

University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

THE TREATMENT
OF THE HĀL IN KITĀB SĪBĀWAYHI

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED FOR
THE DEGREE OF M. LITT. IN ST. ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

APRIL 1985

A. R. HJ. ISMAIL



ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a study of the treatment of the circumstantial accusative (ḥāl) in the Book of Sībawayhi. The study is aiming at two important goals. Firstly, it is aiming at a complete transformation of Sībawayhi's style into modern idiomatic English. Secondly, it presents the major discussions of the circumstantial accusative in the Book of Sībawayhi. To achieve these goals the relevant section of the Book have been re-arranged into six chapters.

The first three chapters concentrate on the categories of word in which a circumstantial accusative may occur. It begins with the discussion of the circumstantial accusative of an adjective, which is followed by the discussion of the circumstantial accusative of a verbal noun and finally of a non-verbal noun. The presentation of these discussions in such an order is based on the priority of each of them in accordance with Sībawayhi's point of view. These chapters are further divided into a number of sub-headings in order to point out the pattern of the sentences in which the circumstantial accusative occurs. For example, the circumstantial accusative may occur in either a verbal or a nominal sentence.

The fourth chapter presents Sībawayhi's view concerning the occurrence of the circumstantial accusative in a definite form. It contains a collection of rare examples of this definite circumstantial accusative. Furthermore, it is arranged into a sequence of sub-headings which manifest Sībawayhi's view concerning the degree of rarity of the various types of the definite circumstantial accusative. For example, Sībawayhi regards the definite verbal noun, despite its being exceptional, as the most acceptable form of the definite circumstantial accusative. It is followed by the definite non-verbal noun and finally the definite adjective.

The last two chapters concentrate on the discussion of the noun to which a circumstantial accusative refers (sāhibu l-hāl) and the agent of the circumstantial accusative (ʿāmilu l-hāl) respectively. Sībawayhi points out that sāhibu l-hāl should be definite. Therefore, he describes its occurrence in an indefinite form as ugly. As far as the agent of the circumstantial accusative is concerned, Sībawayhi recognizes two distinct types of the agent. Firstly, it may be a single word such as a verb or derivative noun such as 'ismu l-fāʿil , 'ismu l-mafʿūl etc. Secondly, it may be a proposition or a nominal sentence the meaning of which contains the meaning of a verb. Both types of agent, however, are regarded by Sībawayhi as equivalent.

CERTIFICATION

The introduction to the M. Litt. dissertation shall be prefaced by the following declaration:

a- I. Ah..Rahim.Hj..Ismail hereby certify that this dissertation has been written by me, that it is the record of work carried out by me, and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

date. *28 March 1985* signature of candidate!

b- I was admitted as a candidate for the degree of M. Litt. on *7 October 1982*; the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St. Andrews between...*1982*.....(year) and...*1985*.....(year).

date. *28 March 1985* signature of candidate. *A*.....:

c- I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate to the degree of *M. Litt.*.....of the University of St. Andrews and that he/~~she~~ is qualified to submit this dissertation in application for that degree.

date. *28 March 1985* signature of supervisor.....

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very glad to express my first and utmost gratitude to my supervisor Mr. R.A. Kimber of the Department of Arabic Studies in St. Andrews University who has been not only an excellent supervisor to me, but also a good teacher as well as a compassionate friend, and whose great effort and support have been an indispensable help to completing this dissertation.

My heartfelt thanks are also due to Dr. J. Burton and Dr. J. Mattock who have kindly read through this dissertation. My warm appreciation is due to Dr. D.E.P. Jackson and Dr. M.Y.S. Sulaiman of the Department of Arabic Studies in St. Andrews University who always provided me with invaluable advice. I would also like to acknowledge my indebtedness to my dear friend Ismail Mohd who assist me in typing this dissertation on the computer.

Lastly, I would like to express my warmest thank to my wife whose support and encouragement, during the course of my study and writing up, have been crucial.

List of Symbols Used for Transliteration of Arabic Texts

Consonants

<u>Arabic</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Arabic</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Arabic</u>	<u>Symbol</u>
ء	'	ز	z	ق	q
ب	b	س	s	ك	k
ت	t	ش	sh	ل	l
ث	th	ص	s.	م	m
ج	j	ض	d.	ن	n
ح	h.	ط	t.	ه	h
خ	kh	ظ	z.	و	w
د	d	ع	c	ي	y
ذ	dh	غ	gh		
ر	r	ف	f		

Vowels and Diphthongs

Long Vowels

اَ	ā
وُ	ū
يَ	ī

Short Vowels

اِ	a
وِ	u
يِ	i

Diphthongs

اَؤُ	aw
اَئِ	ay

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	i- v
CHAPTER ONE: THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE OF AN ADJECTIVE....	1- 35
1.1 The Simple Pattern.....	2- 5
1.2 The Circumstantial Accusative Governed by a Nominal Proposition.....	6- 18
1.2.1 The Predicative Circumstantial Accusative of the Predicate of a Demonstrative Pronoun.....	7
1.2.2 The predicative Circumstantial Accusative of the Predicate of a nominative Personal Pronoun.....	14
1.3 The Circumstantial Accusative which Occurs in an Interrogative Sentence.....	19- 27
1.3.1 The Circumstantial Accusative which Comes after a Sentence.....	19
1.3.2 The Circumstantial Accusative which Comes after the Interrogative Prefix.....	23
1.4 The Circumstantial Accusative of an Adjective which is Governed by a Comparative or Superlative adjective.....	28- 32
 CHAPTER TWO: THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE OF A VERBAL NOUN.....	 36- 56
2.1 The Circumstantial Accusative of a Verbal Noun Governed by a Verb.....	36
2.2 The Circumstantial Accusative of a Verbal Noun which Occurs after the Introductory 'Ammā.....	40
2.3 The Circumstantial Accusative of a Verbal Noun which Occurs after a Nominal Sentence.....	45

2.4	The Circumstantial Accusative of the Noun of Plurality.....	52
CHAPTER THREE: THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE OF A NON-VERBAL NOUN..... 57- 80		
3.1	The Circumstantial Accusative which Occurs after an Interrogative Prefix.....	58
3.2	The Circumstantial Accusative of the Noun Phrase.....	64
3.3	Other Examples of The Circumstantial Accusative of a Non-Verbal Noun.....	74
CHAPTER FOUR: THE DEFINITE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE..... 81- 97		
4.1	The Definite Circumstantial Accusative of a Verbal Noun.....	81
4.2	The Definite Circumstantial Accusative of a Non-verbal Noun.....	85
4.3	The Definite Circumstantial Accusative of an Adjective.....	91
CHAPTER FIVE: ṢĀḤIB al-ḤĀL..... 98-114		
5.1	The definite Ṣāḥib al-ḥāl.....	98
5.2	The Indefinite Ṣāḥib al-Ḥāl.....	104
CHAPTER SIX: THE AGENT OF THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE.....115-128		
CONCLUSION.....129-132		
BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 133		

INTRODUCTION

The circumstantial accusative, as a grammatical category, is explained, in the Book, by Sībawayhi with two distinct terms. The first is ḥālun and the second is khabarun li-l-ma^crūfi l-mabniyyi ^calā mā qabla-hu or khabarun li-l-ma^crūfi or only khabarun. However, both terms are not only employed to refer to the circumstantial accusative but also in their original meaning in a wider sense. Moreover, the word khabar, in particular, is also used to refer to the predicate.

In the Book, the circumstantial accusative is discussed by Sībawayhi in over thirty places under different headings, each of which deals with a particular pattern of speech in which the circumstantial accusative is constructed. Moreover, each pattern, on many occasions, is used as a model from which other similar patterns, irrespective of whether they contain the circumstantial accusative or not, are derived. The discussions under those headings, therefore, are not only devoted to patterns of the circumstantial accusative, but also to other possible patterns that may not include it. Furthermore, some of those headings are unspecific, hence, it is difficult to identify the content with which they are dealing.

The circumstantial accusative is, according to Sībawayhi, a redundant part of the sentence (fadlatun). This concept is implicit in Sībawayhi's first discussion of the circumstantial accusative where he compares it with the noun which comes after the genitive noun of the genitive construct. Furthermore, he explicitly says that a sentence can be expressed alone without a circumstantial accusative and the circumstantial accusative is not an essential part of the sentence but only represents extra information concerning someone or something which is mentioned in the sentence.

As far as the form of the circumstantial accusative is concerned, it is understood that the circumstantial accusative may take the form either of an adjective or of a verbal noun or even of a non-verbal noun. However, Sībawayhi seems to consider the form of an adjective as the basic form of the circumstantial accusative and the form of a verbal noun and of a non-verbal noun as secondary. Regarding this, Sībawayhi explains that the occurrence of a particular verbal noun as a circumstantial accusative is not to be made an analogy for the occurrence of other verbal nouns as such, because the verbal noun in this particular case is in the place of the participle (fā^cil). As for the non-verbal noun which occurs as a circumstantial accusative, Sībawayhi frequently explains its occurrence as such with a form of a verbal noun.

It is obvious from what we have already mentioned that Sībawayhi, unlike modern Arab grammarians, describes the form of a circumstantial accusative in three stages. The first and the basic form of it is an adjective. The second is a verbal noun which should be construed as an adjective. The third is a non-verbal noun which is not to be construed directly as an adjective but as a verbal noun. It is also obvious that Sībawayhi regards the circumstantial accusative of a verbal noun and of a non-verbal noun as rare and exceptional.

The form of the circumstantial accusative, according to Sībawayhi, should be indefinite. Therefore, the occurrence of it in a definite form is regarded as rare and exceptional. Sībawayhi considers the circumstantial accusative of a definite verbal noun as the most possible one and it is followed by a definite non-verbal noun, which is regarded as more rare than a definite verbal noun, and finally, it is followed by a definite adjective which is regarded as the most rare of all. Moreover, Sībawayhi points out that the occurrence of a definite circumstantial accusative should be construed, when it is possible, as its equivalent indefinite form.

chapters concentrate on the discussions of ṣāhibu l-ḥāl and of the agent of a circumstantial accusative, respectively, which are occasionally discussed by Sībawayhi throughout the various discussions of the circumstantial accusative.

CHAPTER ONE

THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE

OF

AN ADJECTIVE

The adjectives which occur as circumstantial accusatives, under this heading, are all varieties of the derivative noun ('al-ismu l-mushtaqu). They include the active participle ('ismu l-fā^cili), the passive participle ('ismu l-maf^cūli), the assimilated adjective (as-sifatu l-mushabbahatu) and the comparative and superlative adjective ('ismu t-tafdīli).

An adjective of this class of noun, the derivative noun, presents a basic form in which a circumstantial accusative is constructed. This is because, due to its derivativeness, the derivative noun, in most cases, expresses a transitory state. This point, however, is not expressed explicitly by Sibawayhi in his various discussions of the circumstantial accusative. Nevertheless, the number of examples of the circumstantial accusative of an adjective, in the Book, is far greater than the number of examples of the circumstantial accusative of any other kind.

The circumstantial accusative that comes in the form of an adjective can be divided into four sub-divisions, with respect to the pattern of the sentence in which it occurs.

1.1 The Simple Pattern

The simplest form of the circumstantial accusative is that of a noun in the accusative following the direct object (maf^cūlun bi-hi) of a transitive verb or the subject (fā^cilun) of an intransitive verb. For example:¹

darabtu ^cabdallāhi qā'iman

" I beat ^cAbdullāh standing up "

and

dhahaba zaydun rākiban

" Zayd went, riding."

Sībawayhi is careful to distinguish the circumstantial accusative of qā'iman and rākiban from the accusative of the direct object of a transitive verb. Unlike qā'iman in the first example, 'ath-thawba in

kasawtu zaydani th-thawba

" I put the garment on Zayd "

may be placed first, or alone as in

kasawtu th-thawba

" I put the garment on(someone) "

without affecting its meaning. Moreover, ath-thawba may take the place of the subject as in

kusiyā th-thawbu

" the garment was put on "

and it may be defined.²

By contrast, the circumstantial accusative, such as qā'iman or rākiban of the previous examples, is not an object since it can be constructed with both transitive and intransitive verb such ḍarabtu (I beat) or dhahabtu (I went) respectively. Furthermore, it does not occur in a definite form. Therefore, it is not permissible, for example, to say either

ḍarabtu zaydan 'abā-ka

" I beat Zayd, your father "

or

ḍarabtu zaydani l-qā'ima

" I beat Zayd, the one who was standing up "

unless 'abā-ka and al-qā'ima both refer to Zayd, the former being a substitute (badalun) and the latter being a

description (ṣifatun).³

In addition, Sībawayhi emphasizes that the circumstantial accusatives in

ḍarabtu ^cabdallāhi qā'iman

and

dhahaba zaydun rākiban

cannot be either an object or a subject, because the object (in the first sentence) and the subject (in the second) have intervened between the circumstantial accusatives and the verbs. This, as he further explains, resembles nouns or pronouns in the genitive ('al-'asmā'u l-majrūratu) which intervene between what comes after them and between the genitivizer ('al-jārru) in such cases as

lī mithlu-hu rajulan

" I have the like of him as a man "

lī mil'u-hu ^casalan

" I have the fill of it in honey "

and

wayḥa-hu fārisan

" woe be upon him as a horseman."

