad spectrum of opinions in the Kūfan school was set out in al-Farrāʾ’s *Maʿāni l-Qurʾān* and in Thaʿlab’s *Majālis Thaʿlab* (Thaʿlab’s Sessions).

This school arose when the science of Arabic grammar was well developed, and the majority of its rules had been created. Therefore, the opinions of the school’s grammarians were a mixture of those of the Başran and Kūfan schools, so the Baghdādians acknowledged only what was drawn from well
established evidence. Their school started after the period of al-Mubarrid and Tha‘lab in the early fourth/tenth century; thus practically all grammarians of this period had their views influenced by those of the previous grammarians. They commented on the Başran and Kūfan views when discussing their own thinking. Dependence on the Ḥadith in discussing or supporting the rules of Arabic grammar also made its appearance during this period.

Although the grammarians of this school relied on the views of both the other schools, it is possible to divide them into the following groups (Da‘yf, 1968: 245; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 219-225): a) The first group which, on the whole, preferred the opinions of the Başran grammarians, such as al-Zajjāj (d. 310/922), Ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 316/928), al-Zajjājī (d. 337/948), and Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1001); b) The second which mostly preferred the views of the Kūfan grammarians, for example al-Ḥāmiḍ (d. 305/917) and Abū Bakr al-Anbārī (d. 327/938); c) The third which took on the observations of the Başran and Kūfan grammarians equally, such as al-Akhfāsh al-Ṣaghīr (d. 315/927), Ibn Kaysān (d. 320/932), and Niftawayh (d. 323/934).

By and large, Başran and Kūfan Arabic grammatical thinking are revealed by their fixed system of principle and structure, with Sibawayh and al-Mubarrid epitomising the Başran school, while the Kūfan school is exemplified by al-Farrā‘ and Tha‘lab. In addition, there is no difference between the Başran and Kūfan schools in terms of the fundamental rules of Arabic grammar; they differed on some issues largely because they differed in terms of the way they applied their methods (al-Sāmarrā‘ī, 1987: 94). Although there is some difference between them regarding terminology, it is the understanding of Modern Arabic linguists, that certain terms are synonymous; however, it seems that the Başrans depended on meaning or formal features, whereas the Kūfans based their usage on criteria of meaning (Owens, 1990: 150; Versteegh, 1993: 10-11). Furthermore, the Kūfan school never presented all its grammatical rules in a complete work, unlike the Başran school, where the Ma‘ānī l-Qur‘ān and Majālis Tha‘lab recorded the thinking of the Kūfan school, even though
they were unable to expound most of the rules of Arabic grammar. As a result of the difference between the Başran and Küfan schools regarding their methods, controversy appeared over certain rules of Arabic grammar, and subsequently the Baghdādian school grew by absorbing both schools.

3.3. **Modern works:**

In the Modern period, methodological criticism has begun to make an appearance, whereby modern linguists have criticised some of the methodologies of the Classical Arabic grammarians. In addition, they attempt to mention aspects that the classical grammarians omitted, or try to explain their rules clearly. Therefore, several studies have appeared in modern times, the most significant of which are mentioned here; they are divided into: a) Arabic works; and b) English works.

3.3.1 **Arabic works:**

First, to date there has been no book in Arabic that has received the high level of attention given to the Qurʾān. This is because it is believed to have been saved from distortion, and that it presents a coherent and ideal language. Several studies were undertaken in Başra that focused on the Qurʾānic text and its variant readings, and these studies led to concern for its language because the Qurʾān played a crucial role in developing the Arabic language (Rabin, 1955: 21; Owens, 1990: 5; Versteegh, 1997: 53). Thus classical grammarians regarded the Qurʾān as a first source for creating the rules of Arabic grammar, and looked in depth into its text in order to devise grammatical rules, so that Arabic grammar would conform to Qurʾānic structures.

Secondly, the Başran grammarians relied on 'poetry' a great deal; for example, Sibawayh alluded to more than a thousand lines. However, they placed a time limit for poetry that could be relied on, whereby they took

---

7 The variant Qurʾānic readings refer to the different ways of vocalising a word, case markers, form, and so on.
examples from pre-Islamic poetry and up to the middle of the second/eighth century (circa 140/757). Such citations came from poets such as al-Farazdag (d. 144/761) and Jarîr (d. 144/761) (al-Suyûṭî, 2006: 148; see also al-Sâmarrâ‘î, 1987: 20; al-Ḥudayṭî, 2002: 76). Certain trustworthy narrators are considered the main source to provide the grammarians with many poems: Abû ʿAmrû b. al-ʿAlâ (d. 159/775), al-Muqaddal al-Ḍabîbî (d. 178/794) and al-ʿAsmaʿî (d. 216/831), took examples from the Bedouins and poets themselves (cf. al-Zabîdî, 1997: 106).

**Thirdly,** the Başran grammarians went out to the Bedouins of Najd, Tuhâma, al-Ḥijâz and others found near the city of Başra, to listen to the narratives recounted by these people and then to write down what they had heard. In addition, they documented accounts and anecdotes from the tribes of Quraysh, Qays, Tamîm, Asad, Hudhayl and some of the Kinâna and Ṭayy until 150/767; however, Quraysh was considered the most eloquent speech because it was distant from foreigners influence (al-Suyûṭî, 2006: 101-4; see also ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, 1995: 103-4; Agius, 1984: 124; al-Ḥudayṭî, 2002: 75).

**Fourthly,** grammarians based their thought on a system called grammatical analogy (*al-qiyâs*). This system is based mainly on the usage in which the grammarians acknowledged the difference and similarity between two things (Versteegh, 1977: 111; Owens, 1990: 2; Sûsûr, 1985: 188). Thus, Classical Arabic grammarians looked into examples from the Qurʾān and spoken Arabic, whether poetry or prose, and then formulated rules in order to create an Arabic grammar on which all Arabic users have since come to rely. They focused on the relationship between the primary

---

8 According to Majmâ‘ al-lughâ l-ʿArabiyya (1934, I. 202), the Arabic language was modeled, until the second/eighth century, after the way people spoke in urban areas but as the language of the city became corrupt with non-Arabic usages the grammarians sought another model of correct speech, that of the Bedouins in the Arabian Peninsula because of its purity. This was true until the fourth/tenth century; after that there are no agreement as to whether the Bedouins or the urbanised areas were the right model for Classical Arabic.

9 “A parallel or similar instance, referred to because it helps the process of explanation” (Crystal: 1992, 19); or “a process by which words or morphemes are created or re-created on the model of existing linguistic patterns” (Versteegh *et al.* 2006, I: 74).
(al-maqis ‘alayh) and the secondary (al-maqis) in terms of meaning and form or one of them (‘Abd al-‘Azîz, 1995: 129). The Başran grammarians depended a great deal on this source from the earliest period, where it appears in Sibawayh’s al-Kitâb (Turzî, 1969: 121; Agius, 1984: 163-64; al-Zabîdî, 1997: 19).

The Başran grammarians did not rely on the Ḥadîth (the sayings and deeds of the Prophet), claiming that the Ḥadîth had not been passed on in the original words spoken by the Prophet Muḥammad. They argued that, the narrators had focused on the meaning of what the Prophet was saying rather than taking his form of expression into account; hence they did not report the Prophet’s exact utterances. The Başran grammarians also believed that the majority of narrators of Ḥadîth were not Arabic speakers of the Arabian Peninsula. Thus, they could not take the Ḥadîth as supporting evidence for their grammatical/syntactic rules (al-Makhzûmî, 1958: 52; Dayf, 1968: 19; al-Sâmarrâ’î, 1987: 26; al-Ḥudaythî, 2002: 77). According to Abû l-Ḥasan al-Dâ’î (680/1281), the first grammarian to rely on Ḥadîth for supporting grammatical rules was Ibn Kharûf (609/1212) (al-Sâmarrâ’î, 1987: 27; al-Ḥudaythî, 2002: 77). Abû Ḥayân (745/1344) observed somewhat later that Ibn Mâlik (672/1273) had also depended a great deal on Ḥadîth; possibly he was the first of the grammarians to use Ḥadîth as a main source for establishing grammatical rules (ibid)\textsuperscript{10}.

Many grammarians were reported as belonging to the Başran school. I mention here the most important: ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî Ishâq (117/735); ‘Isâ b. ‘Umar (149/766); al-Khalîl b. Aḥmad (170/786); Yûnûs b. Ḥabîb (182/798); Ya’qûb al-Ḥadrâmî (205/820); and Abû l-Ḥasan al-Akhfash (215/830) (cf. al-Zabîdî: nd, 33, 45, 51, 53, 54, 74). However, even though they were reported as the experts of the Başran school, none of their works have ever been located. Their contributions can be found in the most

important works emanating from the Başran school, i.e., Sībawayh's *al-Kitāb*, and al-Mubarrid's *al-Muqtaṣab* (The Extemporised), in which the views of such previous grammarians were recorded and extensively discussed. The works by Sībawayh and al-Mubarrid provide a clear and detailed record of the thinking of the Başran grammarians, and are considered as the most important works during this period, and as such I have chosen them as the basis of my examples and discussions in this thesis.

The Kūfan school followed the Başran school; though, according to most scholars who have studied the methods of these early schools, the inconsistencies between them do not suggest that Kūfan grammar was in any respect different to Başran grammar, but simply that there were some variations in terms of their methods (cf. al-Makhzūmī, 1958: 36 and 327; Dayf, 1968: 5; al-Sāmarrāʿī, 1987: 142; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 24). Moreover, Kūfan grammar was based on Başran grammar, and the early grammarians of the Kūfan school, such as al-Kīṣāʿī (d. 189/ 803) and al-Farrāʾ (d. 207/ 822), studied the fundamentals of knowledge established by the Başran grammarians (al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 128). The Kūfan school, nonetheless, used some different terms for certain concepts; for example, the Başran school called the genitive case marker *jarr*, while the Kūfan school called it *khafḍ* (Versteegh, 1993: 9).

By and large, the Kūfan school of thought relied on the sources on which the Başran school had depended, but the Kūfan school differed in the way these sources were dealt with (Figure 3):

**First**, the Kūfans were more interested in the Qurʾān and its readings than the Başran school; evidence of this appears in the way they dealt with various rules of grammar. In addition, they borrowed certain terminologies from Qurʾānic commentary which became standard in Arabic grammar (Dayf, 1968: 215; Versteegh, 1993: 174 and 197- 98). The study of Arabic grammar through Qurʾānic exegesis arose during this period, as is evident
from al-Farrāʾ’s *Maʿānī l-Qurʾān* (Explanations of The Qurʾān) through which he laid the beginnings of Kūfan reasoning.

**Secondly,** the Kūfan like the Başran grammarians relied on poetry but expanded the time period from pre-Islamic poetry up to the school’s flourishing time in the early fourth/tenth century. They borrowed from the poets who lived in the city of Kūfa, and also attended the caliphs’ courts (al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 139).

**Thirdly,** the Kūfāns went to meet the Bedouins of al-Ḥijāz, Najd, and Tuhāma, and the tribes of Tamīm, Asad and Nizār who lived near Kūfa (al-Makhzūmī, 1958: 330-331; Abū ʾl-Makārim, 1973: 36; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 139). They excelled in narration, which they took from the nomads as well as from urban populations, whereas the Başran grammarians had focused only on the Bedouins, believing that the urban dwellers had to deal with foreign people through trade, and that their languages were compromised by this mixing with non-Arabs.

**Fourthly,** the Kūfan grammarians based themselves on the Başran school, by attending to the discussions presented by their grammarians and what they had to say about one another. A main leading teacher of the Başran school reported that al-Farrāʾ, when he slept, put Sibawayh’s manuscript under his pillow as an indication of his respect to Sibawayh’s *al-Kitāb* (al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 141; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 138).

**Fifthly,** some linguists claimed that the Kūfan school applied grammatical analogy (*al-qiyās*) more than the Başrans, who were critical of *al-qiyās* (Dayf, 1968: 6); while others viewed the Kūfāns concentrating on the usage of hearing (*samāʾ*) more than *al-qiyās* (cf. Agius, 1984: 164).

Many grammarians belonged to the Kūfan school, including, for instance, Muʿādh al-Harrāʾ (d. 187/ 803), al-Kisāʾī, al-Farrāʾ and Thaʿlab (d. 291/903) (cf. al-Zabīdī: nd, 125, 130, 133, 150). The broad spectrum of opinions in the Kūfan school was set out in al-Farrāʾ’s *Maʿānī l-Qurʾān* and in Thaʿlab’s *Majālis Thaʿlab* (Thaʿlab’s Sessions).
This school arose when the science of Arabic grammar was well developed, and the majority of its rules had been created. Therefore, the opinions of the school’s grammarians were a mixture of those of the Başran and Kūfan schools, so the Baghdādians acknowledged only what was drawn from well established evidence. Their school started after the period of al-Mubarrid and Thaʿlab in the early fourth/tenth century; thus practically all grammarians of this period had their views influenced by those of the previous grammarians. They commented on the Başran and Kūfan views when discussing their own thinking. Dependence on the Ḥadīth in discussing or supporting the rules of Arabic grammar also made its appearance during this period.

Although the grammarians of this school relied on the views of both the other schools, it is possible to divide them into the following groups (Dayf, 1968: 245; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 219-225): a) The first group which, on the whole, preferred the opinions of the Başran grammarians, such as al-Zajjāj (d. 310/922), Ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 316/928), al-Zajjājī (d. 337/948), and Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1001); b) The second which mostly preferred the views of the Kūfan grammarians, for example al-Ḥāmid (d. 305/917) and Abū Bakr al-Anbārī (d. 327/938); c) The third which took on the observations of the Başran and Kūfan grammarians equally, such as al-Akhfash al-Ṣaghīr (d. 315/927), Ibn Kaysān (d. 320/932), and Niftawayh (d. 323/934).

By and large, Başran and Kūfan Arabic grammatical thinking are revealed by their fixed system of principle and structure, with Sibawayh and al-Mubarrid epitomising the Başran school, while the Kūfan school is exemplified by al-Farrāʾ and Thaʿlab. In addition, there is no difference between the Başran and Kūfan schools in terms of the fundamental rules of Arabic grammar; they differed on some issues largely because they differed in terms of the way they applied their methods (al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 94). Although there is some difference between them regarding terminology, it is the understanding of Modern Arabic linguists, that certain terms are synonymous; however, it seems that the Başrans depended on meaning or formal features, whereas the Kūfans based their
usage on criteria of meaning (Owens, 1990: 150; Versteegh, 1993: 10-11). Furthermore, the Kūfan school never presented all its grammatical rules in a complete work, unlike the Başran school, where the Maʿānī l-Qurʾān and Majālis Thaʿlab recorded the thinking of the Kūfan school, even though they were unable to expound most of the rules of Arabic grammar. As a result of the difference between the Başran and Kūfan schools regarding their methods, controversy appeared over certain rules of Arabic grammar, and subsequently the Baghdādian school grew by absorbing both schools.

3.3.2. English works:

First, to date there has been no book in Arabic that has received the high level of attention given to the Qurʾān. This is because it is believed to have been saved from distortion, and that it presents a coherent and ideal language. Several studies were undertaken in Başra that focused on the Qurʾānic text and its variant readings, and these studies led to concern for its language because the Qurʾān played a crucial role in developing the Arabic language (Rabin, 1955: 21; Owens, 1990: 5; Versteegh, 1997: 53). Thus classical grammarians regarded the Qurʾān as a first source for creating the rules of Arabic grammar, and looked in depth into its text in order to devise grammatical rules, so that Arabic grammar would conform to Qurʾānic structures.

Secondly, the Başran grammarians relied on ‘poetry’ a great deal; for example, Sibawayh alluded to more than a thousand lines. However, they placed a time limit for poetry that could be relied on, whereby they took examples from pre-Islamic poetry and up to the middle of the second/eighth century (circa 140/757). Such citations came from poets such as al-Farazdag (d. 144/761) and Jarīr (d. 144/761) (al-Suyūṭī, 2006: 148; see also al-Sāmarrāʿī, 1987: 20; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 76). Certain trustworthy narrators are considered the main source to provide the grammarians with many poems: Abū ʿAmr b. al-ʿAlā (d. 159/775), al-Mufaḍḍal al-Ḍabbī (d.

11 The variant Qurʾānic readings refer to the different ways of vocalising a word, case markers, form, and so on.
Thirdly, the Başran grammarians went out to the Bedouins of Najd, Tuhāma, al-Ḥijāz and others found near the city of Başra, to listen to the narratives recounted by these people and then to write down what they had heard. In addition, they documented accounts and anecdotes from the tribes of Quraysh, Qays, Tamīm, Asad, Hudhayl and some of the Kināna and Ṭayy until 150/767; however, Quraysh was considered the most eloquent speech because it was distant from foreigners influence (al-Suyūṭī, 2006: 101-4; see also Ābd al-ʿAzīz, 1995: 103-4; Agius, 1984: 124; al-Hudaythī, 2002: 75).

Fourthly, grammarians based their thought on a system called grammatical analogy (al-qiyās). This system is based mainly on the usage in which the grammarians acknowledged the difference and similarity between two things (Versteegh, 1977: 111; Owens, 1990: 2; Sūsūr, 1985: 188). Thus, Classical Arabic grammarians looked into examples from the Qurʾān and spoken Arabic, whether poetry or prose, and then formulated rules in order to create an Arabic grammar on which all Arabic users have since come to rely. They focused on the relationship between the primary (al-maqīs ʿalayh) and the secondary (al-maqīs) in terms of meaning and form or one of them (ʿĀbd al-ʿAzīz, 1995: 129). The Başran grammarians depended a great deal on this source from the earliest period, where it appears in Sibawayh's al-Kitāb (Ṭurzī, 1969: 121; Agius, 1984: 163-64; al-Zabīdī, 1997: 19).

---

12 According to Majmaʿ al-lughā 1-ʿArabiyya (1934, I. 202), the Arabic language was modeled, until the second/eighth century, after the way people spoke in urban areas but as the language of the city became corrupt with non-Arabic usages the grammarians sought another model of correct speech, that of the Bedouins in the Arabian Peninsula because of its purity. This was true until the fourth/tenth century; after that there are no agreement as to whether the Bedouins or the urbanised areas were the right model for Classical Arabic.

13 “A parallel or similar instance, referred to because it helps the process of explanation” (Crystal: 1992, 19); or “a process by which words or morphemes are created or re-created on the model of existing linguistic patterns” (Versteegh et al. 2006, I: 74).
The Başran grammarians did not rely on the Ḥadīth (the sayings and deeds of the Prophet), claiming that the Ḥadīth had not been passed on in the original words spoken by the Prophet Muḥammad. They argued that, the narrators had focused on the meaning of what the Prophet was saying rather than taking his form of expression into account; hence they did not report the Prophet’s exact utterances. The Başran grammarians also believed that the majority of narrators of Ḥadīth were not Arabic speakers of the Arabian Peninsula. Thus, they could not take the Ḥadīth as supporting evidence for their grammatical/ syntactic rules (al-Makhzūmī, 1958: 52; Dayf, 1968: 19; al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 26; al-Hudaythī, 2002: 77).

According to Abū l-Hasan al-Dāʾīc (d. 680/1281), the first grammarian to rely on Ḥadīth for supporting grammatical rules was Ibn Kharūf (d. 609/1212) (al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 27; al-Hudaythī, 2002: 77). Abū Ḥayān (d. 745/1344) observed somewhat later that Ibn Mālik (d. 672/1273) had also depended a great deal on Ḥadīth; possibly he was the first of the grammarians to use Ḥadīth as a main source for establishing grammatical rules (ibid).

Many grammarians were reported as belonging to the Başran school. I mention here the most important: ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Ishāq (d. 117/735); ʿIsā b. ʿUmar (d. 149/766); al-Khalīl b. Aḥmad (d. 170/786); Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (d. 182/798); Yaʿqūb al-Ḥadrāmī (d. 205/820); and Abū l-Ḥasan al-Akhfash (d. 215/830) (cf. al-Zabānd, 33, 45, 51, 53, 54, 74). However, even though they were reported as the experts of the Başran school, none of their works have ever been located. Their contributions can be found in the most important works emanating from the Başran school, i.e., Sibawayh’s al-Kitāb, and al-Mubarrid’s al-Muqtadab (The Extemporised), in which the views of such previous grammarians were recorded and extensively discussed. The works by Sibawayh and al-Mubarrid provide a clear and detailed record of the thinking of the Başran grammarians, and are considered as the most important works during this period, and as such I

---

have chosen them as the basis of my examples and discussions in this thesis.

The Kūfan school followed the Başran school; though, according to most scholars who have studied the methods of these early schools, the inconsistencies between them do not suggest that Kūfan grammar was in any respect different to Başran grammar, but simply that there were some variations in terms of their methods (cf. al-Makhzūmī, 1958: 36 and 327; Dayf, 1968: 5; al-Sāmarrā‘ī, 1987: 142; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 24). Moreover, Kūfan grammar was based on Başran grammar, and the early grammarians of the Kūfan school, such as al-Kisā‘ī (d. 189/803) and al-Farrā‘ (d. 207/822), studied the fundamentals of knowledge established by the Başran grammarians (al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 128). The Kūfan school, nonetheless, used some different terms for certain concepts; for example, the Başran school called the genitive case marker *jarr*, while the Kūfan school called it *khafḍ* (Versteegh, 1993: 9).

By and large, the Kūfan school of thought relied on the sources on which the Başran school had depended, but the Kūfan school differed in the way these sources were dealt with (Figure 3):

**First**, the Kūfans were more interested in the Qurʾān and its readings than the Başran school; evidence of this appears in the way they dealt with various rules of grammar. In addition, they borrowed certain terminologies from Qurʾānic commentary which became standard in Arabic grammar (Dayf, 1968: 215; Versteegh, 1993: 174 and 197-98). The study of Arabic grammar through Qurʾānic exegesis arose during this period, as is evident from al-Farrā‘s *Ma‘āni l-Qurʾān* (Explanations of The Qurʾān) through which he laid the beginnings of Kūfan reasoning.

**Secondly**, the Kūfan like the Başran grammarians relied on poetry but expanded the time period from pre-Islamic poetry up to the school’s flourishing time in the early fourth/tenth century. They borrowed from the
poets who lived in the city of Kūfa, and also attended the caliphs’ courts (al-Ḥudaythi, 2002: 139).

**Thirdly,** the Kūfans went to meet the Bedouins of al-Hijāz, Najd, and Tuhāma, and the tribes of Tamīm, Asad and Nizār who lived near Kūfa (al-Makhzūmī, 1958: 330-331; Abū l-Makārim, 1973: 36; al-Ḥudaythi, 2002: 139). They excelled in narration, which they took from the nomads as well as from urban populations, whereas the Başran grammarians had focused only on the Bedouins, believing that the urban dwellers had to deal with foreign people through trade, and that their languages were compromised by this mixing with non-Arabs.

**Fourthly,** the Kūfan grammarians based themselves on the Başran school, by attending to the discussions presented by their grammarians and what they had to say about one another. A main leading teacher of the Başran school reported that al-Farrāʾ, when he slept, put Sibawayh’s manuscript under his pillow as an indication of his respect to Sibawayh’s *al-Kitāb* (al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 141; al-Ḥudaythi, 2002: 138).

**Fifthly,** some linguists claimed that the Kūfan school applied grammatical analogy (*al-qiyās*) more than the Başrans, who were critical of *al-qiyās* (Ṣayf, 1968: 6); while others viewed the Kūfans concentrating on the usage of hearing (*samāʾ*) more than *al-qiyās* (cf. Agius, 1984: 164).

Many grammarians belonged to the Kūfan school, including, for instance, Muʿādh al-Harrāʾ (d. 187/ 803), al-Kisāʾī, al-Farrāʾ and Thaʿlab (d. 291/ 903) (cf. al-Zabidi: nd, 125, 130, 133, 150). The broad spectrum of opinions in the Kūfan school was set out in al-Farrāʾ’s *Maʿānī l-Qurʾān* and in Thaʿlab’s *Majālis Thaʿlab* (Thaʿlab’s Sessions).

This school arose when the science of Arabic grammar was well developed, and the majority of its rules had been created. Therefore, the opinions of the school’s grammarians were a mixture of those of the Başran and Kūfan schools, so the Baghdādians acknowledged only what was drawn from well established evidence. Their school started after the period of al-Mubarrid
and Tha‘lab in the early fourth/tenth century; thus practically all grammarians of this period had their views influenced by those of the previous grammarians. They commented on the Başran and Kūfan views when discussing their own thinking. Dependence on the Ḥadīth in discussing or supporting the rules of Arabic grammar also made its appearance during this period.

Although the grammarians of this school relied on the views of both the other schools, it is possible to divide them into the following groups (Dayf, 1968: 245; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 219-225): a) The first group which, on the whole, preferred the opinions of the Başran grammarians, such as al-Zajjāj (d. 310/922), Ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 316/928), al-Zajjājī (d. 337/948), and Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1011); b) The second which mostly preferred the views of the Kūfan grammarians, for example al-Ḥāmiḍ (d. 305/917) and Abū Bakr al-Anbārī (d. 327/938); c) The third which took on the observations of the Başran and Kūfan grammarians equally, such as al-Akhfash al-Ṣaghīr (d. 315/927), Ibn Kaysān (d. 320/932), and Niftawayh (d. 323/934).

By and large, Başran and Kūfan Arabic grammatical thinking are revealed by their fixed system of principle and structure, with Sibawayh and al-Mubarrid epitomising the Başran school, while the Kūfan school is exemplified by al-Farrā’ and Tha‘lab. In addition, there is no difference between the Başran and Kūfan schools in terms of the fundamental rules of Arabic grammar; they differed on some issues largely because they differed in terms of the way they applied their methods (al-Sāmarrā‘ī, 1987: 94). Although there is some difference between them regarding terminology, it is the understanding of Modern Arabic linguists, that certain terms are synonymous; however, it seems that the Başrans depended on meaning or formal features, whereas the Kūfans based their usage on criteria of meaning (Owens, 1990: 150; Versteegh, 1993: 10-11). Furthermore, the Kūfan school never presented all its grammatical rules in a complete work, unlike the Başran school, where the Maṣānī l-Qurān and Majālis Tha‘lab recorded the thinking of the Kūfan school, even though they were unable to expound most of the rules of Arabic grammar. As a
result of the difference between the Başran and Kūfan schools regarding their methods, controversy appeared over certain rules of Arabic grammar, and subsequently the Baghdādian school grew by absorbing both schools.

3.4. Conclusion:

The Başran grammarians did not rely on the Ḥadīth (the sayings and deeds of the Prophet), claiming that the Ḥadīth had not been passed on in the original words spoken by the Prophet Muhammad. They argued that, the narrators had focused on the meaning of what the Prophet was saying rather than taking his form of expression into account; hence they did not report the Prophet’s exact utterances. The Başran grammarians also believed that the majority of narrators of Ḥadīth were not Arabic speakers of the Arabian Peninsula. Thus, they could not take the Ḥadīth as supporting evidence for their grammatical/syntactic rules (al-Makhzūmī, 1958: 52; Īṣaf, 1968: 19; al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 26; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 77).

According to Abū l-Ḥasan al-Dāʾī (d. 680/1281), the first grammarian to rely on Ḥadīth for supporting grammatical rules was Ibn Khārīf (d. 609/1212) (al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 27; al-Ḥudaythī, 2002: 77). Abū Ḥayān (d. 745/1344) observed somewhat later that Ibn Mālik (d. 672/1273) had also depended a great deal on Ḥadīth; possibly he was the first of the grammarians to use Ḥadīth as a main source for establishing grammatical rules (ibid).15

By and large, Başran and Kūfan Arabic grammatical thinking are revealed by their fixed system of principle and structure, with Sibawayh and al-Mubarrid epitomising the Başran school, while the Kūfan school is exemplified by al-Farrāʾ and Thaʿlab. In addition, there is no difference between the Başran and Kūfan schools in terms of the fundamental rules of Arabic grammar; they differed on some issues largely because they differed in terms of the way they applied their methods (al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1987: 26).

1987: 94). Although there is some difference between them regarding terminology, it is the understanding of Modern Arabic linguists, that certain terms are synonymous; however, it seems that the Başrans depended on meaning or formal features, whereas the Kūfans based their usage on criteria of meaning (Owens, 1990: 150; Versteegh, 1993: 10-11). Furthermore, the Kūfan school never presented all its grammatical rules in a complete work, unlike the Başran school, where the Ma‘āni l-Qur‘ān and Majālis Tha‘lab recorded the thinking of the Kūfan school, even though they were unable to expound most of the rules of Arabic grammar. As a result of the difference between the Başran and Kūfan schools regarding their methods, controversy appeared over certain rules of Arabic grammar, and subsequently the Baghdādian school grew by absorbing both schools.
CHAPTER FOUR
Parts of Speech and Types of Sentence

4.1. Introduction:

Parts of speech are classes of words which combine together to form sentences. The part of speech determines how the word is used within various contexts.

Research into parts of speech started from the earliest studies on language; they represent communication, whether in speech or writing. Types of sentence cannot be studied before studying the parts of speech, since the meaning of the sentence is derived from the function of the parts of speech. It is generally agreed that the classification of parts of speech is one of the most important elements in linguistics (Weiss, 1976: 34; Suleiman, 1990: 245). Discussion about this issue in the Arabic language started, as it is believed, as early in the times of Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib who said to Abū l-Aswad al-Duʿailī (d. 69/688): "all [that concerns] speech is a noun, verb or particle" (al-Qūzī, 1981: 27; al-Ṭanṭāwī, 1995: 24). Following this statement of definition Arabic grammarians took to discussing these parts of speech explaining how every issue in language works in written and formal speech.

Because every sentence or speech is produced from these constituents, this chapter will discuss several issues, as follows:

A- Parts of speech (noun, verb and particle) and their features.
B- The definition of some terminology in the description of the Arabic word and sentence.
C- Common Arabic sentence components.
D- The structure of Arabic sentences.
E- Types of sentence.
F- The structure of the verbal sentence.
4.2. Parts of speech:

Every language has parts of speech, but they differ from one to another; Arabic, for example, has three parts of speech, viz, noun, verb and particle (Figure 5). Sibawayh noted in his introduction that (1988, I: 12): "the word is a noun, verb or particle which has a particular meaning independently of a noun or verb". According to al-Mubarrid, every language has these parts of speech (1994, I: 141). Early Arabic grammarians, whether Başran or Kūfan, and other later scholars agreed on this classification (al-Zajjājī (d. 340/ 951) (1979: 41) and Ibn Fāris ( d. 395/ 1004) (1910: 49). However, Abū Ja’far Ahmad b. Ṣābir al-Qaysī (d. 662/ 1263) added one more part of speech to these which he called *al-khālīfa*, that is, the verbal noun *ism al-fā’l* (al-Suyūṭī, nd, III: 69). Grammarians who came after Sibawayh observed the features of parts of speech by analysing them morphologically, syntactically and semantically because these parts had been identified without any definition.

![Diagram of Arabic parts of speech](image)

Figure 5: Arabic parts of speech

4.2.1. Noun:

The noun is what indicates an individual meaning, whether it is person or thing (Ibn al-Sarrāj, 1973, I: 2). This part is an important element in Arabic, because no type of sentence can be composed without a noun. Some features which distinguish the Arabic noun from other parts of speech are shown in (Figure 6):

---

16 "Al-kalimu kulluhu ismun wa-fā’lun wa-ḥarfun jā’a li-ma’an laysa bi-ismin wa-lā fī’lin”.
17 Ḥassān (1994, 89) claims that al-Farrāʾ added this part.
This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice.
The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

Finally, a noun is any of a class of words that are distinguished by having plural and possessive endings; it comes as subject with either types of sentence, or predicate in the nominal sentence and object in the verbal sentence, and it designates persons, places and things (Lyons, 1977: 425).

4.2.2 Verb:

This part of speech comes in the second group of the Arabic parts of speech classification, after the noun, because a sentence could be structured without it (i.e., a nominal sentence). However, there are some features that belong to the Arabic verb which do not occur with other parts of speech, as shown in (Figure 7):

---

18 Every verbal form in Arabic contains a root and stem. The root contains the radical letters of a verbal form, representing the basic meaning of the word and typically is classified according to the number and type of constituent phonemes (Gene, 1962: 360; Beeston, 1970: 72), as drs is the root of the verbal form DaRaSa 'he studied'. Then the vowels added to the root forms a stem (al-Muzayni, 1994: 1), as in jalasa/yajlisu 'He sat/sits'; both of these stems are taken from jis root.
This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in
Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

Finally, the verb is a class of word which is placed as the predicate element musnad of the verbal sentence, and it expresses an action or state, and carries a tense, aspect and mood (Lyons, 1977: 425).

4.2.3 Particle:

It is a word which does not have the characteristics of the noun or verb. In other words, it is the word which "has a meaning by virtue of referring to another word" (Ibn Jinnī, 1988: 16; Owens, 1989: 215) or the word which has meaning only when it stands together with other words (noun or verb). Accordingly, the particle could change the type of aspect or tense of the nominal or verbal sentence without, however, affecting the type of sentence (Peled, 2009: 14).

4.3 Modern linguists’ points of view about parts of speech:

As said earlier, the majority of Early Arabic grammarians agreed on the part of speech classification of noun, verb and particle. However, some modern linguists disagree with this because they claim that there are some words which cannot be classified in this way. Thus, they have attempted a re-classification.  

Ibārīm Anīs, for example, adds the pronoun (al-damīr) to these parts of speech, which he categorises as undefined nouns (al-asma). The pioneers of the modern classification will be mentioned.

---

19 The pioneers of the modern classification will be mentioned.
Under this heading, This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent's place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.
By contrast, English grammar typically defines eight parts of speech (Sweet: 1898, 54-144; Abbott, 1905: 15-83; Fries, 1957: 65; Gleason, 1965: 114-15; Milne et al. 1970: 15-49; Huddleston, 1984: 90-91) namely (Figure 8):

![Diagram of parts of speech]

Figure 8: The parts of speech of English

1- noun which indicates substance and the name of living or lifeless being, as illustrated by following two examples 9a and 9b:

*S. 9a)*

The **man** came.

*S. 9b)*

The **house** was built.

Substance-nouns are divided into two types: a. common nouns, as 'man', 'house', b. proper names, such as 'Mark'.

2- verb which indicates phenomena (i.e., changing attributes), verb, also, denotes actions and carries inflection of aspect and tense, as examples 10a and 10b below show:

*S. 10a)*

Tom **studies**.

*S. 10b)*

Tom **studied**.

3- adjective that indicates the attributes of substance-words, or the word which describes a noun or pronoun, as the example in 11:

*S. 11)*

A **famous** teacher retired.
4- adverbs qualifying time, manner, quantity, cause etc, as exemplified in 12a- 12d:

*S. 12a)* Today I am going to Rome.
*S. 12b) The boy walks slowly.
*S. 12c) John will be greatly missed by his children.
*S. 12d) Rebecca is tired. Therefore, she will leave.

5- pronoun which largely expresses a general meaning and used as instead of noun, as illustrated by S. 13:

*S. 13) She drank water.

6- preposition is a small word which occurs before a noun phrase making a prepositional phrase (Hurford, 1994: 190), as illustrated in S. 14:

*S. 14) I will go to school after ten o'clock.

7- conjunction which joins sentences or parts of a sentence together, as shown in S. 15:

*S. 15) John and Mark went home.

It is classified according to its meaning to: a. affirmative, as 'and'; b. alternative, as 'or'; c. negative, as 'neither...nor'; d. adversative, as 'but'; e. concessive, as 'though'; f. hypothetical, as 'if'; g. temporal, as 'before'; and h. causal, as 'because'.

8- interjection that is "an outcry to express pain, surprise, anger, pleasure, or some other emotion" (Huddleston, 1984: 91), like ‘oh’, and as the example 16:

*S. 16) Hey! I have not seen you for a while!

The English parts of speech can be classified also into two types: a) the 'open' which includes noun, verb, adjective and adverb; b) the 'closed' type that includes the rest of parts of speech (Huddleston, 1988: 23; Khalil, 2010: 35).
To sum up, although English grammar defines eight parts of speech, Arabic also includes all these. In the traditional classification, however, as discussed, Arabic has three, though it must be said that the Arabic noun corresponds to the English noun, adjective, adverb, and pronoun; the verb part too in Arabic corresponds to the English verb, whereas the particle in Arabic corresponds to the English preposition and conjunction. Moreover, although the Classical Arabic classification is brief, it covers all classes of words. So we do not require Modern classification of Arabic parts of speech. That is, the modern analysis of parts of speech is not consistent, and all parts that are added relate to the noun because the features of the noun which the grammarians mentioned could be applied to those parts. Furthermore, Hurford (1994: 150) claims that a noun and verb are more basic parts of speech than others in almost all languages because the sentence usually contains and relies in many ways on these parts.

4.4. The definition of some terminology regarding the Arabic word and sentence:

Before I discuss the constituents of either word, phrase or sentence, it is useful to examine some terminology which the Early Arabic grammarians used (Figure 9):

![Terminology regarding the word and sentence diagram]

Figure 9: Some terminology regarding the Arabic word and sentence

4.4.1. Word (*al-kalima*):
It denotes one word whether a noun or verb. The noun or verb has a singular meaning; in other words, it is a single unit of vocabulary which expresses a complete singular meaning, as in *al-kursī* 'the chair' (Ibn ʿAqīl, 1980, I: 16); this corresponds to the modern linguistic term morpheme²⁰ (Levin et al. 1986: 423).

4.4.2. Speech (*al-kālim*):
The group of words which give a complete meaning, as exemplified in 16:

*S. 16*  
khārāja  ʿAlīyyun musrīʿan  
went out- 3ms ʾAlī- nom indef- quickly- accus  
= ʾAlī went out quickly.

4.4.3. Group of words (*al-kalīm*):
It is the generic noun (*ism jīns*) of *al-kalīma*. It means a group of three words or more, whether it gives a complete meaning or not, as shown in the following examples 17a and 17b:

*S. 17a*  
jāʿa ʿAlīyyun ilā l-ḥaflatī  
came- 3ms ʾAlī- nom prep- to def-party- gen  
= ʾAlī came to the party.

*S. 17b*  
*in jāʿa ʿAlīyyun musrīʿan*  
part- if came- 3ms ʾAlī- nom indef- quickly- accus  
= *If ʾAlī came quickly.*

The difference between 'words' and 'speech' is an independent meaning not a condition with 'words', while it is a condition in 'speech'; so 'words' is more general than 'speech' in terms of the meaning. In addition, 'words' are composed of three words at least, whereas 'speech' could be composed from two words only or more than two, thus 'speech' is more general in terms of the structure.

4.4.4. Utterance (*al-qawl*):

---
²⁰ “Morpheme: the minimal distinctive unit of grammar, and the central concern of morphology. Its original motivation was as alternative to the notion of the word, which had proved to be difficult to work with in comparing languages” (Crystal: 1980, 231).
It is everything which gives meaning; hence it includes all the terminology mentioned above.

4.4.5. Form (al-lafz):
It is a group of sounds (hurūf) which are pronounced together as one unit whether they give meaning or not, as in rajul 'a man' and qū 'group of sounds that do not give a meaning' (Ibn ʿAqīl, 1980, I: 14; Levin et al. 1986: 430).

4.4.6. Sentence (al-jumla):
Although Sībawayh’s book is considered to be the first on Arabic grammar and establishes most, but not all, of the terminology of Arabic linguistics, it does not include the term jumla because his focus was on clarifying views regarding the use of sentence by employing examples and he was not interested in terminology. Other grammarians who came later added this terminology (ʿAbd al-Łatīf, 2003: 30). As far as I know al-Mubarrid (d. 285/898) is the first grammarian who employed jumla to explain the function of a sentence\(^{21}\). There is though a difference of opinion among Arabic grammarians about the use of terms for ‘sentence’ and ‘speech’, where some of them have claimed that they are the same thing. Ibn Ḫiṣām said in his book al-Khaṣāʿīs (nd, I: 17): ‘speech’ is everything which gives a complete meaning and has an independent structure; this is what the grammarians called ‘sentence’. Consider the following examples in 18a and 18b:

\[
\begin{align*}
S. 18a) & \\
& Zaydun \quad akhū-ka \\
& \quad Zayd- nom \quad def- brother- nom- pro- your \\
& = Zayd is your brother.
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
S. 18b) & \\
& qāma \quad Zaydun \\
& \quad stood up- 3ms \quad Zayd- nom \\
& = Zayd stood up.
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{21}\) He said "wa-innamā kāna l-fāʿīlu rafʿan li-annahu huwa wa-l-fāʿīlu jumla" 'the agent takes a nominative case because the verb and agent is a sentence' (al-Mubarrid, 1994, I: 146).
The majority of the Arabic grammarians have taken the view that 'speech' and 'sentence' are different in meaning. That is, 'speech' is given a complete meaning, while 'sentence' may or may not contain a complete meaning, i.e., the essential point of a 'sentence' is that it includes two elements: predicate (musnad) and subject (musnad ilayh). Therefore, every 'speech' includes a 'sentence' because a complete meaning is necessary in the 'speech' but not in the 'sentence', and sometimes 'speech' includes more than one 'sentence'.

However, not every 'sentence' includes 'speech' because a 'sentence' might or might not have a complete meaning, so the difference between 'sentence' and 'speech' is considered in a complete meaning or not. Al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1143) said:

The speech is called sentence but the right view is that the sentence is more general than speech (as al-Zamakhsharī claimed) because a complete meaning is a condition in the speech unlike the sentence, a view shared by Ibn Hishām (Ibn Hishām, 2000, V: 8).