In each of these examples -hu cuts off the government of the

genitivizer insofar as it prevents the following noun from being genitive also. Similarly, the object and the subject (in the examples of the circumstantial accusative) are like the nūn of ^cishrūna which prevents what comes after it from becoming genitive in such cases as⁴

la-hu ^cishrūna dirhaman

" he has a score in dirham."

Consequently, Sībawayhi explains that the verb, in the examples of the circumstantial accusative, governs the circumstantial accusative in the same way as lī mithlu-hu governs the noun which comes after it in the accusative, because both the circumstantial accusative and the noun after lī mithlu-hu do not occur except in indefinite form.⁵

1.2 The Circumstantial Accusative Governed by
a Nominal Proposition

Sībawayhi describes the circumstantial accusative of this type with two different terms. Sometimes he terms it ḥāl and sometimes khabarun li-l-ma^crūfi l-mabniyyi ^calā mā qabla-hu: a predicate referring to a known noun which is itself the predicate of what precedes it. The second term is often abbreviated khabarun li-l-ma^crūfi or khabar. His discussion of what he terms khabarun li-l-ma^crūfi or khabar, however, makes it clear that he regards it as analogous to what he terms a ḥāl.⁶

On the basis of this fact and for our convenience I will use, in this discussion, the term predicative circumstantial accusative to refer to all types of the circumstantial accusative described by Sībawayhi as khabarun li-l-ma^crūfi or khabar. Where it is described by Sībawayhi as a ḥāl, the same term will be used but it will be distinguished from the other by the term ḥāl in brackets.

The nominal proposition is composed of two important elements which are the subject (mubtada') and the predicate ('al-mabniyyu ^calay-hi). The subject of the proposition under this heading, however, mainly takes the form of what

Sībawayhi refers to as the unspecific nouns ('al-'asmā'u l-mubhamatu). According to Sībawayhi the unspecific nouns are the demonstrative pronouns ('asmā'u l-'ishārati) which are hādhā, dhālika and their feminine, dual and plural derivatives and the separate nominative personal pronouns (damā'iru r-raf^ci l-munfasīlatu) such as huwa, hiya, humā, hum, hunna etc.⁷

On the basis of the obvious distinction between the two groups of the unspecific nouns, as well as the clear division between them in Sībawayhi's discussion, it is useful to divide the discussion under this heading into two sub-headings.

1.2.1 The Predicative Circumstantial Accusative of the Predicate of a Demonstrative Pronoun.

The examples of the predicative circumstantial accusative of the predicate of a demonstrative pronoun are:⁸

hādhā^c abdullāhi muntaliqan

" this is ^cAbdullāh departing "

hā'ulā'i qawmu-ka muntaliqāna

" these are your people departing "

dhāka^c abdullāhi dhāhiban

" that is ^cAbdullāh going "

and

hād̄hā ^cabdullāhi ma^crūfan

" this is ^cAbdullāh, being well-known."

It is obvious from the above examples that the predicative circumstantial accusative, muntaliqan of the first example, muntaliqāna of the second, dhāhiban of the third and ma^crūfan of the fourth, do not come immediately after the demonstrative pronouns, but after the predicates. These, according to Sībawayhi, are required by the demonstrative pronouns in order to make a complete statement. Demonstrative pronouns, therefore, govern what comes after them in the same manner as the verb and the genitivizer do.⁹

As for the meaning of these examples, Sībawayhi explains that these expressions are used not in order to identify the person spoken about to the hearer, as one would do if one thought that the hearer did not know the person spoken about, rather they are used to attract the attention of the hearer to the circumstance of the person spoken about in each sentence. For example, the purpose of saying the first example is to indicate ^cAbdullah's departure. On the basis of this purpose, it is understood that the words hād̄hā ^cabdullāhi, of the example, imply the meaning of a verb. Thus, the meaning of the example is

'unzur 'ilay-hi muntaliqan

" look at him departing."

Therefore, Sībawayhi further explains, muntaliqan is the predicative circumstantial accusative (hāl)¹⁰ of ^cAbdullāh and ^cAbdullāh has prevented muntaliqan from being the predicate of hādihā, in the same way as ^cAbdullāh prevents rākiban from being the subject (fā^cil) of the verb jā'a when one says

jā'a ^cabdullāhi rākiban

" ^cAbdullāh came riding "

in which rākiban is a circumstantial accusative.¹¹

Another example¹², which is slightly different from the previous examples of the predicative circumstantial accusative (hāl) is

hādha r-rajulu muntaliqan

" this is the man departing."

In this example the active participle muntaliqan is a predicative circumstantial accusative (hāl) because the definite noun ar-rajulu is the predicate of hādihā. The sentence is, according to Sībawayhi, similar to one's saying

hād̄hā c'abdullāhi muntaliqan¹³

Sībawayhi points out that the active participle muntaliqan of the previous example can also occur in the nominative case as the predicate of hād̄hā. For example,

hād̄ha r-rajulu muntaliqun

" this man is departing."

In this case, the definite noun ar-rajulu becomes the description of the subject hād̄hā and constitutes together with hād̄hā a single noun. The sentence

hād̄ha r-rajulu muntaliqun

is, therefore, with respect to its meaning, equivalent to

hād̄hā muntaliqun¹⁴

The difference between the sentence in which the active participle muntaliqun is nominative and the sentence in which muntaliqan is accusative is that in the first sentence the speaker does not intend to identify anyone in particular to the hearer, but he simply indicates the act of the person spoken about, which is departing, while in the second

sentence, apart from giving the indication of the man's departure, the speaker also wishes to identify to the hearer a man who is already known to him.¹⁵

Similarly, the active participle *muntaliqan* in

hādhā ^c*abdullāhi muntaliqan*

may also be used in the nominative case as in

hādhā ^c*abdullāhi muntaliqun*

" this (man), ^c*Abdullāh* is departing."

According to *Sībawayhi*, *muntaliqun* in this example is nominative in one of four ways. Firstly, *muntaliqun* may be the predicate of either *hādhā* or *huwa* elided after ^c*Abdullāh*. Secondly, both ^c*Abdullāh* and *muntaliqun* may be regarded as predicates of *hādhā*. Thirdly, ^c*Abdullāh* may be in apposition (*ma^ctūf*) with *hādhā* and therefore *muntaliqun* is the predicate of them. Finally, ^c*Abdullāh* may be the substitute (*badal*) of *hādhā* and *muntaliqun* is therefore a predicate.¹⁶

With respect to the government of the accusative muntaliqan of the sentence¹⁷

hādha r-rajulu muntaliqan

Sībawayhi explains that the circumstantial predicative referring to the definite noun ar-rajulu is accusative because it is as though it were a circumstantial accusative in which the action of a verb has taken place (hālun maf^Cūlun fī-hā). This is because the subject governs what comes after it in the same way as the verb governs what comes after it. In this way the proposition which is comprised of a subject and a predicate gives the meaning of alerting (at-tanbīhu) and identifying (at-ta^Crīfu). Furthermore, the fact that the noun ar-rajulu in such a nominal sentence prevents muntaliqan from being a predicate, is similar to the subject (fā^Cil) of a verbal sentence preventing a circumstantial accusative from being a fā^Cil. Sībawayhi further explains that the adverbial accusative of muntaliqan in such a sentence without a verb is similar to a zarf which has its place in a sentence without a verb. This due to the fact that

fī-hā zaydun

" in it is Zayd "

means

'istaqarra fī-hā zaydun

" Zayd settled in it."

From another point of view, the active participle *muntaliqan* is accusative in the same way as the noun *dirhaman* is made accusative by the *nūn* of *ishrūna*, in

lī *ishrūna* dirhaman

" I have twenty dirhams."

This is because both *muntaliqan* and *dirhaman* are not descriptions of their preceding nouns and, furthermore, neither of them is constructed in the same way as a description is. On this basis, it is observed that the nominal proposition and the noun *ishrūna* both govern what comes after them in the same way as the active participle (*'ismu l-fā'ili*), which governs in the same way as an imperfect verb (*al-fi'lu l-mudāri'u*), governs a direct object which comes after it, as in

ḍāribun zaydan¹⁸

" beating Zayd "

1.2.2 The Predicative Circumstantial Accusative of the
Predicate of a Nominative Personal Pronoun

An example of a predicative circumstantial accusative of a predicate of a nominative personal pronoun is

huwa zaydun ma^crūfan¹⁹

" he is Zayd, being well known "

in which ma^crūfan is a predicative circumstantial accusative (ḥāl). According to Sībawayhi such an expression is used to address a hearer who has no knowledge of the person spoken about or one who is assumed to have no knowledge of that person. It is, therefore, similar to one's saying

'intabih 'ilay-hi ma^crūfan

" take note of him, being well known "

or

'ilzam-hu ma^crūfan

" cleave to him, being well known."

On the basis of this account, the passive participle ma^crūfan becomes a predicative circumstantial accusative (ḥāl) and is similar to the active participle muntaliqan in the sentence

hādhā zaydun muntaliqan²⁰

Sībawayhi further explains that the purpose of mentioning ma^crūfan in such a sentence is to clarify the identity of the person spoken of. On this basis, it is only permissible to put in the place of ma^crūfan what resembles it in identifying the person spoken of in the sentence and reinforcing his identification. If, however, ma^crūfan of the previous example were replaced by muntaliqan, it would not be permissible because muntaliqan does not clarify the identity of Zayd, nor reinforce his identification. Furthermore, muntaliqan does not contain the meaning of ma^crūfan which is lā shakka (without any doubt).²¹

Another example of a predicative circumstantial accusative of this type is

huwa l-ḥaqqu bayyinan wa-ma^clūman

" it is the truth, clear and understood."

In this example bayyinan and ma^clūman are predicative circumstantial accusatives because both of them clarify and reinforce the predicate al-ḥaqqu.²²

Regarding the subject of the previous examples, Sībawayhi explains that huwa can be replaced by other nominative personal pronouns such as hiya, humā, hunna, 'anā, or one such as 'inna-hu. For example: 'Ibn Dāra said²³

'ana bnu dārata ma^crūfan bi-hā nasabī

" I am the son of Dāra, my descent from
her being well known "

Besides the examples discussed above, Sībawayhi explains that it is also possible to say, for example,

'anā ^cabdullāhi karīman jawādan

" I am ^cAbdullāh, noble and generous "

huwa ^cabdullāhi shujā^can baṭalan

" he is ^cAbdullāh, courageous and brave "

'innī ^cabdullāhi musaghghiran nafsa-hu

li-rabbi-hi 'ākilan kamā ya'kulu l-^cabdu wa-

shāriban kamā yashrabu l-^cabdu

" I am ^cAbdullāh, belittling himself to his Lord,
eating and drinking as a slave "

These sentences have the purpose respectively of exalting

oneself, threatening others or showing one's humility. They are possible because by uttering them one makes known, about the person spoken of in the sentences, what one thought the hearer did not know, or what one chooses to regard the hearer as not knowing. They are, therefore, similar to one's simply making known to the hearer the name of the person spoken of.²⁴

Sībawayhi then asserts that when a nominative personal pronoun is used as the subject of a sentence, it is not permissible to put the noun to which it refers after it if the only purpose is to give information about an action or a description and not to identify the noun, whether it is for example Zaid or ^cAmr, or to exalt or belittle oneself, or to threaten another²⁵. It is accordingly impossible, for example, for a person's friend who is known to him to tell him something about himself or another person who is known to him by saying

'anā ^cabdullāhi muntaliqan

" I am ^cAbdullāh, departing "

or

huwa zaydun muntaliqan

" he is Zayd, departing "

This is impossible because it is understood from the

sentences that the speaker does not wish to identify himself or another as ^cAbdullāh or Zayd, respectively, but only wishes to give information about his or Zayd's departure. This is because whenever one says 'anā or huwa, it is understood that the person to which the pronoun refers is already known and, therefore, naming him is no longer required²⁶. However, in a circumstance where there is a person one knows behind a wall or in a place which prevents one from recognizing him, it is then correct for him, when replying to one's question

man 'anta

" who are you ?"

to say

'anā zaydun muntaliqan fī hājati-ka²⁷

" I am Zayd, departing on your errand."

Finally, Sībawayhi explains that everything which is applicable to huwa and its sisters ('akhawātu-hā) is also applicable to the predicate of a specific noun ('ismun ghayru mubhamin). For example:

'akhū-ka ^cabdullāhi ma ^crūfan²⁸

" your brother is ^cAbdullāh, being well known "

1.3 The Circumstantial Accusative which Occurs in an Interrogative Sentence

An interrogative sentence, in this discussion, is a sentence that begins with an interrogative particle such as mā (what?), man (who?), or a prepositional construct such as li-man (whose?), or the prefix 'a (do or does?).

The circumstantial accusative which occurs in an interrogative sentence can be divided into two divisions, with respect to the pattern of the sentence in which it occurs.

1.3.1 The Circumstantial Accusative which Comes after a Sentence

The sentence, in this discussion, is comprised of a subject which is an interrogative particle, and a predicate which in many cases takes the form of a genitive construct. Sībawayhi describes the circumstantial accusative which occurs after such a sentence as the circumstantial accusative of the person who has been questioned (hālun li-l-mas'ūli) or the circumstantial accusative of the person who has been the subject of a question (hālun li-l-mas'ūli c^can-hu).²⁹

The examples of this type of circumstantial accusative are:

mā sha'nu-ka qā'iman

" what is it with you, standing up?"

mā sha'nu zaydin qā'iman

" what is it with Zayd, standing up?"

and

mā li-'akhi-ka qā'iman

" what is it with your brother, standing up?"

According to Sībawayhi the active participle qā'iman in the above examples is accusative because it is governed by the preceding sentences. Thus, for example, qā'iman in the first example is governed by mā sha'nu-ka. Sībawayhi further explains that their government is, therefore, similar to the government of the sentence

hādha^c abdullāhi qā'iman.

Furthermore, the sentences such as mā sha'nu-ka and mā la-ka contain the meaning of li-ma qumta (why did you stand?).

This is clearly shown by a Qur'ānic passage:³⁰

fa-mā la-hum^c ani t-tadhkirati mu^cridīna

" why are they turning aside from the warning?"

Another similar example of the circumstantial accusative of this type is

man dhā qā'iman bi-l-bābi

" who is that standing by the door?"

Sībawayhi explains that the meaning which it is wished to express is

man dha l-ladhī huwa qā'imun bi-l-bābi

" who is that, who is standing by the door?"

and the agent which governs the active participle qā'iman in this example is equivalent to

hādhā^c abdullāhi

because man is the subject of the sentence and dhā is its predicate. This explanation is also applicable to one such as

li-mani d-dāru maftūhan bābu-hā³¹

" whose is the house, with its door open?"

As for an example such as

man dhā khayrun / khayran min-ka

the comparative adjective khayr can be either in the nominative case or in the accusative. On the one hand it is nominative if the sentence expresses the meaning

man dha l-ladhī huwa khayrun min-ka

" who is it that is better than you?"

from which is not understood that one expects the person to whom one addresses the question to identify a particular person whose superiority over the person questioned is apparent. On the other hand, it is accusative in the same way as qā'imān of the previous examples is, if one wishes the person to whom one addresses the question to identify a particular person indicated by the question. Thus, one may say for this purpose³²

man dhā khayran min-ka

" who is that better than you?"

1.3.2 The Circumstantial Accusative which Comes
after the Interrogative Prefix

It can be pointed out in advance that Sībawayhi's discussion of these examples includes several examples which do not in fact have the interrogative prefix. The heading is used, however, as Sībawayhi gives priority to the examples that do have the interrogative prefix.

The examples of the circumstantial accusative which comes after the interrogative prefix are:

'a-qā'iman wa-qad qa^Cada n-nāsu

" do you remain standing while the people
have sat?"

and

'a-qā^Cidan wa-qad sāra r-rakbu

" do you remain sitting while the riders
have departed?"

According to Sībawayhi, these sentences can be expressed in a different way without the interrogative prefix, in which case the adjectival participles remain as they were when they were preceded by the interrogative prefix. Thus we may say

qā'iman qad ^calima llāhu qad qa^cada n-nāsu

" you remain standing, God knows,
while the people have sat "

and

qā^cidan ^calima llāhu wa-qad sāra r-rakbu³³

" you remain sitting, God knows,
while the riders have departed."

Sībawayhi explains that both types of expression are said in order to warn a person who remains standing or sitting. They are as if one says

'a-taqūmu qā'iman

" do you remain standing?"

and

'a-taq^cudu qā^cidan

" do you remain sitting?"

However, the verb is elided because the circumstances of the person to whom one addresses the question clearly imply its presence. In this case, where the verb is elided, the active participle becomes the substitute (badal) of the verb and, according to Sībawayhi, the active participle in such a case behaves like the verbal noun.³⁴

Another example of the circumstantial accusative of this type which comes in a slightly different pattern of sentence from the previous one is

^Cā'idhan bi-llāhi min sharri-hā

" seeking God's protection from its mischief!"

According to Sībawayhi, this sentence is said when the speaker finds himself in a state of fear and seeking God's protection from something that should be avoided. Sībawayhi explains that the speaker finds himself in such a state in the same way as the previous speaker found someone else in the state of standing or sitting. Furthermore, ^Cā'idhan is similar to qā'iman or qā^Cidan of the previous examples because when one says

^Cā'idhan bi-llāhi

" seeking God's protection!"

it is as though one says

'a^Cūdhu bi-llāhi ^Cā'idhan bi-llāhi

" I seek God's protection, seeking
God's protection."

However, the verb of 'a^cūdhu bi-llāhi is elided and replaced by ^cā'idhan bi-llāhi as its substitute. It thus behaves like the verbal noun in

^ciyādhan bi-llāhi³⁵

" recourse to God!"

in which the verbal noun ^ciyādhan substitutes for the verb 'a^cūdhu.

Examples of this type of circumstantial accusative which occur in poetry are:

'alhiq^c adhāba-ka bi-l-qawmi l-ladhīna ṭaghaw
wa-^cā'idhan bi-ka 'an ya^clū fa-yuṭghūni

" extend your punishment upon the people who have exceeded the limit, I seeking your protection from their prevailing and causing me to exceed the limit "

in which ^cā'idhan is a circumstantial accusative, and the saying of a poet

'arā-ka jama^cta mas'alatan wa-hirṣan
wa-^cinda l-ḥaqqi zahhāran 'unānā

" I see you are both demanding and greedy,
(and see you) moaning and grumbling at

what is right "

in which *zahhāran* and *'unānā* are circumstantial accusatives,
as though he says

*tazharu zahīran wa-ta'innu 'anīnan*³⁶

" (you) moaning away and grumbling away."

Finally, *Sībawayhi* explains that when one refers to the state of oneself or another by means of a circumstantial accusative, one establishes the sense of the verb, just as one does in the case of

saqyan wa-hamdan

" may God give a drink, God be praised."

He further emphasizes that *'ā'idhan bi-llāhi* in the substitution (*badal*) and the concealment of a verb (*'al-'idmār*) behaves like a verbal noun (*maṣdar*), as *hanī'an* (may it do you much good) does, because it is equivalent to a verbal noun.³⁷

1.4 The Circumstantial Accusative of an Adjective which is Governed by a Comparative or Superlative Adjective

The circumstantial accusative which is governed by the comparative or superlative adjective ('ismu t-tafdīli) is discussed by Sībawayhi under the heading " the chapter of those nouns and adjectives which become accusative because they are circumstances in which things occur ".³⁸ The pattern of the sentences in which the comparative or superlative adjective governs a circumstantial accusative of an adjective tends to follow the pattern of the sentence in which it governs a noun as a circumstantial accusative. Sībawayhi discusses both types together, but the case of noun will be discussed later.

The examples in which the comparative or superlative adjective governs a circumstantial accusative of another adjective are:

marartu bi-rajulin 'akhbatha mā yakūnu

'akbathu min-ka 'akhbatha mā takūnu

" I passed by a man who at his worst is worse
than you at your worst "

marartu bi-rajulin khayra mā yakūnu

khayrin min-ka khayra mā takūnu

" I passed by a man who at his best is better
than you at your best "

and

huwa 'akhbatha mā yakūnu 'akhbatha min-ka
'akhbatha mā takūnu³⁹

" he at his worst is worse than you at your worst."

The superlative adjectives which come before and after the comparative adjectives in the above examples, according to Sībawayhi, are circumstantial accusatives similar to the two non-derivative nouns ('ismun ghayru mushtaqqin) in such an example as⁴⁰

hādhā busran 'aṭyabu min-hu ruṭaban

" these (dates) are better as unripe dates
than as ripe dates "

where busran and ruṭaban are circumstantial accusatives.

As for the example

marartu bi-rajulin khayra mā yakūnu
khayrin min-ka khayra mā takūnu

Sībawayhi notes that the superlative adjectives can also occur in the nominative case as in

marartu bi-rajulin khayru mā yakūnu

khayrun min-ka

" I passed by a man whose best is better
than you "

in which the speaker means

marartu bi-rajulin khayru 'ahwāli-hi

khayrun min-ka

" I passed by a man the best of whose conditions
is better than you "

which actually means

...khayrun min 'ahwāli-ka

"...better than your conditions."

Similarly one may say

nahāru-ka sā'imun wa-laylu-ka qā'imun⁴¹

" your day is fasting and your night is praying."

Sībawayhi includes here two examples where the circumstantial accusative is a superlative adjective governed by a verb. They are:

'ātī-ka yawma l-jum^Cati 'abta'a-hu

" I shall come to you on Friday at the latest "

'a^Ctaytu-hu dirhaman aw dirhamayni

'akthara mā 'a^Ctaytu-hu

" I gave him one or two dirhams at the most."

In the first example 'abta'a-hu expresses the meaning

'abta'a l-'ityāni

" coming at the latest "

In the second example 'akthara mā 'a^Ctaytu-hu expresses the meaning

'akthara l-^Catīyyati

" giving at the most."

On the other, however, they may be read in the nominative as predicates if the speaker wishes to express such a meaning as

dhāka 'abta'u-hu

" that is at the latest "

and

dhāka 'aktharu-hu

" that is at the most "

respectively.⁴²

Notes

- 1_ Sībawayhi, al-kitāb, vol.1, p. 20, ll. 14-15.
- 2- Ibid, p. 20, ll. 11-14.
- 3- Ibid, p. 20, ll. 15-17,21.
- 4- Ibid, p. 20, ll. 17-20.
- 5- Ibid, p. 20, ll. 20-21.
- 6- This subject is discussed by Sībawayhi in two separate discussions: the first is the chapter of what is accusative because it is a predicative referring to a known noun which itself is the predicate of an unspecific noun. The second is the chapter of the nominative predicative because it is the predicate of the subject or of the accusative predicative because it is the circumstantial accusative of a known noun which is the predicate of the subject. see, pp. 256-258, 260-261.
- 7- Ibid, p. 256, ll. 12-14.
- 8- Ibid, p. 256, ll. 15-16.
- 9- Ibid, p. 256, ll. 16-18.
- 10- Sībawayhi describes muntaliqan, here, as ḥāl. Thus, this proves that he regards khabarun li-l-ma^crūfi as analogous to al-ḥāl. see, p. 256, l. 20.
- 11- Ibid, p. 256, ll. 12-14.
- 12- The term ḥāl is consistently used by Sībawayhi when

describing the predicative circumstantial accusative of this chapter. see, p. 260, l. 5.

13- Ibid, p. 260, ll. 9-10.

14- Ibid, p. 260, ll. 6-7.

15- Ibid, p. 260, ll. 10-12.

16- This is described by Sībawayhi in the chapter of what may be nominative of what is (otherwise) accusative when it refers to a definite noun. see, pp. 258-260.

17- Ibid, p. 260, ll. 12-16.

18- Ibid, p. 260, ll. 16-18.

19- Ibid, p. 256, l. 24.

20- Ibid, p. 257, ll. 1-3.

21- Ibid, p. 257, ll. 3-6.

22- Ibid, p. 257, l. 6.

23- Ibid, p. 257, ll. 6-8.

24- Ibid, p. 257, ll. 10-14, 16-18.

25- Ibid, p. 257, ll. 14-17.

26- Ibid, p. 257, ll. 19-22.

27- Ibid, p. 257, l. 22, p. 258, l. 1.

28- Ibid, p. 258, ll. 1-3.

29- Ibid, p. 247, l.21.

30- Ibid, p. 247, ll. 21-24.

31- Ibid, p. 247, l. 21, p. 248, ll. 1-2.

32- Ibid, p. 248, ll. 2-7.

33- Ibid, p. 171, ll. 4-6.

34- Ibid, p. 171, ll. 6-8. For the example, see below p.

26,27.

35- Ibid, p. 171, ll. 8-11.