Finally, some structures could be called either speech or sentence, as in sentences 18a and 18b above, because they give an independent meaning and they are composed from the predicate and subject only.

4.5. The common components of an Arabic sentence:

Parts of speech are constituents consisting of components that make an Arabic structure of speech, namely (Figure 10):

---

22 A complete meaning cannot be achieved without the predicate and subject. However, the structure that contains these elements may not give a complete meaning.
This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.
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Whereas the English sentence structures has four basic components according to Milne, Jupp (1970: 32) and Palmer (1971: 72-73), as follows in (Figure 11):

Figure 11: The common English sentence components

1- Noun and verb, (sentence 26):
   S. 26) Tom comes.

2- Noun, verb and adjective, (sentence 27):
   S. 27) Tom is tall.

3- Noun, verb and noun, (sentence 28):
   S. 28) Tom is a teacher.

4- Noun, verb, noun and noun, (sentence 29):
   S. 29) Tom is a teacher and priest.
4.6. The fundamental elements of an Arabic sentence:

All languages have a particular structure to form their sentences, and the structure is essentially based on parts of speech. Arabic sentences have two fundamental elements, and neither of them can exist without the other (Levin, 1981: 145), namely, the predicate (al-musnad) and the subject (al-musnad ilayh) (Figure 12) and the relation holding between these is called the attribution (al-isnād). The attribution issue is the result of a syntactic and semantic analysis not a morphological one, where the verb darasa 'studies', for example, is not given a complete attribution without its subject (al-musnad ilayh), viz, the agent, ʿAli, for example. This subject also supports the sentence to give a complete meaning. Arabic grammarians have discussed these parts since the first ever written Arabic grammar. Sibawayh mentioned this issue at the beginning of his book; he said (1988, I: 23): "that the predicate and the subject cannot exist one without the other and the speaker cannot avoid using them."

Arabic grammarians have called these parts (predicate and subject) essential (ʿumda) which means that a complete sentence cannot be constituted without them. Thus, the grammarians have defined the Arabic sentence as a structure in which the subject and the predicate are the main components (Weiss, 1985: 610). Other parts are called optional items (faḍla) which means that the sentence can be structured without them. They are constituents which are not the subject and the predicate like a direct object (al-mafʿūl bih), as the example in (30) shows:

\[ \text{qara’a} \quad \text{‘Aliyyun} \quad \text{kitāban} \]

---

23 "ḥadhḥā bahu l-musnadi wa-l-musnadi ilayhi wa-humā mā lā yughnī wāhidun minhumā ‘ini l-akhirī wa-lā yajjyu l-mutakalimu minhu budd".
Because of the Arabic grammarians' concern with 'attribution' and its significance in the Arabic sentence, it is important to demonstrate it in more detail.

### 4.6.1. *Al-musnad:*

*Al-musnad* denotes the predicate, which is also called *al-mutahaddath bih* or *al-mukhbar bih*. This part of the sentence occurs as a verb or noun like the comment of the nominal sentence (*al-khabar*). That is, it comes with both types of sentence; the verbal sentence (*al-jumla l-fī'līyya*) and the nominal sentence (*al-jumla l-ismīyya*), as illustrated by the following two examples 31a and 31b:

**S. 31a)**

\[
\text{darasa} \quad \text{onacci}\text{nom}\text{nom} \quad \text{read- 3ms} \quad \text{Ali- nom} \quad \text{indef- book- accus}
\]

\[= \text{Ali read a book.}\]

**S. 31b)**

\[
\text{Muhammadun} \quad \text{indef- plumber- nom} \quad \text{Muhammad- nom} \quad \text{Muhammad is a plumber.}
\]

### 1.6.2. *Al-musnad ilayh:*

*Al-musnad ilayh* denotes the subject, and is also called *al-mutahaddath ḍanh* or *al-mukhbar ḍanh*. It occurs only as a noun like the topic and the agent or deputy agent, i.e., it comes with the verbal sentence whether active or passive and the nominal sentence. Consider the structure of the following sentences 32a- 32c:

\[
\text{jā’a} \quad \text{Aliyyun} \quad \text{came- 3ms} \quad \text{Ali- nom}
\]
The predicate element is a wider part than the subject, since the predicate may be a verb or noun, while the subject of a sentence can only be a noun. Abū Ḥayyān claimed (1947, II: 13-15): "some grammarians believed that the subject is *al-musnad ilayh*, and the predicate is *al-musnad*, a view that I share; accordingly, 'Zayd' in sentences *qāma* Zaydun and in *Zaydun qāʿimun* is subject, and 'qāma' and 'qāʿimun' are predicate."

According to this classification, the predicate may precede or follow the subject whether in the verbal or nominal sentence and this issue will be demonstrated when types of sentences are discussed. By comparison with Arabic, the predicate in English occurs as a verb, and the subject occurs as a noun or pronoun (Vallins, 1966: 66; Crystal, 1986: 94; Burton-Roberts, 1986: 33). The Arabic verbal sentence then could be compared with the English sentence, where both of them contain a verb and noun. i.e., these sentences cannot be structured without these fundamental parts.

**4.7. The structure of a sentence:**

In Arabic, there are two possible sentence structures, namely (Figure 13):
4.7.1. The simple sentence (*al-jumla l-basīṭa*):

The clause or sentence includes one event (*ḥadath wāḥid*) or a singular attribution *isnād mufrad* only, like components 1, 2, 4 and 8 above. The Arabic sentence cannot be composed by one word in an original constitution because the basic sentence is composed by the predicate (*al-musnad*) and the subject (*al-musnad ilayh*) in the same way as English (Sweet: 1898, 16-17).

4.7.2. The compound sentence (*al-jumla l-murakkaba*):

The compound sentence includes more than one attribution or idea in the same structure, the same as that of a simple sentence, like 3, 5, 6, and 7 components above. In this structure, a compound sentence contains two predicates and two subjects at least. Maṣuma ʿAbd al-Ṣāhib (2008: 47) claims that a compound sentence, similar to the one in (S. 25), has a predicate clause. However, this claim seems to be inappropriate since other compound sentences, which include more than attribution, do not have clause predicates as in (S. 21) above.

By contrast, English has two structure clauses, namely:

1- The simple structure, consists of subject and verb, or subject, verb and whatever completers\(^{24}\). Consider sentences 33a and 33b:

*S. 33a*) Tom comes.

*S. 33b*) Tom is writing an essay.

---

\(^{24}\) Completer is any word which comes after basic structure (subject and verb).
2- The compound structure, includes more than one simple sentence joined by means of coordination (Fries, 1957: 30; Clarke et al. 1966: 3 and 29), for example (S. 34):

*S. 34) I bought a gift yesterday and posted it to my brother.*

### 4.8. Types of sentences:

This topic has been the subject of discussion by Modern Arabic grammarians but the Early Arabic grammarians discussed this rather sporadically. We find two types of sentences: nominal and verbal sentences\(^{25}\) (Figure 14):

![Figure 14: Types of Arabic sentence](image_url)

1- The nominal sentence (*al-jumla l-ismiyya*), as in (S. 35):

*S. 35) ^cAliyyun kātibun^ cAli- nom indef- writer- nom = ^cAli is a writer.*

2- The verbal sentence (*al-jumla l-fi`liyya*), as in the following sentence:

*S. 36) qāma ^cAliyyun stood up- 3ms ^cAli- nom = ^cAli stood up.*

There is, however, a controversy among the grammarians in terms of the definition of what a nominal and verbal sentence is in Arabic (Ibn Hiṣhām, 2000, V: 13-28). It is claimed by some that the nominal sentence always

---

\(^{25}\) There is a controversy in terms of the classification of Arabic sentences (cf. al-Dujani: 1978, 77). However, I will point out the well-known view because this does not relate to our topic, namely, the verbal sentence.
starts with a noun, as shown by sentence 35, while the verbal sentence always starts with a verb (sentence 36 above). This is the view of the Başran school of thought (cf. al-Sayyid, 2004: 21), who argue that a nominal sentence starts with a noun word even if it contains a verb (Sibawayh, 1988, I: 92; al-Mubarrid, 1994, IV: 128), as in the following example:

Sentence 37:

\[ S.\ 37) \quad \text{Aliyyun} \quad qāma \\
\quad \text{Ali- nom} \quad \text{stood up- 3ms} \\
\quad = \text{Ali stood up.} \]

In this sentence they argue that \text{Ali} is the topic (\textit{mubtada}), even though the predicate in both sentences 36 and 37 is still the verb, i.e. \textit{qāma} 'stood up'. These grammarians have, however, taken the view that some structures are verbal sentences, even though they start with a noun. Consider sentence 38:

Sentence 38:

\[ S.\ 38) \quad \text{idhā} \quad \text{l-\textit{dayfu} kharaja sawfa anāmu} \\
\quad \text{part- when} \quad \text{def-guest- nom left- 3ms part-will 1ms-sleep} \\
\quad = \text{When the guest leaves I will sleep.} \]

i.e., the first part of this structure (\textit{al-\textit{dayfu kharaja}}) is regarded as the verbal sentence by the Başran school, irrespective of the noun preceding the verb (Ibn Hishām, 2000, V: 15-16; see also al-Makhzūmī, 1986: 43). It is noted that this group does not rely upon the attribution structure and meaning of the whole sentence.

Other grammarians considered the nominal sentence to be one starting with a noun, while the verbal sentence is one starting with a verb, neither assumption being precise. They attempted to find a more accurate definition by employing an attribution structure, i.e., the place of predicate and the subject inside these types of sentence (al-Makhzūmī, 1986: 39-44). They believe that in the nominal sentence the predicate and subject are nouns. Therefore, the topic of this sentence may occur as a proper noun or a pronoun, and the comment of this sentence may be an adjective, a prepositional phrase or adverb, (as in sentences 39a to 39d, respectively), because these parts are a sub-class of noun. In addition, the topic is placed
in the first position in these sentences which is the original order in the nominal sentence, but this order is not a condition.

\[ S. 39a) \quad \text{anta} \quad \text{karīmūn} \]
\[ \text{pro- you} \quad \text{indef- generous- nom} \]
\[ = \text{You are generous.} \]

\[ S. 39b) \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} \quad \text{naḥīfūn} \]
\[ ^{c}\text{Alī- nom} \quad \text{indef- thin- nom} \]
\[ = ^{c}\text{Alī is thin.} \]

\[ S. 39c) \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} \quad \text{fī} \quad \text{l-bayti} \]
\[ ^{c}\text{Alī- nom} \quad \text{prep- at} \quad \text{def- home- gen} \]
\[ = ^{c}\text{Alī is at home.} \]

\[ S. 39d) \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} \quad ^{c}\text{inda-ka} \]
\[ ^{c}\text{Alī- nom} \quad \text{adv- with- pro- you} \]
\[ = ^{c}\text{Alī is with you.} \]

On the other hand, they consider the verbal sentence to be one in which its predicate is a verb and the subject a noun, whether the verb is placed before the noun or after. This is according to the Kūfan thinking, Ibn al-ʿArif and Ibn Mālik's point of view (Ibn Hishām, 2000, V: 28; al-Sayyid, 2004: 21), is also supported by the purists according to Jamāl al-Dīn (1984: 249). The grammarians of this group take the view that both sentences 40a and 40b below are verbal sentences, since the predicate in both sentences is a verb.

\[ S. 40a) \quad \text{qāma} \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} \]
\[ \text{stood up- 3ms} \quad ^{c}\text{Alī- nom} \]
\[ = ^{c}\text{Alī stood up.} \]

\[ S. 40b) \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} \quad \text{qāma} \]
\[ ^{c}\text{Alī- nom} \quad \text{stood up- 3ms} \]
\[ = ^{c}\text{Alī stood up.} \]
I believe that a nominal sentence contains a predicate and subject which are nouns, whereas the verbal sentence, has a predicate is a verb and a subject which is a noun whether the verb precedes the noun or not; this is for several reasons, namely:

1- The meaning of both sentence (40a and 40b above) is similar, and the difference between them is that the verb precedes the noun in the first sentence, while the noun precedes the verb in the second. This depends upon two factors, the meaning and rhetorical purpose or pre-posing and post-posing (al-taqdim wa-l-ta’khîr). I.e., sentence 40a is concerned with the event and tense (qâma), and this is the original constitution in the verbal sentence. However, sentence 40b is concentrated upon the subject of the event (׳Alî) who did the event, while the event and tense of this sentence come on the second stage.

2- When sentence 40b above is regarded as a nominal sentence, this structure becomes compound sentence in terms of its syntactic structure, i.e., the first sentence of this structure is the topic and its comment, and the second sentence is the verb (qâma) with its agent, that is, it is a hidden pronoun (damîr mustatîr) (huwa ‘he’). Although the Baṣran grammarians claimed that this sentence 40b is the same as sentence 40a in meaning, they differed in the classification of the type of sentence (al-Makhzûmî, 1986: 42 and 43). This difference is against the general concept which all the Arabic grammarians agree on, namely, kullu ziyâdatin fî l-mabná tadullu ‘alâ ziyâdatin fî l-ma‘nâ ‘each addition to the structure denotes an addition in the meaning’ (Ibn Jinni, nd, II: 3; Abû l-Makârim, 2007: 12; Hawash, 1999: 55). However, even if they believed that such a sentence is a verbal sentence, they have still preserved an important concept.

---

26 These reasons will be mentioned in detail because there is a huge controversy in terms of this issue, so I will attempt to clarify this issue to show the right view, and sometimes I require mentioning another groups evidence in order to clarify this point and respond to this evidence.

27 This construction contains two kinds of sentence: the first one is a nominal sentence and the other a verbal sentence as the Baṣran’s school thought.
3- For Başran grammarians, a nominal sentence which is initiated by a noun, can be taken as a verbal sentence when initiated by the conditional particle *harf al-shart*, although the verb is still prefixed by a noun (Ibn Hishām, 2000, V: 15-16; see also al-Makhzūmī, 1986: 43). This idea is illustrated by the following example:

*S. 41)*  

\[
\text{in } ^c\text{Aliyyun qāma fa-sa-ughādiru} \\
\text{part- if } ^c\text{Ali- nom stood up- 3ms part- will-1ms- leave} \\
= \text{If } ^c\text{Alī stood up I will leave.}
\]

The Başran grammarians did not give any reasonable evidence for this difference. The Başran grammarians hold the view that some particles (i.e. the conditional particles) affect the sentence type. For them, the negative particles lack such influence. This idea is clarified by the following example.

*S. 42)*

\[
\text{lam ya-ṭi } ^c\text{Aliyyun} \\
\text{neg- not 3ms- comes } ^c\text{Ali- nom} \\
= ^c\text{Alī did not come.}
\]

On the other hand, the Kūfan grammarians see no difference between nominal and verbal sentences even when the sentence is initiated by a conditional particle (al-Farrāʾ, 1980, I: 422). Accordingly, their classification of the sentence types seems accurate.

4- Ibn Hishām was one of the grammarians who classified the sentence according to its initial constituent. He argued that if the sentence appears after the *wāw* of coordination (as in S. 43 below), it is taken to be a verbal sentence although it starts with a noun.

*S. 43)*

\[
\text{qa-ṭada } ^c\text{Aliyyun wa-Ṭāriqu qāma} \\
\text{sat down- 3ms } ^c\text{Ali- nom part-and-Ṭāriq- nom stood up-3ms} \\
= ^c\text{Alī sat down and -Ṭāriq stood up.}
\]

He took the view that there is a verb deleted after the *wāw* 'and' of coordination, because he believed that there is no coordination between a
verbal and nominal sentence. Therefore, the sentence (qaʿada ʿAliyyun wa-qāma Ṭariqun qāma) is here composed of three sentences i.e., 1) qaʿada ʿAliyyun 'Ali sat down', 2) qāma Ṭariqun 'Tariq stood up', and 3) qāma huwa 'he stood up' (Ibn Hishām, 2000, V: 27). Ibn Hisham's analysis yields a deviant structure and interpretation which is not common in the Arabic language. What is needed is a simpler analysis which rests on the existence of two verbal sentences in that structure.

5- With the dual and plural, vowel marks suffixed to the verb are preceded by an agent, i.e., /-ā/ with the dual form, and /-ū/ with plural form. This idea can be illustrated by the examples in S. 44a and S. 44b:

**S. 44a)**  
al-mudirānī  
def- two directors- nom- d  
came- 3md  
= The two directors came.

**S. 44b)**  
al-mudirūnā  
def- directors- nom- p  
came- 3mp  
= The directors came.

These long vowels /-ā/ and /-ū/ suffixed to the verb, however, are not pronouns as grammarians who have relied upon the first word have claimed. In addition, I believe that the possibility of adding a long vowel to a verb is expected as it indicates that this word order (SVO) is not the basic order in the sentence even if two structures (VSO and SVO) can be accepted. According to Ibrāhīm Muṣṭafā in his book *Iḥyāʾ al-nahw* (1992: 56- 58), he claims that these long vowels are a consequence of the subject advancement whether in the nominal or verbal sentence. When the predicate is placed at the beginning, there is no agreement between the predicate and the subject whether in the nominal or verbal sentence, as in the following examples (S 45a and 45b):

**S. 45a)**  
jāʾa  
came- 3ms  
def- engineers- nom- p  
= The engineers came.

---

28 This idea will be discussed later in the thesis.
On the other hand, there is an agreement when the subject precedes the predicate (al-Farrâ’i, 1980, II: 386); consider S 46a and 46b:

S. 46a)  
\begin{align*}
\text{al-muhandisûna} & \quad jâ³-û \\
\text{def- engineers- nom- p} & \quad \text{came- 3mp}
\end{align*}
  = The engineers came.

S. 46b)  
\begin{align*}
\text{al-muhandisûna} & \quad qâdimûn \\
\text{def- engineers- nom- p} & \quad \text{indef- are coming- nom- ap}
\end{align*}
  = The engineers are coming.

Consequently, the agreement issue is the result of the pre-posing and post-posing feature whether in the nominal or verbal sentence.

6- Banî l-Hârith and Azdî Shanû’s dialects of Early Arabic had agreement between the predicate and the subject even if the predicate preceded the subject, and this one finds in the Qur’an, as shown in sentences 47a (Sûrat al-Mâ’îda, V: 71) and 47b (Sûrat al-Anbiyâ’, XXI: 3); it could also be used in normal speech as illustrated in sentence 47c:

s.47a  
\begin{align*}
\text{thumma} & \quad \overset{\text{c}}{\text{am-û}} & \quad \text{wa-šamm-û} \\
\text{part- then} & \quad \text{were blind- 3mp} & \quad \text{part- and- were deaf-3mp}
\end{align*}
 - 
\begin{align*}
\text{kathîrun} & \quad \text{min-hum} \\
\text{indef- many- nom} & \quad \text{prep- from- pro- them}
\end{align*}
  = "Yet again many of them became blind and deaf". (Ali, 1968: 266)

\begin{align*}
\text{wa-³asarr-û} & \quad l-najwâ & \quad alladhîna & \quad žalam-û \\
\text{and-concealed} & \quad \text{def-counsels} & \quad \text{who} & \quad \text{wronged}
\end{align*}
 - 
\begin{align*}
\text{part- 3mp} & \quad \text{- accus} & \quad \text{- rel} & \quad -3mp
\end{align*}
Grammarians called this *lughat akalūnī l-barāghīth* 'the dialect of the fleas devoured me' or *lughat yataʾaqabūna fikum malāʾika* 'the dialect angels watch over you'. Interestingly, grammarians regarded these dialects as *fusḥā* (Literary Arabic) (al-Farrāʾ, 1980, I: 316; see also Wright, 1974, II: 294; Levin, 1989: 40). In brief, the agreement in the verbal sentence occurs even when the predicate precedes the subject as it occurs when the subject precedes the predicate.

7- The Baṣran school claimed that when the agent precedes the verb the sentence cannot be called verbal because the agent may be a definite noun (*ism maʾrifa*) or indefinite noun (*ism nakira*). Two examples (48a and 48b) will illustrate this point:

*S. 48a)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{jāʾa} & \quad \text{l-rajulu} \\
\text{came-3ms} & \quad \text{def- man- nom}
\end{align*}
\]

= The man came.

*S. 48b)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{jāʾa} & \quad \text{rajulun} \\
\text{came-3ms} & \quad \text{indef- mam- nom}
\end{align*}
\]

= A man came.

Here, the agent cannot precede the verb in the verbal sentence, where it is fundamental that the Arabic sentence cannot start with an indefinite noun, and this condition occurs with topic as well (i.e., it must be a definite noun) not with the agent only. If the agent precedes a verb, this condition is violated even if the agent is an indefinite noun (Jamāl al-Dīn, 1984: 252,
However, I argue against this assumption based on the following observations:

i- The defining of the noun (eg. al-rajul) or the assignable indefinite noun (eg. rajulun ُتَأْوِيلُون) at the beginning of the Arabic sentence is a fundamental condition as all the Arabic grammarians have agreed upon; the reason being it cannot give a judgment on an unknown thing (eg. rajulun). Thus, when the agent precedes the verb, the agent must be placed in the defining case or an assignable indefinite noun. Since definiteness and assignability are a requirement which both the agent and the topic have to meet, the grammarians’ distinction between them, based on definiteness/ indefiniteness, is no longer applicable.

ii- I believe that the most important characteristics of a sentence are those of meaning and attribution. Here, if a sentence gives both a complete attribution and meaning, it is a correct sentence whether the topic or agent is in the defining case or be an assignable indefinite noun. So the sentence 49a and 49b below are then considered correct sentences, where the writer wants to talk about the event but does not want to know the actor exactly. Accordingly, a complete attribution and meaning are available now whether these sentences are regarded as a nominal or verbal sentence (al-Istirābādhī, 1996, I: 231; see also Jamāl al-Dīn, 1984: 254).

\begin{align*}
S. 49a) & \text{jā’}a \quad \text{rajulun} \quad \text{ُتَأْوِيلُون} \\
& \text{came- 3ms} \quad \text{indef- man- nom} \quad \text{indef- tall} \\
& = \text{A tall man came.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
S. 49b) & \text{rajulun} \quad \text{ُتَأْوِيلُون} \quad \text{jā’}a \\
& \text{indef- man- nom} \quad \text{indef- tall} \quad \text{came- 3ms} \\
& = \text{A tall man came.}
\end{align*}

To sum up, the Arabic verbal sentence should contain the verb whether it is placed at the beginning of the sentence or not. Moreover, the relationship between the parts of a nominal and verbal sentence is one of attribution (‘alāqat isnād) and not of form (‘alāqat shakīl) because the relation of

\footnote{The context of sentence plays a major role to determine a complete meaning of sentence.}
attribution is more accurate with respect to the structure and the meaning. The condition that the sentence type is decided upon by its initial constituent seems to contradict the linguistic analysis which follows a fixed system. This condition depends on a deletion strategy in order to account for a given structure which does not require that.

4.9. **The structure of the verbal sentence:**

The fundamental parts of verbal sentence and its restrictions come in different positions. In addition to this, the verbs in a verbal sentence come in either transitive or intransitive and active or passive form, as will be demonstrated. Therefore, there are several structures for the Arabic verbal sentence as follows in (Figure 15):

![Figure 15: The structure of verbal sentence](image)

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.
The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent's place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

It is noted that the verb is placed before the agent in all these structures and it is possible to combine them in four ways, namely:

1- The verb and the nominative case (al-marfuʿ).
2- The verb, the nominative case and the optional item.
3- The verb, the optional item and the nominative case.
4- The optional item, the verb and the nominative case.
However, there are other structures in which the agent is placed before the verb, as follows in Figure 16:

![Diagram of Other structures of VS]

**Figure 16: The structures in which the agent precedes the verb**

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on
the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

The common parts in all these structures are the verb, the nominative case and the optional item whether the verb precedes the nominative case or not (Abū l-Makārim, 2007: 71 and 72) and these structures will be discussed in more detail in the word order chapter (Chapter Nine).

4.10. Discussion:

4.10.1. This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.
This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.
This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

4.10.2. The original word order in a verbal sentence is that the agent comes after the verb. In other words, the verb’s position is at the beginning of the verbal sentence. However, the agent could be placed before the verb, and this kind of sentence is still called a verbal sentence though some grammarians are in disagreement with this as mentioned earlier. The auxiliary verb *kāna* ‘was’ is placed before the main verb, as shown in S. 77:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{kāna} & \text{yal}^c\text{abu} & \text{kūrata} & \text{qadamin} & \text{jayyidan} \\
\text{used to} & \text{plays} & \text{indef-ball} & \text{indef-foot} & \text{indef-well} \\
-3ms & -3ms & -\text{accus} & -\text{gen} & -\text{accus} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[=\text{He used to play football very well.}\]

Moreover, the optional item *al-faḍla* in the Arabic sentence usually appears after the main constituents of the sentence (i.e. the predicate and the subject), as illustrated in 78a:
The structure of the above sentence\(^{30}\) is changed for rhetorical purposes (al-Waer, 1987: 86).

The default word order of a nominal sentence is Topic-Comment or Comment-Topic. By contrast, English is an SVO language where the verb should follow the subject. Consider the following Arabic and English examples 78b, 78c and 79, respectively:

\(S.\ 78b\)
\[{\text{Aliyyun}} \quad fi \quad l\text{-madrasati}
\]
\[{\text{Ali- nom}} \quad \text{prep- at} \quad \text{def- school- gen}
\]
\[= \text{\text{Ali} is at the school.}\]

\(S.\ 78c\)
\[fi \quad l\text{-madrasati} \quad \text{\text{Aliyyun}}
\]
\[\text{prep- at} \quad \text{def- school- gen} \quad \text{\text{Ali- nom}}
\]
\[= \text{\text{Ali} is at the school.}\]

\(S.\ 79\)
The lesson is interesting.

However, in a question expression the English verb could be placed before the subject (Lado et al. 1958: 1), as shown by the following example in 80:

\(S.\ 80\)
Is the lesson interesting?

Moreover, the auxiliary verb in English is placed before the main verb like the Arabic auxiliary (S. 77), as the example in 81:

\(S.\ 81\)
He has studied English.

4.10.3. This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians’ views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

\(^{30}\) The word order of this sentence will be discussed later in the thesis.
The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent's place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

By contrast, the English sentence has several kinds of coordination (Milne et al. 1970: 114-17), as follows in (Figure 19):
i. Coordination between verbs (S. 92):

*S. 92*) I tried and tried but I failed.

ii. Coordination between subjects (S. 93):

*S. 93) Lemons and mint can be used to make delicious drinks.*

iii. Coordination between two sentences (S. 94):

*S. 94) The visitor rang the bell and Tom opened the door.*

In Arabic, it is noted that the particle of conjunction should be placed between each coordinated noun, whether it is single or many. On the other hand, the particle of conjunction in English is placed before the last coordinated noun only.

4.11. Conclusion:

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians’ views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb).
study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

After the discussion of general issues of the Arabic sentence, the following chapters will focus on the verbal sentence structure. Chapters Five and Six investigate the first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate/ the verb); Chapter Five focuses on transitive and intransitive verbs while Chapter Six focuses on the passive voice.
Transitivity is a category "...used in the grammatical analysis of sentence constructions to define the types of relationship between a verb and the presence or absence of object elements" (Crystal, 1992: 394). Transitivity has a special significance in Arabic because it relates directly to the 'operator issue' (qadiyyat al-‘āmil), regarded as the most important in Arabic syntax. It is a transitive verb that governs a direct object, while an intransitive does not, so that this topic relates directly to verbal sentences only, where it shows the relationship between its verb and nouns regardless of whether it is an agent or object in this kind of sentence.

Complete Arabic verbs\(^{31}\) (\(al-af\text{"āl al-\text{tāmma}\)) have been divided into two groups according to the number and types of noun which they take. One group includes the verbs which require or take a nominative noun (\(marfū\text{"}) only to give a complete meaning and in which the receivers do not need a direct object in order to clarify the meaning of the sentence for them, as illustrated in S. 1:

\[S. 1\)
nāma
\(^{\text{c}}\text{Aliyyun}
\]
slept- 3ms
\(^{\text{c}}\text{Ali- nom}
\]
\[= \text{^{c}Ali slept.}\]

The other group of verbs is that in which the verbs that require a nominative and a direct object to give a complete meaning, while the receivers need the accusative in order to clarify the meaning of the sentence for them, as shown in S. 2:

---

\(^{31}\) Incomplete verbal forms such as \(kāna\) and its sisters require an accusative noun. Therefore, they are not classified under this division.
Therefore, when the accusative is omitted from this sentence, it does not give a complete meaning and the receiver has many options because the speaker or the writer does not limit the sentence, viz, what the student understood. This chapter deals with the following issues in order to show the relationship between the verb and its agent or direct object by employing transitivity:

a. Intransitive and transitive verbs.
b. The characteristics of transitive and intransitive verbs.
c. Types of transitive verb.
d. Transformation of the intransitive.
e. Transformation of the transitive.

### 5.2. Intransitive and transitive verbs

#### a. Intransitive verb (al-fi‘l al-lāzīm)

Arabic grammarians called this type (al-fi‘l al-lāzīm,\(^{32}\) al-fi‘l al-qāṣīr or al-fi‘l ghayr al-mutta‘addī\(^{33}\); all these terms refer to verbs that cannot govern a direct object directly (al-Istirābādī, 1996, I: 136), (S. 3) is an example:

\[ S. 3) \hspace{1cm} dhahaba \quad c\text{Alīyyun ilā l-madrasati} \]

= c\text{Alī went to school.}

One cannot say *dhahaba ‘Alīyyun al-madrasa ‘*c\text{Alī went school}', without the preposition particle (ilā).

#### b. Transitive verb (al-fi‘l al-mutta‘addī)

Arabic grammarians call the transitive verb: al-fi‘l al-mutta‘addī or al-fi‘l al-mujāwiz which mean the verbs can pass over from a nominative noun to

---

\(^{32}\) It is called al-fi‘l al-lāzīm because it cannot govern the direct object.

\(^{33}\) It is called al-fi‘l al-qāṣīr or al-fi‘l ghayr al-mutta‘adi because it takes the agent only.
a direct object directly, i.e., they can govern the direct object directly (al-
Istirābādhi, 1996, I: 136), as illustrated by the following example:

\[ S. 4) \quad \text{sharaḥa} \quad \text{ʻAlīyyun} \quad \text{al-darsa} \]
\[ = \text{ʻAlī explained the lesson.} \]

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the
main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb
and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and
modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any
single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular;
hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal
sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This
study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and
the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential
characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence
structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction.
Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic
grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the
literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points
of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech
and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the
predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on
the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice.
The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in
Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between
agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight
is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent,
the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent's place. The
basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

It seems that this kind of verb is the same as the verbs that come in one form (*fa‘il* pattern form, for example), some of which are intransitive while others are transitive; i.e., when the *fa‘il* pattern form denotes ‘illness’ or ‘sadness’, it becomes an intransitive verb. Consider the following example in 7a:

\[
S. 7a) \quad \text{marida} \quad \text{cAliyyun}
\]

\[
\text{became ill- 3ms} \quad \text{cAli- nom}
\]

\[
= \text{cAli became ill.}
\]

whereas when it denotes other meanings, it becomes a transitive verb (S. 7b):

\[
S. 7b) \quad \text{rabiha} \quad \text{cAliyyun} \quad \text{al-jā‘izata}
\]

\[
\text{gained- 3ms} \quad \text{cAli- nom} \quad \text{def- award- accus}
\]

\[
= \text{cAli gained the award.}
\]

By contrast, in terms of transitive and intransitive categories, English has three types of verbs (Figure 20):

![The types of verbal form in English](image)

**Figure 20: The types of verb in English**

i. Transitive verbs

Verbs which take the direct object directly (S. 8):

\[
S. 8) \quad \text{She eats the apple.}
\]
However, transitive verbs may not always require the direct object for several reasons, as shown in the following example, taken from Sweet (1898: 90):

*S. 9)*  The book sells well.

In addition, a transitive verb takes a pronoun as a direct object (S. 10a):

*S. 10a)*  John met her.

It means that we cannot say:

*S. 10b)*  *John met she.

Note, here, 'she' is used as the subject pronoun while 'her' is the direct object comparable to the Arabic accusative case. 'You' and 'it', however, do not have a special form in an accusative case (Burton-Roberts, 1986: 75), as (S. 10c):

*S. 10c)*  John met you.

ii. Intransitive verbs

They do not require an object to complete their meaning (Sweet, 1898: 90).

In other words, the verb cannot take a direct object (S. 11):

*S. 11)*  The temperature rises to fifty degrees in Saudi Arabia.

When the intransitive verb requires a noun to complete its meaning, the noun is added by employing a preposition (Sweet, 1898: 91) (S. 12):

*S. 12)*  He goes to the city centre.

Auxiliary verbs and the verb 'to be' are classified under the intransitive because they cannot take the direct object (Hurford, 1994: 67). Liu (2008: 298-305) claims that there are four types which should be classified under intransitive verb:

a. Pure intransitive: verbs which inherently are intransitive and cannot be used as transitive (S. 12a):

*S. 12a)*  She arrives at seven o'clock.
b. Ergative intransitive: verbs which contain a subject which act as the subject as object when the verb is used as transitive (S. 12b):

\[ S. 12b \]  The glass broke/ they broke the glass.

c. Transitive-converted intransitive verbs of activity: the subject is still the same whether it appears with a transitive or an intransitive verb. However, the focus is placed on the verb (activity) rather than the object; in addition, there is usually no specific deletion object, as shown by the following example in 12c:

\[ S. 12c \]  He ate an apple/ he ate.

d. Object deleting: verbs which contain no 'meaning change' when the verb is used without the object; in addition, they cannot be used without a discourse or situational context.

iii. Transitive and intransitive verb

Verb sometimes take or do not take a direct object with a complete meaning; i.e., can be used as either transitive or intransitive verbs. Consider the following example in 13a:

\[ S. 13a \]  Most birds can fly.

The verb 'fly' in this sentence is an intransitive verb because it does not take a direct object. However, it is transitive in sentence 13b, where the main verb 'fly' takes a direct object, namely, the plane:

\[ S. 13b \]  The pilot is flying the plane.

Many English verbs are classified under this type (Scheurweghs, 1959: 12; Kilby, 1984: 37; Crystal, 2004: 83; Liu, 2008: 289). Hurford (1994: 117) notes that the subject of an intransitive verb corresponds to the direct object of the transitive. The following examples illustrate the point:

\[ S. 14a \]  The glass broke.

\[ S. 14b \]  David broke the glass.
5.3. The characteristics of transitive and intransitive verbs:

In trying to clarify the difference between transitive and intransitive verbs, Arabic grammarians agreed on two characteristics which distinguished these types, namely:

i. A complete passive participle (ism mafūl tāmm) can be derived from a transitive verb, and does not require an adverb or a prepositional phrase to complete its meaning, as in the following sentences (15a and 15b):

S. 15a) al-bābu maftūḥun
        def-door- nom indef- was opened- nom- pp
        = The door was opened.

S. 15b) al-tuffāhatu ma’kūlatun
        def- apple- nom indef- was eaten- nom- pp
        = The apple was eaten.

Maftūḥ and ma’kūla are derived from fataḥ and akala verbs (see for example Sūrah al-Ḥijr, XV: 4 and al-Anbiyāʾ, XXI: 26). However, if the derived passive participle needs an adverb or a prepositional phrase in order to complete its meaning, this type is regarded as an intransitive verb, as (16a) below shows:

S. 16a) jalasa ʿAliyyun ʿinda Ṭāriqin
        stayed- 3ms ʿAlī- nom adv- at Ṭāriq- gen
        = ʿAlī stayed at Ṭāriq’s (house).

The passive participle form could be derived from this verb jalasa as a word, but it must include an adverb or a prepositional phrase within the sentence to give a complete meaning (see for example Sūrah al-Māʾida, V: 26 and al-An’ām, VI: 139), another example is 16b:

S. 16b) Ṭāriqun majlūsun ʿinda-hu
        Ṭāriq- nom indef- was staying- nom-pp adv- at-pro-him
        = Ṭāriq was staying with him.
It is important to note here that this feature (i.e., i) is observed in a complete sentence structure only, in order to understand that the passive participle requires an adverb or a prepositional phrase to give a complete meaning since a passive participle is derived from any verb when it stands alone. So here, morphological, syntactic and semantic characteristics are combined.

ii. The transitive verb could link with a pronoun */hā/* which refers to a noun, but this noun is not a verbal noun (*maṣdar*), as exemplified in 17:

\[S. 17\]

\[\text{al-tuffāhatu akala-hā \text{cAliyyun}}\]

\[\text{def-apple- nom ate- 3ms \text{cAlī- nom}}\]

\[= \text{cAlī ate the apple.}\]

The feminine pronoun */-hā/* in this sentence refers to 'the apple'. On the other hand, the intransitive verb could not link with */-hā/*, which does not refer to a verbal noun (al-Jawārī, 1974: 64-65). That is, the */-hā/* is added to a verb, and a noun is placed before this verb. If the structure gives a complete meaning and a correct structure, it is regarded as a transitive verb, but if it does not give a complete meaning or a correct structure, this form will be an intransitive. By contrast, this pronoun cannot be mentioned after a transitive verb in English, as shown in S. 18:

\[S. 18\]

* The apple ate cAlī.

iii. Concerning the question form, Ibn al-Sarrāj (1973, I: 204-205) added another characteristic to distinguish these types. He observed that a transitive and an intransitive verb could be identified by employing a question form; i.e., a question with a transitive verb is (*bi-man waqa\text{c} al-fi\text{‘l})* 'to whom did the act happen?', while the question with an intransitive verb is 'when and where did the act happen?'[^34]. This is a precise observation

[^34]: "wa-i‘lam anna hādhā innamā qīla la-hu maf‘ūlun bi-hi li-annahu lammā qāla l-qā‘īlu ḍaraba wa-qatala qīla la-hu hādhā l-fī’lu bi-man waqa‘?... fa- hādhā innamā yakūnu fī l-muta‘addi... wa-lā yuqālu fī-mā lā yata‘addā...wa-innamā yuqālu matā kāna l-qiyām? wa-fi ayyī waqt? wa-ayna kān?"
from Ibn al-Sarrāj (ibid), in which he observed the difference between a transitive and an intransitive verb by analysing it semantically and used a question as the instrument, to confirm his observation.

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on
the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

I believe that the characteristics mentioned above by Ibn Hishām are details of two features noted by grammarians who preceded him; he also repeats the characteristics agreed on by the grammarians, as in i and ii (above).

In English, verbs are also classified into transitive and intransitive; each type has its own characteristics, namely:

i. The transitive verb takes a direct object, while the intransitive does not. Sentences 21a and 21b are good examples to illustrate this point:

\[ S. 21a \]

The house faces north.

\[ S. 21b \]

The students compete with each other.

Here, the verb of S. 21a takes a direct object 'north', while the verb 'compete' does not take a direct object in S. 21b.

ii. Transitive verbs are verbs which have a receiver of their action, (S. 22):

\[ S. 22 \]

Tom meet Mark at seven o'clock.

iii. Only transitive verbs have a passive voice, so intransitive verbs have largely the active voice, (S. 23):

\[ S. 23 \]

The car was stolen by thief.

iv. Intransitive verbs are classified as either linking or complete.

v. The passive verb must of necessity be intransitive (Walton, 1965: 187), as shown in sentence 23:

5.4. Types of transitive verb:
Verbs can take more than one direct object, and therefore there are several types of transitive verb in Arabic (Figure 21):

![Figure 21: Types of transitive verb](image)

5.4.1 Single transitive:

The verb which requires one direct object (S. 23):

\[
S. 23) \quad \text{qara}^{a}a \quad \text{\textsuperscript{c}Aliyyun} \quad \text{kitāban} \\
\quad \text{read- 3ms} \quad \text{\textsuperscript{c}Alī- nom} \quad \text{indef- book- accus} \\
\quad = \text{\textsuperscript{c}Alī read a book.}
\]

All verbs of sense and feeling require one direct object only. This can be illustrated by the following example 24:

\[
S. 24a) \quad \text{sami}^{c}-\text{tu-hu} \\
\quad \text{heard- 1ms- 3ms} \\
\quad = \text{I heard him.}
\]

Others verbs of sense and feeling are *shamamtuhu* 'I smelled it'; *duqtuhu* 'I tasted it'; *absartuhu* 'I saw him'; and *lamistuhu* 'I touched it'. Abū ʿAlī l-Fārisī (d. 377/987) claimed that the verb *samiʿa*, 'he heard' governs two objects. Consider the following example in 25a:

\[
S. 25a) \quad \text{sami}^{c}-\text{tu} \quad \text{\textsuperscript{c}Aliyyan} \quad \text{yaqūlu} \quad \text{dhā-likā} \\
\quad \text{heard- 1ms} \quad \text{\textsuperscript{c}Alī- accus} \quad \text{3ms- says} \quad \text{dem-that-part} \\
\quad = \text{I heard \textsuperscript{c}Alī says that.}
\]

The first object is \textsuperscript{c}Alī and the second one is the sentence *yaqūlu dhālik*. However, this view goes against a syntactic concept whereby the object could be composed from the sentence as long as the main verb could come
before the topic and comment, like *zanna* and its sisters, as the example in sentence 26:

\[ S. 25b) \quad \text{zanan-tu} \quad \text{Aliyyan} \quad \text{yaqūlu} \quad \text{al-ṣīdqa} \]

\[
\text{thought-1ms} \quad \text{Ali-accus} \quad 3\text{ms-says} \quad \text{def-truth-accus}
\]

= I thought *ʿAli* says the truth.