36- Ibid, p. 171, ll. 14-18, p. 172, l. 1

37- Ibid, p. 171, ll. 11-14.

38- Ibid, p. 199, l. 12.

39- Ibid, p. 199, ll. 17-18, p. 120, l.1

40- Ibid, p. 199, ll. 13,17. For further explanation, see
below chapter three, p. 74

41- Ibid, p. 200, ll. 1-3.

42- Ibid, p. 200, ll. 3-7.

CHAPTER TWO

THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE

OF

A VERBAL NOUN

The verbal noun (masdar), for example, dhahābun (going), ḍarbun (beating), 'iftikhārūn (boasting) etc, is, according to Basran grammarians, a basic form from which the other categories of Arabic words are derived. The verbal noun, along with the non-derivative noun, represents the secondary form in which the circumstantial accusative occurs. This fact is widely accepted by the Arab grammarians and Sībawayhi's view will become evident throughout his various discussions of the circumstantial accusative of a verbal noun.

In the Book, the circumstantial accusative of a verbal noun occurs in a few groups of examples, the patterns of which can be discussed separately under four headings.

2.1 The Circumstantial Accusative of a Verbal Noun

Governed by a Verb

Although Sībawayhi does not point out the agent of the circumstantial accusative in this discussion, it is unmistakable, from studying the examples which follow, that the agent of the circumstantial accusative of a verbal noun under this heading is a verb.¹ The examples which come under this heading are as follows:

qataltu-hu ṣabran

" I killed him captive "

laqītu-hu fujā'atan / mufāja'atan

" I met him suddenly "

laqītu-hu kifāhan / mukāfahatan

" I met him face to face "

laqītu-hu ^ciyānan

" I met him eye to eye "

kallamtu-hu mushāfahatan

" I spoke to him face to face (literally,
mouth to mouth "

'ataytu-hu rakdan / ^cadwan / mashyan

" I came to him running / walking "

'akhadhtu dhālika ^can-hu sam^can
/ samā^can²

" I took that from him aurally "

According to Sibawayhi, the verbal nouns in the above examples are circumstances in which things occur, and therefore they take the accusative case. He further explains that not every verbal noun, even by analogy, can be a circumstantial accusative in the same way as the verbal nouns in the above examples, because the above verbal nouns are in the place of the fā^cil. That is, a verbal noun does not regularly occur in place of the fā^cil and any occurrence of it as such does not imply the necessary occurrence of the

others. Therefore, it is not permissible, for example, to say

'atā-nā sur^catan

" he came to us speedily "

or

'atā-nā rujlatan

" he came to us on foot "

in which sur^catan and rujlatan are put in the place of the fā^cil as circumstantial accusatives modelled after the verbal nouns of the previous examples.³ Sībawayhi then explains that such a restriction on the use of the verbal noun as a circumstantial accusative is analogous to the restriction on its use in saqyan (may God give you rain) and ḥamdan (I praise God) where the verbal nouns are substitutes for their verbs.⁴ Other verbal nouns may not necessarily be used in the same way.

Other examples of the circumstantial accusative which occurs in the form of a verbal noun are: the saying of the poet Zuhayr ibn Abī Salmā,

fa-la'yan bi-la'yin mā ḥamal-nā walīda-nā

^calā zahri mahbūkin zimā'in mafāsilu-h

" with much delay we mounted our young lad

on the back of a strongly built (horse) with
lean limbs "

in which the verbal noun la'yan is a circumstantial
accusative, and the saying of a composer of rajaz

wa-manhalin waradtu-hu ltiqātan

" many a pool I have come to unexpectedly "

in which the verbal noun 'iltiqātan is a circumstantial
accusative.⁵

At the end of the discussion under this heading
Sībawayhi maintains that the verbal nouns in the above
examples are circumstantial accusatives because they answer
the question

kayfa laqīta-hu⁶

" how did you meet him?"

2.2 The Circumstantial Accusative of a Verbal Noun which
Occurs after the Introductory 'Ammā

The verbal nouns in this discussion, according to Sibawayhi, are accusative because they refer to the circumstance of the person mentioned in the sentence.⁷ The examples are:

'ammā simanan fa-samīnun

" as for being fat, he is fat "

and

'ammā ^cilman fa-^cālimun

" as for being knowledgeable, he is
knowledgeable "

in which the accusative verbal nouns simanan and ^cilman describe the state of the person to whom the verbal adjectives samīnun and ^cālimun refer. The verbal adjectives themselves govern the verbal nouns as circumstantial accusatives.⁸ The circumstantial accusatives in the above examples, like the circumstantial accusatives of the verbal noun of the previous discussion, are in the place of the fā^cil. This implies that not only their occurrence in the form of a verbal noun is rare but also their form is likely to be construed as the form of their equivalent

participles. Thus, *simanan* is to be construed as *saṁānan* and *ʿilman* as *ʿāliman*.⁹

Sībawayhi notes that *Khalīl* claimed that the circumstantial accusatives of a verbal noun in the previous examples are equivalent to the circumstantial accusatives of a verbal noun in such cases as

'anta r-rajulu ʿilman wa-dīnan

"you are the man in knowledge and religion "

and

'anta r-rajulu fahman wa-'adaban

"you are the man in understanding

and manners."

This is due to the fact that, in the first place, the verbal nouns *simanan* and *ʿilman* of the former examples, and the verbal nouns *ʿilman*, *dīnan*, *fahman*, and *'adaban* of the latter examples, are circumstances referring to the persons spoken about in the sentence. In the second place, they are circumstantial accusatives, governed by the following verbal adjectives, as far as *simanan* and *ʿilman* are concerned, and by the preceding propositions as far as *ʿilman*, *dīnan*, *fahman*, and *'adaban* are concerned. Finally, they are circumstantial accusatives which occur in the place of the *fāʿil*, and since they are circumstantial accusatives, they

could not possibly be defined with 'alif and lām.¹⁰

Other examples of the circumstantial accusative of this type which occurs in a slightly different pattern are:

'ammā ^Cilman fa-lā ^Cilma la-hu

" as for being knowledgeable he has no knowledge "

'ammā ^Cilman fa-lā ^Cilma ^Cinda-hu

" as for being knowledgeable he has no knowledge "

and

'ammā ^Cilman fa-lā ^Cilma

" as being knowledgeable, there is no knowledge "

with the elision of the prepositional construct la-hu in the third example, since the man spoken about is known. The verbal noun ^Cilman in the above examples is a circumstantial accusative. Sibawayhi notes that in the dialect of Tamīm, ^Cilman in the above examples occurs in both the accusative and nominative cases. However, its occurrence in the accusative case is better since they assume it to be circumstantial accusative.¹¹

However, in the dialect of Tamīm the nominative would be used in these cases, since if the accusative were used Tamīm would regard it as a circumstantial accusative, and this cannot be defined.. In the Hijāzī dialect however, they

may still be accusative even though defined, but they are then no longer understood as circumstantial accusatives and are regarded instead as maf^{c̄}ūlun la-hu or causative adjectives.¹²

Lastly, there are a few examples, modelled after the previous examples, in which a verbal adjective occurs as a circumstantial accusative. They are such cases as:

'ammā ṣadiqan muṣāfiyan

fa-laysa bi-ṣadiqin muṣāfin

" as a sincere friend, he is not a
a sincere friend "

'ammā zāhiran fa-laysa bi-zāhirin

" as an apparent thing, it is not apparent "

and

'ammā c̄āliman fa-c̄ālimun

" as a knowledgeable man he is knowledgeable."

Ṣadiqan (in the first sentence), zāhiran (in the second) and c̄āliman (in the third) are in the accusative case because, in the first sentence, the person referred to is regarded as outside the state of friendship. In the second sentence, the thing referred to is regarded as outside a state of being apparent. In the third sentence, the person is regarded as being in a state of knowledgeability.¹³

Furthermore, unlike the verbal nouns of this section, these verbal adjectives cannot occur in the nominative case because no person or thing to which the description belongs is referred to in these sentences, while in the sentence

'amma l-^cilmu fa-^cālimun

" as for knowledge, he is knowledgeable "

a person is specifically referred to as having knowledge. Furthermore, these verbal adjectives cannot be defined with 'alif and lām and thus become causative accusatives like the verbal nouns. This is because, according to Sībawayhi, the verbal noun has other places and functions of its own in the sentence, while in the case of its being a circumstantial accusative it merely follows the verbal adjective and is placed in its place.¹⁴

2.3 The Circumstantial Accusative which Occurs
after a Nominal Proposition

The discussion under this heading will include not only the circumstantial accusative of verbal nouns but also the circumstantial accusative of some adjectives as well as of some non-derivative nouns. The reason for putting them together in one discussion and under the heading of the verbal noun is that, according to Sībawayhi, they are accusative for the same reason and though some of them are not verbal nouns, they are considered equivalent to verbal nouns.¹⁵ The discussion of the circumstantial accusative, under this heading, falls into two categories. The difference between the two categories is that, in the first category the words mostly occur in the accusative case and although some of them may also occur in the nominative case, their occurrence in the accusative is predominant. In the second category, although they may occur in the accusative, their occurrence in the nominative is predominant.

The examples of the first category of the circumstantial accusative are:

huwa bnu ^cammī dīnyān

" he is the son of my paternal uncle,

very close "

and

huwa jāri bayta bayta

" he is my neighbour, house to house "

The verbal noun dinyan in the first example and the noun bayta in the second, are similar to ^Cilman in such a case as

'anta r-rajulu ^Cilman

" you are the man in knowledge."

They are governed by the preceding propositions which govern what comes after them in the same way that the noun ^Cishrūna governs the dirham which comes after it as in

^Cishrūna dirhaman

" a score of dirhams "

because, according to Sībawayhi, dirhaman is not a noun in construct with ^Cishrūna nor are they the same thing.¹⁶

Other examples which follow the pattern of the previous examples and involve the same type of reasoning are

hādḥā dirhamun waznan

" this is a dirham in weight "

hādḥā ḥasībun jiddan

" this one is very noble "

and

hādḥā ^cisḥrūna mirāran

" this is a score, several times over "

in which waznan, jiddan and mirāran, like dinyan and bayta bayta in the previous examples, are accusative as circumstantial accusatives.¹⁷ As for the example

hādḥā dirhamun sawā'an

" this is a dirham completely "

sawā'an is a circumstantial accusative and can be elucidated with its equivalent verbal noun 'istiwā'an, though 'istiwā'an is not actually used in this context, as in

hādḥā dirhamuni stiwā'an

" this is a dirham completely."

Alternatively sawā'un can be used as a description as in

hādḥā dirhamun sawā'un

" this is a complete dirham "

which means

hādhā dirhamun tāmmun

" this is a complete dirham "

Both uses of sawā' are also found in the Qur'ān. For example:

fī 'arba^cati 'ayyāmin sawā'an li-s-sā'ilīna

and

fī 'arba^cati 'ayyāmin sawā'in li-s-sā'ilīna.

Sawā'an in the first example is accusative as a circumstantial accusative, while in the second example it is genitive as a description because, according to Khalīl, it is made equivalent to the participle mustawiyātin. Sawā'in, however, is an exceptional usage and is less common than sawā'an. It is used only in some less common readings of the Qur'ān.¹⁸

In addition to the examples that we have already mentioned, we also have two other examples in which the verbal noun and the adjective occur as circumstantial accusatives in the definite form. They are:

hādhā^c arabiyyun hasba-hu

" this one is an Arab, sufficient to himself "

and

hādhihi ^cishrūna 'ad^cāfa-hā

" these are twenty as the multiple of them."

Sībawayhi explains that, as reported by Abū l-Khaṭṭāb from trustworthy Arabs, ḥasba-hu in the first example is made equivalent to dinyan and waznan of the previous examples and its meaning can be elucidated as

huwa ^carabiyyuni ktifā'an

" he is an Arab, as sufficient to himself "

which is, however, not used in everyday language.¹⁹ As for 'ad^cāfa-hā, Sībawayhi explains that, although Yūnus claimed that some people also said it in the nominative case, and without the pronominal suffix as in

hādhihī ^cishrūna 'ad^cāfu-hā

and

hādhihī ^cishrūna 'ad^cāfun

its occurrence in the accusative case is predominant.²⁰ Sībawayhi says that ḥasba-hu and 'ad^cāfa-hā as circumstantial accusatives always have the pronominal suffix as jahda-hu and ṭāqata-hu have. By contrast, the verbal noun, the adjective, and the noun, of the previous

examples, do not occur as circumstantial accusatives unless they come without 'alif and lām and without pronominal suffix, because they are equivalent to the verbal nouns in such cases as

laqītu-hu kifāhan

" I met him face to face "

and

'ataytu-ka jihāran²¹

" I came to you openly."

The examples of the second category of the circumstantial accusative referred to at the beginning of this section are:

hādha^c arabiyyun maḥdan

" this one is an Arab of pure descent "

and

hādha^c arabiyyun qalban

" this one is an Arab of genuine descent."

The verbal noun maḥdan and the noun qalban in the above examples are both in the accusative case, because they are equivalent to the verbal noun dinyan and other verbal nouns and nouns which have already been mentioned in the previous examples. However, as it is claimed by Yūnus, their

occurrence in the nominative case as descriptions is predominant. For example,

hādihā ^carabiyyun maḥḍun

and

hādihā ^carabiyyun qalbun.²²

In conclusion, Sībawayhi emphasizes that the verbal noun, the adjective, and the noun which have already been discussed are accusative because they are neither related to nor part of the preceding nouns themselves nor are they their descriptions. This is because they cannot be the predicates of the preceding nouns. It is not possible to say

'ibnu ^cammī dinyun

or

^carabiyyun jiddun.

Since it is not possible for them to be predicates, they are even less able to be descriptions. ²³

2.4 The Circumstantial Accusative of the Noun
of Plurality

The noun of plurality ('ismu l-jam^Ci) is a noun which signifies three or more objects. Since 'ismu l-jam^Ci is a category of noun, it belongs to the discussion of nouns used as circumstantial accusatives. However, it is discussed here along with the circumstantial accusative of a verbal noun on the basis that, on the one hand, unlike the noun, it is derived from the verbal root and on the other its occurrence as a circumstantial accusative is likened by Sibawayhi to that of the verbal noun.²⁴

The examples of the circumstantial accusative of a noun of plurality which are given by Sibawayhi are:

marartu bi-him jamī^Can

" I passed by them altogether "

marartu bi-him ^Cāmmatan

" I passed by them collectively "

and

marartu bi-him jamā^Catan

" I passed by them in a crowd. "

In these examples the nouns of plurality jamī^Can, ^Cāmmatan

and jamā[̣]atan are in the accusative case because they are used as circumstantial accusatives. According to Sībawayhi, these examples are similar to one's saying

marartu bi-him qiyāman

" I passed by them, standing up "

in which the verbal noun qiyāman is a circumstantial accusative.²⁵ As far as the declinability of these nouns is concerned, the nouns jamī[̣]an and [̣]ammatan differ from the noun 'al-jammā'a l-ghafīra because jamī[̣]an and [̣]ammatan are fully declinable while 'al-jammā'a l-ghafīra is not and is therefore not included in the same discussion.²⁶ Apart from being declinable, the nouns of plurality jamī[̣]an and [̣]ammatan do not occur as circumstantial accusatives in their definite form. This is because a noun which occurs as a circumstantial accusative cannot normally be defined either by 'alif and lām or by the attachment of the second noun of a genitive construct. Therefore, Sībawayhi explains that it is ugly to say either

darabtu-hu l-qā'ima

" I beat him, the standing up "

or

darabtu-hum qā'imī-him

" I beat them the standing ones of them "

if we mean by al-qā'ima and qā'imī-him the same as we mean by qā'iman and qā'imīna, respectively.²⁷

In conjunction with this discussion Sībawayhi explains that Khalīl describes that on the basis of the fact that a circumstantial accusative of a noun cannot be defined by either 'alif and lām or the second noun of a genitive construct, people make the circumstantial accusative of a definite noun which is defined by a pronominal suffix such as khamsata-hum equivalent to tāqata-hu, jahda-hu and wahda-hu. Al-jammā'a l-ghafīra is made equivalent to al-^cirāka, and qāṭibatan and ṭurran, since they are not nouns, are made equivalent to jamī^can, ^cāmmatan, kifāhan and mukāfahatan.²⁸

Notes

- 1- The chapter concerning those verbal nouns which are accusative because they are states in which things occur...". See, Sībawayhi, al-kitāb, vol. 1, p. 186 , l. 5.
- 2- Ibid, p. 186 , ll. 5-7.
- 3- Ibid, p. 186 , ll. 7-9.
- 4- Ibid, p. 186 , ll. 9-10.
- 5- Ibid, p. 186 , ll. 11-10.
- 6- Ibid, p. 186 , ll. 16-17.
- 7- Ibid, p. 192 , l. 9.
- 8- On the basis of his saying: wa-^camila mā qabla-hu wa- mā ba^cda-hu, it is also understood, apart from what is already mentioned, that Sībawayhi considers both 'ammā and the active participles samīnun and ^cālimun to be the agents of the circumstantial accusative in such a sentence. See, p. 192 , ll. 9-11.
- 9- Ibid, p. 102 , ll. 11-12.
- 10- Ibid, p. 192 , ll. 10-12.
- 11- Ibid, p. 192 , ll. 13-15.
- 12- Ibid, p. 193 , ll.3-6.
- 13- Ibid, p. 193 , ll. 15-17.
- 14- Ibid, p. 193 ,l. 17, p. 194, ll. 1-5.

15- Ibid, p. 274 , l. 24, p. 275, ll.13-14, 24-25.

16- Ibid, p. 274 , l. 24, p. 275, ll. 1-4.

17- Ibid, p. 275 , ll. 4,8.

18- Ibid, p. 275 , ll. 9-12.

19- Ibid, p. 275 , ll. 4-6,8.

20- Ibid, p. 275 , ll. 8-9.

21- Ibid, p. 275 , ll. 6-8.

22- Ibid, p. 275 , ll. 13-16.

23- Ibid, p. 275 , ll. 24-25, p. 276 , ll. 1-2.

24- Ibid, p. 189 , l. 1.

25- Ibid, p. 188 , l. 17, p. 189 , l.1.

26- Ibid, p. 186 , ll. 1-2.

27- Ibid, p. 186 , ll. 2-4.

28- Ibid, p. 186 , ll. 4-6.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE

OF

A NON-VERBAL NOUN

The category of noun which occurs as a circumstantial accusative in this discussion is called 'ismun jāmidun. 'Ism jāmid is a category of noun which is not derived from the verbal root according to any predetermined pattern, such as dirhamun (a dirham), shātun, (a sheep), hadīdun (iron) etc. It is referred to here as the non-verbal noun. Furthermore, unlike the adjective, this type of noun does not express a transitory meaning, therefore, its occurrence as a circumstantial accusative is regarded by later Arab grammarians, Ibn Mālik in particular, as secondary by comparison with the occurrence of an adjective as a circumstantial accusative.

As far as Sībawayhi's view is concerned, although he does not make the point explicit in his various discussions of the circumstantial accusative of a noun, we may assume, on the basis of the limited number of the examples of this type of noun as such by comparison with the adjective, that he holds the same view.

The circumstantial accusative which occurs in the form of a noun can be grouped under three major headings, with respect to the pattern of the sentences in which it occurs.

3.1 The Circumstantial Accusative which Occurs
after the Interrogative Prefix

Sībawayhi discusses this topic under the heading " the chapter concerning those nouns which are not obtained from the verbal root but which are treated as those nouns which are obtained from the verbal root ".¹The examples of the circumstantial accusative of this type are:

'a-tamīmiyyan marratan wa-qaysiyyan 'ukhrā²

" do you belong to Tamīm at one time
and to Qays at another?"

'a-fi s-silmi 'a^cyāran jafā'an wa-ghilzatan³

wa-fi l-ḥarbi 'ashbāha n-nisā'i l-^cawāriki

" are you wild asses in roughness and
coarseness during the peace and like
menstruating women during the war?"

and

'a-fi l-walā'imi 'awlādan li-wāhidatin

wa-fi l-^ciyādati 'awlādan li-^callāti⁴

" are you sons of one mother at banquets,
and sons of different mothers when
visiting the sick ?"

The nouns tamīmiyyan and qaysiyyan (in the first example),

'a^cyāran and 'ashbāha (in the second) and 'awlādan (in the first and the second hemistichs of the third) are circumstantial accusatives, because, according to Sībawayhi, they describe the circumstances of the persons addressed. That is to say that the persons to whom the sentences were addressed were in the state of shifting from one place to another or changing their attitudes or in what Sībawayhi refers to as the state of shifting about or changing appearance (tanaqqul and talawwun).⁵ Furthermore, they are circumstantial accusatives governed by the concealment of the appropriate verb such as tatahawwalu (you change) and tatanaqqalu (you shift about).⁶ Thus the previous examples can be elucidated, by means of those verbs, as

'a-tahawwalu tamīmiyyan marratan
wa-qaysiyyan 'ukhrā (tahawwalu for tatahawwalu)⁷
'a-tatahawwalūna fi s-silmi 'a^cyāran...⁸

and

'a-tatahawwalūna fi l-walā'imi
'awlādan li-^callāti...⁹

Another similar example is one such as

'a-^cabdan halla fī shu^cabā gharīban
" are you as a slave who has settled
in Shu^cabā as a stranger?"

In this example, however, ^cabdan could be accusative in two ways. it could be a circumstantial accusative governed by the concealment of the verb 'a-tafkharu (do you exalt yourself). Alternatively, it could be a vocative accusative (munādā).¹⁰

As we have seen in the case of the similar sentences which contain the adjective, the previous sentences could also be expressed without the interrogative prefix 'a-. Thus, for example, the sentence

'a-tamīmiyyan marratan wa-qaysiyyan 'ukhrā

can be transformed into one such as

tamīmiyyan qad ^calima l-lāhu
marratan wa-qaysiyyan 'ukhrā¹¹

" a Tamīmite, God knows, at one time
and Qaysite at another "

The purpose of using the two distinct patterns, however, is the same. That is to rebuke the addressed person rather than to question him.¹²

As for the agent of the circumstantial accusative in the sentence without the interrogative particle, Sībawayhi explains that it is governed by its substituting for its verb. In other words, tamīmiyyan, qaysiyyan and 'a^Cyāran substitutes for 'a-tatammamu (for 'a-tatatammamu), 'a-tataqayyasu and 'a-ta^Cayyarūna (for 'a-tata^Cayyarūna) respectively. However, since tamīmiyyan, qaysiyyan, and 'a^Cyāran are non-derivative nouns they do not have the kind of verbs that we have mentioned. Those verbs, therefore, are specially devised only to clarify the manner in which the substitution of the verb may occur. Instead of using those uncommon verbs, Sībawayhi says, it is better to use the common verb which contains the intended meaning of the noun which substitutes for the verb. That is instead of saying that they substitute for the verbs 'a-tatammamu, 'a-tataqayyasu and 'a-ta^Cayyarūna, it is better to explain that they substitute for the verbs such as 'a-tahawwalu, 'a-tanaqqalu or other similar verbs which give the intended meaning.¹³

Another similar example of the circumstantial accusative of the previous type is one such as

'a^Cwara wa-dhā nābin

" one-eyed and with a canine tooth "

This sentence was addressed by a man of the tribe of Asad to his people in order to warn them of the danger of continuing their progress towards war while such a camel was approaching them. Thus, the man used the expression to describe the state of his people as they proceeded on their way to war.¹⁴ Similarly to the previous nouns, the noun 'a^cwara is a circumstantial accusative governed by a substitution for a verb which is said by Sībawayhi to be:¹⁵

'a-tamdūna wa-qad 'istaqbala-kum hādhā

" do you proceed while this (camel)
approaches you (one-eyed and with a
canine tooth)?"

Finally, Sībawayhi explains that the accusative nouns tamīmīyyan and 'a^cwara can also be used in the nominative case. For example,

'a-tamīmīyyun

" are you a Tamīmīte?"

and

'a^cwaru wa-dhū nābin

" (it is) one-eyed with a canine tooth "

In this case the nominative nouns tamīmiyyun and $\text{'a}^{\text{C}}\text{waru}$ are the predicates of 'anta and huwa , respectively, which are implicit in the sentences.¹⁶ Furthermore, in the case where the agent, either an accusativizer (nāsib) or a nominativizer (rāfi^{C}), is explicit in the sentence, those nouns are bound to take only one appropriate case according to the agent. Thus, if a verb were explicit those nouns would not occur except in the accusative case and if a noun such as 'anā , huwa , 'anta etc. were explicit they would not occur except in the nominative case.¹⁷ This is, according to Sībawayhi , because it is not permissible for us to make those nouns nominatives by the implication of a nominativizer when an accusativizer is explicitly used in the sentence and likewise it is not permissible to make those nouns accusative by the implication of an accusativizer while a nominativizer is explicit.¹⁸ However, Sībawayhi points out that in the case in which the agent is implicit, the accusative case is preferable for those nouns because, he explains, those nouns are in the place where they become substitutes for their verbs.¹⁹

3.2 The Circumstantial Accusative of the Noun-Phrase

This heading is devised to signify those nouns which occur as circumstantial accusatives together with another noun or a group of words, usually a prepositional genitive construct, that cannot be separated or omitted if the intended meaning is to be preserved.