However, the verb 'heard' in sentence 25a is not one of these verbs, and thus it governs one direct object only (Ibn Yaʿīsh, 2001, IV: 295-296). Therefore, the sentence (*yaqūlu dhālik*) after an accusative noun in sentence 25a above is a circumstantial qualifier (*ḥāl*), as in Sūrat al-Jāthiya, XLV: 8; or an adjective (*ṣifā*), as in Sūrat al-Anbiyāʾ, XII: 60. In addition, the verb *samiʿa* takes only one object, we have several examples from the Qurʾān (see for example Sūrahs al-Qāṣaṣ, XXVIII: 55 and Fāṭir, XXXV: 14).

5.4.2 Double transitive:

This type of verb requires two direct objects, and is divided into three types:

**First**, the verb whose second object originally came with a preposition particle but is omitted because of extensive use (*kathrat al-istiʿmāl*), as the example in 26:

\[ S. 26) \quad \text{astaghfiru} \quad \text{Allāha} \quad \text{dhānban} \quad \text{kabīran} \]

\[
1\text{ms-forgive} \quad \text{God-accus} \quad \text{indef-sin-accus} \quad \text{indef-great-accus}
\]

= I asked God to forgive a great sin.

The second object (*dhānban*) basically comes with a preposition (*min*) but this is deleted (*astaghfiru Allāha min dhānbin*) (cf. Sibawayh, 1988, I: 37). There is, however, a controversy among Arabic grammarians in terms of whether the verb *istaghfara* governs a second object or not. One group viewed that this verb governs the second object by itself; i.e., they did not believe that this verb governs the second object by a preposition. The most popular Arabic grammarians to have believed this view were Ibn al-Ṭarāwīḥī (d. 528/1133) and his student al-Suhaylī (al-Suhayli, 1992: 272, 273). The other group believed that this kind of verb could govern a second object by a
preposition (cf. Abū Ḥayyān, 1998: 2091). So we have to say (astaghfiru Allāha min dhanbin).

Al-Suyūṭī (1998, III: 10-11), on the other hand, limited the verb that are classified under this type, namely: *istaghfara* 'forgave'; *amara* 'ordered'; *sammā* 'named'; *da‘ā, kannā* 'called'; *zawwaja* 'married'; *ṣaddaqā* 'believed'; *ḥadā* 'guided'; *farraga* 'divided'; *fazī‘a* 'appalled'; *jā‘a* 'came'; *rāḥa* 'went'; *iṣbā‘a* 'desired'; *na‘ā* 'distanced'; and *‘ayyara* 'taunted'. However, it seems that this verbal type of double transitive is not limited to some verbs because there is no evidence to support that claim. In fact, as there are more than 10 verbs falling within this type, it is certainly not limited.

To sum up, this kind of verb (i.e., the verb whose second object originally came with a preposition) can govern the second object without a preposition, since all grammarians agreed as to whether the second object originally came with a preposition or without. In addition, we cannot find any evidence proving that verb of this kind came originally with a preposition because, like *istaghfara*, it is found in poetry without the preposition, although it comes with a preposition in the Qurʾān, as in Sūrahs Maryam, XIX: 47; al-Nūr, XXIV: 62 and al-Mumtaḥana, LX: 12. Moreover, the verb *ḥadā* 'guided' governs the second object with and without a preposition in the Qurʾān, as in Sūrahs al-Nisā’, IV: 26 and al-Ḥujurāt, XLIX: 17.

**Secondly**, the verb whose second direct object is related originally to the first one; in other words, this is the verb whose two objects are already in an underlying attribution relationship, i.e., subject and predicate (Badawi *et al.* 2004: 374 and 378), as shown by the following example:

\[
\text{s. 27) zanān-tu ʿAliyyan karīman}
\text{thought-1ms ʿAlī-accus indef-generous-accus}
\text{= I thought that ʿAlī was generous}
\]

The Arabic grammarians called this type (*al-mutta‘addī ilā maf‘ūlayn ašluhumā l-mubtada‘ wa-l-khabar*) "the verb which governs two objects and
these objects are originally the topic and comment". These objects could compose a complete nominal sentence which would contain the fundamental Arabic sentence, viz., the predicate and subject, or the topic and comment of the nominal sentence, as in ‘Aliyyun karīmun ‘Ali is generous’. Moreover, Arabic grammarians classified under this type żanna and its sisters\(^{35}\) (żanna wa-akhawātuḥā), as sentence 28:

\[
\text{S. 28)
\begin{align*}
\text{za'a} \text{ama} & \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} & \quad \text{al-ṭaqsa} & \quad \text{dāfi'ān} \\
\text{claimed- 3mp} & \quad ^{c}\text{Ali- nom} & \quad \text{def- weather- accus} & \quad \text{indef- warm- accus- ap} \\
= & \quad ^{c}\text{Ali claimed that the weather is warm.}
\end{align*}
\]

This kind of transitivity is common in the Qurʾān, as in Sūrahs Hūd, XI: 93 and al-Naba’, LXXVIII: 9. In addition, even if the second object is occupied as a verb with its agent, it is considered as a predicate in basic structure, as shown in S. 29:

\[
\text{S. 29)
\begin{align*}
\text{žanan-tu-hu} & \quad \text{yal' Abu} \\
\text{thought- 1ms- 3ms} & \quad \text{3ms- plays} \\
= & \quad \text{I thought he is playing.}
\end{align*}
\]

here, yal' Abu 'play' is the second object in this structure.

Third, the verb whose second direct object does not relate to the first one in the original structure. This type is called (al-muta’addi ilā maf‘ūlayn laysa aṣluhumā l-mubtada’ wa-l-khabar) "the verb which takes two objects and these objects are not the topic and comment originally", as exemplified in 30:

\[
\text{S. 30)
\begin{align*}
\text{a'ṭay-tu} & \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyan} & \quad \text{darāhima} \\
\text{gave- 1ms} & \quad ^{c}\text{Ali- accus} & \quad \text{indef- money- accus} \\
= & \quad ^{c}\text{Ali money.}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{35}\) Like ra'ā, 'alima, wajada, ḥasiba, za'ma and ja'ala.
The verb *aʿtā* and its sisters\(^{36}\) (*aʿtā wa-akhwātuhā*) are classified under this type, as in sentences 30 above. This kind of transitivity is common in the Qurʾān as well, (Sūrah ʿĀliyā, XX: 50 and al-Kawthar, CVIII: 1).

### 5.4.3. Triple transitive:

The verb which requires three objects, as represented in S. 32:

\[
S. 32) \quad \text{aʿlam-tu }  
\text{Aliyyan Mājidān karīman}
\]

\[
\text{informed- 1ms } \quad \text{ʿAlī- accus Mājid- accus indef-generous- accus}
\]

\[
= \text{I informed ʿAlī that Mājid is generous.}
\]

One of these objects cannot be mentioned without the other because the second and third objects compose a complete nominal sentence, and the first object does not give a complete meaning (Sībawayh, 1988, I: 41). Classical Arabic grammarians agreed on only two verbs that could be classified under this type, namely, *aʿlama* 'informed', and *arā* 'showed' (Form IV), derived from the simple verbs *ʿalima* and *raʿā*, which require two objects; in this case it is not possible to mention one of them without another. However, al-Farrāʾ, Ibn al-Sarrāj and Ibn Mālik believed that this type was not in fact limited to these verbs only, as there were other verbs which take a third object like *anbaʿa*, *khabarā*, *ḥaddath*, all meaning 'informed'; and *ʿarafa* 'knew' (al-Suyūṭī, 1998, III: 507).

This kind of transitive verb seems originally to have been of a double transitivity, but when these basic verbs changed to the derived forms *afʿala* (Form IV) and *faʿala* (Form II), they sometimes govern a third object. In addition to this, it is seen that these verbs, which appear in the Qurʾān in several verses, govern two objects, and that there is only one position which the verb governs three objects, namely, *arā* (Form IV), as in Sūrat al-Anfāl, VIII: 43 (S. 33):

\[
S. 33) \quad \text{wa-law }  
\text{arā-ka-hum kathīran}
\]

\[
\text{part- and-if show- 3ms- 2ms- 3mp indef- much- accus}
\]

\[
= \text{“If he had shown them to thee as many”} \quad \text{(Ali, 1968: 426)}
\]

\(^{36}\) such as *kasā*, *wahaba* and *manaha*. 
By contrast, English has two types of transitive verbs, as follows:

**1. Single transitive:**
The verb which takes one object which is called a direct object (Hurford, 1994: 67). This kind of transitive is called monotransitive (Gelderen, 2002: 66; Peters, 2004: 548) (S. 39):

*S. 39) He eats the apple.*

**2. Double transitive:**

The verb which takes two objects. One of these is called an indirect object and usually indicate the receiver, and the other is called a direct object and usually denotes something that occurs from the subject to the receiver (Zandvoort, 1966: 55; Young, 1984: 73). In other words, with the verbs that take two objects, the first answers the question ‘to whom?’ or ‘for whom?’, and the other answers the question ‘what?’, as illustrated in 40a:

*S. 40a) I give my son money.*

This kind of transitive is, also, called a ditransitive; in addition, both of these objects must take, if they are pronouns, an accusative case (Burton-Roberts, 1986: 76-77; Thomas, 1993: 41; Gelderen, 2002: 66), and both of them are obligatory, not optional. However, if one of them is mentioned through the context, it can be omitted thus avoiding repetition (Chalker, 1984: 143; Thomas, 1993: 42), as in the following example:

*S. 40b) I gave money.*

This sentence is a reply to the question:

*S. 40c) What did you give to your son?*

Quirk *et al.* (1985: 727) and Crystal (2004: 95), on the other hand, claim that the indirect object can be omitted in some cases without affecting the meaning relation between other elements of the sentence, as shown in S. 40d:

*S. 40d) Mark read a book.*
The indirect object is largely presented by the prepositions 'to' and less often by 'for' when it follows the direct object (Scheurweghs, 1959: 16; Young, 1984: 73; Burton-Roberts, 1986: 77; Hurford, 1994: 104), as illustrated in the following sentence:

*S. 40e*) I give money to my son.

So, the question is 'I give who and what'? 'my son' and 'money'. There are, however, some verbs which cannot take an indirect object without a preposition, as in the following example taken from Scheurweghs (1959: 17):

*S. 41*) He transmitted to him a retentive memory.

Here the indirect object precedes the direct. It is preferred for the direct object to precede the indirect object in two positions (Thomson et al. 1980: 70 71; Hurford, 1994: 67; Jacobs, 1995: 57):

a. When the indirect object occurs with a preposition (usually 'to'), as in the following sentence:

*S. 42*) I give the book to a person who will benefit from it.

b. When the direct object is 'it' or 'them' pronoun, as illustrated in:

*S. 43a*) I give it or them for my son.

When the indirect and direct object are both pronouns, the indirect object can precede the direct or occur after it, as in the following examples:

*S. 43b*) I give him it.
*S. 43c*) I give it to him.

To sum up, the intransitive verb in English takes one object at least and it is always the direct object, so the indirect object cannot occur without a direct object. Moreover, indirect objects mainly refer to humans or animals not to inanimate things, while direct objects can indicate inanimate things (Hurford, 1994: 67).

5.5. Transformation of the intransitive:
Classical Arabic grammarians were of the view that verbs could be transferred from intransitive to transitive verbs by using some devices within the verb system. According to them there are seven ways which this transfer can be affected (al-Suyūṭī, 1998, III: 8-10; Ibn Hishām, 2000, V: 683-700; see also Ḥasan, 1973: 165-170) (Figure 22):

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.
This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

On this matter, the Majmaʾ al-lughā l-ʿArabiyya in Cairo (1935: 180-81; see also Gully, 1997: 476) takes the view that it can be applied by following three conditions:

i. The two verbs are similar in meaning.
ii. There exists an indication that it should not be associated with another verb.
iii. It follows one of the syntactic rules of the Arabic language (al-dhawq al-ʿArabi)

It seems that 'implication of meaning' (al-tadmīn) sets a pattern which Arabic grammarians follow in changing normal methods of use, such as figurative usage (al-majāz), and that it relates directly to semantics.

37 "wa-majmaʾ al-lughā l-ʿArabiyya yarā annahu qiyāṣiyyun lā samāʿiyyun bi-shurūtīn thalāthā: 1- taqīqū l-munāsabat bayna l-fīlāy, 2- wujūdu qarīnātīn tadullū ʿalā mulāḥaqatī l-fīlī l-ḥāri wa-yuʿmanū maʿahā l-lūbs, 3- mulāʿamātī l-tadmīnī l-dhawqī l-ʿArabi".
g. Omitting a preposition for the purpose of extension (al-tawassū‘). Grammarians cite four examples for this device; three are from the Qur’ān\(^{38}\) and the fourth is from poetry. They regarded this device as not regular (qiyāṣī) (Ibn Hishām, 2000, V: 695). I hold the view that in the examples they cited, the verb governs (similar to transitive and intransitive verbs) an accusative rather than a direct object. The only exceptional case is illustrated by the example in Sūrat al-A‘rāf, VII: 150, (S. 53) below:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{a-‘ajil-tum} & \text{amra} & \text{rabbī-kum} \\
\text{inte- did- haste- 2mp} & \text{indef- judgment- accus} & \text{def- Lord- gen- pro- your} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
= "\text{Did ye make haste to bring on the judgment of your Lord?". (Ali, 1968: 385)\)
\]

Even though this verb (‘ajila) governs a direct object, it seems that it does so because it implies the verb sabīqa, meaning ‘haste’. Accordingly, this device is not regarded as a means of transformation.

5.6. Transformation of the transitive:

Arabic grammarians considered that verbs could be transferred from transitive to intransitive by using various devices with them (Abū Ḥayyān, 1998: 2089; see also Ḥasan, 1973: 183- 85; Abū l-Makārim, 2007: 52) (Figure 23):

![Figure 23: Four ways of transitive transformation](image)

\(^{38}\) (a) Sūrat al-Baqara, II: 235; (b) Sūrat al-A‘rāf, VII: 150; (c) Sūrat al-Tawba, IX: 5.
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5.7. Discussion:

5.7.1. Both transitive and intransitive verbs can take different kinds of object and these are "true objects" (Owens, 1988: 167), namely, as Arabic grammarians call them, the absolute object (al-maf‘ūl al-muṭlaq) (S. 58a); the locative object (al-maf‘ūl fīh) (S. 58b); the purposive object (al-maf‘ūl lah) or (al-maf‘ūl li-ajlih) (S. 58c); and the accompanying object (al-maf‘ūl ma‘ah) (S. 58d):

\[ S. 58a \]  ihtaram-tu-hu ihtirāman

respected- 1ms- 3ms indef- respecting- accus

= I really respected him.

\[ S. 58b \]  ra‘ay-tu l-qitṭta fawqa l-jidāri

saw- 1ms def- cat- accus adv- on def- wall- gen

= I saw the cat on the wall.

\[ S. 58c \]  ji‘-tu-ka ṭama‘an fi birri-ka

came- 1ms- 2ms indef- needing- accus prep- on def- help - gen- pro-your

= I came to you needing your help.

The difference between the transitive and intransitive verb is the type of object. The transitive governs a direct object, the intransitive does not. As a result of this, objects are divided into two types according to the verb, namely:

a. an accusative noun which requires transitive verbs, viz., the direct object only.

b. an accusative noun which requires either transitive or intransitive verbs. This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.
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5.7.2. Some grammarians such as Ibn Jinnī (1988: 46) and al-Shalawbinī (1981: 204) are of the view that there are two kinds of transitive verb, namely:

i. A direct transitive:
A verb which governs the direct object without any device, as illustrated in S. 61:

*S. 61)*

\[
\text{rasam-tu l-kharīṭata} \\
\text{drew- 1ms def- map- accus} \\
= \text{I drew the map.}
\]

ii. *An indirect transitive*.

A verb whose direct object is governed by a preposition particle. The following example illustrates the point:

*S. 62)*

\[
\text{marar-tu bi-ʾAliyyin} \\
\text{passed- 1ms prep- with-ʾAlī - gen} \\
= \text{I passed by ʾAlī.}
\]

However, I believe that the second type of the previous division (ii) is not a transitive verb for several reasons, namely that:

a. A transitive verb which govern the direct object does so directly without any device, as explained by the Arabic grammarians.

b. If the type of verb mentioned in (ii) is considered transitive, the Arabic verbs need not be classified into transitive and intransitive since the latter can govern the direct object by a preposition.

c. The noun that comes after the preposition is in the genitive. In other words, although it is an object in the meaning, it is not an accusative noun, as in S. 63:

*S. 63)*

\[
\text{sāfar-tu ilā madīnatin ʂaghīratin} \\
\text{traveled- 1ms prep-to indef-city-gen indef- small-gen} \\
= \text{I traveled to a small city.}
\]

However, this does not mean that these verbs are transitive. This may be explained as follows:

*a. Direct object:*
Verbs that govern their object without a preposition.

*b. Indirect object:*

Verbs that govern their object by a preposition. Here, the classification depends on the noun following a preposition which is an object in meaning but not syntactically.

**5.7.3.** All triliteral perfective and imperfective forms may be transitive or intransitive except the *fa‘ula* and *yaf‘ulu* form which is only intransitive only (S. 64 below is an example) because they are placed to assert a particular feature which is linked with some body or thing (Ibn al-Sarrāj, 1973, III: 139), so that all the verbal triliteral forms are transitive and intransitive, or intransitive only:

\[
\begin{align*}
S. 64) & \quad \text{hasuna} \quad l\text{-jaww} \\
& \quad \text{improved- 3ms} \quad \text{def- weather- nom} \\
& = \text{The weather improved.}
\end{align*}
\]

This analysis may lead to the result that there are more verbal triliteral forms of intransitive rather than transitive verbs where there is a form for an intransitive only, something that does not occur specifically with transitive verbs.

**5.7.4.** Although transitivity seems to be a syntactic issue, grammarians gave a morphological and semantic analysis when they distinguished between transitive and intransitive verbs; i.e.,

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \quad \text{Morphologically, they determined that there are some forms for intransitive and transitive, such as } fa\text{‘ala } yaf\text{‘ilu } \text{and } fa\text{‘ala } yaf\text{‘ulu. There are, however, forms like } fa\text{‘ula } yaf\text{‘ulu } \text{and } infa\text{‘ala } \text{which are only intransitive. Moreover, there are some verbal quadrilateral forms that are transitive verbs, like } fa\text{‘nal } \text{and } yaf\text{‘alu, as in qalnasa } \text{‘he wore al-qalnas’ (it is a kind of garment); and } yarna\text{‘u } \text{‘he dyed}
\end{align*}
\]
with henna' (al-Ashbîlî, 1996: 125), but these verbs, which are only used in the transitive are not used in normal speech.

b. Syntactically, grammarians considered that a transitive verb governs a direct object without any device, whereas an intransitive verb does not unless a particular device, such as implication of meaning (al-taḍmîn) is added to these verbs.

c. Semantically, the definition of transitive and intransitive verbs relies upon the meaning of the verb; i.e., if the meaning of the verb requires an object, the verb is transitive and if it does not, the verb is intransitive. In addition, grammarians believe that all verbs of 'sense' are transitive, while the verb which indicates a temporary state or quality is intransitive, as illustrated in 65:

\[
\text{S. 65) carija} \quad \text{Muḥammadun hobbled-3ms Muḥammad- nom} = \text{Muḥammad hobbled.}
\]

Ibn al-Sarrâj (1973, I: 204) holds the view that two verbs may differ in meaning, however, they can share (in)transitivity (i.e., transitive and intransitive). For example, the verbs qa'ada 'sat' and qāma 'stood up' are both intransitive. On the other hand, some verbs which carry similar meanings can also agree in terms of (in)transitivity. For example, the verbs qa'ada and jalasa, both meaning 'sat', are both intransitive. I argue against this idea based on the observation that there are some verbs which carry the opposite meanings but differ in (in)transitivity. For example, the verb dakhala 'entered' is transitive, whereas the verb kharaja 'went out' is intransitive.

5.7.5. Sibawayh (1988, IV: 5 and 9) mentioned that the verbal noun of an intransitive verb is in the fuʿil form, while the verbal noun of a transitive verb is in the faʿl form; he also claimed that there are a few transitive verbs whose verbal nouns may come in the fuʿil and vice versa. However, through her study of the verbal noun forms in pre-Islamic poetry,
Wasmiyya l-Manṣūr (1984: 139-146) asserted that these forms (fuʿūl and faʿl) occur with intransitive and transitive verbs, without any restrictions. She noted that the faʿl form is formed with intransitive and transitive verbs at the same level, while fuʿūl occurs with intransitive more than transitive verbs. In brief, it appears that this concept is not suitable for differentiating between the transitive and intransitive.

5.7.6. Both objects or one of them can be omitted with doubled transitivity if this does not affect the meaning (S. 66a and 66b):

*S. 66a)*

ayna l-aṣdiqāʾu alladhīna tazʿum-ūna?
inte-where def- friends- nom rel- which claim-3mp

= Where do you think the friends are?

*S. 66b)*

jaʿala-t al-ʿankabūtu baytan la-hā
made- 3fs def- spider- nom ind- house- accus prep-for- pro-her

= The spider made itself a nest.

Both objects are omitted in (S. 66a), while only one of them is in (S. 66b). The original sentences, for example, are ayna l-aṣdiqāʾu alladhīn tazʿumūna annahum aṣdiqāʾu, and jaʿalat al-ʿankabūtu hādhā l-makāna baytan lahā. Both usages are found in the Qurʾān, as in Sūrah al-Baqara, II: 16 and al-Qaṣaṣ, XXVIII: 62. However, if the omission of these objects or one of them affects the meaning, they have to be mentioned, as in example 66c:

*S. 66c)*

daṭay-tu ʿAlīyān darāhima
gave- 1ms ʿAlī- accus indef- money- accus

= I gave ʿAlī money.

5.7.7. I believe that it is not possible to transform a verb from intransitive to transitive by using devices unless its form or meaning is changed, whether in Arabic or in English (Sweet, 1998: 90).
5.8. Conclusion:

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent's place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.
Karîman, as the third object in this sentence, is the second object in the corresponding basic form ʿalima ʿAliyyun Mâjidân karîman ʿAlî knew that Mâjid is generous'. Most of the verbs which are classified as triple transitive are originally double transitive, where they are derived from the basic form. By contrast, the basic English intransitive verb does not transform to transitive by using a derived verb method (al-Jarf, 1994: 90). However, English transitive verbs can be converted into intransitive and vice versa by changing the meaning of the verb, as in the following example taken from Sweet (1998: 90):

S. 70) The groom walks the horse about.

Here 'walk' means 'cause to walk' or 'make walk'. It is noted that there is only one method, on a sentence level of transferring the Arabic intransitive verb to transitive (al-tadmîn) (cf. S. 52a and 52b). On the other hand, one can transfer a transitive to intransitive verb both syntactically and semantically.
CHAPTER SIX  

The Passive Verb (*al-fī al-mabnī li-l-majhūl*)

6.1. Introduction:

The passive is "...a grammatical analysis of voice, referring to a sentence, clause and verb form where the grammatical subject is typically the recipient or goal of the action denoted by the verb" (Crystal, 1980: 259). The form of the active and passive in different languages is frequently discussed since this issue presents different patterns, and the Arabic passive primarily expresses an act whose agent is unknown or suppressed (Badawi et al. 2004: 383).

Grammarians have argued about the derivation of these voices, i.e., what the original pattern might have been (Siewierska, 1984: 7). The majority of Arabic grammarians believe that the active voice is basic, and that the verb requires a particular process in order to transfer it to the passive voice (Ibn Abī al-Rabil, 1986: 951; Ibn Ya‘ish, 2001, IV: 309; see also Saad, 1982: 31).

Some grammarians, such as al-Mubarrid, Ibn al-Sid al-Baṭlayūsī (nd: 211) and Ibn al-Ṭarāwa (‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, 1995: 215), view both of these verbs as basic or lexical. The passive voice seems to be derived from the active, as is the case with the English passive (Suleiman, 1998: 164), because, with the active voice, the real actor must be mentioned in the sentence, whether the actor is an external noun (*ism zāhir*) or a hidden pronoun (*damir mustatir*). On the other hand, with the passive voice, the real actor or agent is omitted, so all grammarians call the noun which comes after the passive voice the deputy agent (*nā’ib fā’il*). By contrast, with the English language, grammarians disagree as to whether or not the passive construction is derived from the active (Palmer, 1974: 82; Beedham, 1982: 5), but the majority of them believe that it occurs from the active (cf. Chomsky, 1957: 79- 80; Svartvik, 1966: 1- 2; Christophersen *et al.* 1969: 223; Alexander *et*

The passive voice relates directly to transitivity, where the transitive verb can be directly converted to a passive; this is because a transitive verb governs a direct object which basically takes an agent position, whereas the intransitive requires a condition/state to be able to be transferred to a passive, as will be discussed below. The passive is also associated with both fundamental elements of the verbal sentence (verb and noun), and the direct object. However, in this chapter, the focus will be on the following issues which relate to verbs; General kinds of active verbs; Passive verbs.


There are three kinds of active verb which are shown in (Figure 24):

![Figure 24: Kinds of active verbs](image)

6.2.1. The perfective verb:

This is the basic form, since other kinds are derived from it and there are some obvious characteristics that distinguish it; figure 25 explains the features perfective form of an active verb:

![Figure 25: The characteristics of the active perfective](image)

---

39 The deputy agent will be discussed in Chapter Eight because it is placed in the agent position when it is omitted.
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6.2.2. The imperfective verb:
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6.2.3. The imperative verb:
The characteristic of this form is that it denotes an imperative meaning and *nūn* can be added at the end of this form for emphasis (Sibawayh, 1988, III: 509), this pattern is used to give a command, order, advice or to make suggestions (Parrott, 2000: 264-65), as illustrated by S. 5:

*S. 5)*

\[
\text{qūma-nna}
\]

stand up- 2fp

= Stand up.

I cannot find any imperative verb with this *nūn* in the Qur’ān. However, although the basic imperfective form accepts the *nūn* of emphasis at the end of its form, it does not indicate an imperative meaning, as shown by the following example in 6:

*S. 6)*

\[
\text{la-yadrusa-nna} \quad \text{I-Faransiyyata}
\]

part-3ms- studies-part def-French- accus

= He will study French.

Therefore, the morphological and semantic analysis have to be noted with an imperative usage. By contrast, English has declarative and imperative moods. The former includes perfective and imperfective verbs as discussed by Hurford (1994: 95). This idea is illustrated by the following examples:

*S. 7a)*

Mark drives the car.

*S. 7b)*

Mark sent a letter.

*S. 7c)*

Call me.

The subject of the imperative pattern is a hidden second person (you) either in Arabic or English as can be seen in the previous examples (S. 5 and 7c). Furthermore, the imperative cannot usually occur with auxiliary and modal verbs (Hurford, 1994: 95).

**6.3. Passive verbs:**

---

40 Arabic grammarians called this kind of voice in different terms: *al-mafūlu alladhi lam yata‘addā ilayhi fī‘lu fā‘il* 'the object whose verb does not govern it'; *mā lam yusamma fā‘īluh* 'that whose agent is unnamed'; *nā‘ibu fā‘īl* 'deputy agent'; *al-maf‘ūlu alladhi lam yusamma fā‘īluh* 'the object whose agent is unnamed'; and *al-fī‘lu l-mabnī li-l-majhūl* 'the verb is infected to unknown' (al-Qūzī, 1981, 143-44). It is noted that all these names of the passive voice relate to the omitted agent or actor of the verbal form.
All kinds of active verbs can be changed to a passive voice except the imperative, since it cannot give a complete meaning without its actor. The passive voice is basically the result of a vowel change, and this change affects not only the phonology and morphology of the verb, but also the syntax and semantics of the verbal sentence. In the following section, the change required to create the perfective and imperfective verbs of the passive is explained.

6.3.1. The perfective passive verb:
The verbs of this kind can be converted to a passive by adding the vowel /u/ *(damma)* after the first radical letter, and the vowel /i/ *(kasra)* before the last radical letter, as (S. 8) below shows:

\[
\begin{align*}
S. \ 8) \ & \text{kataba} \ \text{`}\text{Al}i\text{yyun} \ \text{al-darsa/} \ \text{kutiba} \ \text{l-darsu} \\
& \text{wrote} \ \text{`}\text{Al}i \ \text{def- lesson/} \ \text{was written} \ \text{def- lesson} \\
& \text{- 3ms} \ - \text{nom} \ - \text{accus} \ - \text{3ms} \ - \text{nom} \\
& \text{=} \ `\text{Al}i \ \text{wrote the lesson/} \ \text{the lesson was written.}
\end{align*}
\]

However, there are some forms of the perfective verb which require another process in addition to that mentioned above, as illustrated by the following:

i. Form V *(tafaʕala)* requires a change of three vowels: /u/ vowel after the first and second radical, and /i/ before the last (S. 9):

\[
\begin{align*}
S. \ 9) \ & \text{taʕallama} \ \text{1-ṭullābu} \ \text{l-Asbāniyyaṭa/} \ \text{tuʕullima-t} \ \text{l-Asbāniyyatu} \\
& \text{learned} \ \text{def- students} \ \text{def- Spanish/} \ \text{was learned} \ \text{def- Spanish} \\
& \text{- 3ms} \ - \text{nom- p} \ - \text{accus} \ - \text{3fs} \ - \text{nom} \\
& \text{=} \ \text{The students learned Spanish/} \ \text{Spanish was learned.}
\end{align*}
\]
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v. Hollow verbs of Forms VII and VIII ( infixal or infixal) can follow any one of three methods which are used with the triliteral hollow (cf. Item iv above) (Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 155), as in sentences 16a and 16b:

\[ S. 16a \]
\[ \text{inqāda/ inqīda, unqūda or inq(u-i)yda} \]
\[ \text{led- 3ms} \]
\[ = \text{He led.} \]
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6.3.2. The imperfective passive verb:

This type of basic verb is converted to a passive voice by adding the vowels
\(/\text{u}/\) after the first radical and \(/\text{a}/\) before the last radical (S. 20):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S. 20) } & \quad \text{taqra}\text{\textdegree}\text{u} \quad \text{Fā\textit{imatu}} \quad \text{l-jar\textit{idatu}} \\
3\text{fs- reads} & \quad \text{Fā\textit{ima- nom}} \quad \text{def- newspaper- accus} \\
\text{tuqra}\text{\textdegree}\text{u} & \quad \text{l-jaridatu} \\
3\text{fs- is read} & \quad \text{def- newspaper- nom} \\
\text{=} & \quad \text{Fā\textit{im}\text{a reads the newspaper/ the newspaper is read.}}
\end{align*}
\]

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the
main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb
and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and
modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any
single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular;
hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal
sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This
study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and
the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential
characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence
structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction.
Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic
grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the
literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points
of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech
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6.4. Discussion:

6.4.1. There are more changes with the perfective than with the imperfective, because the imperfective form starts with a subject marker. Accordingly, the short vowel /u/ is added after the first radical of the perfective which starts with the augmentative tāʾ, as in the following example:

\[ S. 23 \]  
\[ tuʕullima-t \quad al-Asbāniyyatu \]
\[ was \text{ learned-} \quad 3fs \quad \text{def-} \quad \text{Spanish-} \quad \text{nom} \]
\[ = \text{Spanish was learned.} \]

This short vowel /u/ is not added with the imperfective Form V, as shown in S. 24:

\[ S. 24 \]  
\[ tutaʕallamu \quad l-Asbāniyyatu \]
\[ 3fs- \text{is learned} \quad \text{def-} \quad \text{Spanish-} \quad \text{nom} \]
\[ = \text{Spanish is learned.} \]

Furthermore, the short vowel /i/ which is placed after the second radical of the triliteral perfective in a passive voice can be omitted, as illustrated in S. 25:
This occurs in the dialect of two Arabian tribes, namely Banī Tamīm and Taghlib binti Wā’il (Abū Ḥayyān, 1998: 1340). In addition, the Arabic grammarians Quṭrub (d. 206/823) and Ibn Mālik believed that /v/ could be placed after the first radical in the triliteral perfective passive voice, rather than /u/, S. 26 is an example:

\[ S. 26 \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccl}
\text{qirā’} \text{a-t} & \text{al-jaridatu} \\
\text{was read- 3fs} & \text{def- newspaper- nom} \\
\end{array}
\]

= The newspaper was read.

Ibn Mālik recognised this as \textit{fushā} (ibid). Since the previous verbs lose one of their vowels, a derived verb can also lose one of its derivational element in the passive, as in the following sentence 27:

\[ S. 27 \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccl}
\text{ḥubba} & \text{'Aliyyun} \\
\text{loved- 3ms} & \text{'Ali- nom} \\
\end{array}
\]

= 'Alī was loved.

The active verb of ḥubba is \textit{ahabba} (Form IV). However, the majority of Arabic grammarians disagree with this (al-Istirābadhī, 1996, IV: 133; Abū Ḥayyān, 1998: 1340- 41; see also Owens, 1988: 180). This diversity of thinking is due to multi-dialect influence on the patterning of the passive verb.

6.4.2. An un-derivable verb\footnote{The kind of verbal form which comes in one form and from which another forms cannot be derived.} (\textit{al-fi‘l al-jāmid}) cannot be converted from active to passive voice because the passive, in my view, is a kind of derivation and this type of verb is positively not derived. Therefore, it is not feasible to convert the verb \textit{mi‘ma}, for example, to a passive voice because it is an un-derivable verb. In addition, if the active voice cannot be derived
from this kind of verb, it is practically impossible to form a passive voice from it. Furthermore, many Arabic grammarians thought that verbs of 'getting close' (af‘āl al-muqāraba) (e.g., kāda, awshaka, ‘asā and ḥarā) could not be passivised. Only al-Kisā‘ī and al-Farrā‘ī took the view that they might be passivised (Ibn Mālik, 1990, II: 130). It seems that some of them may be used in the passive voice because the verb akhādh, a verb of 'getting close', comes in the Qur‘ān in the passive voice, e.g., Sūrat al-Ahzāb, XXXIII: 61, (S. 28):

\[ S. 28) \text{ ukhidh-ū} \text{ wa-quttīl-ū} \text{ taqtīlān} \]
\[ \text{ be seized- 3mp part- and-slain- 3mp indef-slain- accus} \]
\[ = "\text{They shall be seized and slain".} \text{ (Ali, 1968: 1127)} \]

As a result, it is difficult to say that all these verbs occur only as active verbs.

There are some verbs that are basically passive. They are not used in the active form(cf. Ibn Manṣūr, 1981: 1882 and 3302), The following examples illustrate the point (S. 29a and 29b):

\[ S. 29a) \text{ zuhiya} \text{ ‘alay-nā (ayy: takabbara)} \]
\[ \text{ were arrogant- 3ms prep- on- pro- us} \]
\[ = \text{They were arrogant.} \]

\[ S. 29b) \text{ ghumma} \text{ l-hilālu} \]
\[ \text{ was clouded- 3ms def- crescent- nom} \]
\[ = \text{The crescent (moon) was clouded.} \]

English also has this feature (Quirk et al. 1985: 162; Khalil, 2010: 280), as exemplified in 30:

\[ S. 30) \text{ It is rumoured that John is a burglar.} \]

6.4.3. The changes which intervene upon the active voice in order to convert it to the passive are morphological, syntactic and semantic (Osvaldo, 1986: 587). Accordingly, some verbs can be used as passive with a particular
meaning (S. 31a), but cannot be used as passive in another meaning, as (S. 31b) (Palmer, 1974: 85):

S. 31a) The thief was held by the police.
S. 31b) *Oil is held by the jar.

The changes, however, which intervene upon the passive voice are generally phonological in Arabic, whereas in English they are morphological and syntactic, where the auxiliary verb 'to be' is added and the main verb changes to another form. In other words, the Arabic passive has special forms which are taken originally from the active, whereas the English passive construction must contain two elements, namely the verb 'to be' and the past participle (S. 32a):

S. 32a) The car was stolen.

The auxiliary 'get' can also be used instead of 'be' with the past participle, as in S. 32b), but 'get' is avoided with formal style and the verb 'to be' is more frequent (Hasegawa, 1968: 232; Palmer, 1974: 89; Quirk et al. 1985: 161).

S. 32b) John got beaten in the garden.

Thus, the passive in Arabic requires one process, changing of vowels, while in English it requires two processes, changing the main verb to a past participle form and adding the verb 'to be'. The simplification feature is an aspect of the Arabic language which all linguists attempt to apply. Furthermore, the processes that follow with the English passive are clearer than in Arabic because they are regular with every sentence, whereas there are different processes with the Arabic passive, especially with the perfective.

6.4.4. It is important to note here that the three ways of converting active to passive voice in Arabic must not be confused with other active verb forms (cf. no. iv in section 6.3.1 above). In other words, if there is any confusion
with the active form, another pattern must be used; for example, when the slave says:

\[ S. \, 33 \]  
\[ bu^{c}\text{-}tu \]
\[ \text{was sold- 1ms} \]
\[ = [\text{The slave}] \text{ was sold}. \]

It means that someone sold him, and it is a passive voice. One cannot, therefore, say \( bi^{\prime}tu \) in this case as a passive because the meaning will be active, that is, he sold something, so the real actor of its verb is not omitted. Although this kind of verb occurs in three forms with a passive voice being a triliteral hollow (cf. no. iv above), it must then come in this pattern (i.e., \( bu^{c}tu \)) or \textit{ishmām} pattern because of this confusion in meaning (Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 157; al-Ḥamlāwī, 1895: 91). In brief, when the nominative pronoun comes with a triliteral hollow verb as one word, the first vowel of the form changes to \( i \) with a passive if it is \( u \) with an active. Consider the following example 34a:

\[ S. \, 34a \]  
\[ \text{ṣum-}tu/\text{ṣim-}tu \]
\[ \text{be fasted- 1ms} \]
\[ = \text{Be fasted}. \]

and changes to \( u \) if it is \( i \) with an active, as in verb:

\[ S. \, 34b \]  
\[ \text{bi}^{c}\text{-}tu/\text{bu}^{c}\text{-}tu \]
\[ \text{be sold- 1ms} \]
\[ = \text{Be sold}. \]

\textbf{6.4.5.} The majority of Arabic-speakers when using an everyday spoken language use a reflexive pattern, such as Forms VII and VIII rather than the passive (al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1986: 97) or they use the non-fuṣḥā passive voice, such as:

\[ S. \, 35 \]  
\[ \text{fitiḥ} \quad \text{al-bābu} \]
\[ \text{was opened- 3ms \ def- door- nom} \]
\[ = \text{The door was opened}. \]
There are some who still use a passive, especially in an academic register. The reason, I think, for using a reflexive is because of the simple base form. There are three important points relating to this issue:

a. An active voice which is used when the speaker or writer wants to identify the actor of the verb (S. 36a):

\[
S. 36a) \quad \text{fataḥa} \quad \text{cAliyyun} \quad \text{al-bāba} \\
\text{opened- 3ms} \quad \text{cAli- nom} \quad \text{def- door- accus} \\
= \text{cAlī opened the door.}
\]

b. A passive voice is used when, for various reasons, the speaker or writer does not identify the actor of the verb, i.e., what is done is more important than who does it (Lewis, 1986: 133), and the verb, here, is derived from an active voice, as the example in 36b:

\[
S. 36b) \quad \text{futiḥa} \quad \text{l-bābu} \\
\text{was opened- 3ms} \quad \text{def- door- nom} \\
= \text{The door was opened.}
\]

c. A reflexive pattern is used when the speaker or writer wants to inform the recipient about the act (S. 36c):

\[
S. 36c) \quad \text{infataḥa} \quad \text{l-bābu} \\
\text{opened- 3ms} \quad \text{def- door- nom} \\
= \text{The door opened.}
\]

In my opinion, the second type (cf. b above) is a morphological, syntactic and semantic passive, whereas the third type (c) is a semantic passive only, where the reflexive verb does not have a real actor, i.e., there is no omission agent as a passive voice. In addition to this, it does not take those processes that are required for the passive (S. 36d):

\[
S. 36d) \quad \text{inṣarafa} \quad \text{cAliyyun} \\
\text{left- 3ms} \quad \text{cAlī- nom} \\
= \text{cAlī left.}
\]

\text{cAlī left (by himself); nobody went with him, while the passive verb has a real actor which is omitted for several reasons, as exemplified in 36e:}
According to Aziz Khalil (2010: 274), who employs the Qur’ān to support his point, the active voice is used more than the passive in Arabic, and the regular passive is used more than a reflexive. He notes, therefore, that the total number of verbs used in the Qur’ān are 18,181, and only 1,145 are passive, while 18 verbs are reflexive. By contrast, English has these usages, though English grammarians differentiate between them. Thus in the passive, the underlying object, resulting from the surface subject and identical to the semantic object, becomes the grammatical subject; in the reflexive, however, the grammatical subject and the underlying object are already identical from the beginning, as exemplified in S. 37a and S. 37b below. English reflexive is end in /–self/ or /–selves/ (Haiman, 1976: 34; Hurford, 1994: 207). The reflexive is used to speak about the same person or thing as the subject, or when to emphasize that one person and no other does something (Alexander et al. 1975: 73; Thomson et al. 1980: 42; Greenbaum, 1991: 88). In addition, the reflexive verb is regarded as transitive because the pronoun which comes after the verb is considered as an object (Peters, 2004: 548):

S. 37a) Max was kicked by Hortense.
S. 37b) Max kicked himself.

Further, the active voice is preferred in most English writing (Espinoza, 1997: 231), although logically the active voice becomes more than a passive because the active is a basic form, and the writer or speaker uses a passive for particular reasons.