The nouns which occur as circumstantial accusatives under this heading fall into two distinct types. The first type is a definite noun which is defined by a pronominal suffix and the second type is an indefinite noun.

An example of the circumstantial accusative of the definite noun of this type is²⁰

kallamtū-hu fā-hu 'ilā fiyya

" I spoke to him face to face (literally
mouth to mouth) "

The definite noun fā-hu is a circumstantial accusative and it combines with 'ilā fiyya to form a single meaning which can be construed as a verbal noun as in

kallamtū-hu mushāfahatan

" I spoke to him directly "

and which describes the state of speaking as shown by

kallamtu-hu fī hādhihi l-hāli²¹

" I spoke to him in this manner "

Besides the occurrence of the definite noun fā-hu in the accusative as a circumstantial accusative it also occurs in the nominative as a subject as in the saying of certain Arabs

kallamtu-hu fū-hu 'ilā fiyya

as if they said

kallamtu-hu wa-fū-hu 'ilā fiyya

" I spoke to him and his face was near
to mine "

with the addition of the conjunction wa-. This can be interpreted as

kallamtu-hu wa-hādhihi hālu-hu²²

" I spoke to him and this was his state "

In addition to the circumstantial accusative of the definite noun, we also find the circumstantial accusative of the definite verbal noun, which occurs in a sentence modelled on the pattern of the sentence which contains the definite noun as a circumstantial accusative. They are such cases as

raja^ca fulānun^c awda-hu^c alā bad'i-hi

or

'inthanā fulānun^c awda-hu^c alā bad'i-hi²³

" so-and-so returned back to where he
had started "

The definite verbal noun ^cawda-hu in both examples is a circumstantial accusative and, like the definite noun of the previous example, it can also be read in the nominative case as the subject, as in

raja^ca fulānun^c awdu-hu^c alā bad'i-hi

and

'inthanā fulānun^c awdu-hu^c alā bad'i-hi²⁴

" so-and-so returned and his returning was
upon his starting "

However, the verbal noun in the above examples and the noun

in the previous one do not occur in such expressions as circumstantial accusatives without the pronominal suffix -hu. Thus it is not permissible to say either

kallamtu-hu faman 'ilā famin

or

raja^ca fulānun^c awdan^c alā bad'in²⁵

As for the example of the indefinite noun which is used as a circumstantial accusative, under this heading, it is such a case as

bāya^cta-hu yadan bi-yadin

" I contracted a sale with him for ready money "

As we have seen in the case of the definite noun in the previous example, the indefinite noun yadan is also a circumstantial accusative and it combines itself with bi-yadin to form a single meaning which can also be construed as a verbal noun as in

bāya^ctu-hu naqdan²⁶

" I contracted a sale with him for cash "

However, unlike the definite noun fā-hu, the noun yadan

cannot occur in the nominative case. It is not possible to say

bāya^ctu-hu wa-yadun bi-yadin

because, according to Sībawayhi, one does not mean that one's hand was in another's hand (yadu-hu fī yadi-hi). One simply means that one was dealing with another in cash rather than credit (bi-t-ta^cjīli). When one says yadan bi-yadin, one does not specify at all the distance between oneself and the person with whom one was dealing, whether near or far, as one does when one says

kallamtu-hu wa-fū-hu 'ilā fiyya

in which one means that one spoke to the person closely and directly without anyone between oneself and him.²⁷

Another example of the circumstantial accusative of the noun-phrase is a group of examples in which the nouns become accusative because, according to Sībawayhi, they are circumstantial accusatives in which the verbs occur. They are such cases as

bi^ctu sh-shā'a shātan wa-dirhaman

" I sold the sheep, at one sheep for a dirham "

qāmartu-hu dirhaman fī dirhamin

" I gambled with him, at a dirham for a dirham "

bi^ctu-hu dārī dhirā^can bi-dirhamin

" I sold my house to him, at a cubit for
a dirham "

bi^ctu l-burra qafīzayni bi-dirhamin

" I sold the wheat at two qafīz for a dirham "

'akhadhtu zakāta māli-hi dirhaman

li-kulli 'arba^cina dirhaman

" I took the tax of his wealth, at a
dirham for every forty dirhams "

bayyantu la-hu ḥisāba-hu bāban bāban

" I explained his account to him item by item "

and

tasaddaqtu bi-mālī dirhaman dirhaman

" I gave for charity, with my money,
dirham by dirham "

The accusative nouns shātan (in the first example), dirhaman (in the second, fifth and the seventh), dhirā^can (in the third), qafīzayni (in the fourth) and the first bāban (in the sixth) are circumstantial accusatives which, like the accusative nouns of the previous examples, cannot occur in such expressions without the following words if they are to retain the particular meanings given by the sentences.²⁸

Moreover, Sībawayhi points out that Khalīl claimed that some of the accusative nouns of the previous examples may also occur in the nominative case as in

bi^Ctu sh-shā'a shātun wa-dirhamun

" I sold the sheep, one sheep was for a dirham "

and

bi^Ctu d-dāra dhirā^Cun bi-dirhamin

" I sold the house, one cubit was for a dirham."

in which the nouns shātun, in the first example, and dhirā^Cun, in the second, are nominative as the subjects of wa-dirhamun and bi-dirhamin respectively, both of which are predicates. In the case where the nouns are accusative, however, wa-dirhamun and bi-dirhamin cannot be the predicates of their preceding nouns but they are there as explicatives.²⁹ Khalīl also claimed that it is also possible to say

bi^Ctu dāri dh-dhirā^Cāni bi-dirhamin

" I sold my house, two cubits were for a dirham "

and

bi^Ctu l-burra l-qafīzāni bi-dirhamin

" I sold the wheat, two qafīz were for a dirham."

However, in these two examples the definite nouns 'adh-dhirā^Cāni and 'al-qafīzāni must be in the nominative case as subjects and they cannot possibly be in the accusative case as circumstantial accusatives. This is because, according to Sībawayhi, they are definite and cannot be made equivalent to the definite circumstantial accusative fā-hu which is made equivalent to a verbal noun. As Sībawayhi explains, since not all verbal nouns may be definite when they occur as circumstantial accusatives, even less may all non-verbal nouns be defined when they occur as such.³⁰

Another example of the circumstantial accusative of this type is the accusative noun which is described by Sībawayhi as the circumstantial accusative in which the price (as-si^Cru) occurs when there is no verb. It is such as

la-ka sh-shā'u shātan bi-dirhamin

shātan bi-dirhamin³¹

" the sheep are for you, at one sheep

for a dirham, one sheep for a dirham "

According to Sībawayhi, the noun shātan can be either a circumstantial accusative, as in the above example, or a nominative predicate when the government of the

prepositional construct la-ka is eliminated in such a case
as

la-ka sh-shā'u shātun bi-dirhamin
shātun bi-dirhamin
" for you, the sheep are one sheep for
a dirham, one sheep for a dirham "

In the accusative, the noun shātan is governed by the
proposition la-ka sh-shā'u which gives the meaning of the
verbal proposition wajaba sh-shā'u "the sheep are due".³²

Finally, there are a few examples of the circumstantial
accusative of an adjective which occurs in a sentence
modelled on the pattern of the sentences of this
discussion. They are such cases as

'abī^c u-hu s-sā^c ata nājizan bi-nājizin
" I will sell it now as ready (merchandise)
for ready (money) "

and

sādū-ka kābiran^c an kābirin
" they ruled over you one great (man)
from another "

in which the adjectives nājizan (in the first sentence) and

kābiran (in the second) are circumstantial accusatives. Sībawayhi further explains that the pattern of both sentences resembles the pattern of another example of the circumstantial accusative of the noun-phrase which is

bi^ctu-hu ra'san bi-ra'sin³³

" I sold it one for another "

3.3 Other Examples of the Circumstantial Accusative
of a Non-Verbal Noun

The first group of examples, under this heading, is the example of the noun governed by the comparative adjective as in

hād̄hā busran 'aṭyabu min-hu ruṭaban³⁴

" these (dates) are better as unripe dates
than as ripe dates "

in which busran and ruṭaban are circumstantial accusatives governed by the comparative adjective 'aṭyabu. This is because Sībawayhi rejects the opinion that 'idhā kāna, for the future, or 'idh kāna, for the past, can be understood in this case, and that the accusative nouns are thus the predicates of the concealed kāna. This is evident, as Sībawayhi says, because kānā governs the definite noun as well as the indefinite noun, while in such an example as this, the nouns do not occur in the definite form as in

hād̄ha l-busra 'aṭyabu min-hu r-ruṭaba³⁵

Other examples which are modelled on the previous one are:

'al-burru 'arkhaṣu mā yakūnu qafīzayni
" wheat is cheapest of all in two qafīz "

and the saying of the poet ^cAmr ibn Karib

'al-ḥarbu awwalu mā takūnu futayyatan...
" war is in its earliest stage of all
as a little girl..."

Unlike the nouns of the previous examples, the nouns qafīzayni (in the first example) and futayyatan (in the second), can be either accusative as shown in the above examples or nominative predicates as in

'al-burru 'arkhaṣu mā yakūnu qafīzāni
" the cheapest that there is of wheat is
two qafīz "

and

'al-ḥarbu awwalu mā takūnu futayyatun...
" the first that there is of war is
a little girl..."

in which qafīzāni and futayyatun are the predicates of 'arkhaṣu and awwalu, respectively.³⁶

The second group of examples is the example of what Sībawayhi describes as the noun which becomes accusative because it is ugly as description.³⁷ The first example of this is

'al-^cajabu min burrin marar-nā bi-hī
qablu qafīzan bi-dirhamin qafīzan bi-dirhamin
" how remarkable was the wheat that we
passed by before, at one qafīz for a
dirham, one qafīz for a dirham "

in which qafīzan is an indefinite circumstantial accusative referring to the definite pronoun -hi. It is also necessarily accusative due to the fact that qafīzan cannot be a description of the indefinite noun burrin because, according to Sībawayhi, it is a noun like dirham and ḥadīd which cannot be descriptions either and, hence, also take the accusative case as circumstantial accusatives in

hādhā mālu-ka dirhaman
" this is your money, being a dirham "

and

hādhā khātamū-ka ḥadīdan³⁸

" this is your ring, being iron."

Another example of the circumstantial accusative which involves the same argument as the previous one is

hādhihi jubbatu-ka khazzan

" this is your robe, being silk "

in which khazzan is a circumstantial accusative. In addition to the previous arguments already mentioned, Sībawayhi further explains that the noun such as khazzan cannot be a description because it is not made equivalent to those nouns which are derived from the verbal root. A non-derivative noun such as khazz occurs only after an accusativizer or a nominativizer or a genitivizer, and not as a descriptive. Therefore, the circumstantial accusative in the above example is like a circumstantial accusative in a verbal sentence (maf^cūlun fī-hā).³⁹

Finally we have a few examples in which the quasi-verbal noun ('ismu l-fi^cli) ruwayd occurs as a circumstantial accusative. They are such cases as

sārū ruwaydan

" they walked slowly "

yu^cāliju shay'an ruwaydan

" he treats something gently "

and

da^c-hu ruwaydan

" put it down gently."

However, if the qualified noun is explicit in the sentence, the verbal noun ruwayd would no longer be a circumstantial accusative. For examples:

sārū sayran ruwaydan

" they walked in a slow way "

da^c-hu waḍ^can ruwaydan

" put it down in a gentle way "

and

yu^cālīju sh-shay'a ^cilājan ruwaydan

" he treats the thing in a gentle way "

in which ruwaydan is a description.⁴⁰

Notes

1- Sībawayhi, al-kitāb, vol. 1, p. 172, ll. 2-3.

2- Ibid, p. 172, l. 3.

3- Ibid, p. 172, l. 12.

4- Ibid, p. 172, l. 14.

5- Ibid, p. 172, ll. 3-4,13.

6- Ibid, p. 172, ll. 4,13.

7- Ibid, p. 172, l. 4.

8- Sībawayhi explains that the meaning which it is intended to express in this poetry is : 'a-tanaqqalūna wa-'a-talawwanūna marratan kadhā wa-marratan kadhā (do you shift and change like this at one time and like that at another?).Ibid, p. 172, l.13.

9- Although Sībawayhi does not exemplify this example with any particular verb, it is understood from his explanation that it can be exemplified with any verb which conveys the meaning.

10- Ibid, p. 173, ll. 1-3.

11- Ibid, p. 173, ll. 4-5.

12- Ibid, pp. 172,173, ll. 5-6.

13- Ibid, p. 173, ll. 6-12.

14- Ibid, p. 172, ll. 7-10.

15- Ibid, p. 173, l. 7.

16- Ibid, p. 174, ll. 6,8.

17- Ibid, p. 174, ll. 2-4,11.

- 18- Ibid, p. 174, ll. 11-12.
- 19- Ibid, p. 174, ll. 6-7.
- 20- Ibid, p. 195, l. 21.
- 21- Ibid, p. 195, ll. 21-22, p. 196, ll. 1,11-12.
- 22- Ibid, p. 195, ll. 22-23.
- 23- Ibid, p. 196, ll. 4-5.
- 24- Ibid, p. 196, l. 7.
- 25- Ibid, p. 196, ll. 4-6.
- 26- Ibid, p. 195, ll. 21-22, p. 196, ll. 12-13.
- 27- Ibid, p. 196, ll. 1-4.
- 28- Ibid, p. 196, ll. 7-21.
- 29- Ibid, p. 197, ll. 1-4,6-7.
- 30- Ibid, p. 197, ll. 7-10.
- 31- Ibid, p. 197, l. 21.
- 32- Ibid, p. 197, ll. 22-23, p. 198, ll. 1-2.
- 33- Ibid, p. 198, ll. 11-12.
- 34- Ibid, p. 199. l. 13.
- 35- " the chapter concerning those nouns and adjectives which are accusative because they are circumstantial accusatives in which things occur ", Ibid, pp. 199-201.
- 36- Ibid, p. 200, ll. 4,7,9,11-12.
- 37- Ibid, p. 198, l. 4, p. 274, l. 15.
- 38- Ibid, p. 198, ll. 5-8.
- 39- Ibid, p. 274, ll. 20-22.
- 40- Ibid, p. 124, ll. 5,7-9.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE DEFINITE
CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE

As we have seen in the previous discussions, the circumstantial accusative mostly occurs in an indefinite form. It is the rule that the circumstantial accusative should not be defined with either 'alif and lām or pronominal suffixes or others. On this basis, the occurrence of the circumstantial accusative in such a form is very limited and, moreover, no analogy can be deduced from such an occurrence.¹

The definite circumstantial accusative, like the indefinite one of the previous discussions, can be either an adjective or a noun or a verbal noun. Thus, the discussions of this chapter can be discussed separately under three main headings.

4.1 The Definite Circumstantial Accusative of a Verbal Noun

The definite verbal noun which occurs as a circumstantial accusative is defined by either 'alif and lām or the pronominal suffix or the second noun of the genitive construct. The prominent example of the definite verbal noun which is defined by 'alif and lām is

'arsala-ha l-^cirāka

" he sent them all together "

which was said by the poet Labīd ibn Rabī^Ca in

fa-'arsala-ha l-^Cirāka wa-lam yadhud-hā

wa-lam yushfiq ^Calā naghāsi d-dikhāli²

" he sent them all together (to drink) without
driving them back and showed no concern for
some preventing others from drinking "

The verbal noun 'al-^Cirāka in the above examples is a circumstantial accusative and, according to Sībawayhi, it can be transformed into an indefinite form 'i^Ctirākan. However, not every verbal noun which occurs as a circumstantial accusative can be defined with 'alif and lām as 'al-^Cirāka. This is not unexpected since the occurrence of the verbal noun in such a form in the chapter of the verbal noun (masdar) itself is also restricted, as in

'al-ḥamda li-llāhi

" praising God! "

and

'al-^Cajaba la-ka

" how strange you are!"

in which 'al-ḥamda and 'al-^Cajaba, like 'al-^Cirāka, are accusative definite verbal nouns. However, 'al-ḥamda and

'al-^Cajaba are accusative because they are verbal nouns (maṣḍar) of a verb understood, while 'al-^Cirāka is accusative because it is not identical with the preceding noun of the example to which it refers. That is, it is a circumstantial accusative and not a description of the pronoun -hā.³

The second type of the circumstantial accusative of a definite verbal noun is that of a verbal noun which is defined by a pronominal suffix. The examples are

ṭalabta-hu jahda-ka

" you sought it at your utmost "

the meaning of which can be elucidated by employing another indefinite verbal noun of the same root which is 'ijtihādan,

and

ṭalabta-hu ṭāqata-ka

" you sought it as well as you could "

and

fa^Caltu-hu ṭāqatī

" I did it as well as I could "

The definite verbal nouns jahda-ka, ṭāqata-ka and ṭāqatī, in the above examples, are circumstantial accusatives and, like

ma^Cādha l-lāhi (the accusative definite verbal noun in the chapter of the maṣḍar), they cannot occur as circumstantial accusatives in an indefinite form. Thus, we cannot transform them into jahdan and tāqatan as circumstantial accusatives just as we cannot transform ma^Cādha l-lāhi into ma^Cādhan as a maṣḍar. Furthermore, the above definite verbal nouns, like 'al-^Cirāka, represent only rare cases of the circumstantial accusative and therefore their occurrence cannot be used as an analogy.⁴

Finally, there is an example of a circumstantial accusative of the definite verbal noun which is defined by the second noun of a genitive construct. It is one such as

fa^Cāla-hu ra'ya ^Caynī wa-sam^Ca 'udhunī

qāla dhāka

" he did it in my sight and said that

in my hearing "

in which ra'ya ^Caynī and sam^Ca 'udhunī are circumstantial accusatives. Unlike the definite verbal nouns which are defined by a pronominal suffix, this type of circumstantial accusative can also occur independently from the second noun of the genitive construct as in

sam^Can qāla dhāka

" he said that audibly "

According to Sībawayhi, this is permissible if the hearing is not restricted to oneself. It should convey a similar meaning to

'akhadhtu-hu ^can-hu samā^can⁵

" I learned it from him aurally "

4.2 The Definite Circumstantial Accusative of a Non-Verbal Noun

There are two types of the definite noun which occurs as a circumstantial accusative. The first is defined by a pronominal suffix and the second is defined by 'alif and lām. Both types, according to Sībawahi, are made to follow the pattern of the definite verbal nouns jahda-ka and 'al-^cirāka.⁶

The examples of the first type are:

marartu bi-hi wahda-hu

" I passed by him alone "

marartu bi-him wahda-hum

" I passed by them alone "

marartu bi-rajulin wahda-hu

" I passed by a man alone "

and an example which is found in the language of the Hijāz:

marartu bi-him thalāthata-hum / 'arba^cata-hum

" I passed by them , they being three

/ four "

and so on up to ten.

The definite nouns, waḥda-hu, waḥda-hum, thalāthata-hum and 'arba^cata-hum in the above examples are in the accusative case because they are circumstantial accusatives.⁷ Khalīl claimed that they are accusative because they give the meaning

marartu bi-hi faqaṭ lam 'ujāwiz-hu

" I passed by him only, and no one else "

and

marartu bi-him faqaṭ wa-lam 'ujāwiz

hā'ulā'i

" I passed by them only and no one else "

respectively, and they are like one's saying

'afradt-hum 'ifrādan

" I set them apart "

which is unused in everyday language, but specially devised to illuminate the meaning of the previous examples when the definite nouns are in the accusative case as circumstantial accusatives.⁸

In the language of Tamīm, the definite noun thalātha(ta)-hum is considered to be a substitute (badal) and, hence, it follows the case of the noun which precedes it. The meaning which is conveyed by it, however, is like one's saying

marartu bi-him kulli-him

" I passed by them all "

or

lam 'ada^c min-hum 'ahadan

" I did not omit any one of them "

in which one wishes to include any one of the people by whom one passed in the group.⁹

An example which follows the pattern of the previous examples and conforms to the same rule is the saying of 'ash-Shammākh

'atatnī sulaymun qadda-hā bi-qadīdi-hā...

" the people of Sulaym came to me one
and all (literally: its large pebbles
with its small pebbles "

in which the definite noun qadda-hā is a circumstantial
accusative. According to Sibawayhi, it is as though he said

'inqidāda-hum i.e. 'inqidādan
" their coming all together, i.e. coming
all together "

which is similar to saying

marartu bi-him qadda-hum bi-qadīdi-him
" I passed by them all together "

which is as though we say

marartu bi-him 'inqidādan¹⁰

However, the noun 'inqidādan (an indefinite form) is not
used in such a context. It is employed only to explain the
meaning of the example in the way that being apart
('ali-nfirādu) explains the meaning of waḥda-hu,
thalāthata-hum etc. This is due to the fact that the
meaning of qadda-hum is derived from the meaning of

'inqidādan as though qadda-hum meant

'inqadda 'ākhiru-hum ^Calā 'awwali-him

" the last of them tumbled upon the
first of them "

in the same way the meaning of waḥda-hu is derived from the meaning of being apart (at-tafarrud). On account of such a meaning, that is the meaning of being apart, the definite nouns thalāthata-hum, 'arba^Cata-hum etc. as well as the definite noun qadda-hum take the accusative case as circumstantial accusatives.¹¹ However, if these definite nouns are used to express the meaning

lam 'ada^C min-hum 'ahadan

" I did not omit any one of them "

they then, like kulli-him (all of them), take the case of the preceding nouns which take different cases according to their context.¹²

The examples of the circumstantial accusative of a definite noun which is defined by 'alif and lām are:

marartu bi-himu l-jammā'a l-ghafīra

" I passed by them in a single great crowd "

and

'an-nāsu fī-hā l-jammā'a l-ghafīra¹³

" the people are in there in a single
great crowd "

According to Sībawayhi, the definite noun 'al-jammā'a l-ghafīra in the above examples is accusative for the same reason that the definite verbal noun 'al-^cirāka is accusative. Khalīl claimed that, though it is defined with 'alif and lām, the people omit them in their mind when they utter it. On this basis, 'al-jammā'a l-ghafīra resembles the indefinite nouns qāṭibatan and ṭurran in such cases as

marartu bi-him qāṭibatan

" I passed by them all "

and

marartu bi-him ṭurran

" I passed by them all "

in which qāṭibatan and ṭurran are circumstantial accusatives. The nouns qāṭibatan and ṭurran do not occur except in the indefinite form.¹⁴ As for the meaning of the examples which contain qāṭibatan and ṭurran in which they are circumstantial accusatives, Sībawayhi explains that they simply mean

marartu bi-him jamī^Can

" I passed by them all."

However, though qāṭibatan and ṭurran and jamī^Can are in the place of a verbal noun as circumstantial accusatives, qāṭibatan and ṭurran differ completely from jamī^Can. On the one hand, qāṭibatan and ṭurran, like the verbal noun subhāna l-lāhi, are indeclinable and do not have a definite form, while jamī^Can is declinable and has its definite form such as 'al-jamī^Cu or jamī^Cu-hum. On the other hand, neither of them is an adjective and they therefore cannot be either descriptions of their preceding nouns or predicates of a subject, while jamī^C can be both.¹⁵

4.3 The Definite Circumstantial Accusative of an Adjective

The definite adjective which occurs as a circumstantial accusative, in this discussion, is defined by 'alif and lām. According to Sībawayhi, such an adjective is a circumstantial accusative because it is likened to certain definite nouns such as fā-hu 'ilā fiyya, which is, in turn, likened to the definite verbal noun ^Cawda-hu ^Calā bad'i-hi. The definite noun fā-hu is neither a definite verbal noun itself nor a subject (fā^Cil) nor an object (maf^Cūl) in the sentence. In addition, this adjective is also likened directly to the definite verbal noun. However, since the

occurrence of a definite verbal noun as a circumstantial accusative is exceptional, the occurrence of a definite adjective as well as a definite non-verbal noun as such is also exceptional.¹⁶

An example of the definite adjective which occurs as a circumstantial accusative is one such as

dakhalu l-'awwala fa-l'awwala

" they came in one by one "

in which 'al-'awwala is a circumstantial accusative. Sībawayhi explains that the meaning of such an example is similar to one's saying

dakhalū wāḥidan fa-wāḥidan

" they came in one by one "

and

dakhalū rajulan rajulan

" they came in man by man "

in which the indefinite nouns wāḥidan fa-wāḥidan ,of the first example, and rajulan rajulan, of the second, are also circumstantial accusatives.¹⁷ The definite adjective 'al-'awwal fa-l-'awwal is also used in the nominative case, when it becomes a substitute (badal), as though one said

dakhalu l-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu¹⁸

" they, one after another, came in "

Because 'alawwalu fa-l-'awwalu here is a badal of the subject, it is also possible to use it as the subject itself, as in

dakhala l-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu

Similarly, the indefinite noun rajulan rajulan is also used in the nominative case where it is a substitute in the same way as nāsiyatin is in God's saying

bi-n-nāsiyati nāsiyatin kādhibatin

" with the forelock, a lying forelock "

in which the indefinite noun nāsiyatin is a substitute.¹⁹

By contrast, if the verb used in such a sentence is an imperative one such as 'udkhulū (come in), the definite adjective 'al-'awwal fa-l-'awwal as well as the indefinite noun rajul rajul can only occur in the accusative case. This is due to the fact that, on the one hand, they can no longer be substitutes since there is no subject for them to be a substitute of, nor can they be the subject itself. It

is clearly impossible to say either

'udkhuli l-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu

" come in, you (singular), one by one "

or

'udkhul rajulun rajulun

" come in, you (singular), one man at a time "