6.4.6. The passive voice depends basically upon transitive verbs in Arabic. As Ibn Jinnī (1954, I: 24) noted, unless the verb is transitive the verb is not changed to fuʿila (the passive pattern)⁴². According to Siewierska (1984: 8)

⁴² “wa-l-fuʿilu lā yunqalu ilā fuʿila ḥattā yakūna mutaʿaddiyan qabla l-naqīl”
most linguists claim that the passive voice comes only with a transitive verb. Therefore, it is not possible to study one of them without another because, in my view, the noun which can take and cover the place of the agent is a direct object, and this does not come with an intransitive verb, such as:

\( S. 38 \)
\[
\text{māta} \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun}
\text{died- 3ms} \quad ^{c}\text{Alī- nom}
\]
\[= ^{c}\text{Alī died}. \]

However, if the intransitive verb takes a locative object (\( al-maf\text{"ūl fih} \)), for example, it can change to a passive voice because it can take the agent place which is omitted (al-Mubarrid, 1994, IV: 51; Ibn al-Sarrāj, 1973, II: 77; Abū Ḥayyān: 1998: 1327), as shown in S. 39:

\( S. 39 \)
\[
\text{ṣīma} \quad \text{Ramādānu}
\text{was fasted- 3ms} \quad \text{Ramadan- nom}
\]
\[= \text{Ramadan was fasted}. \]

The English passive as well depends upon transitive verbs: transitivity determines the possibility of applying the passive. There is, though, an exception to this rule, where there are some verbs that are transitive but which, nevertheless, do not passivise, especially the verbs which indicate possession (Beedham, 1982: 30-31 and 41; Hudson, 1989: 23; Hurford, 1994: 156) (S. 40a):

\( S. 40a \)
\[
\text{This computer costs 300 pounds.} \]

Moreover, 'have', and 'resemble' do not largely occur in the passive voice, although they are considered as transitive (cf. Christophersen \textit{et al.} 1969: 223- 24; Alexander \textit{et al.} 1975: 114; Quirk \textit{et al.} 1985: 162) (S. 40b and S. 40c):

\( S. 40b \)
\[
\text{I have a car in the city}. \]

\( S. 40c \)
\[
\text{She resembles her mother}. \]
Some transitive verbs do not passivise in Arabic as well, S. 41 is a good example:

\[ S. \text{ 41)} \]
\[
yukallifu \quad \text{shirā}^u \quad l-sayyārati \quad amwālan \quad kathīratan
cost \quad buying \quad def-car \quad indef-\text{money} \quad indef-\text{lot}
- 3ms \quad -\text{nom} \quad -\text{gen} \quad -\text{accus} \quad -\text{accus}
\]
\[ \text{= Buying the car costs a lot of money.} \]

It is asserted in the previous chapter that the majority of devices that transfer an intransitive verb to a transitive are not really devices as the classical grammarians thought; so we cannot add a causative *hamza* before an intransitive passive voice in order to transfer it to a transitive verb, as shown by the following example:

\[ S. \text{ 42)} \]
\[
*\text{afutiha} \quad l-bābu
\]
\[ \text{was opened- 3ms \quad def-\text{door}-\text{nom}} \]
\[ = \text{"The door made be opened."} \]

\[ 6.4.7. \] Ibn Yaʿīsh (2001, IV: 308-9) argued that the first vowel changes to */u/* in the passive voice. This observation is based on the idea that the suffix which is attached to the end of the agent indicates its case. In passive constructions, the agent is deleted so the vowel */u/* changes to the first radical of the verb in order to substitute the deleted agent. I argue against this assumption of Ibn Yaʿīsh (ibid) because when the agent is deleted, another noun takes its case and appears in its original position. For al-Mayyāḥ (1967: 119), this change takes place when the real actor of the verbal sentence is deleted, so it is crucial to have a special form for a passive voice to avoid sharing the forms of other patterns. Furthermore, Abū ʿAlī l-Fārisī (1996: 105; see also Owens, 1988: 183) observed the differences between causitivization and passivization: the former increases the number of nouns in the verbal sentence by adding an object, whereas the latter decreases the number of nouns by deleting the main subject.

\[ 6.4.8. \] All the alterations that occur for passive changes in Arabic mean that we do not need to add any special elements, while English must contain those two elements (i.e., verb 'to be' and past participle) because
both of the passive components occur with the perfect and the progressive; the past participle occurs with the perfect and the verb 'to be' occurs with the progressive.

6.4.9. The subject markers (*ḥurūf al-muḍāra‘a*) do not change with external noun (*ism ẓāhir*) when an active converts to a passive voice. Consider the following example:

*S. 43*)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{yuṣāfiḥu} & \text{cAliyyu}\text{n Ziyā\text{ā}dan/ yuṣāfaḥu Ziyā\text{ū}n} \\
\text{shakes hand} & \text{c\text{Ā}lī Ziyā\text{d} / hand is shaken Ziyā\text{d}} \\
- 3ms & - nom - accus - 3ms - nom \\
= \text{c\text{Ā}lī shakes hand with Ziyā\text{d}/ Ziyā\text{d} is shaken hands.}
\end{array}
\]

However, if we say:

*S. 44a)*

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{yuṣāfiḥu} & \text{cAliyyu}\text{n Zaynaban} \\
\text{3ms-shakes hand} & \text{c\text{Ā}lī nom Zaynab- accus} \\
\ = \text{c\text{Ā}lī shakes hand with Zaynab.}
\end{array}
\]

The subject marker is changed to fit with the deputy agent, so we must say:

*S. 44b)*

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
tuṣāfaḥu & \text{Zaynabun} \\
\text{3fs-hand is shaken} & \text{Zaynab- nom} \\
\ = \text{Zaynab is shaken hands.}
\end{array}
\]

In addition, the subject markers (*tā‘ and yā‘*) are changed to (*ʔu*) when an accusative pronoun links with the verb (S. 45a):

*S. 45a)*

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
tuṣāfiḥu\text{un-}\text{i} & \text{Zaynabun wa-yuṣāfiḥun-}\text{i} \text{cAliyyu}\text{n/ uṣāfaḥu} \\
\text{shakes hand} & \text{Zaynab and-shakes hand c\text{Ā}lī / hand is shaken} \\
- 3fs- 1ms & - nom part - 3ms- 1ms - nom - 1ms \\
\ = \text{Zaynab shakes hands with me and c\text{Ā}lī shakes hands with me/ someone shakes hands with me.}
\end{array}
\]

Likewise, these subject markers change to (*nu*) when the verb links with (*nā*) pronoun at the end of the form (S. 45b):

*S. 45b)*

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
tuṣāfiḥu\text{un-}\text{i} & \text{Zaynabun wa-yuṣāfiḥu}\text{n-}\text{i} \text{cAliyyu}\text{n/ uṣāfaḥu} \\
\text{shakes hand} & \text{Zaynab and-shakes hand c\text{Ā}lī / hand is shaken} \\
- 3fs- 1ms & - nom part - 3ms- 1ms - nom - 1ms \\
\ = \text{Zaynab shakes hands with me and c\text{Ā}lī shakes hands with me/ someone shakes hands with me.}
\end{array}
\]
Therefore, the subject markers change depending on the agent/deputy agent or pronoun that comes with the verb. Also the long vowel that is omitted with an active is backed with a passive voice, as (46) below shows:

S. 46) 
\[
talidu \quad Hindun \quad ṭiflatan/ \quad ṭuladu \quad l-ṭiflatu
\]
gives birth Hindu indef-girl/ is born def-girl
- 3fs - nom - accus - 3fs - nom
= Hind gives birth to a girl/ a girl is born.

The vowel /ʊ/ is returned with a passive voice because the short vowel which precedes is changed from /a/ to /u/.

6.5. Conclusion:

A passive is derived from an active voice, so vowel changes are required to transfer to a passive., Here the vowel that is placed after the first radical is /u/, whether the verb is perfective or imperfective, and the general forms are fu‘ila and yuflalu, respectively. Furthermore, a long vowel /ā/ converts to another when it is preceded by /u/ or /i/ for a circumstantial purpose (al-munāsaba), where a /u/ vowel is appropriate for /ʊ/, and when the vowel /i/ is appropriate for /i/ because the pronunciation of these vowels is from one outlet, as in bū‘at al-sayyāratu and bi‘at al-sayyāratu ‘the car was sold’. Accordingly, this is basically a phonetic change which may influence the morphology of the verb.

It can be argued that in Arabic, passive constructions are to do with issues of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. Moreover, these constructions are accompanied by some changes of form, structure and meaning.
The main imperative verbal form *if*āl comes as an active voice only because it occurs in the second person (*al-mukḥātab*) and the passive voice is for the third person (*ghāʾīb*). Nor can the imperative be described as transitive or intransitive either. However, the /lām/ of command (*lām al-amr*) can be added before the imperfective passive to strengthen the meaning to an imperative (ʕAbd al-Ḥamīd, 1995: 214), as exemplified in 47:

*S. 47*  
li-yaktuba  ʿAlīyyun  al-darsa|  li-yuktaba  l-darsu  
writes  ʿAlī  def-lesson/ is written  def-lesson  
- part- 3ms  - nom  - accus  - part- 3ms  - nom  
= Let ʿAlī writes the lesson/ let the lesson be written.

In addition, this /lām/ is sometimes omitted and the form still indicates an imperative meaning, especially in labels and instructions for use (Badawi *et al.* 2004: 389), as in *yuḥfaḍu fī makānin bāridin* 'It is kept in a cold place'. Nor can stative verbal forms be shaped as a passive voice, since these kinds of verbs require only one noun phrase to complete their meanings (Saad, 1982: 39), as in *qabuḥa* ʿAlīyyun 'ʿAlī was ugly'.

Having described the first element of a verbal sentence in the previous two chapters, the next two chapters will look into the second element of this structure (the subject); Chapter Seven will be allocated to the agent while Chapter Eight is for the deputy agent.
CHAPTER SEVEN
Agent (\textit{al-fā‘il})

7.1. Introduction:

As mentioned earlier, the sentence necessarily contains two fundamental elements, whether in Arabic or in English (Levin, 1981: 145; Börjars \textit{et al.} 2001: 84), i.e., the predicate and the subject. The Arabic verbal sentence is composed of the verb that corresponds to the predicate, and the agent (\textit{al-fā‘il}) that corresponds to the subject. Therefore, the agent comes with both kinds of verb – transitive and intransitive - because this kind of sentence cannot be completed syntactically or semantically without an agent. The first element has been discussed in Chapters five and six.

In this chapter, I will discuss the concept of agent and the difference between agent and subject. Moreover, the rules which relate directly to the agent will be discussed.

7.2. Definition:

The agent is "an element of a clause which typically expresses the person or animate being responsible for a particular action" (Crystal, 1992: 11). 'Agent' is a more accurate term than 'subject' in Arabic, because in Arabic the subject occurs with both kinds of sentences, i.e., as the topic (\textit{al-mubtada}) in the nominal sentence and the agent in the verbal sentence. Classical Arabic grammarians give this term a specific definition; namely, the plain noun or paraphrase, from which is predicated a complete verb that precedes the agent and occurs in its normal form. i.e., it is an active verb (al-Jurjānī, 1982: 325; Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 83; Ibn Ya‘īsh, 2001, I: 200; see also Carter, 1981: 150).

However, the Kūfān grammarians did not mention that the verb precedes the agent, because they believed that sometimes the agent could come before the verb. This is a view that I support after having discussed this point in Chapter Four. Even so, it seems that they agreed on two conditions,
namely that the agent must be a noun which is predicated by a complete verb. The subject in English also has to fulfil these conditions, but in English the subject comes typically before the verb, e.g.:

\[ S. 1) \quad \text{John travelled to Spain.} \]

where the subject is a noun which governs by the verb 'travelled'.

### 7.3. Rules of the Agent:

Because the agent is a significant element in the verbal sentence, the Arabic grammarians studied this issue in fair detail, giving several rules and characteristics as follows (Figure 26):

![Figure 26: Rules of the agent](image)

**7.3.1. Agent takes the nominative case:**
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7.3.4. The government of the agent must necessarily be mentioned:

However, it appears that there is a difference between the syntactic agent and the semantic agent. Therefore, in my view, the noun occurring after the first one is an agent semantically and is coupled syntactically. In comparison, the English subject usually occurs as a single word, compounded with more than one (S. 18):

*S. 18* Mary, John and David went to Rome.

In addition, it occurs as a clause either introduced by a *wh*‐word or by *that* (Huddleston, 1984: 66; Kosur, 2009: 1). Two examples will illustrate this point:

*S. 19a* That Mark was late annoyed the teacher.
Verb with complements are sometimes considered as subject but usually with two special markers; ‘to’ and '-ing' (Wardhaugh, 1995: 75; Kosur, 2009: 1), as shown in the following examples (S 20a and S 20b), taken from Gleason (1965: 318):

S. 20a) To ride the roller-coaster was exciting.
S. 20b) Giving beggar money is foolish.

The verb preceded by 'to' is called infinitive, while with '-ing' is called gerund. Moreover, a prepositional phrase can cover the subject (Huddleston, 1984: 62; Wardhaugh, 1995: 75), as illustrated in S. 21:

S. 21) From the city centre to university is about ten minutes.
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To sum up, it seems that the motivation for the claim (i.e., the omission in the three case a- c) is due to two causes: (i) the grammarians seek the government of the agent which has to be included because the verbal sentence is structured by both these elements; and (ii) the sentence which comes after a conditional particle must be a verbal sentence, so it means that there is a deleted verb if the noun comes after this kind of particle. However, I do not think that there is any evidence for this claim (i.e., the sentence that comes after a conditional particle must be a verbal sentence).
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By contrast, the English subject cannot be mentioned without its government (i.e., the verb) in the normal structure because the verb governs the elements of the sentence which are going to be used. The cases (a and b) above, however, can be applied to English as they occur in Arabic (Crystal, 2004: 48).

Arabic grammarians studied other rules of the agent which are mentioned here only briefly since they will be discussed in detail later (Chapter Nine). The rules are:

7.3.5. The agent comes after the verb (in other words, it cannot precede the verb), as shown by the following example:
7.3.6. The verb is singular, even if the agent is dual or plural. This can be seen in sentences 28a and 28b:

\[ S. \text{28a)} \quad \text{naja\text{"}a} \quad l-\text{\text{"}alib\text{"}a}i \quad \text{succeeded-3ms} \quad \text{def- two students- nom- d} \]
\[ = \text{The two students succeeded.} \]

\[ S. \text{28b)} \quad \text{naja\text{"}a} \quad l-\text{\text{"}ull\text{"}a}bu \quad \text{succeeded-3ms} \quad \text{def- students- nom- p} \]
\[ = \text{The students succeeded.} \]

7.3.7. The agent controls agreement of the verb according to its gender, person, and number, as exemplified in 29a and 29b:

\[ S. \text{29a)} \quad \text{shariba} \quad \text{Mu\text{"}ammadun} \quad \text{qahwatan} \quad \text{drank-3ms} \quad \text{Mu\text{"}ammad- nom} \quad \text{indef- coffee- accus} \]
\[ = \text{Mu\text{"}ammad drank coffee.} \]

\[ S. \text{29b)} \quad \text{shariba-t} \quad \text{Hindun} \quad \text{qahwatan} \quad \text{drank-3fs} \quad \text{Hind- nom} \quad \text{indef- coffee- accus} \]
\[ = \text{Hind drank coffee.} \]

7.4. Discussion:

7.4.1. The definitions must be focused on the points upon which the grammarians have agreed (Abū Ḥayyān, 1998: 1320). The Kūfans were more precise than the Başrans grammarians because they did not make the verb precede the agent (subject) as a condition for a verbal sentence structure. It is observed that the definition of the agent lies principally on a morphological and syntactic basis (the agent must be as a noun which occurs before or after its verb), on which Classical Arabic grammarians
normally focus, although its terminology relies on a meaning observation (\textit{al-fāʿil}) – i.e., the person or thing who carries out an action.

Here, we can combine all these analyses to draw up the definition of an agent, viz., a nominative noun conveys what performs an action, indicated by the active verb (Owens, 1988: 231), as (\textit{Ṣ}Alī) in sentence 30:

\begin{verbatim}
S. 30)  dhahaba  ḌAlīyyun  ilā  l-jāmiʿati
       went- 3ms  ḌAlī- nom prep- to  def- university-gen
       = ḌAlī went to university.
\end{verbatim}

In English, on the other hand, the subject is a nominal item that refers to the doer of the action denoted by the verb (Scott \textit{et al.} 1968: 42; Khalil, 2010: 79). The subject can be a noun or a pronoun which is followed by the active verb (Swan, 2009: xxv) as the example in 31:

\begin{verbatim}
S. 31)  David is a writer.
\end{verbatim}

However, although the subject in English can be a noun, it basically precedes its verb as in the previous example. In addition, it can be called a subject because there is no mixing with other elements as in an Arabic sentence.

7.4.2. The agent may take an accusative or a genitive case marker, although the basic case is nominative:

\begin{itemize}
\item[i.] \textbf{The agent’s accusative:}
\end{itemize}

Arabic grammarians disagreed in terms of this issue (al-Suyūṭī, 1998, I: 510; al-Azhārī, 2000, I: 395); one group, including Ibn al-Ṭarāwa, believed that the agent can take the accusative case if the meaning of the verbal sentence is apparent and obvious, as illustrated by the following example:

\begin{verbatim}
S. 32)  shariba  Muḥammadan  al-māʾu
       drank- 3ms  Muḥammad- accus  def-water- nom
       = Muḥammad drank water.
\end{verbatim}
The meaning of this sentence indicates the agent and the object without looking for the case marker of the two nouns (i.e., the agent is *Muhammad* and the object is *al-māʾ* even if the agent takes an accusative case). On the other hand, the majority of Arabic grammarians considered that the agent takes an accusative case in one verse of the Qurʾān in ʿAbd Allāh b. Kathīr’s reading (Sūrat al-Baqara, II: 37), as well as in several lines of poetry (ibid). The accusative case is used in these constructions only so as not to violate the basic rule (the agent takes a nominative case). I hold the view that such as analysis is in line with what is encountered in everyday speech. In addition, the agent takes a nominative case in this verse (Sūrat al-Baqara, II: 37) (S. 33 below) in all readings except for that of ʿAbd Allāh b. Kathīr (Ibn Zinjila, 1982: 19-20). There seems to be no fixed rule for the use of agent with the accusative case.

*S. 33)*

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{fa-talaqqā} & \text{Ādamu} & \text{min} & \text{rabbī-hi} \\
\text{part-then-learnt-3ms} & \text{Adam-nom} & \text{prep-from} & \text{def-Lord-gen-pro-his} \\
\text{- kalimātīn} & \text{fa-tāba} & \text{ʿalay-hi} \\
\text{indef-words-gen} & \text{part-then-turned-3ms} & \text{prep-on-pro-his} \\
\end{array}
\]

= "Then learnt Adam from his Lord words of inspiration, and his Lord turned towards him". (Ali, 1968: 26)

**ii. The agent's genitive:**

The agent can also take a genitive case in several positions, but there are two circumstances that are more common:

(a) After the preposition *min* 'from' (Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 84; Ibn Yaʿīsh, 2001, IV: 460-61); three conditions are required when this preposition is added before the agent, namely: (i) the agent is indefinite; (ii) the sentence gives negative; (iii) this preposition takes a general meaning, as *S. 34* shows:

*S. 34)*

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
mā & \text{yaʿti-him} & \text{min} & \text{muʿallimin illā rafaḍa tadrīsa-hum} \\
\text{no} & \text{comes from indef-teacher except refuse def-teaches-accus} \\
\end{array}
\]
Moreover, this expression arises in several Qur’anic verses (Sūrah al-Mā‘ida, V: 19; al-Ḥijr, XV: 11 and al-Shu‘arā, XXVI: 5).

(b) When the agent is preceded by the preposition /bi/ 'by or with' and occurs typically after the verb kafā 'be enough', as shown in S. 35:

S. 35)

\[
\text{kafā bi-} \text{Alīyyin mu‘alliman}
\]

be enough- 3ms prep-for- Alī- gen indef- teacher- accus

= For teaching Alī is enough.

This expression is found in several verses as well, for instance in Sūrah al-Nisā, IV: 6; al-Isrā, XVII: 14 and al-Anbiyā, XXI: 47. The agent of the verb kafā comes often with /bi/ preposition. Ibn Hishām (2000, II: 146-157) divided this preposition /bi/ preceding the agent into three categories:

(i) obligatory: the agent cannot be mentioned without this preposition, and this occurs with an exclamation mark (af‘il al-ta‘ajub), as exemplified in 36a:

S. 36a)

\[
\text{aḥsin bi-} \text{Zaydin}
\]

make something good- 2ms prep- with- Zayd- gen

= *Make something good with Zayd.

The basic sentence is (S. 36b):

S. 36b)

\[
\text{aḥsana Zaydan}
\]

made good- 3ms Zayd- accus

= *He made Zayd good.

However, some grammarians such as al-Farrā, al-Zajjāj, and al-Zamakhsharī, took the view that the agent in this construction is a hidden pronoun (dāmir mustatīr) because morphologically and semantically this expression is an imperative pattern whose agent is a hidden pronoun (Abū Ḥayyān, 1998: 2067; Ibn Ya‘īsh, 2001, IV: 420; see also Ḫayf, 1990: 31- 32).
(ii) frequently: the meaning that the agent typically occurs with this preposition, and this case is found with *kafā* 'to be enough' verb, as illustrated in S. 35 above.

(iii) */bi-/* which comes with the agent only in poetry.

Finally, it is worth noting here:

(a) there are specific situations where the agent takes the genitive case marker (i, ii and iii above), but this is not so with the accusative case marker. The agent takes an accusative case marker in some examples which have no specific rule: Linguists have disagreed over this marker, and consider that it is not a part of the spoken structure. This case only occur in written Arabic as long as the meaning of the verbal sentence is apparent and obvious, as shown in S. 37:

*S. 37)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{akala} & \quad \text{Zaydan} & \quad \text{al-tuffāhatu} \\
\text{ate-3ms} & \quad \text{Zayd-accus} & \quad \text{def-apple-nom} \\
& \quad \text{= Zayd ate the apple.}
\end{align*}
\]

(b) I believe that the suffix that occurs at the end of the agent differs according to the tool which precedes it, but the case is still a nominative; i.e., the instrument affects the agent literally but the original case remains a nominative. Therefore, when these prepositions are omitted, the agent’s basic case (nominative) will appear, as S. 38 below shows:

*S. 38)*

\[
\begin{align*}
kafā & \quad \text{‘Aliyyun} & \quad \text{mu‘alliman} \\
\text{be enough-3ms} & \quad \text{‘Alī-nom} & \quad \text{indef- teaching-accus} \\
& \quad \text{= For teaching ‘Alī is enough.}
\end{align*}
\]

In addition, these devices have an effect meaning on, whereby they add emphasis to the meaning of the verbal sentence.

(c) In the examples in which the agent take an accusative case marker, its object takes a nominative case marker as in sentence 37 above. However, this does not happen with a genitive case, where there is no noun to take a nominative case marker as in sentence 35. The examples in which the agent
takes an accusative should therefore be reconsidered because the case marker is not a result of a specific device /bi-/ followed by a genitive case. When the agent takes an accusative case marker, the structure cannot be properly understood, so those who pronounced or heard these structures may be mistaken.

7.4.3. Arabic grammarians believe that the verbal sentence cannot be structured without its second element (agent); they identified some areas from which the agent is deleted; This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent,
the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians’ views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent,
the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The
basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms
are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on
the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of
them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and
makes recommendations for future research.

This appears to depend on the context of the sentence, as in Sūrah al-
Aʿrāf, VII: 100 and Hūd, XI: 150, where it is not necessary to repeat the
agent since, as in English, it is understood from the question, as
exemplified in 46a:

\[ S. \ 46a \] Went to school.
which might be the answer to the question:

\[ S. \ 46b \] Where is Mary?

Furthermore, Arabic grammarians noted other circumstances where the
verb does not require an agent:

(i) Al-Farrāʾ observed that the verb ḥāshā ‘forbid’ does not have an agent
where it means ‘except’ (al-Istirābādī, 1996, II: 123; Abū Ḥayyān, 1998:
1537). Consider the following example in 47:

\[ S. \ 47 \] qāma l-qawmu ḥāshā ʿAlīyyin stood up-3ms def- people- nom-p part- except ʿAlī gen

= The people stood up except ʿAlī.

Al-Farrāʾ considered that the noun which comes after ḥāshā originally had
a preposition /lī/ but through extensive use this was dropped (ibid). In
addition, the Majmaʿ al-lughā l-ʿArabiyya in Cairo supports this view
because there is apparently no agent after this verb, either syntactically or
semantically (Dayf, 1968: 29-30; al-ʿUṣaymī, 2002, 128). The majority of
Abū Ḥayyān, 1998: 1532) considered that ḥāshā was an exception particle.
Al-Mubarrid (1994, IV: 391) and Ibn Ḥīṣām (2000, I: 259), on the other
hand, claimed that ḥāshā could be a transitive verb and its agent a hidden
pronoun (dāmir mustatir) after ḥāshā, so the noun in S. 47 will take an
accusative case marker (i.e., أليّن). It seems that 

\[ \text{hashā} \]

here means 'except' like 

\[ \text{illā} \]

, so the agent is not needed (because there is no verb); nor is there any deletion in this usage.
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7.4.4. The agent plays a significant role in determining the aspect in a verbal sentence. This can be shown by S. 50:

\[
\text{S. 50)} \quad \text{gharaba-t} \quad \text{al-shamsu} \\
\text{set- 3fs} \quad \text{def-sun- nom} \\
= \text{The sun set.}
\]

where the verb (gharabat) gives a primary (or a perfective) aspect as a single word. However, the agent changes this sort of aspect to an action which has always happened (Yaḥyā, 2005: 10). This point asserts that the structure is employing each element in order to specify the kind of aspect and tense, where it is not enough simply to look at one element to determine its type.

7.4.5. There is a major relationship between a verb and an agent in a verbal sentence, whether morphologically, syntactically or semantically. Therefore, the Arabic grammarians believe that the verb and agent are not deleted unless there is an underlying reason for doing so, whereas the relationship between the verb and object is semantic.

i. morphologically: the predicate has to be an active verb, whereas the agent is a noun.

ii. syntactically: the subject (agent) which it is a noun or pronoun requires a predicate (verb) because the Arabic sentence cannot be composed without both of these elements. Thus, the agent becomes part of a verb (Ibn Yaʿīsh, 2001, I: 203). The agent determines the structure of the verb, where the agent such as Hind is identified by the feminine marker /-t/ suffixed to the verb (S. 51):

\[
\text{S. 51)} \quad \text{laʿiba-t} \quad \text{Hindun} \quad \text{kūrata} \quad \text{qadamin} \\
\text{played- 3fs} \quad \text{Hind- nom} \quad \text{indef- ball- accus} \quad \text{indef- foot- gen} \\
= \text{Hind played a football.}
\]
Moreover, the lexical nature of the verb may change the structure of sentence, for example an active verb requires an agent. Consider the structure of the following sentence:

\[ S. 52) \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{jalasa} & \quad ^\text{cAliyyun} \\
\text{sat down- 3ms} & \quad ^\text{cAli- nom} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[ = ^\text{cAli sat down.} \]

whereas, a passive verb requires an object which is placed in an agent position, whether or not the agent is mentioned, as in the following example:

\[ S. 53) \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{shuriba} & \quad ^\text{l-mā³u} \\
\text{was drunk- 3ms} & \quad \text{def- water- nom} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[ = \text{Water was drunk.} \]

In addition, the agent is the only noun which takes a nominative case in the verbal sentence structure.

iii. semantically: the agent does not give a complete meaning without its verb and vice versa. In addition, the verb determines the type of agent. The agent (dog), for instance, cannot go with the verb(read) since it requires a human agent like (cAli). All these aspects (morphological, syntactic and semantic) can be applied to the verb and the subject in an English sentence.

Arabic agent pronouns are more precise than English because there are specific pronouns for the dual and plural in Arabic, whereas in English does not have a pronoun for the dual but has general pronouns for both masculine and feminine in the plural.

\[ 7.4.7. \] The Arabic grammarians would consider the (cAli) in this sentence:

\[ S. 56) \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{māta} & \quad ^\text{cAliyyun} \\
\text{died- 3ms} & \quad ^\text{cAli- nom} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[ = ^\text{cAli died.} \]
is an agent, although it loses its semantic feature (doing something). Therefore, their analyses focus on a syntactic characteristic (nominative case), where the agent is only the nominal that takes this case in the verbal sentence. Furthermore, there is a difference between category and function because phrasal categories have different functions. That is, the subject is usually a noun but, whether in Arabic or English, not all nouns function as subjects (Börjars et al. 2001: 83).

7.5. Conclusion:

This study is concerned with the Arabic verbal sentence structure and the main purpose is to examine the elements of this structure - both the verb and the agent - and their relationship, investigating the classical and modern grammarians' views. Therefore, this research is not based on any single aspect within this structure.

The general trend of this research is from the general to the particular; hence a discussion on the parts of speech precedes an analysis of the verbal sentence structure since it is composed of these parts (noun and verb). This study concentrates on syntactic and semantic issues that relate to verbs and the agent. In addition, an attempt is made to compare the essential characteristics of the Arabic verbal sentence with an English sentence structure.

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Chapter One is an introduction. Chapter Two presents a brief account of the three schools of Arabic grammatical thought and their methods. In Chapter Three I review the literature related to the verbal sentence. Chapter Four discusses the points of view of medieval and modern grammarians regarding parts of speech and the types of sentence. The first element of the verbal sentence (the predicate) is examined in Chapters Five and Six; Chapter Five focusing on the transitive and intransitive verb while Chapter Six is in a passive voice. The second element of the verbal sentence (the subject) is examined in
Chapters Seven and Eight; Chapter Seven showing the difference between agent and subject terminology and the rules related to them. Chapter Eight is on the deputy agent, examining the reasons for the omission of the agent, the types of deputy agent and the element which takes an agent’s place. The basic word order of verbal sentence and the alternative word order forms are analysed in detail in Chapter Nine while Chapter Ten concentrates on the concept of the tense and aspect and the primary and secondary types of them. Chapter Eleven summarises the main findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

By contrast, the subject controls only the number of the English verb, as S. 59a and 59b below show, so the verb relies on the subject (Jacobsson, 1990: 34; Bock et al. 1993: 58):

S. 59a) The student attends the lesson.
S. 59b) The students attend the lesson.

Although the instrument affects the word of the agent literally, as the example in 60:

S. 60) kafā bi-‘Aliyyin mu‘alliman
be enough- 3ms prep- for-‘Ali-gen indef-teacher- accus
= For teaching ‘Alī is enough.

the nominative case is the original case. Therefore, when these prepositions are deleted, the agent’s original case (nominative) occurs, as in: kafā ‘Aliyyun mu‘alliman ‘for teaching ‘Alī is enough’.
CHAPTER EIGHT
Deputy Agent (nā‘ib al-fā‘il)

8.1. Introduction:

The agent must be mentioned in the original verbal sentence, being considered the second element in this sort of sentence, as illustrated in S. 1:

\[ S. 1 \]
\[
\text{nāma} \quad ^{\text{c}}\text{Aliyyun} \\
\text{slept- 3ms} \quad ^{\text{c}}\text{Ali- nom} \\
= ^{\text{c}}\text{Ali slept.}
\]

For various reasons that will be mentioned later, the agent is sometimes omitted from the verbal sentence; however, there is another nominative noun that must cover its place, S. 2 is an example:

\[ S. 2 \]
\[
\text{suriqa-t} \quad \text{al-sayyāratu} \\
\text{was stolen- 3fs} \quad \text{def- car- nom} \\
= \text{The car was stolen.}
\]

where the object replaces the deleted agent. Thus, the noun which takes its place is called the deputy agent (nā‘ib al-fā‘il). In addition, it follows all the rules pertaining to the agent that were mentioned earlier, so the deputy agent is a nominative noun which takes an agent-deleted position and occurs with the passive voice.

In this chapter, I discuss the reasons for the omission of the agent and the types of deputy agent. The element which takes an agent's place will, in addition, be examined.

8.2. Reasons for the omission of the agent

Arabic grammarians have cited several reasons for this deletion, the majority of which relate to meaning, namely:
i. the agent is well known; therefore there is no benefit to its being mentioned, as illustrated by the following example:

*S. 3)*  
\[
\text{khu\'liqa-t} \quad \text{al-samāwāt} \quad \text{wa-l-ārd}u
\]
were created- 3fs def-heavens- nom-p part-and-def-earth- nom  
= The heavens and the earth were created.

ii. the agent is unknown (S. 4):

*S. 4)*  
\[
\text{futi\'ha} \quad \text{l-bābu}
\]
was opened- 3ms def- door- nom  
= The door was opened.

iii. there is scepticism about the agent (*al-tashakkuk fīh*), as in S. 5:

*S. 5)*  
\[
\text{dummira} \quad \text{l-manzilu}
\]
was destroyed- 3ms def- house- nom  
= The house was destroyed.

Where we do not know precisely who destroy it (i.e., is it *'Alī* or *Muhammadsal*?).

iv. to show the agent is contemptuous (*mu\'taqar*); consider the following example:

*S. 6)*  
\[
\text{ukila} \quad \text{l-kalbu}
\]
was eaten- 3ms def- dog- nom  
= The dog was eaten.

We do not want to mention his/her name because he/she did something which not good.

v. fear of the agent who has done something wrong. This can be seen by S. 7:

*S. 7)*  
\[
\text{ţulima} \quad \text{\textsuperscript{c}Aliyyun}
\]
was wronged- 3ms \textsuperscript{c}Ali- nom  
= \textsuperscript{c}Ali was wronged.
The speaker or writer fears to mention the actor’s name.

vi. to express general meaning, as the example in S. 8:

*S. 8*)

\[ \text{idhā ḥuuyiy-ta bi-taḥiyyatin fa-rudda-hā} \]

\[ \text{when- part greet-2ms prep- with- indef- greeting-gen part-then-2ms-meet- 3ms} \]

\[ \text{- bi-mithli-hā} \]

\[ \text{calā l-aqalli} \]

\[ \text{prep- with- def- similar- pro- it prep- at def- least} \]

\[ = \text{When a greeting is offered to you, at least meet it with a similar greeting.} \]

It means when any greeting is offered to you return it with a similar greeting without looking for any specification or any purpose.

vii. glorification, as S. 9a shows:

*S. 9a*)

\[ \text{qutila l-qātilu} \]

\[ \text{was killed- 3ms def- killer- nom} \]

\[ = \text{The killer was killed.} \]

One would not say,

*S. 9b*)

\[ \text{qatala l-sulṭānu l-qātila} \]

\[ \text{killed- 3ms def- sultan- nom def- killer- accus} \]

\[ = \text{The sultan killed the killer.} \]

where the sultan has great status.

The most common reason in English, on the other hand, is to avoid mentioning the person or thing who carried out the action because it is well known, or unknown, or because it is not necessary (Palmer, 1974: 86; Zandvoort, 1966: 53; Young, 1984: 82; Greenbaum, 1991: 53), as illustrated by the following examples (10a- 10c):

*S. 10a*)

\[ \text{The lesson was explained.} \]

*S. 10b*)

\[ \text{The house was sold.} \]

*S. 10c*)

\[ \text{The criminal was arrested.} \]
8.3. The types of deputy agent are:

The agent comes in different types as follow (Figure 27):

- **explicit noun**
- **pronoun**
- **demonstrative**
- **verbal noun phrase**
- **relative pronoun**
- **adverb**
- **prepositional phrase**

![Figure 27: Types of deputy agent](image)

a. explicit noun (*ism ṣarīḥ*) (S. 11):

\[S. 11\]

\[
\text{shuriba} \quad \text{l-mā’u} \\
\text{was drunk- 3ms} \quad \text{def- water- nom} \\
= \text{Water was drunk.}
\]

b. pronoun, as in sentences 12a and 12b:

\[S. 12a\]

\[
\text{suriq-tu} \\
\text{was robbed- 3ms- 1ms} \\
= \text{Someone robbed me.}
\]

\[S. 12b\]

\[
\text{suriqa} \quad \text{(huwa)} \\
\text{was robbed- 3ms- pro- he} \\
= \text{Someone robbed him.}
\]

c. demonstrative (*ism al-ishāra*) (S. 13):

\[S. 13\]

\[
\text{uṣliha} \quad \text{hādhā} \quad \text{amsi} \\
\text{was repaired- 3ms} \quad \text{dem- this} \quad \text{adv- yesterday} \\
= \text{This was repaired yesterday.}
\]
d. relative pronoun (*al-ism al-mawsul*) (S. 14):

\[S. 14) \text{ukrima alladhī fāza} \]

was honoured- 3ms rel- who won -3ms

= He who won was honoured, or: he was honoured to have won.

e. adverb, as exemplified in 15a and 15b:

\[S. 15a) \text{julisa fawqa l-kursiyyi} \]

was seated- 3ms adv- on def- chair- gen

= Someone was seated on the chair.

\[S. 15b) \text{štima yawmu l-Khamisi} \]

was fasted- 3ms day- nom def- Thursday- gen

= Thursday was fasted.

f. prepositional phrase (*jārrun wa-majrūr*) (S. 16):

\[S. 16) \text{sīra bi-}^{c}\text{Aliyyin} \]

was gone travelling- 3ms prep- with- \(^c\)Alî- gen

= \(^c\)Alî was gone travelling.

g. verbal noun phrase (S. 17a):

\[S. 17a) \text{yufaḍdalu an tata’akkad-ū min }^{c}\text{Aliyyin} \]

be preferable that confirm from \(^c\)Alî
- 3ms - part - 2mp - prep - gen

= It would be preferable to confirm this with \(^c\)Alî.

here, the verb (*tata’akkadū*) following the particle (*an*) is transferred into a noun which is regarded as a deputy agent, as shown in S. 17b:

\[S. 17b) \text{yufaḍdalu ta’akkudu-kum min }^{c}\text{Aliyyin} \]

be preferable- 3ms def-make sure- nom- pro- you-p prep- from \(^c\)Alî- gen

= *It is preferred that you make sure from \(^c\)Alî.
The noun, pronoun and prepositional phrase can take subject-deleted places in English. These all are represented in sentences 18a to 18c, respectively:

18a) The computer was sold.
18b) He was hit.
18c) In the house was slept.

8.4. Alternatives to an agent:

When an agent is omitted, another element in the structure occurs in its place. This is considered to be fundamental (Figure 28):

- **Replacing an agent**
  - direct object
  - locative object
  - verbal noun
  - prepositional phrase

![Figure 28: Alternatives to an agent](image)

**8.4.1. Direct object:**

A transitive construction contains three elements in the following order: verb, agent and object. Sentence (19) is a good example:

19) kataba c.aliyyun al-darsa
    3rote- 3ms c.ali- nom def- lesson- accus
    = c.ali wrote the lesson.

Therefore, logically the best element to take an agent after its deleting from the sentence is a direct object and I will call it agent-deleted position/place, as illustrated below in (S. 20 b). There are many places where the direct object takes agent-deleted position in the Qurʾān, as in Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 48; Āl-ʾUmrán, III: 195 and al-Anfāl, VIII: 70.

kutiba l-darsu

---

43 I have counted more than two hundred places.
In addition, the first object takes an agent-deleted position if the verb governs two or three objects. Consider the following examples (21a-21c):

\[ S. \ 21a) \quad \text{was thought-} \ 3ms \quad \text{\`Ali-} \ \text{nom} \quad \text{indef-} \ \text{generous-} \ \text{accus} \]

\[ = \text{It was thought that \`Ali is generous.} \]

\[ S. \ 21b) \quad \text{was given-} \ 3ms \quad \text{\`Ali-} \ \text{nom} \quad \text{indef-} \ \text{dirhams-} \ \text{accus} \]

\[ = \text{\`Ali was given dirhams.} \]

\[ S. \ 21c) \quad \text{was informed} \ \text{\`Ali} \ \text{Majid} \ \text{indef-} \ \text{generous} \]

\[ = \text{\`Ali was informed that Majid is generous.} \]
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d. **Third object** of a triple transitive:
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8.4.2. Verbal noun (al-maṣdar):

When the agent is omitted with an intransitive verb, the verbal noun may occupy an agent-deleted place, but there are two conditions that have to be obtainable to achieve this function:

a. variability (mutaṣarrif): means that it takes different cases according to its position in the sentence, such as qawl 'word (saying)', where it can take nominative, accusative and genitive cases. These all are represented in S. 25a to S. 25c, respectively:

\[
S. 25a) \quad qawlu \quad ^c\text{Aliyyin} \quad mu^\text{aththirun} \\
\text{word- nom} \quad ^c\text{Ali- gen} \quad \text{indef- effective- nom- ap} \\
= ^c\text{Ali's word is effective.}
\]
S. 25b) inna qawla-hu mu aththirun
   part- indeed def- word- accus- pro-his indef- effective- nom- ap
   = Indeed his speech is effective.

S. 25c) fi qawli-ha hikmatun
   prep- in def- word- gen- pro- her indef- wisdom- nom
   = There is wisdom in her speech.

Therefore, this verbal noun can take an agent-deleted place (S. 26):
S. 26) u tubira qawlu c Aliyyin hujjatan
   was considered word c Ali indef- pretext
   - 3ms - nom - gen - accus
   = c Ali’s word was considered as a pretext.

If, however, the verbal noun takes only an accusative case, it cannot occur in an agent-deleted position, S. 27 is a good example:
S. 27) macadha Allahi
   forbidding- accus God- gen
   = God forbid.

Where macadha cannot take different cases (only accusative), so it is impossible to cover an agent-deleted position.

b. the verbal noun must add a useful meaning to the sentence by following one of three things:
1. to describe the verbal noun, (S. 28):
   S. 28) wuifica wasfun daqiqun
   was described- 3ms indef- description- nom indef- accurate- nom
   = It was described by an accurate description, or It was described accurately.

2. annexation (al-idāfa): two nouns juxtaposed, (S. 29):
   S. 29) julisa julusu l umarā’i
   was sat- 3ms sitting- nom def- princes- gen
   = *It was sat as a royal sitting.
3. to indicate the number with the verbal noun, (S. 30):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S. 30)} & \quad \text{kūfi‘a thalāthu mukāfa‘ātin} \\
\text{was rewarded- 3ms indef- three- nom indef- prizes- gen-p} \\
= & \text{He was awarded three prizes.}
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, the verbal noun cannot occur in an agent-deleted place if, for example, we delete *daqiqun* 'accurate' in sentence 28; *al-umarāʾi* 'princes' in sentence 29; and *thalāthu* 'three' in sentence 30. This is because the verbal sentence will be ambiguous and require something to clarify this verbal noun. I can find only one position which a verbal noun covers the agent-deleted place in the Qurʾān (Sūrat al-Ḥāqq, LXIX: 13).

### 8.4.3. Locative object:

There are also two conditions that must obtain if the locative object is to take an agent-deleted place (Abū Ḥayyān, 1998: 1333-35; al-Murādī, 2001: 604):

a. variability, as the locative object *yawm* 'day', where it takes nominative, accusative and genitive cases according to its position in the sentence. Consider the structure of the following sentences (31a-31c):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S. 31a)} & \quad \text{hādhā yawmun jamīlun} \\
\text{dem- this indef- day- nom indef- beautiful- nom} \\
= & \text{This is a beautiful day.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S. 31b)} & \quad \text{inna yawma l-ikhtibāri yawmun shāqqun} \\
\text{indeed day def- examination indef- day indef-hard} \\
\text{- part - accus - gen - nom - nom} \\
= & \text{Indeed the day (on which the) exam (will take place) is hard.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S. 31c)} & \quad \text{yafrahū l-nāsu fī yawmi l-īḍi} \\
\text{is happy def-people on day def-festive} \\
\text{- 3ms - nom - prep - gen - gen}
\end{align*}
\]
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**8.4.4. Preposition with the genitive:**

There are also two conditions a prepositional phrase that takes an agent place (al-Jawhari, 2004: 341):

a. variability: a preposition can come before different nouns; i.e., there are some prepositions occur with a specific sort of noun, as *rubba* 'many', which occurs with an indefinite noun only, whereas the preposition *ilā* 'to', occurs with any noun whether definite or not, as illustrated in S. 36a and S. 36b:

\[
\text{S. 36a) } \text{dhahaba } c\text{Aliyyun ilā l-jāmi`ati} \\
\text{went-3ms } c\text{Alī- nom prep-to def-university-gen} \\
= c\text{Alī went to university.}
\]

\[
\text{S. 36b) } \text{sāfara } c\text{Aliyyun ilā madinatin} \\
\text{travelled-3ms } c\text{Alī- nom prep-to indef-city-gen} \\
= c\text{Alī travelled to a city.}
\]

However, the agentless (i.e., agent not mentioned at the end of the sentence) in the passive voice is dominant in Arabic, and in English because of the reasons for the use of the passive in the first place (Bryant, 1960: 51; Svartvik, 1966: 141; Huddleston, 1984: 441; al-Tarouti, 1999: 44; Khalil, 2010: 270). Siewierska (84: 35) and al-Tarouti (1999: 44- 45), also believe, the agentless is dominant in all languages of the world because it is the basic structure with the passive voice. In addition, the agent in this voice takes a genitive case, affected by the preposition of phrase that occurs before it.

Saad (1982: 53- 36) claims that there is no agentive passive in Arabic, nor does Arabic have an agentive particle like the English (by) or French (par); he considers that examples such as these are not real passive agentive phrases. Furthermore, it is noted by Saad (1982: 36) that there is no language that has an agentive passive without having an agentless passive.
Finally, it should be noted here that the agent in Arabic can be mentioned or omitted with a passive voice as well as in English (although it is largely omitted), whereas the agent must be mentioned in Arabic and English with an active voice.

On comparison, when a subject is omitted in English, another element in the structure occurs in its place (Figure 29):

![Figure 29: Elements that take a subject place in English](image)

**i. Object:**

The object in English takes a subject-deleted place as well, for example in:

*S. 40) The house has been built.*

Moreover, the direct and indirect object can cover this place when the transitive verb takes two objects. Two examples will illustrate this point (S. 41a and S. 41b):

*S. 41a) The book was given Tom by John.*
*S. 41b) Tom was given the book by John.*

The second usage (S. 41b) is the more frequent (Huddleston, 1984: 440; Burton-Roberts, 1986: 128). Huddleston (1984: 441) and Jacobs (1995: 161-62), however, claim that the direct object with double transitive (ditransitive) cannot take a subject-deleted place, as in the following sentence:

*S. 42a) She was saved a lot of worry by his action.*

It cannot be said:

*S. 42b) *A lot of worry was saved her by his action.*
When the object of active voice is an infinitive or a clause, 'it' covers the subject-deleted position (Scheurweghs, 1959: 341), as illustrated by the following two examples (43a and 43b):

S. 43a) It is decided to write an essay tomorrow.
S. 43b) It is believed that the student understand the lesson.

**ii. The complement of a preposition:**

This complement can cover the subject-deleted place and this kind occurs usually with a prepositional verb, as in Huddleston's example (1988: 177):

S. 44) The matter was looked into by the management.

8.5. **Discussion:**

8.5.1. As the deputy agent takes an agent-deleted place, the agent rules have to be applied to the deputy agent as follows (Figure 30):

However, the agentless (i.e., agent not mentioned at the end of the sentence) in the passive voice is dominant in Arabic, and in English because of the reasons for the use of the passive in the first place (Bryant, 1960: 51; Svartvik, 1966: 141; Huddleston, 1984: 441; al-Tarouti, 1999: 44; Khalil, 2010: 270). Siewierska (84: 35) and al-Tarouti (1999: 44- 45), also believe, the agentless is dominant in all languages of the world because it is the basic structure with the passive voice. In addition, the agent in this voice
takes a genitive case, affected by the preposition of phrase that occurs before it.

Saad (1982: 53-36) claims that there is no agentive passive in Arabic, nor does Arabic have an agentive particle like the English (by) or French (par); he considers that examples such as these are not real passive agentive phrases. Furthermore, it is noted by Saad (1982: 36) that there is no language that has an agentive passive without having an agentless passive. Finally, it should be noted here that the agent in Arabic can be mentioned or omitted with a passive voice as well as in English (although it is largely omitted), whereas the agent must be mentioned in Arabic and English with an active voice.

However, the agentless (i.e., agent not mentioned at the end of the sentence) in the passive voice is dominant in Arabic, and in English because of the reasons for the use of the passive in the first place (Bryant, 1960: 51; Svartvik, 1966: 141; Huddleston, 1984: 441; al-Tarouti, 1999: 44; Khalil, 2010: 270). Siewierska (84: 35) and al-Tarouti (1999: 44-45), also believe, the agentless is dominant in all languages of the world because it is the basic structure with the passive voice. In addition, the agent in this voice takes a genitive case, affected by the preposition of phrase that occurs before it.

Saad (1982: 53-36) claims that there is no agentive passive in Arabic, nor does Arabic have an agentive particle like the English (by) or French (par); he considers that examples such as these are not real passive agentive phrases. Furthermore, it is noted by Saad (1982: 36) that there is no language that has an agentive passive without having an agentless passive. Finally, it should be noted here that the agent in Arabic can be mentioned or omitted with a passive voice as well as in English (although it is largely omitted), whereas the agent must be mentioned in Arabic and English with an active voice.
In spite of the fact that passive does away with the agent, modern linguists have mentioned other ways to present the agent by using prepositional phrases (Badawi et al. 2004: 385). Therefore, Arabic has an agentive passive as well as an agentless one (i.e., the agent can be mentioned at the end of the sentence or omitted). The agent is seen in the passive voice by using several expressions:

a. *min qibali* 'on the part of' (S. 49):

*S. 49)*

\[ shurīḥa \quad l-darsu \quad min \quad qibali \quad ʿAlīyin \]
was explained  
def-lesson  
from  
part of  
ʿAlī
e- 3ms  
- nom  
- prep  
gen  
gen

= The lesson was explained by ʿAlī.

b. *bi-wāsiṭati* 'by means of' (S. 50):

*S. 50)*

\[ buniya-t \quad al-jāmiʿatu \quad bi-wāsiṭati \]
was built-3fs  
def-university-nom  
prep-in-means of-gen
- ʿsharikatīn  

kabīratīn
indef- company-gen  
indef- large-gen

= The university was built by a large company.

c. *min jānibi* 'from the side of' (S. 51):

*S. 51)*

\[ rufīda-t \quad al-fikratū \quad min \quad jānibi \quad ʿAlīyin \]
was refused  
def-idea  
from  
side of  
ʿAlī
e- 3fs  
- nom  
- prep  
gen  
gen

= The idea was refused by ʿAlī.

d. *ʿalā aydī* 'at (by) the hand of' (S. 52):

*S. 52)*

\[ qutila \quad ʿalā aydī \quad ʿiṣābatīn \quad majhūlatin \]
was killed  
on  
hand of  
indef-gang  
indef-unidentified
- 3ms  
- prep  
gen  
gen  
gen

= He was killed by an unidentified gang.

e. *min ūtarafi* 'on the part of' (S. 53):

*S. 53)*

\[ sujīla-t \quad al-ahdāfu \quad min \quad ūtarafi \quad lāʾibīn \quad mashhūrin \]
Moreover, the agent with the passive voice is occasionally found in traditional texts; for example, the Qur'an shows the prepositions (min) 'from' (e.g., Sūrat Hūd, XI: 1), (‘alā) 'on' (e.g., Sūrat Yūnus, X: 20) and (bi-) 'with' (Sūrat al-Mā‘īda, V: 78) (al-Tarouti, 1999: 41-42), as shown in Sūrat al-An‘ām, VI: 106 (S. 55):  

**S. 55)**  

\[
\text{Kutiba l-tārikhu bi-aqlāmi ‘ulamā‘a mukhlīsina}
\]

= The history was written by dedicated scientists.

Thus, the agentive passive is not exclusive to Modern Arabic, where a classical text proves that the agent can be expressed in a passive sentence. By contrast, the subject can be mentioned in English at the end of the sentence by using one of two devices 'by' or 'with' (Parrott, 2000: 297; Khalil, 2010: 270). The two strategies are spelt out in the following examples (56a and 56b):  

**S. 56a)**  

The window was broken by Tom.

**S. 56b)**  

The window was broken with a stone.

However, the agentless (i.e., agent not mentioned at the end of the sentence) in the passive voice is dominant in Arabic, and in English because
of the reasons for the use of the passive in the first place (Bryant, 1960: 51; Svartvik, 1966: 141; Huddleston, 1984: 441; al-Tarouti, 1999: 44; Khalil, 2010: 270). Siewierska (84: 35) and al-Tarouti (1999: 44-45), also believe, the agentless is dominant in all languages of the world because it is the basic structure with the passive voice. In addition, the agent in this voice takes a genitive case, affected by the preposition of phrase that occurs before it.

Saad (1982: 53-36) claims that there is no agentive passive in Arabic, nor does Arabic have an agentive particle like the English (by) or French (par); he considers that examples such as these are not real passive agentive phrases. Furthermore, it is noted by Saad (1982: 36) that there is no language that has an agentive passive without having an agentless passive. Finally, it should be noted here that the agent in Arabic can be mentioned or omitted with a passive voice as well as in English (although it is largely omitted), whereas the agent must be mentioned in Arabic and English with an active voice.

8.5.3. There are three kinds of object that may take an agent-deleted place (Figure 31):

![Figure 31: Kinds of objects taking an agent-deleted position]

However, the agentless (i.e., agent not mentioned at the end of the sentence) in the passive voice is dominant in Arabic, and in English because of the reasons for the use of the passive in the first place (Bryant, 1960: 51; Svartvik, 1966: 141; Huddleston, 1984: 441; al-Tarouti, 1999: 44; Khalil, 2010: 270). Siewierska (84: 35) and al-Tarouti (1999: 44-45), also believe,
the agentless is dominant in all languages of the world because it is the basic structure with the passive voice. In addition, the agent in this voice takes a genitive case, affected by the preposition of phrase that occurs before it.

Saad (1982: 53-36) claims that there is no agentive passive in Arabic, nor does Arabic have an agentive particle like the English (by) or French (par); he considers that examples such as these are not real passive agentive phrases. Furthermore, it is noted by Saad (1982: 36) that there is no language that has an agentive passive without having an agentless passive. Finally, it should be noted here that the agent in Arabic can be mentioned or omitted with a passive voice as well as in English (although it is largely omitted), whereas the agent must be mentioned in Arabic and English with an active voice.

However, other kinds of object cannot occur in an agent-deleted position, e.g., purposive object (*maflul lah/ li-ajlih*); and accompanying object (*maflul ma’ah*), as in sentences 60a and 60b:

*S. 60a*

<amal-tu           l-<aflata             takriman                      li-‘Aliyyin
made- 1ms def- party- accus      indef- in honour- accus prep- for-‘Alī-gen
=
I made the party in honour of ‘Alī.

*S. 60b*

ḥadār-tu l-<hafla alldhī yatazāmanu wa-l-mu’tamara
attended    def- party   which coincided    and- def- conference
- 1ms       - accus    - rel   - 3ms       - part - accus
= I attended the party which coincided with the conference.

In these sentences (S. 60a and 60b) the purposive object *takriman* ‘in honour of’ and the accompanying object (wa-*l-mu’tamara*) ‘with the conference’ cannot take the agent place when they change to the passive voice, in order not to lose their basic meaning when they cover an agent-deleted position, where the purposive object presents a reasoning meaning, and the accompanying object denotes ‘withness’. 

In these sentences (S. 60a and 60b) the purposive object *takrīman* ‘in honour of’ and the accompanying object (wa-*l-mu’tamara*) ‘with the conference’ cannot take the agent place when they change to the passive voice, in order not to lose their basic meaning when they cover an agent-deleted position, where the purposive object presents a reasoning meaning, and the accompanying object denotes ‘withness’.
However, the agentless (i.e., agent not mentioned at the end of the sentence) in the passive voice is dominant in Arabic, and in English because of the reasons for the use of the passive in the first place (Bryant, 1960: 51; Svartvik, 1966: 141; Huddleston, 1984: 441; al-Tarouti, 1999: 44; Khalil, 2010: 270). Siewierska (84: 35) and al-Tarouti (1999: 44-45), also believe, the agentless is dominant in all languages of the world because it is the basic structure with the passive voice. In addition, the agent in this voice takes a genitive case, affected by the preposition of phrase that occurs before it.

Saad (1982: 53-36) claims that there is no agentive passive in Arabic, nor does Arabic have an agentive particle like the English (by) or French (par); he considers that examples such as these are not real passive agentive phrases. Furthermore, it is noted by Saad (1982: 36) that there is no language that has an agentive passive without having an agentless passive. Finally, it should be noted here that the agent in Arabic can be mentioned or omitted with a passive voice as well as in English (although it is largely omitted), whereas the agent must be mentioned in Arabic and English with an active voice.

Thus, muʕalliman wa-bāḥīthan 'as a teacher and researcher' and musriʕan 'quickly' in sentences 61a and 61b cannot take an agent-deleted place because they occur as an indefinite noun, whereas the noun which covers an agent place should be a definite or assignable indefinite noun, and the tamyīz and ḥāl cannot be changed to a definite (Ibn Yaʕīsh, 2001, IV: 310-11).

8.5.4. The verb with a prepositional phrase becomes a third person masculine singular in the passive voice (S. 62a and S. 62b):

\[
S. 62a) \quad \text{murra} \quad \text{bi-}^{c}\text{Alīyyin} \\
\text{was passed- 3ms} \quad \text{prep- by-}^{c}\text{Alī- gen} \\
= \text{Someone passed by }^{c}\text{Alī.}
\]
Moreover, the constructions with locative object and absolute object are called impersonal passives (Saad, 1982: 30-31) (S. 63a and S. 63b):

S. 63a) šima yawmun āṭawilun
was fasted-3ms indef-day-nom indef-long-nom
= A long day was fasted.

S. 64b) julisa julūsun mūriḥun
was sat-3ms indef-sitting-nom indef-comfortable-nom
= *It was a comfortable stay.

The impersonal passive comes in English as well and usually with an intransitive verb, as illustrated in 65;

S. 65) It is said that Charley is a good teacher.

However, this kind of passive is not common in Arabic as it is in English, especially with formal written style (Parrott: 2000, 291).

8.5.5. There are four elements which can cover an agent-deleted position; direct object, verbal noun, locative object and prepositional phrase, and all Arabic grammarians agree that each of these elements take this place if the verbal sentence contains only one of them. However, the agentless (i.e., agent not mentioned at the end of the sentence) in the passive voice is dominant in Arabic, and in English because of the reasons for the use of the passive in the first place (Bryant, 1960: 51; Svartvik, 1966: 141; Huddleston, 1984: 441; al-Tarouti, 1999: 44; Khalil, 2010: 270). Siewierska (84: 35) and al-Tarouti (1999: 44-45), also believe, the agentless is dominant in all languages of the world because it is the basic structure with the passive voice. In addition, the agent in this voice takes a genitive case, affected by the preposition of phrase that occurs before it.
Saad (1982: 53-36) claims that there is no agentive passive in Arabic, nor does Arabic have an agentive particle like the English (by) or French (par); he considers that examples such as these are not real passive agentive phrases. Furthermore, it is noted by Saad (1982: 36) that there is no language that has an agentive passive without having an agentless passive. Finally, it should be noted here that the agent in Arabic can be mentioned or omitted with a passive voice as well as in English (although it is largely omitted), whereas the agent must be mentioned in Arabic and English with an active voice.

However, the agentless (i.e., agent not mentioned at the end of the sentence) in the passive voice is dominant in Arabic, and in English because of the reasons for the use of the passive in the first place (Bryant, 1960: 51; Svartvik, 1966: 141; Huddleston, 1984: 441; al-Tarouti, 1999: 44; Khalil, 2010: 270). Siewierska (84: 35) and al-Tarouti (1999: 44-45), also believe, the agentless is dominant in all languages of the world because it is the basic structure with the passive voice. In addition, the agent in this voice takes a genitive case, affected by the preposition of phrase that occurs before it.

Saad (1982: 53-36) claims that there is no agentive passive in Arabic, nor does Arabic have an agentive particle like the English (by) or French (par); he considers that examples such as these are not real passive agentive phrases. Furthermore, it is noted by Saad (1982: 36) that there is no language that has an agentive passive without having an agentless passive. Finally, it should be noted here that the agent in Arabic can be mentioned or omitted with a passive voice as well as in English (although it is largely omitted), whereas the agent must be mentioned in Arabic and English with an active voice.

8.6. Conclusion:
The verbal sentence cannot be structured without two elements and the agent is considered the second element which must be a noun and is governed by a verb. However, the agent can be omitted for several reasons, especially with the passive voice, so another nominative noun must occupy the agent-deleted position and will take all its rules. However, the agentless (i.e., agent not mentioned at the end of the sentence) in the passive voice is dominant in Arabic, and in English because of the reasons for the use of the passive in the first place (Bryant, 1960: 51; Svartvik, 1966: 141; Huddleston, 1984: 441; al-Tarouti, 1999: 44; Khalil, 2010: 270). Siewierska (84: 35) and al-Tarouti (1999: 44-45), also believe, the agentless is dominant in all languages of the world because it is the basic structure with the passive voice. In addition, the agent in this voice takes a genitive case, affected by the preposition of phrase that occurs before it.

Saad (1982: 53-36) claims that there is no agentive passive in Arabic, nor does Arabic have an agentive particle like the English (by) or French (par); he considers that examples such as these are not real passive agentive phrases. Furthermore, it is noted by Saad (1982: 36) that there is no language that has an agentive passive without having an agentless passive. Finally, it should be noted here that the agent in Arabic can be mentioned or omitted with a passive voice as well as in English (although it is largely omitted), whereas the agent must be mentioned in Arabic and English with an active voice.

The agent, however, can be recalled with the passive voice at the end of the sentence through the use of several means; e.g., min qibali 'on the part of'; bi-wāsitati 'by means of'; min jānibi 'from the side of' and using /bi-/; this way of expression being found in the traditional texts as well as in the modern. Because of a verbal sentence contains more than one element as discussed in the previous chapters, the word order of this structure has to be investigated as it will be in Chapter Nine.
CHAPTER NINE

Word Order of the Verbal Sentence

9.1. Introduction:

Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order. Consider the following examples in sentences 1 and 2:

S. 1) qatala ³Aliyyun al-asada
kill- 3ms ³Ali- nom def- lion- accus
= ³Ali killed the lion.

S. 2) qatala l-asadu ³Aliyyan
kill- 3ms def- lion- nom ³Alî- accus
= The lion killed ³Alî.

As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (nazarıyyat al-¢āmil) and considered every element to be governed by another element:
thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.

In this chapter, I focus upon word order in verbal sentences. I will discuss the basic word order of the verbal sentence and, in addition, will examine the alternative word orders in this type of sentence, as well as looking at other important issues in this topic. I will use the following abbreviations for the verbal sentence elements; V= verb; S= agent (subject) and O= object.

9.2. The basic word order of the verbal sentence:

The verb precedes an agent (subject) in the normal word order, and the object comes after the agent if the verb is transitive, as in sentences 1 and 2 above. Although the Kūfan grammarians considered that the agent can precede the verb in the verbal sentence (see Chapter Four), all Classical Arabic grammarians, however, agree that the VSO order is to be considered as the basic word order in this type of sentence (al-Istirābādīhī, 1996, I: 187). Some modern grammarians also believe this, including Cantarino (1974: 41); Thalji (1982: 10); Saad (1982: 8); Badawi et al. (2004: 344); al-Jarf (2007: 300) and Khalil (2010: 96). Likewise, Bakir (1979: 10) and Fassi Fehri (1993: 19) take the view that VSO is the basic order in any Arabic sentence, while Thalji (1982: 15) and Holes (1995: 204) also regard VSO as the dominant order in Modern Literary Arabic (cf. Ingham, 1994: 37-38).

Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in
their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is
sometimes dependent upon the word order.

As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested
in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in
several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the
relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an
important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs
an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an
agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue
in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (naẓariyyat
al-ʿāmil) and considred every element to be governed by another element:
thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study
all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-
Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.

Finally in a question context, where the verb must follow a question
particle, (S. 7):

S. 7a) hal ḥaḍara ʿAlīyyun al-darsa?
inte- did attended- 3ms ʿAlī- nom def- lesson- accus
= Did ʿAlī attend the lesson?

Here the agent follows the verb, but may follow the object, as the example
in 7b:

S. 7b) hal ḥaḍara l-darsa ʿAlīyyun?
inte- did attended- 3ms def- lesson- accus ʿAlī- nom
= Did ʿAlī attend the lesson?

Both usages are found in the Qurʾān, as in Sūrahs al-Māʾīda, V: 112 and al-
Ghāshiya, LXXXVIII: 1.

9.2.1. Verb/agent agreement:
In this order, the verb agrees with its agent in terms of person and gender; the verb takes a third person singular, either masculine or feminine, with an explicit noun and pronoun, as in sentences 8a and 8b below show (see also for example Sūrah al-Baqara, II: 282 and al-Naml, XXVII: 18); while the verb takes a first and second person with a pronoun, as illustrated in S. 8c and S. 8d (see also Sūrah al-Māʾida, V: 117 and al-Tawba, IX: 92):

*S. 8a)*

\[
\text{shariba } \overset{\text{'Aliyyun}}{\text{Al-i}} \overset{\text{al-māʾa}}{\text{nom def-water-accus}} \\
\text{drank-3ms} \\
= \overset{\text{Alī}}{\text{drank the water.}}
\]

*S. 8b)*

\[
\text{shariba-t} \overset{\text{hiya}}{\text{pro}} \overset{\text{l-māʾa}}{\text{def-water-accus}} \\
\text{drank-3fs} \\
= \text{She drank the water.}
\]

*S. 8c)*

\[
\text{sharib-tu} \overset{\text{l-māʾa}}{\text{def-water-accus}} \\
\text{drank-1ms} \\
= \text{I drank the water.}
\]

*S. 8d)*

\[
\text{sharib-tī} \overset{\text{l-māʾa}}{\text{def-water-accus}} \\
\text{drank-2fs} \\
= \text{You drank the water.}
\]

The verb will be masculine with a masculine agent, and feminine with a feminine agent,\(^{44}\) as illustrated by S. 9a and S. 9b:

*S. 9a)*

\[
\text{shariba } \overset{\text{'Aliyyun}}{\text{Al-i}} \overset{\text{al-māʾa}}{\text{nom def-water-accus}} \\
\text{drank-3ms} \\
= \overset{\text{Alī}}{\text{drank the water.}}
\]

*S. 9b)*

\[
\text{shariba-t} \overset{\text{Hindun}}{\text{Hind- nom}} \overset{\text{al-māʾa}}{\text{def-water-accus}} \\
\text{drank-3fs} \\
= \text{Hind drank the water.}
\]

\(^{44}\) The feminine /tāʾ particle is attached to a perfective pattern at the end of the form, as in *akalat Hindun al-tuffāhata* 'Hind ate the apple'; and at the beginning with an imperfective pattern *ta kulu Hindun al-tuffāhata* 'Hind eats the apple'.
However, Sibawayh (1988, II: 38) believed that the /tāʔ/ particle which comes directly after the perfective verb form or at the beginning of imperfective verb could be deleted with a human feminine agent where it was reported that nomadic Arabs said:

\[ S. 10) \quad \text{qāla} \quad \text{fulānatun} \]

\[ \text{said- 3ms} \quad \text{indef- so-and-so- nom} \]

\[ = \text{So-and-so said.} \]

Ibn ‘Usfūr (nd, II: 392) and Ibn Mālik (cited by Ibn ‘Aqīl, 1980, III: 92) followed Sibawayh’s view and depended on his evidence. It seems though, that the verb must come with the /tāʔ/ particle if the agent is human feminine because the majority of grammarians agree on that (‘Āṭṭār, 1998: 243); in addition, there is no strong evidence supporting Sibawayh’s claim since all verbs attach the /tāʔ/ particle with a human feminine agent as can be shown from Qurʾānic examples and other literary sources.

On the other hand, the verb takes a singular form in a VSO order whether the agent is singular, dual or plural, as shown by the following examples (S. 10a- 10c):

\[ S. 10a) \quad \text{jāʔa} \quad \text{l-mudiru} \]

\[ \text{came- 3ms} \quad \text{def- director- nom} \]

\[ = \text{The director came.} \]

\[ S. 10b) \quad \text{jāʔa} \quad \text{l-mudirāni} \]

\[ \text{came- 3ms} \quad \text{def- two directors- nom- d} \]

\[ = \text{The two directors came.} \]

\[ S. 10c) \quad \text{jāʔa} \quad \text{l-mudirūna} \]

\[ \text{came- 3ms} \quad \text{def- directors- nom- p} \]

\[ = \text{The directors came.} \]

The verb can, however, take dual and plural forms with dual and plural agents; this usage comes in two Qurʾānic verses (Sūrah al-Māʾīda, V: 71 and al-Anbiyāʾ, XXI: 3) and in several lines of poetry, an issue discussed
earlier (see Chapter Four) (cf. Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 98-100). In addition, al-Suhaylī said that this usage is frequently found in the Hadīth (the sayings and deeds of the Prophet) (al-Murādī, 2001: 586). Therefore, we can say (S. 11a and 11b):

**S. 11a)**

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{jā²-ā} & \text{l-mudirāni} \\
\text{came- 3md} & \text{def- two directors- nom- d} \\
\end{array}
\]

= The two directors came.

**S. 11b)**

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{jā²-ū} & \text{l-mudirūna} \\
\text{came- 3mp} & \text{def- directors- nom- p} \\
\end{array}
\]

= The directors came.

The verb can also take a plural marker when the agent is referring to something in general plural (Cantarino, 1974: 84), (12) is an example:

**S. 12**

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
yaqūl-\text{ūna} & \text{inna} & \text{l-riyādata} \\
\text{3mp- say} & \text{part- that} & \text{def- exercise- accus} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{lllllllllll}
\text{- ḫalājun} & \text{li-kulli} & \text{dā³in} & \\
\text{indef- cures- nom} & \text{prep- for- indef- every-gen} & \text{indef- diseases- gen} \\
\end{array}
\]

= People say that exercise cures all diseases.

Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order.

As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the
relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (naẓariyyat al-ʿāmil) and considered every element to be governed by another element: thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.

By contrast, the basic word order in English is SVO (Carter et al. 2006: 778; al-Jarf, 2007: 310; Swan, 2009: 496), as exemplified in S. 13:

*S. 13*) Mark drove a car.

Also, the verb will be singular with a singular noun or pronoun (S. 14a and S. 14b):

*S. 14a*) Rebecca teaches at a primary school.
*S. 14b*) He studies very hard.

Whereas the verb comes as a plural with a plural noun or pronoun (S. 15a and S. 15b):

*S. 15a*) The students attend the party.
*S. 15b*) They have a good quality.

The collective noun may take both singular and plural markers, relying on the speaker or writer intended. When all the group members act together to do something as one, the verb takes a singular marker, as illustrated in S. 16a:

*S. 16a*) The family has a party.

While if the members of the group act to do something as individuals, the verb comes as a plural pattern (Vallins, 1966: 119; Burton, 1984: 145; Wardhaugh, 1995: 79; Vigliocco et al. 1996: 262), as shown in the following example:
However, there is a number of plural subject can take a singular verb (Christophersen et al. 1969: 245-46):

i. with names of games and diseases (S. 17a and S. 17b):

S. 17a) Billiards is a popular game.
S. 17b) Mumps is a dangerous disease.

ii. with names of sciences ending in –ics usage mainly take a singular verb (S. 18):

S. 18) Politics is a complicated game.

iii. with nouns denoting units of measurement when they occur in structure of modification with numeral, as in S. 19:

S. 19) Ten miles is an exact distance.

Although the SVO order is the basic order with affirmative English structures, a VSO order is permissible in such cases as the following (Christophersen et al. 1969: 242-44; Burton, 1984: 13-14; Chalker, 1984: 18; Swan, 2009: 280):

i. with 'may', implying wishing or hoping (S. 20):

S. 20) May all the students pass the exam.

ii. After 'so', 'neither' and 'nor' in short responses, when they come within the same structure and are followed by an auxiliary verb and subject, as illustrated by the following two examples:

S. 21a) I am happy. – So am I.
S. 21b) I do not like running. – Neither/ Nor do I.

iii. After 'as' (S. 22):

S. 22) He was very nervous, as were all his family.

iv. With sentences beginning with a negative adverbial, as shown in the following example taken from Christophersen et al. (1969: 243):
Never was a journey more necessary.

9.3. The alternative word orders of a verbal sentence:

The verbal sentence exhibits a number of admissible orders, which are SVO, VOS, OVS, OSV and SOV, as in (Figure 32):

![Word orders diagram]

Figure 32: The alternative word orders of a verbal sentence

Despite the free word order in Arabic, these orders affect the agreement between verb and agent. Each order will be discussed in detail below.

The writer or speaker adjusts to an alternative word order so as to present the most important element at the beginning of the sentence (Sibawayh, 1988, I: 34; al-Jurjānī, 1982: 330). Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order.

9.3.1. SVO:

Although all Arabic grammarians agree that SVO is permissible in Arabic, they disagree in terms of its type, i.e., whether it is a nominal or verbal sentence. I discussed this issue in the types of sentences section (see Chapter Four) and I established that this order is a sort of verbal sentence. If it does not take the basic VSO order, the verbal sentence often takes this
SVO order, frequently occurring in spoken and written Arabic, especially with headlines (Badawi et al. 2004: 349). Indeed, Holes (1995: 205) claims that SVO is the main alternative order. This sort of order is similar to the basic word order in an English sentence, as exemplified in S. 25:

*S. 25*  
\[ \text{'Aliyyun kataba l-darsa} \]
\[ \text{'Ali- nom wrote- 3ms def- lesson- accus} \]
\[ = \text{'Ali wrote the lesson.} \]

Greenberg (1966: 79) comments that "all languages with dominant VSO order have SVO as an alternative or as the only alternative basic order." Greenberg’s remark is applied to Arabic; though Arabic has other alternatives as we will see. Importantly, however, the verbal sentence cannot take SVO order when the agent appears as an indefinite noun, as represented in sentence 26 below, since the defining of the noun or the assignable indefinite noun at the beginning of the Arabic sentence is a fundamental condition. All the grammarians have agreed on this issue because such defining cannot give a judgment on an unknown thing. Thus, when the agent precedes the verb, the agent must be placed in the defining case or be an assignable indefinite noun.

*S. 26*  
\[ \text{‘tālibun kataba l-darsa} \]
\[ \text{indef- student- nom wrote- 3ms def- lesson- accus} \]
\[ = \text{A student wrote the lesson.} \]

Moreover, the verb agrees with the agent in terms of number: singular, dual and plural. This can be illustrated by the following examples 27a- 27c (see also for example Sūrahs Āl-ʾUmran, III: 122; al-Naḥl, XVI: 54 and al-Takwīr, LXXXI: 1):

*S. 27*  
\[ \text{al-muhandisu haḍara l-ijtimāʾa} \]
\[ \text{def- engineer- nom attended- 3ms def- meeting- accus} \]
\[ = \text{The engineer attended the meeting.} \]

\[ \text{al-muhandisānī ḥaḍar-ā l-ijtimāʾa} \]
\[ \text{def- two engineers- nom-d attended- 3md def- meeting- accus} \]
In the SVO order, the verb agrees with its agent in terms of gender, whether human or non-human singular noun (Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 108). Consider the following examples 28a- 28c:

**S. 28a)**

cAliyyun akala tuffāḥatan
cAli- nom ate- 3ms indef- apple- accus

= cAlī ate an apple.

**S. 28b)**

Hindun akala-t tuffāḥatan
Hind- nom ate- 3fs indef- apple- accus

= Hind ate an apple.

**S. 28c)**

al-mubārātu bada’a-t
def- match- nom started- 3fs

= The match started.

However, there are some exceptions to these two rules (that the verb agrees with its agent in terms of gender and number):

i. when the agent is non-human feminine sound plural, the verb comes as singular or plural, as in S. 29:

**S. 29)**

al-sayyārātu waqaf-na/waqaфа-t  fī l-khāriji
def-cars- nom-p parked- 3fp-s prep- in def-outside- gen

= The cars parked outside.

Both usages are found in the Qurʾān (Sūrahs al-Nisāʾ, IV: 160; Maryam, XIX: 90 and al-Jāthiya, XLV: 8).
ii. Ibn Kaysän (d. 299/911) claimed that the verb may or may not agree with a non-human feminine singular agent in terms of gender when the sentence structure comes as SVO (Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 108-10); thus, it can be said:

\[ S. 30 \]

\[
\text{al-mubārātu} \quad \text{bada}^\prime\text{a-}(t) \\
\text{def-match- nom} \quad \text{started- 3(m-f)s} \\
\]

= The match started.

Here the verb can be masculine or feminine. It seems that he did not rely on any evidence, but he did compare the SVO with the VSO order; in the later also stating that the verb may or may not carry the /tāʔ/ particle with a non-human feminine singular agent. There are more than 100 verses in the Qurʾān where the verb attaches the feminine /tāʔ/ particle with a non-human feminine singular agent, whereas in the SVO order non-verse comes without the /tāʔ/ being attached to a non-human feminine agent.

iii. the verb agrees with its broken plural agent (jamʿ taksīr) in terms of number whose singular pattern is human masculine, as, for example:

\[ S. 31a \]

\[
\text{al-rijāl} \quad \text{qām-ū} \quad \text{bi-}^\prime\text{amalīn} \quad \text{shāqqīn} \\
\text{def- men} \quad \text{worked} \quad \text{in- indef- work} \quad \text{indef- hard} \\
\text{- nom- p} \quad \text{- 3mp} \quad \text{- prep- gen} \quad \text{- gen} \\
\]

= The men worked hard.

The verb sometimes is suffixed by a /-tāʔ/ particle without consideration of its masculine agent, as exemplified in 31b:

\[ S. 31b \]

\[
\text{al-tullābū} \quad \text{ḥadāra-t} \quad \text{al-darsa} \\
\text{def- students- nom-p} \quad \text{attended- 3fs} \quad \text{def- lesson- accus} \\
\]

= The students attended the lesson.

Both usages are found in the Qurʾān (Sūrahs al-Ahzāb, XXXIII: 23 and al-Mursalāt, LXXVII: 11). In addition, the verb takes a singular or plural feminine form with a non-human broken plural agent whose singular is masculine. The two strategies are spelt out in the following example (S. 32a and S. 32b):
I find both usages in the Qurʾān (Sūrahs al-Anbiyāʾ, XXI: 79 and al-Infiṭār, LXXXII: 3).

iv. with a collective agent noun\(^{45}\) (ḥisām), the verb will be masculine or feminine singular; or else the verb can take a plural marker (S. 33a and S. 33b):

\[\text{S. 33a) } \text{farīqun } \text{mina } \text{l-ṭullābi} \]
\[\text{indef- group- nom- p prep- from def- students- gen-p} \]
\[-\text{dhhaba-}(t) \quad \text{li-l-ji\text{mi}čati} \]
\[\text{went- 3(m-f)s prep- to def- university- gen} \]
\[\text{= A group of students went to university.} \]

\[\text{S. 33b) } \text{farīqun } \text{mina } \text{l-ṭullābi} \]
\[\text{indef- group- nom- p prep- from def- students- gen-p} \]
\[-\text{dhhab-ū } \quad \text{li-l-ji\text{mi}čati} \]
\[\text{went- 3mp prep- to def- university- gen} \]
\[\text{= A group of students went to university.} \]

Such usages are found in the Qurʾān as in Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 134; Āl-ʿUmrān, III: 13 and 104. In addition, the verb takes masculine or feminine singular with a generic noun\(^{46}\) (ḥisān), as in the following sentence:

\[\text{al-baqaru } \text{akala-}(t) \quad \text{al-čushba} \]

\(^{45}\) A collective noun is "a noun which denotes a group of entities" (Crystal: 1992, 70).

\(^{46}\) A generic noun in Arabic is a plural noun, the singular form of which comes by adding /ṭāʾ/ or /yāʾ/ at the end of the pattern, as in tamr/ tamratun 'dates' or Rūm/ Rūmiyyun 'Greek', or a noun which can be used for a singular or plural, as in māʾ 'water'.

9.3.2. VOS:

The object can be placed between the verb and the agent (Sibawayh, 1988, I: 34); i.e., the object precedes the agent (S. 35):

\[
S. \text{ 35) } \text{kataba } \text{l-risālata } \text{Aliyyun} \\
\text{wrote- 3ms } \text{def- lesson- accus } \text{Ali- nom} \\
= \text{Ali wrote the letter.}
\]

Al-Shalan (1983: 19), Agius (1991: 43), and Holes (1995: 205), relying on examples from Modern Literary Arabic, considered that this order was not a common structure with the verbal sentence. The study by Anshen and Schreiber (1968: 792-97), however, shows that it was the basic order in Arabic. I had thought that this order is in fact common in both Classical and Modern Literary Arabic, given that it occurs in 156 Qurʾānic verses (e.g. Sūrah al-Baqara, II: 55, 118, 115 and al-An'am, VI: 70), though it is not as common as the VSO and SVO orders. This order is allowed as long as it does not lead to ambiguity between the agent and object (al-Mubarrid, 1994, III: 118) i.e., where the case marker does not appear at the end with both of them (i.e., /u/ with the agent and /a/ with the object); consider the following two examples (S. 36a and S. 36b):

\[
S. \text{ 36a) } \text{darrasa } \text{Mūsā } \text{Yahyā} \\
\text{learnt- 3ms } \text{Mūsā- nom } \text{Yahyā- accus} \\
= \text{Mūsā taught Yahyā.
}\]

\[
\text{akhadha } \text{hādhā(1) } \text{hādhā(2)}
\]
These examples clearly show no case marker for the agent or the object. Therefore, we have Mūsā and hādhā(1) as the agent, while Yaḥyā and hādhā(2) are the object. I found only one verse in the Qurʾān which supports this rule, namely Sūrat al-Baqara, II: 282. However, if the structure of the sentence has syntactic evidence (clues), as in sentences 37a to 37c below, or a semantic clue as in sentence 38, the object can precede the agent, even if the case marker does not appear with the agent and object (al-Istirābāḥi, 1996, I: 190), as in the examples:

**S. 37a)**

\[
\text{darrasa-t} \quad \text{Mūsā} \quad \text{Hudā} \\
\text{learnt-3fs} \quad \text{Mūsā-accus} \quad \text{Hudā-nom} \\
= \text{Hudā taught Mūsā.}
\]

**S. 37b)**

\[
\text{akhadha} \quad \text{hādhā} \quad \text{hādhā} \quad \text{l-rajulu} \\
\text{took-3ms} \quad \text{this-accus} \quad \text{this-nom} \quad \text{def-man-nom} \\
= \text{This man took this (book).}
\]

**S. 37c)**

\[
\text{qābala} \quad \text{l-Yaḥyayayni} \quad \text{l-Mūsāni} \\
\text{met-3ms} \quad \text{def-two Yaḥyās-accus} \quad \text{def-two Mūsās-nom} \\
= \text{The two Mūsās met the two Yaḥyās.}
\]

**S. 38)**

\[
\text{akala} \quad \text{l-kummathrā} \quad \text{Mūsā} \\
\text{ate-3ms} \quad \text{def-pear-accus} \quad \text{Mūsā-nom} \\
= \text{Mūsā ate the pear.}
\]

The feminine /-t/ particle that comes at the end of the verb *darrasat* cannot occur with a masculine singular agent in sentence 37a. In sentence 37b, the noun that intended to mean *al-rajulu* ‘the man’ removes the problem of ambiguity where the case marker accompanying it displays which *hādhā* is the agent; in addition, the dual case marker points out the agent and object in sentence 37c, where the agent must show /-āni/ while the object shows /-
ayni/ at the end of the form. The meaning in sentence 38 is obvious. Here 'the pear' was being eaten and as it is impossible for it to eat something, the eater must be the agent. Thus, the objects precede the agent in these sentences, and they can move freely, which means that the sentences which do not have syntactic or semantic clues have a strict word order (VSO), and this order is generally permissible when the agent and object, or one of them, will be carrying an apparent case marker.

It is obligatory for the verbal sentence to take this word order (VOS) in cases such as the following:

i. when the agent is construed with a main exceptive device (illā) (Ibn Abī al-Rabīʿ, 1986: 276), (S. 39) (see, also, for example Sūrahs al-Anʿām, VI: 9 and al-Muddathir, LXXIV: 31):

\[ S. 39 \]
\[
mā ḥadara l-darsa illā ʿAliyyun
\]
\[
no attended def- lesson except ʿAlī
\]
\[
- neg - 3ms - accus - part - nom
\]
\[=\]
No one attended the lesson except ʿAlī.

ii. when the agent is modified by innamā particle (al-Murādī, 2001: 595; Peled, 2009: 75), (S. 40) (see also for example Sūrahs al-Nahl, XVI: 92 and Fāṭir, XXXV: 28):

\[ S. 40 \]
\[
innamā ḥadara l-darsa ʿAliyyun
\]
\[
part- only attended- 3ms def- lesson- accus ʿAlī- nom
\]
\[=\]
Only ʿAlī attended the lesson.

iii. The agent is attached to a pronoun that refers to the object, (S. 41):

\[ S. 41 \]
\[
iḥtarama ʿAliyyan ibnu-hu
\]
\[
respected- 3ms ʿAlī- accus def- son- nom-pro- his
\]
\[=\]
ʿAlī's son respected him.

Word order
is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order.

As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (nazarīyyat al-ʿāmil) and considered every element to be governed by another element: thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.

iv. when the object pronoun is embedded in the verb and the agent is an explicit noun, the agent must follow the object, as in sentence 43, because the object pronoun has to depend on the verb, and the verb, with its object, must precede the agent. The Qurʾān supports this order in more than 130 verses (e.g. Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 55; Āl-ʿUmrān, III: 120 and al-Nisāʾ, IV: 72).

\[\text{S. 43) } \text{samiʿa-nī } \text{ ʿAlīyyun} \]
\[\text{heard- 3ms- 1ms } \text{ ʿAlī- nom} \]
\[= \text{ʿAlī heard me.} \]
Here, the agent cannot precede the object only, but it can precede both the verb and the object, so we can say: ‘Aliyyun sami‘anī ‘Ali heard me’ (Sibawayh, 1988, I: 138).

v. when the object is definite and the agent is indefinite (cf. el-Yasin, 1985: 109- 10; Agius, 1991: 45; Holes, 1995: 205-6), as, for instance:

\[ S. 44) \quad \text{dakhala} \quad \text{l-bayta} \quad \text{rajulun} \]
\[ \quad \text{entered-3ms} \quad \text{def-house-accus} \quad \text{indef-man-nom} \]
\[ = \text{A man entered the house.} \]

This order (VOS) affects the agreement between the verb and the agent in terms of gender; the verb may or may not carry the feminine /tāʔ/ particle with a human feminine agent as classical grammarians thought (Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 112; al-Murādī, 2001: 589), as represented in (S. 45) below, but according to Ibn Hishām and al-Murādī (ibid), the verb usually carries this /tāʔ/ with the human feminine agent. However, I cannot find any verse in the Qurʾān that supports the grammarians’ claims, i.e., where all the verses would carry the /tāʔ/ particle with human feminine agent in the VOS order.

\[ S. 45) \quad \text{akhadha-(t)} \quad \text{al-kitāba} \quad \text{Hindun} \]
\[ \quad \text{took-3(m-f)s} \quad \text{def-book-accus} \quad \text{Hind-nom} \]
\[ = \text{Hind took the book.} \]

It seems that the feminine /tāʔ/ can be omitted with this case in poetry but not in normal speech. Furthermore, the verb comes with the /tāʔ/ and without it with a human feminine and masculine sound plural, as in sentences 46a and 46b below, whereas the verb takes a masculine marker with a human masculine sound plural and feminine with a human feminine sound plural when the verb precedes the agent as I discussed earlier.

\[ S. 46a) \quad \text{akhadha-(t)} \quad \text{al-kitāba} \quad \text{l-tālibātu} \]
\[ \quad \text{took-3(m-f)s} \quad \text{def-book-accus} \quad \text{def-students-nom-p} \]
\[ = \text{The students took the book.} \]
These usages are applied in the Qurʾān (Sūrahs Yūnus, X: 90; Hūd, XI: 10 and al-Jāthiya, XLV: 33). As a result, the VOS order differs from VSO when the agent is a human feminine or masculine sound plural in terms of gender; where the verb agrees with agent when the order is VSO, while it may or may not agrees with the VOS order, as in sentences 46a and 46b.

9.3.3. OVS:

The object can precede both the verb and the agent as an optional order in a verbal sentence structure; it is regarded as one of a number of syntactic structures for verbal sentences. Consider the structure of the following sentence (S. 47) (see also Sūrat al-An‘ām, VI: 84 and 86):

\[ S. 47 \]
\[ al-ṭa‘āma \quad ṭabakha-t \quad Hindun \]
\[ def- meal- accus \quad cooked- 3fs \quad Hind- nom \]

= Hind cooked the meal.

The verbal sentence is obliged to take this word order (OVS) in the following:

Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order.
As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (نازايرییات al-عامل) and considered every element to be governed by another element: thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.

Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order.

As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (نازايرییات al-عامل) and considered every element to be governed by another element:
thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.

By contrast, English can take this order if the writer or speaker wishes to give more attention to the object (Khalil, 2010: 93-94), as illustrated in S. 56:

*S. 56*)

Home went Tom.

### 9.3.4. OSV:

The verbal sentence may take the OSV word order if there is no ambiguity, S. 57 is an example:

*S. 57*)

maqāłatan al-tālibu kataba

indef- essay- accus def- student- nom wrote- 3ms

= The student wrote an essay.

However, this order (OSV) and the one that follows (SOV), cannot be considered obligatory orders, in the way the previous ones can. They take the rule of SVO in terms of gender and number because both of these cases the agent precedes the verb in which the verb agrees with its agent in gender and number (S. 58a and S. 58b):

*S. 58a*)

maqāłatan al-ṭālibānī katabā

indef- essay- accus def- two students- nom d wrote- 3md

= The two students wrote an essay.

*S. 58b*)

al-ṭālibatānī risāłatan katabatā

def- two students- nom indef- letter- accus wrote- 3fā

= The two students wrote a letter.

English also takes this order, as illustrated in S. 59:

*S. 59*)

Your lesson I have not attended to.

In order to emphasise the element that comes first (Jespersen, 1946: 103; Kirkwood, 1969: 90; Khalil, 2010: 93-94).
9.3.5. SOV:

The verbal sentence may take a SOV word order if there is no ambiguity, as in S. 60, where there is no reason, either syntactically or semantically, that would prevent this order and the previous order (OSV). However, I cannot find any verbal sentence structure in the Qurʾān that takes both word orders.

\[ S. 60 \] \quad \text{al-ṭālibu} \quad \text{maqālata} \quad \text{kataba} \\
\quad \text{def- student- nom} \quad \text{indef- essay- accus} \quad \text{wrote- 3ms} \\
\quad = \text{The student wrote an essay.}

9.4. Discussion:

9.4.1. The dual agent depends on its singular pattern with regard to gender, whether the verb precedes the agent or comes after it. For example, a verb preceding or coming after a dual human masculine or feminine agent is masculine or feminine. This can be seen by the following sentences (61a-61d), respectively:

\[ S. 61a \] \quad \text{jāʾa} \quad \text{l-ṭālibānī} \\
\quad \text{came- 3ms} \quad \text{def- two students- nom- d} \\
\quad = \text{The two students came.}

\[ S. 61b \] \quad \text{al-ṭālibānī} \quad \text{jāʾ-ā} \\
\quad \text{def- two students- nom- d} \quad \text{came- 3md} \\
\quad = \text{The two students came.}

\[ S. 61c \] \quad \text{jāʾa-t} \quad \text{al-ṭālibatānī} \\
\quad \text{came- 3fs} \quad \text{def- two students- nom- d} \\
\quad = \text{The two students came.}

\text{al-ṭālibatānī} \quad \text{jāʾa-t-ā}
Sometimes, however, the dual agent does not have a singular pattern, so it is necessary to find out the original pattern; thus, *qawm* 'people', is regarded as a collective noun; hence, the verb can come as masculine or feminine with the dual as the grammarians thought (see 9.4.3-vi) as (S. 62) shows:

\[ S. 62 \]

\[
\text{hāšara-(t)} \quad \text{al-qawmānī} \quad \text{l-madīnata} \]

besieged- 3(m-f)s \quad \text{def- two groups of people- nom- d} \quad \text{def- city- accus}

= The people (dual) besieged the city.

The dual of collective nouns is found in the Qur\textsuperscript{ān}, where the verb comes as masculine with a human masculine collective noun and vice versa (Sūrahs ʿAl-ʿUmrān, III: 122, 155; al-Anfāl, VIII: 48 and al-Šuʿārāʿ, XXVI: 61).

As for number, the verb comes as a singular or dual with a dual agent when the verb precedes the agent, as illustrated by (63):

\[ S.63 \]

\[
\text{wašal-(ā)} \quad \text{al-musāfirān} \quad \text{li-l-madīnati} \]

arrived- 3m(s-d) \quad \text{def-two passengers- nom-d} \quad \text{prep- to-def-city-gen}

= The two passengers arrived in the city.

while it will be only dual when the verb comes after the agent, as exemplified in 64:

\[ S. 64 \]

\[
\text{al-musāfirān} \quad \text{wašal-ā} \quad \text{li-l-madīnati} \]

def-two passengers- nom-d \quad \text{arrived- 3md} \quad \text{prep- to-def-city-gen}

= The two passengers arrived in the city.

**9.4.2.** When the verb precedes a group of two or more nouns which are considered as agent, the verb agrees in gender with the agent which immediately follows it, as in sentences 65a and 65b:

\[ S. 65a \]
Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order.

As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (nazarîyyat al-`âmîl) and considered every element to be governed by another element: thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.
9.4.3. In spite of the verb preceding an agent and agreeing with it in terms of gender, grammarians have mentioned certain cases in which the verb may or may not agree in gender with the agent, namely:


\[ \text{S. 68) badaʾa-(t) al-ḥarbu l-sāʾa} \text{ata l-rābiʾa} \text{ata} \]

\[ \text{started-3(m-f)s def- war- nom def- clock- accus def- four- accus} \]

\[ = \text{The war started at four o'clock.} \]

The feminine /tāʾ/ particle is omitted with a non-human feminine agent in several Qurʾānic verses, as in Sūrahs al-Nisāʾ, IV: 165; al-Anʿām, VI: 37 and al-Rūm, XXX: 57. The agent, however, is separated from the verb by one or more words in all these verses (i.e., the agent does not follow the verb directly), except in one verse (Sūrat al-Qiyāma, LXXV: 9) (S. 69):

\[ \text{S. 69) wa-jumīʿa l-shamsu wa-l-qamaru} \]

\[ \text{part- and- be joined- 3ms def- sun- nom part- and- def- moon- nom} \]

\[ = \text{"And the sun and moon are joined together". (Ali, 1968: 1650)} \]

In this verse, we have non-human feminine and masculine agents together. The feminine /tāʾ/, on the other hand, occurs in many Qurʾānic verses with non-human feminine agents (e.g., Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 16, 48 and al-Anʿām, VI: 115). It seems that the verb should be attached to /tāʾ/ with a non-human feminine agent not remote from the verb by one or more words, whereas the verb may or may not take this /tāʾ/ if the agent is far from the verb as will be discussed in (ii) below. Moreover, this is a common occurrence in the Najdī dialect today.

ii. with a non-human feminine agent when the agent is remote from the verb by one or more words, as shown in (S. 70):

\[ \text{S. 70) waqafa-(t) fi l-mawāqifi l-sayyāratu} \]

\[ \text{parked- 3(m-f)s prep- in def- parking- gen def- car- nom} \]

\[ = \text{The car parked in the parking.} \]
Both usages are found in the Qārān, as in Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 55 and al-Anfām, VI: 37.

Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order.

As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (nażariyyat al-`āmil) and considered every element to be governed by another element: thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.

v. with a broken plural (jamʿ taksīr), whether the agent is feminine or masculine (Ibn Abī al-Rabīʿ, 1986: 267), as exemplified in S. 73a and S. 73b:

S. 73a)  ḥādara-(t) al-rijālu l-ḥaflata
        attended- 3(m-f)s def-men- nom- p def- celebration- accus
        = The men attended the celebration.
Although grammarians agree that the verb can take a feminine or a masculine marker with a broken plural, I believe that the verb often comes as masculine with a broken plural, the singular form of which is human masculine. This can be illustrated by the following example:

\[ S. \, 73c) \quad \text{dhahaba-(t)} \quad \text{al-qabâ‘ilu} \quad \text{li-l-amîri} \]
\[
\text{went- 3(m-f)s} \quad \text{def- tribes- nom- p} \quad \text{prep- to- def- prince- gen}
\]
\[= \text{The tribes went to the prince.} \]

However, a reverse agreement occurs with a broken plural whose singular form is non-human masculine, as illustrated in S. 73d:

\[ S. \, 73d) \quad \text{qâma} \quad \text{l-aṭfâlu} \]
\[
\text{stood up- 3ms} \quad \text{def- children- nom- p}
\]
\[= \text{The children stood up.} \]

My claim is supported by the Qur‘ān, where the verb comes as masculine, with a broken plural whose singular form is human masculine in around 45 verses (e.g., Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 142, 282 and al-ʿAṣf, VII: 50) and feminine in about 15 verses (e.g., Sūrahs Al-ʿUmrān, III: 42 and Hūd, XI: 69). By contrast, the reverse agreement takes place as feminine with a broken plural, the singular of which is non-human masculine in approximately 80 verses (e.g., Sūrahs al-Raʿd, XIII: 17; al-Kahf, XVIII: 105 and al-Muḥsin, XXIII: 102), though it comes as masculine in around seven verses (e.g., Sūrahs al-Anʿām, VI: 5; al-Tawba, IX: 5 and al-Zumar, XXXIX: 21). Furthermore, the verb is feminine or masculine equally with a broken plural whose singular is human feminine (S. 73e):

\[ S. \, 73e) \quad \text{ihtafala-(t)} \quad \text{al-qabâ‘ilu} \quad \text{bi-l-ʿid} \]
\[
\text{celebrated- 3(m-f)s} \quad \text{def- tribes- nom- p} \quad \text{prep- on- def- festive- gen}
\]
\[= \text{The tribes celebrated the ʿid festivity.} \]
It comes in two Qurʾānic verses, as masculine and feminine (Sūrah Yūsuf, XII: 30 and al-Mumtaḥna, LX: 11). On the other hand, it is often feminine with a broken plural, the singular form of which is non-human feminine, as illustrated in S. 73f:

S. 73f)

\[
\text{kataba-t al-jarāʿ idu c' an yawmi l-ummi}
\]
\[\text{wrote- 3fs def-newspapers- nom-p prep- about day- gen def-mother-gen}
\]
\[= \text{The newspapers wrote about mother's day.}
\]

This is a common usage in the Qurʾān (e.g., Sūrah al-Zukhruf, XLIII: 71; al-Najm, LIII: 23 and al-Ṭāriq, LXXXVI: 9), but I found only one verse which the verb comes as masculine (Sūrat al-Zukhruf, XLIII: 53).

vi. with a collective noun (\textit{ism jam‘}) (Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 116), (S. 74a):

S. 74a)

\[
\text{ḥāṣara-(t) al-qawmu l-madīnata}
\]
\[\text{besieged- 3(m-f)s def- people- nom- p def- city- accus}
\]
\[= \text{The people besieged the city.}
\]

Although the majority of grammarians believe that the verb can take both a feminine and a masculine marker with a collective noun agent (‘Aṭṭār, 1998: 275), I think that it should depend on the kind of collective noun:

a. the verb comes as feminine and masculine with a human collective noun as in the previous example (S. 74a), but it usually occurs as masculine as one finds it in the Qurʾān in more than 30 verses (e.g., Sūrat al-Baqara, II: 13, 101), and as feminine in around 14 verses (e.g., Sūrah al-Baqara, II: 113 and Āl-ṭāʾūr, III: 69).

b. as al-Mubarrid thought (1994, III: 347), the verb comes only as feminine with a non-human collective agent (see also Sūrah Āl-ṭāʾūr, III: 101 and al-Anfāl, VIII: 31). Therefore, the verb can take a masculine or a feminine marker with a human collective noun, as in sentence 74a above; whereas it comes as feminine with a non-human collective noun, as shown by the following example in S. 74b:

\[
\text{ḥallaqa-t al-ṭayru}
\]
vii. with a generic noun (*ism jins*) (Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 116). Two examples will illustrate this point (S. 75a and S. 75b):

*S. 75a)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{akala-(t)} & \quad \text{al-samaku} & \quad \text{ṭa'āma-hā} \\
& \quad \text{ate- 3(m-f)s} & \quad \text{def-fish- nom- p} & \quad \text{def-food- accus- pro- their}
\end{align*}
\]

= The fish ate their food.

*S. 75b)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dāfa' a-(t)} & \quad \text{al-'Arabu} & \quad \text{‘an} & \quad \text{ḥuqūqi-hā} \\
& \quad \text{defended- 3(m-f)s} & \quad \text{def-Arabs- nom- p} & \quad \text{prep-about} & \quad \text{def-rightsgen-pro-their}
\end{align*}
\]

= The Arabs defended their rights.

The verb comes as feminine in the Qurān with this kind of agent in several verses (e.g., Sūrahs al-Rūm, XXX: 2 and al-Mulk, LXVII: 19), while it comes as masculine in two verses (e.g., Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 260 and al-Nūr, XXIV: 43); thus, the verb is often feminine with the generic noun agent.

viii. (*ni`ma* or *bi`sa*) verbs in the idiomatic usage 'how good... or how bad...' with a human feminine agent takes masculine or feminine marker, as in the following sentence:

*S. 76a)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ni`ma-(t)/bi`sa-(t)} & \quad \text{al-fatātu} \\
& \quad \text{what a good/what a bad- 3(m-f)s} & \quad \text{def- girl- nom}
\end{align*}
\]

= What a good girl or what a bad girl she is!

Both *ni`ma* and *bi`sa* verbs are treated as a collective noun, so they take masculine or feminine marker with a human feminine agent (Ibn Hishām, 1998, II: 112; Ibn Ya`ish, 2001, IV: 402). These verbs take a masculine marker with a non-human and a singular human masculine agent, as illustrated by following two examples (76b and 76c):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ni`ma/bi`sa} & \quad \text{l-dāru} \\
& \quad \text{what a good/what a bad- 3ms} & \quad \text{def- house- nom}
\end{align*}
\]
It is evident that both verbs ni‘ma/bi‘sa special need not be linked to a human feminine agent. In addition, this would violate a general rule whereby the verb takes a feminine marker when followed directly by a human feminine agent and comes as masculine if followed directly by a human masculine agent.

ix. with a feminine and masculine sound plural (*jami‘* al-*mu‘annath/*al-mudhakkar al-sālim*), as the Kūfan grammarians claimed: they supported their views with two verses: the first being evidence for feminine Sūrat al-Mumtaḥana, LX: 12 (S. 77a) and the other for masculine Sūrat Yūnus, X: 90 (77b) (Ibn Abī al-Rabi‘, 1986: 267; al-Murādi, 2001: 593):

**S. 77a**

\[\text{idhā} \ \text{jā‘a-ka} \ \text{l-mu‘minatū}\]

part- when come- 3ms- 2ms def- believing women- nom-p

= "O prophet! when believing women come".

(Ali, 1968: 1536)

**S. 77b**

\[\text{illā} \ \text{alladhī} \ \text{āmana-t} \ \text{bi-hi} \ \text{banū} \ \text{Isrā‘ila}\]

part-except rel-whom believe- 3fs prep-in-pro-it children- nom-p Israel-gen

= "Except whom the children of Israel believe in". (Ali, 1968: 507)

Here, I believe that the verb carries only the feminine /tā‘/ particle with a human feminine sound, as exemplified in 77c:

\[\text{jā‘a-t} \ \text{al-ṭālibatū} \ \text{ilā} \ \text{l-madrasati}\]

came- 3fs def- students- nom-p prep- to def- school- gen
while the verb does not carry it with the masculine sound plural. Consider the following example (S.77d):

\[
S. 77d) \quad \text{sharaha l-mu'allimuha l-darsa} \\
\text{explained- 3ms def- teachers- nom- p def- lesson- accus} \\
= \text{The teachers explained the lesson.}
\]

The verbs come as masculine with a feminine agent and as feminine with a masculine agent in verses noted above (S. 77a and 77b) because the agent is separated from the verb by one word; i.e., here the object comes between the verb and agent. Therefore, in this case, the verb may or may not carry the feminine /tāʕ/ as I have discussed earlier regarding the VOS order. On the other hand, the verb may or may not carry the /tāʕ/ with a non-human feminine sound plural (S. 78):

\[
S. 78) \quad \text{fataha-(t) al-kulliyatu abwaba-ha} \\
\text{opened- 3(m-f)s def-colleges- nom-p def-doors-accus-p-pro-their} \\
\text{- li-lṭullabi prep- for- def- students- gen- p} \\
= \text{The colleges opened their doors for the students.}
\]

The general view is that the verb carries the feminine /tāʕ/ as also supported by the Qurʾān (e.g., Sūrahs Yūnus, X: 101 and Hūd, XI: 107), though I found only one verse without it (Sūrat Hūd, XI: 10).

\textbf{9.4.4.} Grammarians give a significant role to the issue of word order where the agent cannot precede an un-derivable verb (\textit{al-fīl al-jāmid}), as represented in S. 79a:

\[
S. 79a) \quad \text{*al-ṭālibu niˈma} \\
\text{*def-student- nom what a good- 3ms} \\
= \text{*Student what a good.}
\]
This is because an un-derivable verb is considered as a weak governor. They also believe that an un-derivable verb can take a masculine and a feminine marker with a human feminine agent (Ibn Ya'ish, 2001, IV: 402), as can be seen in S. 79b:

\[ S.\ 79b \] ni'\text{ma}\text{-}(t)/bi\text{h}s\text{-}(t)\text{al-fatåtu} \\
what a good/what a bad- 3(m-f)s def- girl- nom \\
= What a good girl or what a bad girl she is!

On the other hand, the agent may precede a derived verb, as the example in S. 79c:

\[ S.\ 79c \] ّ\text{Aliyyun} dhahaba ilå Pârîsa \\
ّ\text{Ali}- nom went- 3ms prep- to Paris- gen \\
= ّ\text{Ali} went to Paris.

Moreover, the verb takes the first place in the basic word order, and this is regarded as a normal order on which all classical grammarians agree, since the verb governs the agent and the object in the verbal sentence.

The Arabic verb displays the agreement and disagreement between verb and agent, whether the verb comes as perfective or imperfective, as illustrated in S. 80a and S. 80b:

\[ S.\ 80a \] sharia\text{-}t Hindun al-må\text{a}a \\
drank- 3fs Hind- nom def- water- accus \\
= Hind drank water.

\[ S.\ 80b \] tashrabu Hindun al-må\text{a}a \\
3fs- drinks Hind- nom def- water- accus \\
= Hind drinks water.

By contrast, English does not show agent-verb agreement with the perfective; it appears with the imperfective only as we have seen in the previous examples (S. 80a and S. 80b translation). However, the verb 'to be' and 'have/has' are only the main verb which can show the agent-verb agreement with the perfective, where 'was' occurs with the singular subject,
while 'were' comes with plural subject and 'had' with both singular and plural (Hurford, 1994: 15-16). In addition, English exhibits the agreement between the subject and its verb in terms of gender only with singular pronoun, i.e., 'he' is for masculine, whereas 'she' is for feminine (ibid. 79).

It seems that the agent, too, controls the verb in terms of gender, where the verb must take a feminine marker with a singular feminine agent and a masculine marker with a singular masculine agent, (S. 81a and S. 81b) are good examples to illustrate this point:

\[ S. \, 81a) \quad \text{kataba-t} \quad \text{Hindun} \quad \text{maqālātān} \]
\[ \quad \text{wrote-3fs} \quad \text{Hind- nom} \quad \text{indef- essay- accus} \]
\[ \quad = \text{Hind wrote an essay.} \]

\[ S. \, 81b) \quad \text{kataba} \quad \text{ʿAlīyyun} \quad \text{maqālātān} \]
\[ \quad \text{wrote-3ms} \quad \text{ʿAlī- nom} \quad \text{indef- essay- accus} \]
\[ \quad = \text{ʿAlī wrote an essay.} \]

However, the object does not control the verb in terms of gender; thus, we cannot say (S. 82a):

\[ S. \, 82a) \quad \text{*raʿa-t} \quad \text{ʿAlīyyun} \quad \text{Hindan} \]
\[ \quad \text{saw-3fs} \quad \text{ʿAlī- nom} \quad \text{Hind- accus} \]
\[ \quad = \text{ʿAlī saw Hind.} \]

we have to say (S. 82b):

\[ S. \, 82b) \quad \text{raʿa} \quad \text{ʿAlīyyun} \quad \text{Hindan} \]
\[ \quad \text{saw-3ms} \quad \text{ʿAlī- nom} \quad \text{Hind- accus} \]
\[ \quad = \text{ʿAlī saw Hind.} \]

9.4.5. The agreement between verb and agent is more precise with the SVO order than with VSO; if it is SVO, the verb in general agrees with its agent in terms of gender and number, whereas if the word order is VSO, the verb mainly agrees with its agent in terms of gender but not in number. However, I believe that the verb always agrees with its agent in the SVO order because the long vowels that come with the predicate (verb) /-ā/ or /-ū/ are a consequence of the subject advancement, whether in the nominal or
verbal sentence. In other words, when the predicate is placed at the beginning, there is no agreement between the predicate and the subject whether in the nominal or verbal sentence, as the examples in 83a and 83b:

S. 83a)  já’a 1-muhandisûna  
came- 3ms def- engineers- nom- p  
= The engineers came.

S. 83b)  qādimun al-muhandisûna  
are coming- nom- ap def- engineers- nom- p  
= The engineers are coming.

On the other hand, there is an agreement between them when the subject precedes the predicate, as the sentences in 83c and 83d:

S. 83c)  al-muhandisûna já’a-ū  
def- engineers- nom- p came- 3mp  
= The engineers came.

S. 83d)  al-muhandisûna qādimûna  
def- engineers- nom- p are coming- nom- ap  
= The engineers are coming.

Consequently the agreement issue is the result of the pre-posing and post-posing feature, whether in the nominal or verbal sentence (Muṣṭafā, 1992: 56- 58).

9.4.6. The verb comes as feminine or masculine with agent quantifiers when annexed to a feminine noun, e.g., ba’d ‘some’, qalîl ‘few’, kull ‘all’ and kathîr ‘much’, because the quantifiers are masculine in Arabic (Sibawayh, 1988, I: 51), as illustrated in S. 84:

S. 84)  já’a-(t) ba’du l-ṭalibâti  
came- 3(m-f)s some- nom def- students- gen  
= Some students came.
Agent quantifiers as either masculine or feminine are found in the Qurʾān (Sūrah al-Anʿām, VI: 158; al-Raʾd, XIII: 8 and al-Ḥaj, XXII: 2).

9.5. Conclusion:

English has a largely fixed word order that follows the SVO pattern, as exemplified in 85:

\[ S. 85 \]

Mark read a book.

Unlike written Arabic word order, which admits of various orders (VSO, SVO, OVS, VOS, OSV and SOV), although (OSV and SOV) are rare. In spoken Arabic, however, the order is dominantly SVO.

Word order in Arabic plays both an optional and an obligatory part with each of the following orders – VSO, OVS and VOS – while it is optional with the remaining orders – SVO, OSV and SOV. The verb agrees with its agent in gender, whether the verb precedes or comes after it, but as I discussed earlier, this rule is not obligatory. Thus, it is not true to say that the verb always agrees with its agent in gender since there are many cases where the verb may disagree with its agent, as represented in 86:

\[ S.86 \]

The car parked in the parking.

As discussed above (section 9.4.3), this gives the Arabic language the property of flexibility, thereby enabling more than one usage for some structures. On the other hand, it is not obligatory for the verb to agree with its agent in terms of number when the verb precedes its agent, while it is obligatory when the agent precedes the verb.

With regard to the issue of word order, both verb and agent play a major role in which the verb displays agreement or disagreement between them while the agent controls the verb; if the agent is masculine, the verb will be masculine, whereas if the agent is feminine, the verb will be feminine.
However, there are some elements which can affect this role; for example, if the particle 'except' (illā) is placed between the verb and a human feminine agent, the verb may or may not agree with its agent, as, for example: mā nāma(t) illā Hindun 'None slept except Hind'. Having examined the elements of the verbal sentence and the word order of this structure, the following chapter will investigate how these elements influence aspect and tense, and exploring their types with this structure.
10.1. Introduction:

The verb is considered an important element in the construction of the Arabic verbal sentence which, as mentioned earlier, is composed of two fundamental elements; namely the predicate or the verb, and the subject or the agent. Additionally this is a matter of interest for the English language because all English sentences contain a verbal element, whether main or auxiliary (Rashīd, 2008: 26). Although the earlier Arabic grammarians focused on the verb, this did not mean that they did not examin important points in terms of the Arabic tense (indicating the temporal location of the event [see below]), and that the verb did not carry tense meaning as some scholars claim (cf. Fandris, 1950: 136; Trttion, 1952: 53; al-Jawārī, 1974: 5-6; al-Makhzūmī, 1986: 144; al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1986: 23).

Grammarians considered the verb as one of the most significant elements which affect aspect (denoting the relation of action to the passage of time [see below]) and tense in Arabic. Sibawayh (1988, I: 12), al-Anbārī (nd: 11) and Ibn ʿAqīl (1980, I: 15) claimed that it is the most significant element. Moreover, there is an apparent relationship between the aspect and tense in the verbal sentence (Juḥfah, 2006: 13 and 94). The focus of this chapter will be on issues which relate to aspect and tense; 1- what is aspect and tense?; 2- what are the tools which affect aspect and tense?; 3- and what are the types of aspect and tense?.

10.2. Definition:

In Arabic, there is a confusion of the distinction between tense and aspect. It is important to understand the general meaning of aspect and tense before discussing this issue. Tense relates to the time of the situation which is denoted by the verb (Jespersen, 1949, III: 1), which is a fundamental
element, and other elements. The commonest tenses found in languages are past, present and future (Crystal, 1980: 352). The past tense describes an occurrence or situation prior to the moment of speaking, as in S. 1:

\[ S. 1) \quad \text{zāra} \quad '\text{Aliyyun} \quad \text{al-mathafa} \]
\[ \quad \text{visited- 3ms} \quad '\text{Ali- nom} \quad \text{def- museum- accus} \]
\[ = '\text{Ali visited the museum.} \]

The present describes a situation which is located temporally as simultaneous with moment of the speaking, as illustrated in S. 2:

\[ S. 2) \quad \text{yadrusu} \quad \text{Muḥammadun} \quad \text{al-Faransiyata} \]
\[ \quad \text{3ms- studies} \quad \text{Muḥammad- nom} \quad \text{def- French- accus} \]
\[ = \text{Muḥammad studies a French language.} \]

and the future describes events or situations subsequent to the moment of the speaking, as illustrated by the following example:

\[ S. 3) \quad \text{sa-’adhhabu} \quad \text{ilā} \quad \text{Pārīsa} \]
\[ \quad \text{part- will- 1ms- go} \quad \text{prep- to} \quad \text{Paris- gen} \]
\[ = \text{I will go to Paris.} \]

S. 3, is maked as future by adding a particle /sa-/ Thus, we may describe tense as deictic\(^{47}\) "i.e. locates situations in time" (Comrie, 1976: 1-2 and 5; Vladimir, 1991: 18); while aspect is not deictic: it is a semantic category of the verb denoting the relation of action to the passage of time, and it refers especially to completion, duration or habit (al-Aswad, 1983: 9). This can be illustrated by the following examples (4a- 4c):

\[ S. 4a) \quad \text{nāma} \quad \text{Muḥammadun} \]
\[ \quad \text{slept- 3ms} \quad \text{Muḥammad- nom} \]
\[ = \text{Muḥammad slept.} \]

\(^{47}\) Deictic is a term used in grammatical theory to subsume those features of language which refer directly to the temporal or locational characteristics of the situation within which an utterance takes place, whose meaning is thus relative to that situation" (Crystal: 1980, 103).
Aspect sometimes give the action more limitation, but tense is not able to do this. Tense determines the temporal location of the event, whereas aspect determines the temporal properties internal to the event (ibid). Consider the examples in 5a and 5b:

S. 5a) kāna yalʿabu kūrata qadamin kulla yawmin
used to plays indef-ball indef-foot indef-every indef-day
- 3ms - 3ms - accus - gen - accus - gen
= He used to play football every day.

S. 5b) zalā yaʿla kūfī l-nādī l-riyādiyyi ḥattā taʿiba
keep plays in def-club def-sport until tired
- 3ms - 3ms - prep - gen - gen - part - 3ms
= He kept playing in the sports club until he was tired.

The difference between sentence 5a and sentence 5b is not in the tense because it is indicated as past in both cases, but in the aspect; S. 5a is in a habitual aspect, whereas S. 5b is in the progressive aspect. Accordingly, the aspect describes the verb along with the tense and mood, referring primarily to the way the grammar marks the duration or type of an activity (Crystal, 1980: 34).
It seems, therefore, that aspect expresses or describes the condition or case of the action or event in the verbal sentence (completion, incompletion, progressive and habitual); while tense expresses the location of time in a situation. As an example of the latter see sentences 6a- 6c:

S. 6a)  
haḍara  
came- 3ms  
= ʿAlī came.

S. 6b)  
qad  ḥaḍar-tu  l-darsa  
part- just attended- 1ms def- lesson- accus  
= I have just attended the lesson.

S. 6c)  
kun-nā  zanan-nā-hu  rajulan  šālihan  
were- 1mp thought- 1mp- 3ms indef-man- accus indef-good- accus  
= We had thought he was a good man.

All these sentences indicate one action in Arabic: a competed action which is in the perfective aspect. At the same time, they indicate a specific time; the first sentence (6a) indicates a general past event, the second (6b) a recent past and the third sentence a remote past (6c). Therefore, it notes that tense refers to a specific time, while aspect does not.

10.3. The elements which affect Arabic aspect and tense:

In addition to aspect and tense, the difference of meaning and tense in verbs is shown by adding a particle or auxiliary verb; indeed this is, a special feature among other Semitic languages (Bergstrasser, 1994: 88- 89). Therefore, there are some elements that affect Arabic aspect and tense (Figure 33).
a. Verbal forms:

Verbal forms have a significant impact upon aspect, for instance, the \textit{fa\'ala} form indicates a perfective aspect in general (S. 7):

\begin{verbatim}
S. 7) kharaja \textsuperscript{\textdegree}Aliyyun (fa\'ala) went out- 3ms \textsuperscript{\textdegree}Ali- nom = \textsuperscript{\textdegree}Al\textmacron{i} went out.
\end{verbatim}

Whereas the \textit{yaf\textasciiacute{a}lu} form indicates an imperfective aspect in general (al-Mayy\textasciiumlaut{a}h, 1967: 21), as the example in 8:

\begin{verbatim}
S. 8) yakhruju \textsuperscript{\textdegree}Aliyyun 3ms- goes out \textsuperscript{\textdegree}Ali- nom = \textsuperscript{\textdegree}Al\textmacron{i} goes out.
\end{verbatim}

The verbal form, also plays a major role in assigning different tenses. For example an abstract \textit{fa\'ala} pattern cannot be used for a future tense in general because it is formed to denote a past tense; while an abstract \textit{yaf\textasciiacute{a}lu} pattern is formed to indicate a present tense or future with a particular particle unless prefixed by \textit{lam} or preceded by the auxiliary \textit{k\textasciiumlaut{a}na} 'was'.
Sībawayh (1988, I: 12) claimed that these forms are fundamental in assigning verbal tense; hence we could call this a morpheme-tense because it gives a direct tense when it stands alone, while it might give another type of tense when occurring in a sentence (Ḥassān, 1994: 17, 243).

There are some linguists who have claimed that Arabic tense is formed by verbal forms only (cf. al-Sāmarrāʿī, 1986: 23; al-Maṭlabī, 1986: 36 and 46) and this claim leads some linguists to observe that verbal forms do not specify to a particular tense. In other words, the verbal form is generalised into namely a past, present and future (Nūr al-Dīn: 1984: 54). In fact, that view does not seem to be accurate because there are other elements which affect verbal forms and these elements with the basic verbal forms produce new tenses e.g., (S. 11):

S. 11) \( \text{lam} \text{ ya}^{3}\text{khudh} \text{ cAliyyun} \text{ cilāja-hu} \)
\( \text{neg- not} \text{ 3ms- takes} \text{ cAlī- nom} \text{ def- treatment- accus- pro- his} \)
\( = \text{cAlī did not take his treatment.} \)

This sentence (11) indicates a past tense due to the particle \( \text{lam} \), although the basic tense of the \( \text{yaf}^{6}\text{alu} \) pattern is present. Therefore, Arabic tense is a result of different elements; only one of them is a verbal form.

b. prefix:

When the \( /sax/ \) or \( /sawfa/ \) particles are added to the \( \text{yaf}^{6}\text{alu} \) pattern form the event changes from a present event to a future, as illustrated in S. 12:

S. 12) \( \text{yadhhabu} \text{ cAliyyun/ (sa)wfa} \text{ yadhhabu} \text{ cAliyyun} \)
\( \text{3ms- goes} \text{ cAlī- nom/ part- will} \text{ 3ms- goes} \text{ cAlī- nom} \)
\( = \text{cAlī goes/cAlī will go.} \)

These elements precede only the \( \text{yaf}^{6}\text{alu} \) pattern, and it is not feasible to use this form with these particles to indicate a past or present tense.

c. Auxiliary verb \( \text{kāna (was)} \):
Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order.

As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (nazariyyat al-‘āmil) and considerd every element to be governed by another element: thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.

d. Some particles:

The particles in Arabic do not play a major role on their own; however, some change the temporal direction of verbal forms when combined with the verbal forms like qad, lam and lan. For example, lan when combined with subject markers ahruf al-muḍāra‘a, gives a future tense and it does not indicate a present temporal as the direction tense of this form denotes (S. 15):
Whereas *lam* indicates a past temporal action, as in 16:

\[ S. 15a) \quad \text{lan} \quad \text{tahḍura} \quad \text{Hindun} \quad \text{al-ḥaflata} \]
\[ \text{neg- not} \quad 3fs- comes \quad \text{Hind- nom} \quad \text{def- party- accus} \]
\[ = \text{Hind will not come to the party.} \]

In addition, the *fa’ala* pattern form indicates a general past temporal but is changed to a specific tense when preceded by particle *qad*, for example (S. 17):

\[ S. 16) \quad \text{lam} \quad \text{adhhab} \quad \text{ilā} \quad \text{l-sūqi} \]
\[ \text{neg- not} \quad 1ms- go \quad \text{prep- to} \quad \text{def- market- gen} \]
\[ = \text{I did not go to the market.} \]

In this case *fa’ala* indicates a 'recent' past. This usage was studied by Ibn Hishām in his book *Mughnī l-labīb* (2000, II: 534).

**e. Accusative of time (ṣarf al-zamān):**

Some studies of the tense system omit the 'accusative of time' in the understanding that it is not part of the aspect and tense system being considered by many linguists as a lexical element (Hassan, 1990: 62). However, this does not mean that 'accusative of time' has no role in assigning different aspect and tense inside the sentence, as illustrated in S. 18a:

\[ S. 18a) \quad \text{taktubu} \quad \text{Suʿādun} \quad \text{maqālan} \quad \text{ʾan} \quad \text{al-taghdhiyati} \quad \text{al-} \text{āna} \]
\[ \text{writes} \quad \text{Suʿād} \quad \text{indef- essay} \quad \text{on} \quad \text{def- nourishment} \quad \text{def- now} \]
\[ - \quad 3fs \quad - \quad \text{nom} \quad \text{- accus} \quad \text{- prep} \quad \text{- gen} \quad \text{- adv} \]
\[ = \text{Suʿād is now writing an essay on nourishment.} \]
'Now' in this context indicates an imperfective progressive aspect, while sentence (18b) indicates a primary imperfective aspect:

*S. 18b) taktubu Su<ädun maqālan c an al-taghdhiyati
writes Su<äd indef- essay on def- nourishment
- 3fs - nom - accus - prep - gen
= Su<äd writes an essay on nourishment.

The accusative of time should be suited with the verbal form; that is, we cannot say:
*S. 19a) *kataba cAliyyun maqālatan ghadan
*wrote- 3ms cAli- nom indef- essay- accus adv- tomorrow
= *cAli wrote an essay tomorrow.

The accusative of time here ghadan should be placed with yaf<alu or sa-yaf<alu pattern not with fa’ala pattern e.g. (S. 19b):
*S. 19b) (sa-)yaktubu cAliyyun maqālatan ghadan
(part-will)3ms- writes cAli-nom indef- essay- accus adv- tomorrow
= cAli (will) write(s) an essay tomorrow.

Therefore, the Arabic accusative of time can be categorised into four types (Figure 34):

```
Accusative of time
past tense  present tense  future tense  past or the present tense
```

Figure 34: Categories of accusative of time

i. Accusative of time which is used with a past tense such as: amsi 'yesterday', al-shahr al-mādi 'last month', al-sana l-mādiya 'last year' and fī zamanin mādinin 'in the past'.
ii. Accusative of time which is used with a present tense like *al-ʔāna* 'now' and *hādhiihi l-lahza* 'this moment'.

iii. Accusative of time which is used with a future tense like *ghadan* 'tomorrow', *al-shahr al-qādim* 'next month', *al-sana l-qādima* 'next year' and *fī l-zaman al-qādim* 'in the future'.

iv. Accusative of time which is used with either the past or the present like *hādhā l-sabāh* 'this morning' *al-yawm* 'today' and *hādhā l-shahr* 'this month' and *hādhiihi l-sana* 'this year'. For example, *hādhā l-sabāh* 'this morning' indicates a present time if it is still before afternoon, but a past time if the morning is over.

f. Context:

The Arabic verbal forms alone do not necessarily determine aspect and tense, i.e., we cannot classify a particular aspect or tense without context. This could be called a syntactic view of aspect and tense (Ḥassān, 1994: 241) because the verbal forms are composed with other words and all these words give a completed meaning and tense (Ingham, 1980: 137-39). I believe that this is more accurate than a morphological view of aspect and tense because it is syntactic that limits the meaning and types of Arabic tense and aspect. In sentences like 20a to 20d:

*S. 20a*)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yadrusu} & \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} & \quad \text{al-Asbāniyyata} \\
3\text{ms- studies} & \quad ^{c}\text{Alī-} & \quad \text{def- Spanish- accus}
\end{align*}
\]

= ^{c}\text{Alī studies a Spanish language.}

*S. 20b*)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sa-yadrusu} & \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} & \quad \text{al-Asbāniyyata} \\
\text{part- will-} & \quad 3\text{ms- studies} & \quad ^{c}\text{Alī-} & \quad \text{def- Spanish- accus}
\end{align*}
\]

= ^{c}\text{Alī will study a Spanish language.}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lam} & \quad \text{yadrus} & \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} & \quad \text{al-Asbāniyyata}
\end{align*}
\]
The main verbal form of all these sentences is *yadrus* 'study' but there are differences of aspect and tense due to the context and particles that precede the main verb. Therefore, particles and context with verbal form create in written Arabic accurate distinctions of aspect and tense as will be discussed later.

**g. Pattern types:**

There are two pattern types in a sentence, viz., the statement pattern (*al-uslūb al-khabārī*) and the non-statement pattern (*al-uslūb al-inshāʾ*). These patterns are usually what give the sentence a temporal meaning (Hassān, 1994: 245); the statement pattern indicates a past, present or future tense, as in the following sentences (21a-21c):

*S. 21a*)  

hadāra  

= āli attended the lesson.

*S. 21b*)  

yahḍurū  

= āli attends the lesson.

*S. 21c*)  

sa-yahḍurū  

= āli will attend the lesson.
On the other hand, the non-statement pattern indicates a present or future tense only according to the context. Consider sentences 22a and 22b:

\[
\text{S. 22a) } \text{uktub wājiba-ka l-yawma} \\
\text{write.-2ms def-homework-accus-pro-your def-today-accus} \\
= \text{Do your homework today.}
\]

\[
\text{S. 22b) } \text{lā talʿab kūrata qadamin} \\
\text{neg-not 2ms-play indef-ball-accus indef-foot-gen} \\
-\text{fī l-madrasati ghadan} \\
\text{prep-in def-school-gen adv-tomorrow} \\
= \text{Do not play football in the school tomorrow.}
\]

10.4. Types of aspect:

The following figure divides the aspect into two main types and each type includes other sorts of aspect, namely\(^{48}\) (Figure 35):

![Figure 35: Types of aspect]

There are eight sorts of aspect to consider: two of them are classified as primary and the others as secondary. It is important, however, to note that

\[\text{48 After an extensive reading in terms of aspect (especially the works of the Structure of Arabic Language by Yushmanov (1961); Description and Contrastive Analysis of Tense and Time in English and Arabic by al-Khafajī (1972); Aspect by Comrie (1976); Contrastive Analysis of Arabic and English Verbs in Tense, Aspect and Structure by al-Aswad (1983); a Contrastive Analysis of the Use of Verb Forms in English and Arabic by Kharma (1983); Tense and Aspect Systems by Dahl (1985); al-Fiʿīlīlī zamānūhu waʿabniyatuhu by al-Sāmarrāʾī (1986); a Contrastive Study of Tens and Aspect in English and Arabic with Special Reference to Translation by Hassan (1990); al-Lughā l-ʿArabiyya maʿnāhā wa-mabnāhā by Hassān (1994); al-Dilālā l-zamāniyya fi l-jumla l-ʿArabiyya by al-Mansūrī (2002) and Structure and Function of the Arabic Verb by Bahloul (2008)) I believe this division is the best because it is more accurate from the normal which divided into two aspects; perfective and imperfective.}\]
the majority of aspect types are not always observed from the verbal forms or auxiliary verbs only, although the verbal forms play a major role in determining the type of aspect, for example sentence 23a:

*S. 23a*  
akala  ḈAliyyun  tuffahatan  
ate- 3ms  ḈAli- nom  indef- apple- accus  
= ḈAlī ate an apple.

The aspect is observed from the verb *akala* only, but in sentence 23b (below) the aspect type is observed from the expression *kull yawmin* and the verb *yaḵulu* together:

*S. 23b*  
 yaḵulu  ḈAliyyun  tuffahatan  kulla  yawmin  
3ms- eats  ḈAli- nom  indef- apple- accus  indef- every- accus  indef-day-gen  
= ḈAlī eats an apple every day.

The aspect type in sentence 23c is observed from the negative particle *lam* and the verb *yaḵul* together:

*S. 23c*  
lam  yaḵul  ḈAliyyun  tuffahatan  
neg- not  3ms- eats  ḈAlī- nom  indef- apple- accus  
= ḈAlī did not eat an apple.

It is clear that if we only concentrate upon the verbal forms in the last two examples in order to classify an aspect type, we will certainly give a wrong category. By contrast, the types of aspect in English are observed from the main verbal forms or auxiliary verbs with main verbs, as illustrated by following examples 24a to 24c:

*S. 24a*  
He learned French.

indicating a perfective aspect; S. 24b indicating a progressive aspect:

*S. 24b*  
He is learning French.

Here the main verbal form contains an auxiliary verb 'is'. The sentence (24c) indicates a predictive aspect, where it is observed from the main verbal form (learn) with an auxiliary verb 'will':
He will learn French.

The alteration of aspect is noted through the verbal form. It is important to say that English is clearer than Arabic in terms of the aspect as we shall see.

As mentioned earlier, there are two main types of aspect in the Arabic verbal sentence, namely a primary aspect which typically depends upon the basic verbal forms *faʿala* and *yafʿalu* combining with the rest of the sentence. Another type is a secondary aspect that typically is constituted from basic verbal forms and a particular particle or expression which combines with the rest of the sentence.

10.4.1. Primary aspect:

The primary aspect has two kinds, namely: the perfective and imperfective (Figure 36):

![Primary aspect diagram](image)

**Figure 36: The primary aspect**

10.4.1.1. The perfective aspect (*muktamil*):

Perfective aspect indicates a completed action or event and focuses on the beginning and end of a situation, as distinct from a continuing or not necessarily complete action or event. The speaker concentrates upon the boundaries of the event, ignoring its internal structure (Gueron, 2007: 373).

The Arabic perfective aspect is typically classified by a basic verbal form *faʿala* alone, as (S. 25) below shows:

```
jä’a ʿAliyyun min safari-hi
    came-3ms ʿAli- nom prep- from def- travel- gen- pro- his
```
The negative pattern of this perfective aspect is constituted by a *yaf*"alu pattern form combined with the particle *lam* or using the *fa*"ala pattern form with particles *mā* or *lā*, as illustrated in S. 26a to 26c below. However, the particle *lam* with *yaf*"alu is used more than *mā* and *lā* in the Qurʾān, where it is found nearly in (244) verses, and *mā* with *fa*"ala in (214) verses, whereas *lā* is found in two verses (Sūrat al-Qiyāma, LXXV: 31 and al-Balad, XC: 11):

**S. 26a**)

`lam`  `yahḏur`  `cAliyyun`  `al-darsa`  
`neg- not`  `3ms- attends`  `cAli- nom`  `def- lesson- accus`  
= `cAli did not attend the lesson.`

**S. 26b**)

`mā`  `akal-tu`  `tuffāhatan`  `ma`a`  `wajbati`  `l-ghadā`ī`  
`not`  `eat`  `def- apple`  `with meal`  `def- lunch`  
`- neg`  `1ms`  `accus`  `adv`  `gen`  `gen`  
= `I did not eat an apple with lunch meal.`

**S. 26c**)

`lā`  `akal-tu`  `wa-lā-sharib-tu`  
`neg- not`  `eat- 1ms`  `part- and- neg- not- drink- 1ms`  
= `I did not eat and drink.`

The English perfective aspect, on comparison, is indicated by a past form or auxiliary verb 'had' with a past participial, as illustrated by sentences 27a and 27b:

**S. 27a**)  
He left last week.

**S. 27b**)  
She had left.

While sentences 28a and 28b come with a negative usage.

**S. 28a**)  
He did not go to the city centre.

**S. 28b**)  
She had not left.

10.4.1.2. The imperfective aspect (*ghayr muktamil*):
Imperfective aspect indicates an event without regarding its beginning or completion (Benmamoun, 1999: 180 and 183).

The imperfective aspect in Arabic is typically presented by subject markers (ahruf al-mudāra ‘a) which denote a present event (S. 29a- 29d):

\[
\text{S. 29a) } \text{tadẖhabu } \text{Hindun ilā l-madrasati} \\
\text{3fs- goes } \text{Hind- nom prep- to def- school- gen} \\
= \text{Hind goes to school.}
\]

\[
\text{S. 29b) } \text{yuṯi’u } \text{Aliyyun abā-hu} \\
\text{3ms- obeys } \text{Ali- nom def- father- accus- pro- his} \\
= \text{Ali obeys his father.}
\]

\[
\text{S. 29c) } \text{ḏadẖhabu maʿa asḏiqāʔ-ī ilā l-maqhā} \\
\text{1ms- go adv- with def-friends-gen-pro-my prep-to def-café- gen} \\
= \text{I go to the café with my friends.}
\]

\[
\text{S. 29d) } \text{namshī ilā l-madrasati maʿan} \\
\text{1mp- walk prep- to def- school- gen indef- together- accus} \\
= \text{We walk to the school together.}
\]

The negative pattern of this type is preceded by negative particles lā, mā or laysa, as illustrated below (S. 30a to 30c), but the lā particle is used more than mā in the Qurʾān, where lā is found in more than 750 verses, while mā occurs in about 82. Thus, lā is used more than mā with a negative imperfective aspect, whereas mā is used more than lā with a negative perfective aspect, but I cannot find any verse in which laysa is combined with the yafʿalu pattern, although the Classical Arabic grammarians mentioned that it can negate the imperfective event (see al-Murādī, 1992: 494; al-Māliqī, 2002: 369- 70; Ibn Hishām, 2000, III: 553).

\[
\text{lā yalʿabu } \text{Aliyyun kūrata qadamīn kathīran} \\
\text{not plays } \text{Ali indef- ball indef- foot indef- much} \\
- neg - 3ms - nom - accus - gen - accus}
\]
By contrast, the English imperfective aspect is usually presented by a present form, as illustrated in S. 31:

*S. 31)*

We cook a delicious dish.

and sentence 32 with a negative usage.

*S. 32)*

They do not speak French.

10.4.2. Secondary aspect:

There are six kinds of a secondary aspect in the Arabic verbal sentence as I have pointed out earlier, namely (Figure 37):

![Figure 37: Types of secondary aspect](image)

10.4.2.1. The progressive perfective aspect (muktamil mutakarrir):

The progressive perfective indicates a past event happening in a period of time; it is presented by the auxiliary verbs kāna or zalla with the basic form yaf‘alu, as illustrated by the following two examples (S. 33a and S. 33b):
Kāna is more common in written Arabic as it is found in the Qurʾān (e.g., Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 10 and al-Māʾida, V: 14) whereas zalla is found in only three verses (Sūrah al-Hijr, XV: 14; al-Rūm, XXX: 51 and al-Wāqīʿa, LVI: 65). The negative pattern of this type, however, is presented by the particle lam and the auxiliary verb yakūn/ yazall combined with a yafʿalu pattern form (Elder, 1937: 21), as shown by the following example in 34a and 34b:

### S. 33a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kāna</th>
<th>yamshi</th>
<th>ilā</th>
<th>bayti-hi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was- 3ms</td>
<td>3ms- walks</td>
<td>prep- to</td>
<td>def- home- gen- pro- his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ʿindamā</td>
<td>qābala</td>
<td>mudira-hu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when- adv</td>
<td>met- 3ms</td>
<td>def- manager- accus- pro- his</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= He was walking to his home when he met his manager.

### S. 33b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>zalla</th>
<th>yalʿabu</th>
<th>fī</th>
<th>l-nādī</th>
<th>l-rīyādiyyi</th>
<th>ḥattā</th>
<th>taʿība</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>keep</td>
<td>plays</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>def-club</td>
<td>def-sport</td>
<td>until</td>
<td>tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3ms</td>
<td>- 3ms</td>
<td>- prep</td>
<td>- gen</td>
<td>- gen</td>
<td>- part</td>
<td>- 3ms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= He kept playing in the sports club until he was tired.

### S. 34a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lam</th>
<th>yakun</th>
<th>yudakhkhinu</th>
<th>ʿindamā</th>
<th>ḥaṣala</th>
<th>l-ḥādīthu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>smokes</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>happened</td>
<td>def-accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- neg</td>
<td>- 3ms</td>
<td>- 3ms</td>
<td>- adv</td>
<td>- 3m</td>
<td>- nom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= He was not smoking when the accident happened.

### S. 34b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lam</th>
<th>yazal</th>
<th>yudakhkhinu</th>
<th>ʿindamā</th>
<th>ḥaṣala</th>
<th>l-ḥādīthu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td>keeps</td>
<td>smokes</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>happened</td>
<td>def-accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- neg</td>
<td>- 3ms</td>
<td>- 3ms</td>
<td>- adv</td>
<td>- 3m</td>
<td>- nom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= He was not smoking when the accident happened.
The negative usage can be presented by *mā* before these auxiliary verbs, as shown in the following examples below (34c and 34d):

*S. 34ca)*  
\[ \text{mā kāna yuqābilu asdiqā’a-hu cindamā marida} \]  
was-3ms 3ms- meets def-friends accus-pro-his adv-when get ill-3ms  
= He was not meeting his friends when he was ill.

*S. 34d)*  
\[ \text{mā zalla yal’abu fi l-nādī l-riyādiyyi cindamā ta’iba} \]  
not kept plays in def-club def-sport when tired  
- neg - 3ms - 3ms - prep - gen - gen - adv - 3ms  
= He was still not playing in the sports club when he was tired.

Or presented by *lā* after the auxiliary verb, as shown in S. 34e:

*S. 34e)*  
\[ \text{kāna lā yuqābilu asdiqā’a-hu cindamā marida} \]  
was-3ms neg-not 3ms-meets def-friends accus-pro-his adv-when get ill-3ms  
= He was not meeting his friends when he was ill.

All negative usages with *kāna* are found as one would expect in the Qurʾān (Sūrahs al-Nisāʾ, IV: 113; al-Anṣām, VI: 30 and Yūnus, X: 43). The English progressive perfective aspect is indicated by an auxiliary verb 'was' or 'were' and adding /-Ingi/ to an infinitive verb, as illustrated by S. 35:

*S. 35)*  
She was cooking when I entered the flat.

and sentence 36 with a negative usage.

*S. 36)*  
They were not studying when a bell rang.

Abdul-Raof (1998: 157) has mentioned that stative verbs do not normally occur in the progressive aspect like sentences 37a and 37b:

*S. 37a)*  
\[ \text{māta cAliyyun} \]  
died-3ms cAli- nom  
= cAli died.
Therefore, it is not feasible to say sentences 37c and 37d:

**S. 37c)**

* kāna yajidu ʿAlīyyun kitāba-hu
  * was 3ms 3ms finds ʿAlī nom def-book accus pro-his
  = ʿAlī was finding his book.

**S. 37d)**

* zalla yamūtu ʿAlīyyan
  * keep 3ms 3ms dies ʿAlī accus
  = ʿAlī was still dying.

This point is due to the fact that the progressive aspect denotes active on the part of human subject.

### 10.4.2.2. The habitual perfective aspect (*muktamil muʿtād*):

The habitual perfective indicates a repeated event in the past.

The habitual perfective is presented by an auxiliary verb *kāna* with the basic pattern form *yafʿalu* and a particular expression noting a habitual action, generally with the following expressions: *dāʾiman* 'always'; *ghāliban* 'often'; *kulla yawm* 'every day'; *kulla usbū* 'every week'; *kull shahr* 'every month' or *kulla sana* 'every year', as shown in the following examples:

**S. 38a)**

kāna yashrabu qahwatan kulla yawmin fi l-ṣabāḥī
  
  * was drinks indef-coffee indef every indef-day in indef-morning
  - 3ms - 3ms - accus - accus - gen - prep - gen
  = He used to drink coffee every day in the morning.

**S. 38b)**

kāna dāʾiman yulqī kalimatan fi ḥafli l-takharruji
  
  * was indef-always presents indef-speech in ceremony indef-graduation
The negative pattern is presented by adding the negative particle \textit{mā} or \textit{lam} before an auxiliary verb or \textit{lā} after the auxiliary verb, as exemplified in S. 39a- 39c:

\textit{S. 39a)}

\begin{align*}
\text{mā kāna-t tumārisu riyāḍata l-sibāḥati kulla yawmin} & \quad \text{not was exercises sport def-swimming indef- every indef-day} \\
\text{not} & \quad \text{3fs} \quad \text{3fs} \quad \text{accus} \quad \text{gen} \quad \text{accus} \quad \text{gen}
\end{align*}

= She did not use to swim every day.

\textit{S. 39b)}

\begin{align*}
\text{lam takun tumārisu riyāḍata l-sibāḥati kulla yawmin} & \quad \text{not is exercises sport def-swimming indef- every indef-day} \\
\text{not} & \quad \text{3fs} \quad \text{3fs} \quad \text{accus} \quad \text{gen} \quad \text{accus} \quad \text{gen}
\end{align*}

= She did not use to swim every day.

\textit{S. 39c)}

\begin{align*}
\text{kāna-t lā tumārisu riyāḍata l-sibāḥati kulla yawmin} & \quad \text{was not exercises sport def-swimming indef- every indef-day} \\
\text{3fs} & \quad \text{neg} \quad \text{3fs} \quad \text{accus} \quad \text{gen} \quad \text{accus} \quad \text{gen}
\end{align*}

= She did not use to swim every day.

I cannot find any example in the Qur‘ān of this kind of aspect, but it is used a lot in Modern Written Arabic. By contrast, the English habitual perfective aspect is indicated by an auxiliary verb ‘used to’ with a bare infinitive form, as shown in S. 40:

\textit{S. 40)}

She used to do exercise every day.

or sentence 41 comes with a negative usage.

\textit{S. 41)}

They used not to drink wine.

\textbf{10.4.2.3. The progressive imperfective aspect (\textit{ghayr muktamil mutakarrir})}:
The progressive imperfective aspect indicates a present event happening in a period of time (Gueron, 2007: 383-84). The progressive imperfective aspect in Arabic is presented by a basic verbal form yaf'alū combined with the accusative of time (zarf al-zamān) like alʿāna 'now', ḥādhā l-usbū' 'this week', as illustrated in S. 42a and S. 42b:

**S. 42a**

| verb | subject | object  | preposition | time
|------|---------|---------|-------------|------
| yaktubu | ʿAliyyun | wājiba-hu | def- | alʿāna
| 3ms-writes | ʿAlī-nom | def-homework | pro-his | def-now-adv

= ʿAlī is writing his homework now.

**S. 42b**

| verb | subject | object  | preposition | time
|------|---------|---------|-------------|------
| yurājiʿu | ʿAliyyun | durūsa-hu | def- | ḥādhā l-usbū' a
| 3ms-reviews | ʿAlī-nom | def-lessons | accus-pro-his | dem-this | def-week-accus

= ʿAlī is reviewing his lessons this week.

This type is found in the Qurʾān, as in Sūrat al-Jinn, LXXII: 9. The negative pattern is presented by adding the particle lā or mā before the basic verbal form, but lā used more than mā as discussed earlier (S. 43a and S. 43b):

**S. 43a**

| verb | subject | object  | preposition | time
|------|---------|---------|-------------|------
| lā yafʿalū | ʿAliyyun | shayʿan | indef- | alʿāna
| neg-not | 3ms-does | ʿAlī-nom | indef-anything-accus | def-now-adv

= ʿAlī is not doing anything now.

**S. 43b**

| verb | subject | object  | preposition | time
|------|---------|---------|-------------|------
| mā yafʿalū | ʿAliyyun | shayʿan | indef- | alʿāna
| neg-not | 3ms-does | ʿAlī-nom | indef-anything-accus | def-now-adv

= ʿAlī is not doing anything now.

In contrast the English progressive imperfective aspect is presented by an auxiliary verb 'is' or 'are' and adds */-Ing* to an infinitive verb, as in S. 44:

**S. 44**

He is writing an essay.

and sentence 45 comes with a negative usage

**S. 45**

We are not studying French.
10.4.2.4. The habitual imperfective aspect (GHAYR MUTTAMIL MU’TĀD):

The habitual imperfective indicates a repeated event in the present.

The habitual imperfective aspect in Arabic is presented by the basic pattern form *yafr’alu* combined with a particular expression mentioned above (10.4.2.2), S. 46 is an example:

\[
\text{S. 46) tuqābilu Hindun ṣadiqata-hā}
\]

3fs- meets Hind- nom def- friend- accus- pro- her
- kulla usbū‘in
indef- every- accus indef- week- gen
= Hind meets her friend every week.

This kind of aspect is found in the Qur’an (Sūrat Ibrāhīm, XIV: 25). The negative pattern in this type is presented by adding the particle *lā* or *mā* before the basic verbal form, S. 47a and S. 47b are a good examples:

\[
\text{S. 47a) lā yasta’milu ʿAlīyyun al-ḥāsiba-l-āliyya kulla yawmin}
\]

not 3ms uses ʿAlī def- computer indef-every indef-day
- neg - nom - accus - accus - gen
= ʿAlī does not use the computer every day.

\[
\text{S. 47b) mā yasta’milu ʿAlīyyun al-ḥāsiba-l-āliyya kulla yawmin}
\]

not 3ms uses ʿAlī def- computer indef-every indef-day
- neg - nom - accus - accus - gen
= ʿAlī does not use the computer every day.

The English habitual imperfective is presented by an infinitive verbal form with similar expressions indicating a repeated event, as exemplified in S. 48

\[
\text{S. 48) She always goes to her office.}
\]

and sentence 49 with a negative usage:

\[
\text{S. 49) He does not travel to the UK every year.}
\]
10.4.2.5. The predictive aspect (ḥadath mutanabba\(^2\) bih):

Predictive aspect is a kind of verb aspect with particles, such as /sa-/ 'will' indicating a later of time or what will happen. It is presented by subject markers of the yaf\(^alu\) pattern form combined with the particles /sa-, sawfa\(^49\) 'will'; nūn of emphasis (nūn al-tawkid); or any accusative of time indicating the later time. These are represented in S. 50a to S. 50c:

\[S. 50a\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{(sa)wfa } yusāfiru \\
\text{Muhammad- nom}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{part-will } 3ms- \text{travels }
\end{array}
\]
\[
= \text{Muhammad will travel.}
\]

\[S. 50b\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{la-tadrusa-nna } fi \\
\text{māturīdu }
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{part-2ms- study prep-in def- summer-gen rel- what want- 2ms}
\end{array}
\]
\[
= \text{You will study what you want in the summer time.}
\]

\[S. 50c\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{nahullu } hādhā \\
\text{l-wājiba } mustaqbalan
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{1mp-answer dem-this def-homework- accus indef-future- accus}
\end{array}
\]
\[
= \text{We will do this homework in the future.}
\]

All these usages are found in the Qur\(^\text{ān}\), as in Sūrahs al-Nisā\(^\text{3}\), IV: 30; Yūsuf, XII: 32; Luqmisión, XXXI: 34 and al-Qamar, LIV: 26. The negative pattern is presented by the particle lan with the basic verbal form yaf\(^alu\), as illustrated in S. 51:

\[S. 51\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{lan } yukmila } ^{c}\text{Aliyyun } dirāsata-hu
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{neg-not } 3ms-completes } ^{c}\text{Ali-nom def-study- accus-pro-his}
\end{array}
\]
\[
= \text{‘Ali will not complete his study.}
\]

The English predictive is usually indicated by an infinitive form with a particular reference to later time, or preceded by an auxiliary verb such as 'will' or 'is going', as shown in the following examples (S. 52a to 52c):

\[S. 52a\]
\[
\text{The train leaves at ten o’clock tomorrow.}
\]

\(^{49}\) These particles are called particles of amplification hurūf al-tanfīs or particles of futurity hurūf al-istiqbal.
She will go to London.

He is going to London on Monday.

and sentence 53 comes with a negative usage:

We are not going to the party next Friday.

10.4.2.6. The predictive progressive (istiqbāli mutakarrir):

The predictive progressive has the auxiliary verb yakūnu combined with /sa-/ or sawfa particles and the yaf'alu pattern or the auxiliary verb yakūn combined with the yaf'alu pattern (Hassūn, 1994: 246), as, for example:

I found only two verses in the Qurʾān, as in Sūrahs al-Furqān, XXV: 8 and al-Naml, XXVII: 41. The negative pattern is presented by the particle lan preceding the auxiliary verb yakūn, as illustrated in S. 55:

By contrast, the English predictive progressive is usually indicated by an infinitive form preceded by an auxiliary verb such as 'will' plus the verb 'be', as shown in the following example:

Tom will be sleeping when John is watching the film.

and sentence 57 comes with a negative usage:

Tom will not be sleeping when John watches the film.
10.5. Types of tense:

Tense in Arabic is considered a part of the verb which cannot be without the tense feature (al-Kafawi, 1998: 680). This issue has been studied since earlier times (Nür al-Din, 1984: 37-44; Owens, 1988: 228). One of the earlier works the Kitāb of Sibawayh elicits some important observations on the types of tense, namely the past (bunyat limā madā‘ that has elapsed), the present (wa-mā huwa kā‘inun lam yanqati‘ that has begun but has not ceased) and the future (wa-limā yakūn wa-lam yaqa‘ that will or what is going to be, or what has not happened) (Sibawayh, 1988, I: 12).

Not many linguists believe that there is a one-to-one correspondence between form and tense in the real world, i.e., past form for past occurrence and tense, present form for present occurrence and tense, and future form for future occurrence and tense because some forms have more than one temporal references (King, 1983: 104). The Arabic tense, in my opinion, is divided into two types, namely, primary and secondary tense (Figure 38):

![Figure 38: Types of tense](image)

10.5.1. Primary tense:

There are two primary tenses in Arabic; past and present tenses al-mādi and al-mudāri‘ (Figure 39).

---

50 See: Description and Contrastive Analysis of Tense and Time in English and Arabic by al-Khafaji (1972); Tense by Comrie (1985); and Some Temporal, Aspectual, and Modal Features of the Arabic Structure la-qad Prefix Tense Verb by Kinberg (1988), I believe the division which I will demonstrate in this section is the best because it is more accurate than the normal division which divided Arabic tense into two tenses, past and present.
10.5.1.1. Past tense (al-mādī):

It is typically presented by a basic verbal form faʿala pattern which could be compared with the past simple in English. This is illustrated in S. 59:

\[
\text{S. 59) } \text{jāʿa } \text{Aliyyun } \text{mina } \text{l-maktabatī} \\
\text{came- 3ms } \text{Ali- nom prep- from def- library- gen} \\
= \text{Ali came from the library.}
\]

Conversely, the negative pattern of this type is presented by faʿala pattern combined with the particle lā or mā, as in the following example:

\[
\text{S. 60a) } \text{lā } \text{nāma } \text{Aliyyun} \\
\text{neg- not slept- 3ms Ali- nom} \\
= \text{Ali did not sleep.}
\]

\[
\text{S. 60b } \text{mā } \text{jāʿa } \text{Aliyyun} \\
\text{neg- not came- 3ms Ali- nom} \\
= \text{Ali did not come.}
\]

or yafʿalu pattern combined with lam which is called the inversion particle (harf qalb) because it always inverts the main tense of the form, from present to past tense (Ibn Yaʿīsh, 2001, V: 34), as illustrated in the following example:

\[
\text{S. 60c) } \text{lam } \text{yashtari } \text{Aliyyun } \text{qāmūsan} \\
\text{neg- not 3ms- buys Ali- nom def- dictionary- accus} \\
= \text{Ali did not buy a dictionary.}
\]

8.5.1.2. Present tense (al-mudāri):
This is typically presented by a basic verbal form \textit{yaf'al} pattern which can be equated with the present simple in English, as illustrated in the following sentence:

\textit{S. 61)}
\begin{align*}
yuh\text{"w}ilu & ~\text{"Aliyyun} \ \text{ikhtir\text{"a}} \ a \ \text{alatin} \ \text{jadidatin} \\
& ~3\text{ms- tries} \ ~\text{\`Ali- nom} \ \text{indef- invention- accus} \ \text{indef- machine- gen} \ \text{indef- new- gen} \\
& = \text{\`Ali is trying to invent a new machine.}
\end{align*}

The negative pattern of this tense, however, is presented by a \textit{yaf'al} pattern combined with \textit{l\text{"a}}, \textit{m\text{"a}} or \textit{laysa} (\textit{S. 62a} to \textit{S. 62c)}:

\textit{S. 62a)}
\begin{align*}
l\text{"a} & \ \text{ya"kulu} \ \text{\`Aliyyun} \ \text{al-la\text{"a}} \\
& \ \text{neg- not} \ \ 3\text{ms- eats} \ \text{\`Ali- nom} \ \text{def- meat- accus} \\
& = \text{\`Ali does not eat meat.}
\end{align*}

\textit{S. 62b)}
\begin{align*}
m\text{"a} & \ \text{yafhamu} \ \text{\`Aliyyun} \ \text{al-darsa} \ \text{sarib\text{"a}} \\
& \ \text{not} \ \text{understands} \ \text{\`Ali- def- lesson} \ \text{indef- quickly} \\
& \ \text{- neg} \ \ 3\text{ms} \ \ \text{- nom} \ \ \text{- accus} \ \ \text{- accus} \\
& = \text{\`Ali does not understand the lesson quickly.}
\end{align*}

\textit{S. 62c)}
\begin{align*}
l\text{"a} & \text{-tu} \ \text{adr\text{"i}} \ \text{m\text{"a}} \ \text{af\text{"a}lu} \\
& \ \text{neg- not- 1ms} \ \ \text{1ms- know} \ \ \text{rel- what} \ \ \text{1ms- do} \\
& = \text{I do not know what to do.}
\end{align*}

However, the particle \textit{l\text{"a}} is the negative particle most used in this pattern because it has a comprehensive meaning and \textit{l\text{"a}} with this form could indicate a future negative dependent upon context (Mu\text{"s}af\text{"a}, 1992: 135).

Although verbal forms contain a past and present tense and the grammarians agree on these forms\textsuperscript{51}, Arabic does not have a primary future

\textsuperscript{51} It was noted that there are some linguists who argued that al-Zajji\text{"a} denied the existence of the Arabic present tense. These linguists relied on the sentence which al-Zajji\text{"a} cited in his book \textit{al-Jumal fi l-nahw}. For al-Zajji\text{"a}: "\textit{wa-l-fi\text{"i}lu m\text{"a} dall\text{"a} \ "al\text{"a} hadathin wa-zamanin m\text{"a}din wa-mustaqbalin nahw q\text{"a}ma yaq\text{"u}mu wa-qa\text{"a}da yaq\text{"u}du wa-m\text{"a} as\text{"a}bah\text{"a}} dh\text{"a}lika
tense. It requires a specific particle, auxiliary verb or a special usage combined with a main verb, typically with *yaf'al*u pattern, to present this tense (see below).

10.5.2. Secondary tense:

It is presented by the basic verbal forms *fa'ala* and *yaf'al*u pattern combined with particular particles /sa-/ *qad* or *sawfa* and auxiliary verb *kāna*. In other words, the primary tenses are able to produce secondary tenses when they are combined with other special structures. Thus, there are several secondary types for every basic form, namely (Figure 40):

![Secondary tense](image)

*Figure 40: Types of secondary tense*

10.5.2.1. Recent past (*mādī qarīb*):

The recent past is presented by the *fa'ala* pattern combined with the particle *qad* which equates with the present prefect tense in English (Wright, 1974, II: 4; al-Makhzūmī, 1986: 151-152), S. 64 as an example:

*S.63*  
*qad  akal-tu  tinatan  ladḥīdḥatan*

*part  ate-1ms  indef-fig - accus  indef-tasty - accus*

= I have just eaten a tasty fig.

This usage is found in several Qur'ānic verses, as in Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 60 and Āl-'Umrah, III: 165. The negative pattern of this tense, however, is presented by adding *lammā* particle before *yaf'al*u (cf. Sibawayh, 1988, III:

*the verb is what indicates an event and a past and future tense like 'he stood', 'stands up' and 'he sat', 'sits down', and likewise" (al-Zajjājī, 1983: 1). However, later argued that: "*al-af'al*u *thulāthatun fī'lun mādin wa-fī'lun mustaqbalun wa-fī'lun fī l-hal* the verbs are three types; past, future and present" (ibid. 13). Accordingly, al-Zajjāji mentioned the types of tense briefly when he talked about parts of speech and then he mentioned them in detail when he cited the types of verb. (cf. al-Suhaybānī, 2006: 60-62).
114- 15), as shown in S. 64a below, and this pattern is used in the Qurʾān, (as in Sūrahs Sād, XXXVIII: 8 and al-Jumuʿa, LXII: 3):

*S. 64a* lammā yanam al-ṭīflu baʿdu

neg- not 3ms- sleeps def- child- nom adv- yet

= The child has not slept yet.

or mā with the faʿala pattern (Baalbaki, 1975: 97), as exemplified in S. 64b:

*S. 64b* mā jāʿa ʿAlīyun ḥattā alʿāna

neg- not came- 3ms ʿAlī- nom part- until def-now- adv

= ʿAlī has not come yet.

I have not found this particle with this kind of meaning in the Qurʾān, but it is used a lot in Modern Written Arabic, especially in official statements, as the following example:

*S. 64c*

mā wujida l-sāriqu ḥattā alʿāna

neg- not found- 3ms def- thief- nom part- until def-now- adv

= The thief has not been found yet.

### 10.5.2.2. Remote past (māḍī baʿṭid):

Remote past is indicated by the faʿala pattern combined with an auxiliary verb kāna or kāna and qad which could equate with a past prefect tense in English. Two examples will illustrate this point (S. 65a and S. 65b):

*S. 65a* kun-tu zanan-tu-hu rajulan sālihan

was- 1ms thought- 1ms- 3ms indef-man- accus indef-good- accus

= I had thought he was a good man.

*S. 65b* kun-tu qad rabbay-tu ibnat-ī

was- 1ms part brought up- 1ms def- daughter- accus-pro- my

- fi qaryat-ī

prep-in def-village- gen-pro-my

= I had brought up my daughter in my village.
However, the first one seems to be used more than the second, where it occurs in the Qurʾān in several verses, as in Sūrah al-Māʾīda, V: 116 and al-Qamar, LIV: 14, while I found only two verses with second usage (Sūrah al-Muʾminūn, XXIII: 66 and al-Ahzāb, XXXIII: 15). At the same time, the negative pattern of this type is presented by the particle mā or lam before the auxiliary verb kāna/ yakūn, as illustrated by S. 66a and S. 66b:

S. 66a)  
mā kun-tu ẓanan-tu-hu rajulan sayyiʿan  
\( \text{neg- not was- 1ms thought- 1ms- 3ms indef- man- accus indef- bad- accus} \)  
\( = \text{I had not thought he was a bad man.} \)

S. 66b)  
\( \text{lam akun qad rabbay-tu-hā} \)  
\( \text{neg- not 1ms- was part brought up- 1ms- 3fs} \)  
\( = \text{I did not bring her up.} \)

I found only lam with a negative pattern in the Qurʾān in three verses (Sūrah al-Nisāʾ, IV: 23; al-Anʿām, VI: 23 and Ibrāhīm, XIV: 44), but mā is used a lot in Modern Written Arabic.

10.5.2.3. Future of fact (mustaqbal muhaddad):

Word order is "the sequential arrangement of clause elements or words in a sentence... that [provide] the basis of an important system of classification in the syntactic typology of language" (Crystal, 1992: 420-21). Therefore, word order is regarded as a significant syntactic device in every language, and through this system we can decide if the sentences or clauses are syntactically correct or false. This system guides the speaker and writer who requires a means of presenting useful meaningful and correct structure in order to reach to his/her target correctly. Languages differ in their structures and word order: thus the meaning of the structure is sometimes dependent upon the word order.

As a result, classical and modern grammarians have always been interested in this topic; for example, classical grammarians addressed this issue in
several ways; under the agent topic and the object topic. They discussed the relationship between the verb and other elements because the verb has an important role in the ordering of words, where the transitive verb governs an agent (subject) and object, whereas the intransitive governs only an agent. However, most classical grammarians have not discussed this issue in details because they concentrated instead on 'operator theory' (naṣariyyat al-ʿāmil) and considered every element to be governed by another element: thus, for instance, the verb governs an agent. In addition, they do not study all the rules of word order, an area where they focused largely on Verb-Subject-Object and Subject-Verb-Object.

10.5.2.4. Recent or remote future (mustaqbal qarib baʿid):
Recent or remote future is presented by the yafʿalu pattern prefixed by the particle /sa-/ or sawfa equating with the future auxiliary verb 'will' in English, as the example in 70a and 70b:

*S. 70a*) sa-yadhhabu ʿAlīyyun ilā Pārīsa
part- will- 3ms- goes ʿAlī- nom prep- to Paris- gen

= ʿAlī will go to Paris.

*S. 70b*) sawfa yarjiʿu ʿAlīyyun min
part- will 3ms- comes back ʿAlī- nom prep- from
- safari-hi
def- travel- gen- pro- his

= ʿAlī will come back from his travel.

Both usages are found in the Qurʾān, but /sa-/ is more common, where it occurs in nearly 110 verses and is usually used with /ya-/ subject marker, as in Sūrahs al-Baqara, II: 142 and al-Anʿām, VI: 110, while there are 42 verses in the Qurʾān with the yafʿalu pattern preceded by the particle sawfa (e.g., Sūrahs al-Nisāʾ, IV: 30 and al-Māʾīda, V: 14).
On the other hand, the negative pattern of all these types of futurity has the *yaf’talu* pattern combined with the particles *lan* or *lā*, as illustrated below in S. 71a and S. 71b:

**S. 71a)**
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{lan} & \text{taḥdura} & \text{Hindun} & \text{al-ijtimā’ā} \\
\text{neg- not} & \text{3fs- attends} & \text{Hind- nom} & \text{def- meeting- accus}
\end{array}
\]

= Hind will not attend the meeting.

**S. 71b)**
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{lā} & \text{yadhūq-ūna} & \text{fī-ḥā} & \text{bardan} & \text{wa-lā} & \text{sharāban}
\end{array}
\]

(sūrat al-Naba’, LXXVIII: 24)

= "Nothing cool shall they taste therein, nor any drink". (Ali, 1968: 1674)

However, *lan* is more common for the future negative than *lā* because *lan* indicates future exclusively and is used more than 100 times in the Qurʾān, as in Sūrah al-Baqara, II: 55 and al-Māʾida, V: 172, while *lā* could negate a present or future tense dependent upon context as occurred in the Qurʾān (see for example Sūrah al-Baqara, II: 48; Āl-ʾUmrān, III: 5 and al-Aʿrāf, VII: 34).

**10.5. Discussion:**

**10.6.1.** The *faʿala* pattern mainly indicates a past tense, while the *yaf’talu* pattern mainly indicates a present tense. However, the time reference of these forms can be changed by context or the addition of other elements. Consider the following examples (S. 72a and S. 72b):

**S. 72a)**
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{idhā} & \text{jāʾa} & \text{ʿAliyyun} & \text{daʿ-hu}
\end{array}
\]

part- when came- 3ms ʿAlī- nom let- 2ms- 3ms

-  yanāmu & fī  & l-ghurfati

3ms- sleeps prep- in def- bedroom- gen

= When ʿAlī comes, let him sleep in the bedroom.

**S. 72b)**
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{lam} & \text{yadhhab} & \text{ʿAliyyun} & \text{ilā} & \text{Pārīsa}
\end{array}
\]

neg- not 3ms- goes ʿAlī- nom prep- to Paris- gen

= ʿAlī did not go to Paris.
Sentence 72a indicates a future event, although the main verbal form in this example is in the *fa'ala* pattern (*jā'a*). Whereas, sentence 72b indicates a past tense, although the main verb is *yaf'alu* (*yadhhab*). On the other hand, the time reference of English forms cannot be changed. Past simple forms in English, for example, could not be used to indicate a present or future tense. Thus, there is an accurate process when it is required to change the time reference by adding an auxiliary verb and (or) sometimes alter the main verb, as illustrated by S. 73a:

*S. 73a*)

He drank last night.

In order to indicate a present prefect in this sentence (S. 73a), for example, you have to add the auxiliary verb 'has' and change the main verb from a past simple to a past participle (S. 73b):

*S. 73b*)

He has drunk.

It seems that the primary types of tense and aspect can be merged into one another as shown earlier (cf. Comrie, 1976: 80). In addition, neither Arabic nor English has a primary future tense. However, there is process for producing Arabic and English future tense by adding a particle or auxiliary verb as pointed out earlier. Malotki (1983: 627) comments that: "formality English has two tenses only; a past and present as in love and loved and all other so-called tenses are composite forms involving an auxiliary as in was loving and will love etc". Ibn Hishām (2000, II: 341-42) and al-Suyūṭī (1998, II: 498) claimed that the Baṣrī grammarians took the view that */sa-/* is used for near future, while *sawfa* is for remote, though both of them disagreed with this view (cf. al-Murādī, 1992: 60). It seems that both the particles */sa-/* and *sawfa* can be used for near and remote or unknown future and this view is supported by the Qurʾān (see for example Sūrah Al-ʿUmran, III: 137; al-Nisāʾ, IV: 146; 168; al-Tawbah, IX: 90; Yūsuf, XII: 98 and al-Takāthīr, CII: 4). The auxiliary verb *kāna* occurs with past and future tenses only and does not occur with a present tense, as the Qurʾān shows in several verses (Sūrahāls-Baqara, II: 10 and al-Muzammil, LXXIII: 20).
10.6.2. In conditional sentences Arabic tense is determined by the context. Consider the following examples (S. 74a and S. 74b):

**S. 74a)**

```
iddā  wajada  l-nuḥātu  l-qudamā’u
part- when  found- 3ms  def-grammarians-nom  def-early-nom
- baytan  mina  l-shī‘irī  istashhad-ū  bi-hi
indef-line-accus  prep-from  def-poetry-gen  cited-3mp  prep-in-pro-it
```

= When the Early Arabic grammarians found a poetry, it was added as evidence.

**S. 74b)**

```
iddā  jā‘a-t  al-sā‘atu  l-thālīthatu  fa-sa-‘ughādiru
when  came  def-clock  def-three  then-will-leave
- part  - 3fs  - nom  - nom  - part-1ms
```

= I will leave at three o’clock.

Sentence 74a indicates a past event and tense, while sentence 74b indicates a future event and tense, although both verbal forms which come after the conditional particle are the same; is in the *fa‘ala* pattern. However, it seems that the tense is usually future.

Yusuf (1983: 54) observes that a verb, which comes after these particles is a perfective verb (*fa‘ala*) regardless of whether a past, present or future tense is involved, but there is an exception with the particle *in*, where it can occur with the *yaf‘alu* pattern. It seems that the other conditional particles can occur with an imperfective verb (*yaf‘alu*) as well, such as the particles *idhā*, and *law*, as, in Sūrahs al-Ra‘d, XIII: 31 and al-Layl, XCII: 1.

10.6.3. Arabic has a special form for the imperative mood as do many languages, except Modern English (Wickens, 1987: 61); it is an unmarked form in English (Palmer, 1986: 29 and 108). In addition to this, the imperative form *if‘al* indicates a general present or future depending upon an accusative of time or the context of the event; sentence 75a indicates a present tense, while sentence 75b indicates a future tense:

```
uktub  wājiba-ka  al-‘âna
write-2ms  def-homework-accus-pro-your  def-now-adv
```
According to "Abd al-Jābbār Tawwāmā (1994: 6), however, the majority of Arabic grammarians claimed that the *if‘āl* (imperative) form indicates a future tense only. However, it seems that this view is not very accurate because this form comes in the most eloquent source, namely, the Qurʾān with an apparent present element (*alْāna*), as shown in (Sūrat al-Baqra, II:187) (S. 76 below), and this kind of accusative of time cannot come with the future tense:

\[ S. 76 \]

\[ \text{fa-lْāna} \quad \text{bāshir-ْū-hunna} \]

\[ \text{part-so- def- now- adv} \quad \text{associate- 2mp- 3fp} \]

\[ = \text{"So now associate with their wives"}. \] (Ali, 1968: 74)

As a result, this form *if‘āl* indicates a present or future tense dependent upon context, as represented in sentences 75a and 75b above, and in all languages (Palmer, 1986: 97, 108 and 111). Moreover, in Arabic a negative particle cannot occur before the imperative form, i.e., a negative particle cannot be used before *if‘āl* pattern. However, it does not mean that there is no negative imperative usage. When the particle *lā* is combined with *yaif‘āl*, they express a negative imperative usage.

**10.6.4.** The particle *qad* could be equated with a perfect tense in English; also as an expression of emphasis, as in the following example:

\[ S. 77a \]

\[ \text{qad} \quad \text{ḥaqqaqa} \quad \text{l-junndu} \quad \text{intiṣāran} \quad \text{kabiran} \]

\[ \text{part} \quad \text{achieve- 3ms} \quad \text{def- soldiers- nom} \quad \text{indef- victory- accus} \quad \text{indef- big - accus} \]

\[ = \text{Soldiers did achieve a big victory}. \]
This emphatic meaning is expressed by the particle *qad* and context (Ibn Hishām, 2000, II: 544; Ryding, 2005: 450). Sometimes the basic verbal form *fa‘ala* with *qad* indicates a current relevance and emphasis meaning like present perfect in English (Holes, 1995: 190). This can be shown in S. 77b:

*S. 77b*)  
\[
\text{qad} \quad \text{najaha} \quad \text{l-tālibu} \quad \text{l-mujiddu}
\]

\[\text{part} \quad \text{succeed-3ms} \quad \text{def-student-nom} \quad \text{def-hard worker-nom}\]

= The hard working student has succeeded.

In addition, *la-qad* has an emphatic meaning (Zayed, 1983: 150), for instance:

*S. 77c*)  
\[
\text{la-qad} \quad \text{fāza} \quad \text{ʿAliyyun} \quad \text{bi-l-musābaqati}
\]

\[\text{did-part} \quad \text{win-3ms} \quad \text{ʿAli-nom} \quad \text{prep-in-def-competition-gen}\]

= ʿAlī did win the competition.

### 10.6.5. The particles sometimes affect the main verbal forms in Arabic like *lam*, where it transfers a verbal form from its original mood, i.e., an indicative mood to jussive, and the negative particle *lan* transfers a verbal form from its original mood to subjunctive, as in the example in S. 78a:

*S. 78a*)  
\[
\text{taḥbakhu} \quad \text{Hindun}
\]

\[\text{3fs-cooks} \quad \text{Hind-nom}\]

= Hind cooks.

The verb *tatbakhu* transfers to a jussive mood after the negative particle, as shown in sentences 78b:

*S. 78b*)  
\[
\text{lam} \quad \text{taḥbak} \quad \text{Hindun}
\]

\[\text{neg-not} \quad \text{3fs-cooks} \quad \text{Hind-nom}\]

= Hind did not cook.

Whereas *lan* transfers the verb *tatbakha* to a subjunctive mood in sentence 78c:

*S. 78c*)  
\[
\text{lan} \quad \text{taḥbakha} \quad \text{Hindun}
\]

\[\text{neg-not} \quad \text{3fs-cooks} \quad \text{Hind-nom}\]

= Hind will not cook.
By contrast, when a negative auxiliary verb precedes the English past simple form, it is transferred a main verbal form to a present simple form, but the negative auxiliary becomes in past simple form. In addition to this, 's' letter which comes with the third person is omitted from the present form after the negative auxiliary verb. This is illustrated in S. 79a and S. 79b:

*S. 79a*) They did not drive very well.
*S. 79b*) She does not use the internet.

It is, also, noted that the negative particles precede the verbal form whether in Arabic or English, but the verb *to be* and the auxiliary verb occur before the negative particles in English, as illustrated in S. 80a and S. 80b:

*S. 80a*) They are not happy.
*S. 80b*) He has not driven the car.

In addition, the negative particles that occur with a verbal sentence are *lam*, *lammā*, *lan*, and *lā*. These particles occur only with the verbal sentence. However *mā* and *laysa* occur with nominal and verbal sentences as explained earlier. Furthermore, according to al-Makhzūmī (1986: 154-158) and Bergstrasser (1994: 168-170) the original particles for negative are *lā* and *mā* and other particles derived from these.

10.6.6. The *faʿala* pattern refers to other important events and meanings depending on the context:

i. A past event that happen in the past as an action or the part of an action, but this event has always happened e.g. (S. 81):

*S. 81*) *gharabat al-shamsu*

set down- 3fs def- sun- nom

= The sun set down.
ii. A past event that happened in the past and has finished, but this event continues until the period of the utterance, as shown in (Sūrat al-Baqara, II:47) (S. 82):

\[ S. \, 82 \] udhkur-ū niʿmat-ī allatī
call- 2mp def- favour- accus- pro- my rel- which
anʿam-tu ʿalay-kum
bestowed- 1ms prep- upon- pro- you-p

= "Call to mind the (special) favour which I bestowed upon you". (Ali, 1968: 28)

The (special) favour completely happened in the past but it took a period of time until the verse was revealed.

iii. An expression of wish for a good or bad thing, what is called in Arabic ʿiyāgh al-duʿāʾ 'deprecation or prayer moods', as illustrated in S. 83a and S. 83b:

\[ S. \, 83a \] raḍiya Allāhu ʿan-hu
bless- 3ms God- nom prep- on- pro- him

= God bless him.

\[ S. \, 83b \] laʿana-hu Allāhu
damn- 3ms God- nom

= God damn him.

iv. An expression that is happening at the moment of utterance or it is a consequence of request what is called in Arabic siyāgh al-ʿuqūd 'construction moods', as in the following example:

\[ S. \, 84 \] biʿ-tu-ka sayyārat-ī
sell- 1ms- 2ms def- car- accus- pro- my

= I sell you my car.

v. Indicating a temporary or a permanent state or quality (S. 85a and S. 85b):

ʿarija Muḥammadun
vi. *lammā* before this form indicates two events in the past, the second one happened when the first finished, such as:

*S. 86)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lammā} & \quad \text{ji}^{2}\text{-ta-nī} & \quad \text{akram-tu-ka} \\
\text{when- part} & \quad \text{came- 2ms- 1ms} & \quad \text{was generous- 1ms- 2ms} \\
\end{align*}
\]

= When you came to me I was generous to you.

vii. Referring to a general and unrestricted meaning (timeless) by using a gnomic pattern (S. 87):

*S. 87)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{man} & \quad \text{jadda} & \quad \text{wajada} & \quad \text{wa-man} & \quad \text{zara}^{c}\text{a} & \quad \text{hasada} \\
\text{whoever} & \quad \text{work hard} & \quad \text{succeed} & \quad \text{and-whoever} & \quad \text{cultivate} & \quad \text{harvest} \\
- & \quad & \text{accus} & \quad & \text{-3 ms} & \quad & \text{3ms} & \quad \text{- part- accus} & \quad & \text{- 3ms} & \quad & \text{- 3ms} \\
\end{align*}
\]

= Whoever works hard succeeds, and whoever cultivates harvests.

whereas this usage is presented by a present simple tense in English (Gadalla, 2006: 55).

viii. Indicating a future event by adding *kayfamā* 'whoever or whatever' before this *faʿala* or it is understood to have the future meaning from the context, as in S. 88a and S. 88b:

*S. 88a)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kayfamā} & \quad \text{kāna} & \quad \text{l-jawwu} & \quad \text{fa}^{2}\text{-inna-nī} \\
\text{whoever} & \quad \text{was- 3ms} & \quad \text{def- weather- nom} & \quad \text{part- will- pro- I} \\
- & \quad & \text{astați}^{c}\text{u} & \quad \text{an} & \quad \text{uqābila-ka} \\
\end{align*}
\]

1ms- manages prep- to 1ms- meet- 2ms

= Whoever the weather might be, I will manage to meet you.
This indicates a future event because it talks about the day of judgment.

10.6.7. The basic verbal form *yafʿalu* refers to other important events and meanings:

i. Indicating a past narration, as shown in (Sūrat al-Baqara, II: 214) (S. 89):

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{wa-zulzil-ū} & \text{ḥattā} & \text{yaqūla} \\
\text{part- and- were shaken- 3mp} & \text{part- even} & \text{3ms- says} \\
- l-rasūlu & \text{wa-alladhīna} & \text{āman-ū} \\
\text{def- Messenger- nom} & \text{part- and- rel- those} & \text{faith- 3mp} \\
- maʿa-hu & \text{matā} & \text{naṣru} & \text{Allāhi} \\
\text{adv- with- pro- him} & \text{when- part} & \text{help- nom} & \text{God- gen} \\
= \text{"And were so shaken in spirit that even the Messenger and those of faith who were with him cried: When (will come) the help of God".} \\
\text{(Ali, 1968: 84)}
\end{array}
\]

ii. Indicating an expectation/ possible realisation event or action by adding *qad* or *rubbamā* particles before this form. This expression could be equated to the English modal verb 'may'. Consider the following examples, taken from Badawi *et al.* (2004: 367):

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{qad} & \text{lā} & \text{yuwāfīquṁ-ī} & \text{l-baʿdu} \\
\text{part} & \text{neg- not} & \text{3ms- agrees- 1ms} & \text{def- some- nom} \\
= \text{Some may will not agree with me.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{rubbamā} & \text{yaṣīlu} & \text{baʿda} & \text{sāʿatin} \\
\text{part} & \text{3ms- arrives} & \text{adv- after} & \text{indef-one hour- gen} \\
= \text{He may/is possible arrive after one hour.}
\end{array}
\]

*Qad* usage with this form is contrary to *faʿala* pattern which one of its meaning indicates an emphasis. Moreover, *qad* combines with this form expresses a diminution or expresses a possibility meaning. The two strategies are spelt out in the following examples (S. 91a and S. 91b), taken from Fradkin (1985: 229-230):
There is a controversy between the Baṣran and Kūfan schools in terms of the *ifʿal* (imperative). The Baṣran school believed that this form is basic (Sibawayh, 1988, I: 12). On the other hand, the Kūfan grammarians considered this form *muʿrabun majzūmun bi-lāma l-amri l-mahḍūfa* 'declinable jussive by omitting the *lām* of the imperative'. Therefore, when you say *idhhab* 'that you go' the original form is *li-tadhhab*, but the *lām al-amr* is omitted for convenience purpose (Ibn Yaʿṣī, 2001, IV: 294; see also al-Sāmarrāʾī, 1986: 21). Consequently, they took the view that this form is not really a true verb form as *faʿala*, and *yafʿalu*.

To sum up this point, the Kūfan grammarian's view has not altered the view that *ifʿal* is part of an Arabic verbal form and its tense present or feature, because this form occurs in the Qurʾān with a limited tense, as shown in (Sūrat al-Baqara, II: 187) (S. 92):

\[
\text{\textit{S. 92}}\quad \text{fa-}l-\text{ānā} \quad \text{bāshir-ū-hunna} \quad = \quad "\text{So now associate with their wives}". \quad (\text{Ali, 1968: 74})
\]

Although the *yafʿal* pattern is taken from the *faʿala* pattern preceded by one of subject marker, the Kūfan grammarians considered this form as a part of an Arabic verb. Briefly, *ifʿal* is part of the Arabic verband carries a tense like other Arabic verbal forms, present or future tense depending upon the context.

10.6.9. I do not discuss the *fāʾil* form in this connection because there is a controversy between the Baṣran and Kūfan schools in terms of whether this
form is nominal or verbal. The Başran school held the opinion that it was nominal because it accepts some nominal characteristics like the definite article (al al-ta’rif), as in al-qā‘im ‘the standing’ and nunation al-tanwin, as illustrated in S. 93:

S. 93) kullu țālibin jālisun
    indef- every- nom  indef- student- gen  indef- sitting- nom
    - ma‘a șadiqi-hi
    adv- with  def- friend- gen- pro- his
    = Every student sits with his friend.

As al-Sāmarrā‘ī noted these reasons are concentrated around morphological changes (1986: 35). Furthermore, Kūfan grammarians claimed that the fa‘il is parallel to the yaf‘alu pattern, because fa‘il is a noun and the yaf‘alu pattern is similar to a noun, both of them being inflected (mu‘rab) and inflection is a feature of nouns in their view. Accordingly, as the yaf‘alu pattern is affected by the operators (al-‘awāmil) and the effects of the operators are apparent, it is compares with noun. The Kūfans, also, claimed that this form is a verbal form because it carries a tense and an event like other verbal forms. Al-Farrā‘ (1980, I: 20), as a Kūfan grammarian, called this form the permanent verb (al-fi‘l al-dā‘im) (cf. Tha‘lab, 1960, II: 477; al-Zajjāji, 1984: 318 and 349)

In conclusion, although the Başran and Kūfan schools disagreed with respect to whether this form is nominal or verbal, they agreed that it indicates past, present and future event according to the context of sentence, as in sentences 94a and 94b, where sentence 94a indicates a past event, and sentence 94b a present or future event (al-Sāmarrā‘ī, 1986: 20; Basindi, 2005: 94):

S. 94a) Māzinun mu‘tin ʿAlīyyan darahima amsi
    Māzin-nom indef-gave- nom-ap ʿAlī-accus indef-money-accus adv-yesterday
    = Māzin gave ʿAlī money yesterday.
However, I believe that this form is not a verbal form for several reasons:

i. It accepts some nominal characteristics, such as the definite article or nunation, whereas verbal forms cannot accept those as I have demonstrated above (S. 93) (see Chapter Four).

ii. When this form indicates an event, it does not mean that it is a verbal form because there are other forms that carry accidence and are operated like verbal forms; but the Kūfan school did not classify them as verbal forms. These are the verbal noun (al-maṣdar) and the assimilate epithet (al-sīfa l-mushabbaha).

iii. This form is an adjective when it stands alone. Accordingly, it does not carry tense in this case, as in al-qāṭil 'the killer', while verbal forms gives a direct tense when they stand alone; faʿala pattern, for example, indicates a past event. Therefore, the fāʿil pattern is like a subject not a verb (Hassān, 1994: 253; Rashīd, 2008: 52).

iv. Verbal forms (faʿala and yafʿalu patterns) typically are placed for a particular tense not for general; past, present and future as the Kūfan grammarians claimed with fāʿil pattern.

10.6 Conclusion:

Arabic grammarians showed great interest in the verbal system right from the beginning. They have classified the usage of verbal forms whether singly or combined with other particles, or auxiliary verbs. In addition, Arabic aspect and tense are affected by both morphological and syntactic elements. It is not possible then to claim that Arabic aspect and tense are part of Arabic forms only. Particular particles and auxiliary verb alter the time reference; typically the basic verbal forms do not present a particular Arabic tense. By contrast, the English tense is changed largely by specific

\[
S. 94b) \quad \text{al-zuhūru} \quad \text{dḥābilatun} \\
\text{def- flowers- nom} \quad \text{indef-wither- nom- ap} \\
= \text{The flowers wither.}
\]
auxiliary verbs and this makes English tense distinctions more accurate and straightforward.

There is a major role for the accusative of time (zarf al-zamān) in classifying Arabic aspect and tense, where it changes the type of sentence, for example sentence 95a indicates a primary aspect, viz., an imperfective aspect:

S. 95a) yaktubu cAliyyun risālātan
3ms- writes cAli- nom indef- letter- accus
= cAlī writes a letter.

However, when the accusative of time al`āna 'now' is added to sentence 95a, it indicates a secondary aspect, viz., an imperfective progressive aspect, as exemplified in 95b:

S. 95b) yaktubu cAliyyun risālātan al`āna
3ms- writes cAli- nom indef- letter- accus def-now- adv
= cAlī is writing a letter now.

Furthermore, the most important elements in Arabic tense are fa`ala; yaf`alu; (sa)wa`alayalu and the accusative of time because these elements with context control the Arabic tense. Thus, one or two of these elements are found in every type of Arabic aspect and tense whether a primary or secondary tense.

The majority of secondary aspect and tense types whether in Arabic or English contain two fundamental elements. A secondary tense occurs by adding a particle, auxiliary verb kāna or accusative of time with the main verbal forms. In comparison with English, the secondary aspect and tense is formed by adding an auxiliary verb and changing the form of the main verb. It is observed that negative particles in Arabic differ according to the type of aspect and tense; that is, the negative particles and the verbal form differ according to the aspect and tense. The English negative is typically presented by adding 'not' and 'did' or 'do' with the past and present tense,
respectively, or only 'not' between an auxiliary verb and main verbal forms with other aspects and tenses. Moreover, the negative particle is placed before the main and auxiliary verb in Arabic; by contrast, it is placed between auxiliary and main verb in English.

There are some particles which precede only verbal forms like sawfa; /sa-/ and the negative particles (e.g. lam). That is, these particles cannot come with a nominal form in Arabic. A semantic feature is considered an important quality in the tense issue, where the tense is not a morphology and syntax feature only (Juhfa, 2006: 48), the outcome of which, will be presented in the following concluding chapter.
Arabic grammarians showed great interest in the verbal system right from the beginning. They have classified the usage of verbal forms whether singly or combined with other particles, or auxiliary verbs. In addition, Arabic aspect and tense are affected by both morphological and syntactic elements. It is not possible then to claim that Arabic aspect and tense are part of Arabic forms only. Particular particles and auxiliary verb alter the time reference; typically the basic verbal forms do not present a particular Arabic tense. By contrast, the English tense is changed largely by specific auxiliary verbs and this makes English tense distinctions more accurate and straightforward.

There is a major role for the accusative of time (zarf al-zaman) in classifying Arabic aspect and tense, where it changes the type of sentence, for example sentence 95a indicates a primary aspect, viz., an imperfective aspect:

S. 95a) yaktubu ʿAliyyun risāلاتان
       3ms- writes ʿAlī- nom indef- letter- accus
       = ʿAlī writes a letter.

However, when the accusative of time alʿāna 'now' is added to sentence 95a, it indicates a secondary aspect, viz., an imperfective progressive aspect, as exemplified in 95b:

S. 95b) yaktubu ʿAlīyyun risāلاتان alʿāna
       3ms- writes ʿAlī- nom indef- letter- accus def-now- adv
       = ʿAlī is writing a letter now.

Furthermore, the most important elements in Arabic tense are faʿala; yafʿalu; (sa)wfa yafʿalu and the accusative of time because these elements with context control the Arabic tense. Thus, one or two of these elements
are found in every type of Arabic aspect and tense whether a primary or secondary tense.

The majority of secondary aspect and tense types whether in Arabic or English contain two fundamental elements. A secondary tense occurs by adding a particle, auxiliary verb *kāna* or accusative of time with the main verbal forms. In comparison with English, the secondary aspect and tense is formed by adding an auxiliary verb and changing the form of the main verb. It is observed that negative particles in Arabic differ according to the type of aspect and tense; that is, the negative particles and the verbal form differ according to the aspect and tense. The English negative is typically presented by adding 'not' and 'did' or 'do' with the past and present tense, respectively, or only 'not' between an auxiliary verb and main verbal forms with other aspects and tenses. Moreover, the negative particle is placed before the main and auxiliary verb in Arabic; by contrast, it is placed between auxiliary and main verb in English.

There are some particles which precede only verbal forms like *sawfa*; /sa-/ and the negative particles (e.g. *lam*). That is, these particles cannot come with a nominal form in Arabic. A semantic feature is considered an important quality in the tense issue, where the tense is not a morphology and syntax feature only (Juha, 2006: 48), the outcome of which, will be presented in the following concluding chapter.

Arabic grammarians showed great interest in the verbal system right from the beginning. They have classified the usage of verbal forms whether singly or combined with other particles, or auxiliary verbs. In addition, Arabic aspect and tense are affected by both morphological and syntactic elements. It is not possible then to claim that Arabic aspect and tense are part of Arabic forms only. Particular particles and auxiliary verb alter the time reference; typically the basic verbal forms do not present a particular Arabic tense. By contrast, the English tense is changed largely by specific
auxiliary verbs and this makes English tense distinctions more accurate and straightforward.

There is a major role for the accusative of time (zarf al-zamān) in classifying Arabic aspect and tense, where it changes the type of sentence, for example sentence 95a indicates a primary aspect, viz., an imperfective aspect:

\[\text{S. 95a)}\]
\[
yaktubu \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} \quad \text{risālatan}
\]
\[3ms-\text{writes} \quad ^{c}\text{Ali- nom} \quad \text{indef- letter- accus}
\]
\[= ^{c}\text{Alī writes a letter.}
\]

However, when the accusative of time al-`āna ‘now’ is added to sentence 95a, it indicates a secondary aspect, viz., an imperfective progressive aspect, as exemplified in 95b:

\[\text{S. 95b)}\]
\[
yaktubu \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} \quad \text{risālatan} \quad \text{al-`āna}
\]
\[3ms-\text{writes} \quad ^{c}\text{Ali- nom} \quad \text{indef- letter- accus} \quad \text{def-now- adv}
\]
\[= ^{c}\text{Alī is writing a letter now.}
\]

Furthermore, the most important elements in Arabic tense are fa‘ala; yaf‘alu; (sa)wa yaf‘alu and the accusative of time because these elements with context control the Arabic tense. Thus, one or two of these elements are found in every type of Arabic aspect and tense whether a primary or secondary tense.

The majority of secondary aspect and tense types whether in Arabic or English contain two fundamental elements. A secondary tense occurs by adding a particle, auxiliary verb kāna or accusative of time with the main verbal forms. In comparison with English, the secondary aspect and tense is formed by adding an auxiliary verb and changing the form of the main verb. It is observed that negative particles in Arabic differ according to the type of aspect and tense; that is, the negative particles and the verbal form differ according to the aspect and tense. The English negative is typically presented by adding ‘not’ and ‘did’ or ‘do’ with the past and present tense,
respectively, or only 'not' between an auxiliary verb and main verbal forms with other aspects and tenses. Moreover, the negative particle is placed before the main and auxiliary verb in Arabic; by contrast, it is placed between auxiliary and main verb in English.

There are some particles which precede only verbal forms like sawfa; /sa-/ and the negative particles (e.g. lam). That is, these particles cannot come with a nominal form in Arabic. A semantic feature is considered an important quality in the tense issue, where the tense is not a morphology and syntax feature only (Juhfa, 2006: 48), the outcome of which, will be presented in the following concluding chapter.

Arabic grammarians showed great interest in the verbal system right from the beginning. They have classified the usage of verbal forms whether singly or combined with other particles, or auxiliary verbs. In addition, Arabic aspect and tense are affected by both morphological and syntactic elements. It is not possible then to claim that Arabic aspect and tense are part of Arabic forms only. Particular particles and auxiliary verb alter the time reference; typically the basic verbal forms do not present a particular Arabic tense. By contrast, the English tense is changed largely by specific auxiliary verbs and this makes English tense distinctions more accurate and straightforward.

There is a major role for the accusative of time (zarf al-zaman) in classifying Arabic aspect and tense, where it changes the type of sentence, for example sentence 95a indicates a primary aspect, viz., an imperfective aspect:

\[ S. \, 95a \]
\[ \text{yaktubu} \quad ^{3}\text{ms- writes} \quad ^{c}\text{Ali- nom} \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyun} \quad ^{c}\text{risalatan} \]
\[ \text{= } ^{c}\text{Alì writes a letter.} \]

However, when the accusative of time al`āna 'now' is added to sentence 95a, it indicates a secondary aspect, viz., an imperfective progressive aspect, as exemplified in 95b:
Furthermore, the most important elements in Arabic tense are fa‘ala, yaf‘alu, (sa)wfα yaf‘alu and the accusative of time because these elements with context control the Arabic tense. Thus, one or two of these elements are found in every type of Arabic aspect and tense whether a primary or secondary tense.

The majority of secondary aspect and tense types whether in Arabic or English contain two fundamental elements. A secondary tense occurs by adding a particle, auxiliary verb kāna or accusative of time with the main verbal forms. In comparison with English, the secondary aspect and tense is formed by adding an auxiliary verb and changing the form of the main verb. It is observed that negative particles in Arabic differ according to the type of aspect and tense; that is, the negative particles and the verbal form differ according to the aspect and tense. The English negative is typically presented by adding 'not' and 'did' or 'do' with the past and present tense, respectively, or only 'not' between an auxiliary verb and main verbal forms with other aspects and tenses. Moreover, the negative particle is placed before the main and auxiliary verb in Arabic; by contrast, it is placed between auxiliary and main verb in English.

There are some particles which precede only verbal forms like sawfa; /sa-/ and the negative particles (e.g. lam). That is, these particles cannot come with a nominal form in Arabic. A semantic feature is considered an important quality in the tense issue, where the tense is not a morphology and syntax feature only (Juhfa, 2006: 48), the outcome of which, will be presented in the following concluding chapter.

Arabic grammarians showed great interest in the verbal system right from the beginning. They have classified the usage of verbal forms whether
singly or combined with other particles, or auxiliary verbs. In addition, Arabic aspect and tense are affected by both morphological and syntactic elements. It is not possible then to claim that Arabic aspect and tense are part of Arabic forms only. Particular particles and auxiliary verb alter the time reference; typically the basic verbal forms do not present a particular Arabic tense. By contrast, the English tense is changed largely by specific auxiliary verbs and this makes English tense distinctions more accurate and straightforward.

There is a major role for the accusative of time (zarf al-zaman) in classifying Arabic aspect and tense, where it changes the type of sentence, for example sentence 95a indicates a primary aspect, viz., an imperfective aspect:

\[ S. \text{ 95a) } \text{yaktubu } \text{`Aliyyun } \text{risālān} \]
\[ \text{3ms- writes } \text{`Ali- nom } \text{indef- letter- accus} \]
\[ = `\text{Ali writes a letter.} \]

However, when the accusative of time al`ānā 'now' is added to sentence 95a, it indicates a secondary aspect, viz., an imperfective progressive aspect, as exemplified in 95b:

\[ S. \text{ 95b) } \text{yaktubu } \text{`Aliyyun } \text{risālān} \text{al`ānā} \]
\[ \text{3ms- writes } \text{`Ali- nom } \text{indef- letter- accus def-now- adv} \]
\[ = `\text{Ali is writing a letter now.} \]

Furthermore, the most important elements in Arabic tense are fa`ala; yaf`alu; (sa)warf yaf`alu and the accusative of time because these elements with context control the Arabic tense. Thus, one or two of these elements are found in every type of Arabic aspect and tense whether a primary or secondary tense.

The majority of secondary aspect and tense types whether in Arabic or English contain two fundamental elements. A secondary tense occurs by adding a particle, auxiliary verb kāna or accusative of time with the main
verbal forms. In comparison with English, the secondary aspect and tense is formed by adding an auxiliary verb and changing the form of the main verb. It is observed that negative particles in Arabic differ according to the type of aspect and tense; that is, the negative particles and the verbal form differ according to the aspect and tense. The English negative is typically presented by adding 'not' and 'did' or 'do' with the past and present tense, respectively, or only 'not' between an auxiliary verb and main verbal forms with other aspects and tenses. Moreover, the negative particle is placed before the main and auxiliary verb in Arabic; by contrast, it is placed between auxiliary and main verb in English.

There are some particles which precede only verbal forms like sawfa; /sa-/ and the negative particles (e.g. lam). That is, these particles cannot come with a nominal form in Arabic. A semantic feature is considered an important quality in the tense issue, where the tense is not a morphology and syntax feature only (Juḥfa, 2006: 48), the outcome of which, will be presented in the following concluding chapter.

Arabic grammarians showed great interest in the verbal system right from the beginning. They have classified the usage of verbal forms whether singly or combined with other particles, or auxiliary verbs. In addition, Arabic aspect and tense are affected by both morphological and syntactic elements. It is not possible then to claim that Arabic aspect and tense are part of Arabic forms only. Particular particles and auxiliary verb alter the time reference; typically the basic verbal forms do not present a particular Arabic tense. By contrast, the English tense is changed largely by specific auxiliary verbs and this makes English tense distinctions more accurate and straightforward.

There is a major role for the accusative of time ( zarf al-zamān) in classifying Arabic aspect and tense, where it changes the type of sentence, for example sentence 95a indicates a primary aspect, viz., an imperfective aspect:
However, when the accusative of time *alʿāna* 'now' is added to sentence 95a, it indicates a secondary aspect, viz., an imperfective progressive aspect, as exemplified in 95b:

\[
\text{S. 95b)} \quad \text{yaktubu} \quad ^{c}\text{Aliyyun} \quad \text{risālātan} \quad \text{alʿāna} \\
\text{3ms- writes} \quad ^{c}\text{Ali- nom} \quad \text{indef- letter- accus} \quad \text{def-now- adv} \\
\text{= } ^{c}\text{Alī writes a letter now.}
\]

Furthermore, the most important elements in Arabic tense are *faʿala*; *yafʿalu*; *(sa)wfa yafʿalu* and the accusative of time because these elements with context control the Arabic tense. Thus, one or two of these elements are found in every type of Arabic aspect and tense whether a primary or secondary tense.

The majority of secondary aspect and tense types whether in Arabic or English contain two fundamental elements. A secondary tense occurs by adding a particle, auxiliary verb *kāna* or accusative of time with the main verbal forms. In comparison with English, the secondary aspect and tense is formed by adding an auxiliary verb and changing the form of the main verb. It is observed that negative particles in Arabic differ according to the type of aspect and tense; that is, the negative particles and the verbal form differ according to the aspect and tense. The English negative is typically presented by adding 'not' and 'did' or 'do' with the past and present tense, respectively, or only 'not' between an auxiliary verb and main verbal forms with other aspects and tenses. Moreover, the negative particle is placed between the main and auxiliary verb in Arabic; by contrast, it is placed before the main and auxiliary verb in English.

There are some particles which precede only verbal forms like *sawfa*; */sa-/ and the negative particles (e.g. *lam*). That is, these particles cannot come
with a nominal form in Arabic. A semantic feature is considered an important quality in the tense issue, where the tense is not a morphology and syntax feature only (Juhfa, 2006: 48), the outcome of which, will be presented in the following concluding chapter.

Arabic grammarians showed great interest in the verbal system right from the beginning. They have classified the usage of verbal forms whether singly or combined with other particles, or auxiliary verbs. In addition, Arabic aspect and tense are affected by both morphological and syntactic elements. It is not possible then to claim that Arabic aspect and tense are part of Arabic forms only. Particular particles and auxiliary verb alter the time reference; typically the basic verbal forms do not present a particular Arabic tense. By contrast, the English tense is changed largely by specific auxiliary verbs and this makes English tense distinctions more accurate and straightforward.

Arabic grammarians showed great interest in the verbal system right from the beginning. They have classified the usage of verbal forms whether singly or combined with other particles, or auxiliary verbs. In addition, Arabic aspect and tense are affected by both morphological and syntactic elements. It is not possible then to claim that Arabic aspect and tense are part of Arabic forms only. Particular particles and auxiliary verb alter the time reference; typically the basic verbal forms do not present a particular Arabic tense. By contrast, the English tense is changed largely by specific auxiliary verbs and this makes English tense distinctions more accurate and straightforward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>af‘āl al-muqāraba</td>
<td>verbs of getting close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-af‘āl al-tāmma</td>
<td>complete verbal forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-ta‘ajub</td>
<td>exclamation pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahruf al-muḍāra‘a</td>
<td>subject markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ajwaf</td>
<td>hollow verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-‘alam</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿalāqa isnādiyya</td>
<td>attribution relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alif al-ithnayn</td>
<td>alif of the dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alif al-mufāʿala</td>
<td>alif of the reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-ʿāmil</td>
<td>the operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-amr</td>
<td>imperative pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an/ anna l-maṣdariyya</td>
<td>(an/ anna) of a verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-asma‘a al-mubhama</td>
<td>undefined nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍamīr al-faṣl</td>
<td>pronoun of separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍamīr mustatir</td>
<td>hidden pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍamīr muttasīl</td>
<td>attached pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍamīr naṣb munfāṣīl</td>
<td>independent accusative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fadla</td>
<td>optional item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-fāʿil</td>
<td>agent (subject)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-fiʿl</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-fiʿl al-dāʿim</td>
<td>permanent verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-fiʿl al-jāmid</td>
<td>un-derivable verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-fiʿl al-lāzim</td>
<td>intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-fiʿl al-mabnī li-l-majhūl</td>
<td>passive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-fiʿl al-mabnī li-l-m‘lūm</td>
<td>active verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī</td>
<td>transitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghāʿib</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghayr muktamil</td>
<td>imperfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghayr muktamil muʿtād</td>
<td>habitual imperfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥadath wāhid</td>
<td>one event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥadath mutanabbaʿ bih</td>
<td>predictive aspect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
富豪
hamzat al-waṣl
ḥarf qalb
ḥarf sākin
ḥurūf al-istikbāl
ḥurūf al-ṣḥarṭ
ḥurūf al-tanfīs
al-ismāfā
al-iḍrāb
ism al-fī’l
ism iṣhāra
ism jamʿ
ism jins
ism mafʿūl tāmm
ism maʿrifa
al-ism al-mawṣūl
ism nakira
ism šāriḥ
ism zāhir
al-insād
jamʿ mudhakkar sālim
jamiʿ muʿannath sālim
jamʿ taksīr
jarr
jārrun wa-majrūr
al-jumla
al-jumla l-baṣīța
al-jumla l-fīʿlayya
al-jumla l-ismiyya
al-jumla l-murakkaba
al-kalām
al-kalim
al-kalima

circumstantial qualifier
artificial hamza
inversion particle
quiescent letter
particles of futurity
conditional particles
particles of amplification
annexation
inflection
verbal noun
demonstrative pronoun
collective noun
generic noun
complete passive participle
definite noun
relative pronoun
indefinite noun
explicit noun
external noun
attribution
masculine sound plural
feminine sound plural
broken plural
genitive case
prepositional phrase
sentence
simple sentence
verbal sentence
nominal sentence
compound sentence
speech
group of words
word
kathrat al-isti’māl
al-khabar
al-kināya
al-lafḍ
lām al-amr
mā l-maṣdariyya
māḍī
māḍī baʿīd
māḍī qarīb
maʃʿūl bih
al-maʃʿūl fīh
maʃʿūl lahu or li-ajlihi
maʃʿūl maʿahu
maʃʿūl muṭlaq
al-majāz
majzūm
al-maʿmūl
al-maqṣīs
al-maqṣīs ʿalayh
marfūʿc
al-maṣdar
maʿṭūf
al-mubtadaʾ
c muḍaʿc af
c muḍārīc
al-mukhāṭab
muktamil muʿtād
al-munāsaba
muqaddara
al-musṭaqāt al-ismiyya
al-musnad
al-musnad ilayh
mustaqqbal baʿīd/ qarīb

extensive use
comment
personal pronoun
form
lām of command
(prefix) mā of a verbal noun
past tense
remote past tense
recent past tense
direct object
locative object
purposive object
accompanying object
absolute object
figurative usage
jussive mood
operated
secondary element of al-qiyās
primary element of al-qiyās
nominative case
verbal noun
coupled
topic
doubled second or third root consonant
present tense
second person
habitual perfective aspect
circumstantial purpose
implicit
derivations of noun
predicate
subject
remote or recent future tense
mustaqbal muḥaddad  future of fact tense
al-mustaṭānā  excepted
mutaḍuddī  transitive
mutaharrir  mobile letter
mutakarrir  gḥayr muktamil  progressive imperfective aspect
mutakarrir  muktamil  progressive perfective aspect
mutaṣarrīf  variability
al-ṣuṭāwa’a  reflexive
nāfīb fā’il  deputy agent
al-nīdā’  vocative
nūn  al-niswa  nūn of the feminine plural
nūn  al-tawkīd  /-n/ of emphasis
qaḍiyyat al-ṣāmil  operator issue
al-qawl  utterance
al-qiyās  grammatical analogy
samā’  oral observation
ṣabḥ al-mafūl  pseudo object
al-sīfa  adjective
ṣiyāgh al-duṣṭā’  prayer moods
ṣiyāgh al-uqūd  construction moods
al-suhūla wa-l-tawassul fī l-kalām  ease and extensive use
tadṣif al-ṣayn  doubling the second radical of the form
al-tadmīn  implication of meaning
tā’ al-fā’il  /-ta/-tī/-tu personal pronouns
al-ṭalab wa-l-nisba  ordering or attribution purposes
tamyīz  specifying a complement
taqdīm wa-taakhir  pre-posing and post-posing
al-tanwīn  nunation
(al) al-taḍrīf  definite article
al-tasghīr  diminutive
thulūthī ajwaf  triliteral hollow verb
‘umda  essential
al-uslūb al-khabarī  statement pattern
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-uslūb al-inshāʾī</td>
<td>non-statement pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wāw al-jamāʿa</td>
<td>wāw of the masculine plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zarf al-makān</td>
<td>locative object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zarf al-zamān</td>
<td>accusative of time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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