On the other hand, the definite adjective 'al-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu cannot be a description because the meaning it contains cannot be employed to identify and enhance the noun. It is incorrect, for example, to say

qawmu-ka l-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu 'ataw-nā

" your one by one people came to us "

in which 'al-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu is used as a description. Furthermore, its meaning does not have the inclusive meaning of kullu-hum. It cannot, therefore, be treated like wahda-hu or khamsata-hum.²⁰ By contrast, ^cĪsā allowed 'al-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu to be used in the nominative case even in an imperative sentence. For example,

'udkhulu l-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu

" come in one by one "

According to Sībawayhi, this is because he bases his view on the idea that the meaning of the imperative verb 'udkhulū is the same as the meaning of li-yadkhul (let(him) enter). Thus the meaning of

'udkhulu l-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu

is equivalent to the meaning of

li-yadkhuli l-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu
" let one and then another enter "

in which 'al-'awwalu fa-l-'awwalu is used in the nominative case as a subject (fā^cil) which is, according to Sībawayhi, not more improbable than such a case as

li-yubka yazīdun dāri^cun li-khusūmatin²¹
" let Yazīd, one who humbles himself
because of a dispute, be made to weep "

However, as Sībawayhi further explains, one may say

'udkhulu l-'awwalu wa-l-'ākhīru
wa-ṣ-ṣaghīru wa-l-kabīru
" come in, you(plural), the first, the last,
the small and the big "

in which the adjectives are nominative, because their meaning is equivalent to the meaning of kullu-hum and the sentence is the same as one's saying

li-yadkhulū kullu-hum²²

" let them all enter."

Finally, Sībawayhi explains that 'al-'awwala fa-l-'awwala, in the accusative case, is treated as the definite noun khamsata-hum and waḥda-hu as a circumstantial accusative. However, the occurrence of the definite adjective 'al-'awwala as a circumstantial accusative does not imply the similar occurrence of other definite adjectives such as 'ath-thāniya or 'ath-thālitha etc. This is accordingly like waḥda-hu because it is also not permissible to say either

marartu bi-hi wāḥida-hu

" I passed by him alone "

or

marartu bi-hima thnay-himā⁻²³

" I passed by them, the two of them."

Notes

- 1- Sībawayhi, 'al-kitāb, vol. 1, p. 187, ll. 4,8, p. 189, ll. 11-12, p. 198, ll. 15-16.
- 2- Ibid, p. 187, ll. 1-3.
- 3- Ibid, p. 187, ll. 4-6.
- 4- Ibid, p. 187, ll. 7-9.
- 5- Ibid, p. 187, ll. 9-11.
- 6- Ibid, p. 187, l. 12, p. 189, l. 9.
- 7- Ibid, p. 187, ll. 12-14.
- 8- Ibid, p. 187, ll. 14-15,18, p. 188, l. 1.
- 9- Ibid, p. 187, ll. 15-17.
- 10- Ibid, p. 188, ll. 1-4.
- 11- Ibid, p. 188, ll. 4-7.
- 12- Ibid, p. 188, ll. 7-8.
- 13- Ibid, p. 188, ll. 9-10.
- 14- Ibid, p. 188, ll. 10-12.
- 15- Ibid, p. 188, ll. 12-16.
- 16- Ibid, p. 198, ll. 13-15.
- 17- Ibid, p. 198, ll. 17-18.
- 18- Ibid, p. 198, ll. 18-19.
- 19- Ibid, p. 198, ll. 19-20.
- 20- Ibid, p. 198, ll. 20-23, see also above pp. 86,87.
- 21- Ibid, p. 199, ll. 1-3.
- 22- Ibid, p. 199, ll. 3-4.
- 23- Ibid, p. 198, l. 23, p. 199, l. 1.

CHAPTER FIVE

ṢĀHIB al-ḤĀL

Ṣāhib al-ḥāl is a grammatical term applied by Arab grammarians to the noun to which a circumstantial accusative refers. Although this term, or any alternative, is not yet established in the Book of Sībawayhi, Sībawayhi is nevertheless concerned with the question to which the term now refers.

The discussion of ṣāhib al-ḥāl, in the Book, is mostly concerned with the form of the noun which is used as ṣāhib al-ḥāl, whether it is definite or indefinite, and also with its place in the sentence with respect to the place of the circumstantial accusative and its agent. In the Book ṣāhib al-ḥāl is not discussed in a specific place or under a specific heading. It is, instead, implicitly discussed along with the discussion of the examples in which the circumstantial accusative occurs under various headings. In this chapter I gather all the discussions of ṣāhib al-ḥāl of the Book and discuss them under two sub-headings.

5.1 The Definite Ṣāhib al-Ḥāl

If we carefully examine the examples of the circumstantial accusative which have been discussed in the previous chapters, we will find that ṣāhib al-ḥāl or the noun to which a circumstantial accusative refers, is usually

definite. It is either defined by virtue of the meaning, such as the proper nouns ^CAbdullāh, Zayd etc, or by a defining agent such as 'alif and lām as in ar-rajulu , or pronominal suffixes such as -ka -hu etc, as in 'akhū-ka and 'akhū-hu and others. The fact that ṣāhib al-hāl should be definite will be more evident if we study carefully some of the discussions of the examples in which the circumstantial accusative occurs.

In the chapter concerning some of the nouns which are accusative because they cannot be descriptions,¹ Sībawayhi explains that in such an example as

hādhā rajulun ma^Ca-hu rajulun qā'imayni

" this is a man with whom is a(nother) man,

both standing up "

the participle qā'imayni is accusative due to the pronominal suffix -hu in ma^Ca-hu which is definite, and is referred to, together with the second rajulun, by the circumstantial accusative qā'imayni. In the case where a definite noun and an indefinite noun are together referred to, the force of a definite one is always predominant. Thus, it is the same as in the case where a masculine noun and a feminine one are referred to, where the force of the masculine is stronger.² Therefore, the participle qā'imayni, in the above example,

is accusative in consequence of the pronominal suffix -hu which is, together with rajulun, the ṣāhib al-ḥāl.³ The same explanation is also applied to the example

marartu bi-rajulin ma^Ca mra'atin multazimayni
" I passed by a man with a woman,
keeping together "

in which multazimayni is a circumstantial accusative. However, unlike ma^Ca-hu of the first example, the pronominal suffix -hu, in the second sentence, is not explicit with ma^Ca, yet it is there implicitly. This is proved by the occurrence of 'ajma^{C-}una in

marartu bi-qawmin ma^Ca fulānin 'ajma^{C-}una
" I passed by a group of people with so-and-so
all together "

where the nominative 'ajma^{C-}una must agree with the nominative fulānun in the implied reading⁴

marartu bi-qawmin ma^Ca-hum fulānun 'ajma^{C-}una

Furthermore, in the chapter in which a definite predominates over an indefinite,⁵ Sībawayhi explains that *munṭaliqīna* in

hādhāni rajulāni wa-^cabdullāhi munṭaliqīna

" these are two men and ^cAbdullāh,

(all there) departing "

in which the indefinite noun *rajulāni* together with ^cAbdullāh are referred to by *munṭaliqīna*, is a circumstantial accusative because it cannot be the description of either *rajulāni* or ^cAbdullāh. Since the force of a definite is stronger and, hence, predominates over an indefinite when they come together as the reference, the participle *munṭaliqīna*, of the above example, can only be in the accusative case as a circumstantial accusative. It is observed from what we have already mentioned that the noun to which a circumstantial accusative refers should be either definite itself, or combined with another definite noun when both of them are referred to by the circumstantial accusative. Furthermore, Sībawayhi describes the two nouns, one of which is definite and the other indefinite, which are referred to by a circumstantial accusative, as similar to a single definite noun as in

hādhā ^Cabdullāhi muntaliqan⁶

" this is ^CAbdullāh departing."

The fact that the definite noun is always stronger than the indefinite one when they come together in a sentence as a reference is further proved by the occurrence of the example

hā'ulā'i nāsun wa-^Cabdullāhi muntaliqūna

" these are people departing, and ^CAbdullāh "

in which muntaliqūna in the nominative refers only to nāsun as its description. However, if it refers to both the indefinite noun nāsun as well as the definite noun ^CAbdullāh it must be muntaliqīna, in the accusative case as a circumstantial accusative.⁷ On the basis of this fact, the occurrence of rāti^Cayni, in the accusative case as a circumstantial accusative in

hādhihi nāqatun wa-faṣīlu-hā rāti^Cayni

" this is a she camel and her young one,
grazing "

is preferable to its reading in the nominative case as the description of nāqatun and faṣīlu-hā.⁸

Furthermore, the fact that *ṣāhib al-ḥāl* should be definite is further illustrated by these examples:

marartu bi-kullin qā'iman

" I passed by everyone standing up "

and

marartu bi-ba^cdin qā'iman wa-bi-ba^cdin jālisan

" I passed by some standing up and by some sitting down "

in which *qā'iman*, of the first example and the second, and *jālisan*, of the second, are circumstantial accusatives because they cannot be the descriptions of the nouns to which they refer. This is due to the fact that, although the pronominal suffix *-him* which is otherwise attached to *kullin* and *ba^cdin* is omitted, the nouns *kullin* and *ba^cdin* are still considered to be definite and, therefore, the participles *qā'iman* and *jālisan* which refer to them can only be circumstantial accusatives.⁹

Finally, in another chapter,¹⁰ *Sībawayhi* explains that, in the examples

marartu bi-rajulin ma^ca-hu ṣaqrūn ṣā'idan bi-hi

" I passed by a man who had a hawk with him,

hunting with it "

'ataytu ^Calā rajulin wa-marartu bi-hi qā'iman

" I came to a man and passed by him, standing up"

marartu bi-rajulin ma^Ca-hu jubbatun lābisan

ghayra-hā

" I passed by a man who had a robe with him,

wearing a different one "

and others, the adjectives sā'idan, qā'iman and lābisan are accusative as circumstantial accusatives only because they refer to the pronominal suffix -hu/-hi in ma^Ca-hu or bi-hi, of the above examples, which is definite. However, if they are referred to the indefinite noun rajulin they would take the same case as the noun rajulin does, since they are, then, the descriptions of it.¹¹

5.2 The Indefinite Ṣāhib al-Ḥāl

As is clear in the previous discussion ṣāhib al-ḥāl should be definite . However, there are some examples, such as

hādhā rajulun muntaliqan¹²

" this is a man departing "

in which it comes in an indefinite form. The question is

what is Sībawayhi's point of view regarding such an occurrence and to what extent ṣāhib al-hāl may occur in an indefinite form . In order to answer these questions we present two relevant discussions of the Book. They are the discussions of the chapter in which the noun is indefinite (nakiratum), and of the chapter of what is accusative because it is ugly for it to be described by what comes after it, or for it to be a predicate of what comes before it.¹³

In the first chapter mentioned above Sībawayhi explains that, in the example

hādhā 'awwalu fārisin muqbilun

" this is a first horseman coming "

the noun 'awwalu is indefinite, therefore, the adjective muqbilun is in the nominative case as a description. The noun 'awwalu is proved to be indefinite for two reasons. On the one hand it is used to describe an implied indefinite noun as in

hādhā fārisun 'awwalu fārisin muqbilun.

On the other hand, it is in construct with an indefinite noun.¹⁴ Despite that, it is also said

hādhā 'awwalu fārisin muqbilan

" this is a first horseman coming "

in which muqbilan is a circumstantial accusative. According to ^cIsā, it is accusative in the same way as muntaliqan is, in the example

hādhā rajulun muntaliqan.¹⁵

In addition, Khalīl also claimed that it is permissible for an indefinite to be accusative as a circumstantial accusative of an indefinite noun, as it would be if it referred to a definite noun. Hence, it is permissible, according to Khalīl, to say

marartu bi-rajulin qā'iman

" I passed by a man standing up "

or

fī-hā rajulun qā'iman

" in it is a man standing up "

in which qā'iman, in both examples, is a circumstantial accusative of the indefinite nouns rajulin and rajulun respectively.¹⁶ ^cIsā's and Khalīl's point of view is further enhanced by some examples in which an indefinite word occurs

as a circumstantial accusative of an indefinite noun. They are such as

^Calay-hi mi'atun bīdan

" he owes a hundred, being pieces of silver "

and

^Calay-hi mi'atun ^Caynan

" he owes a hundred, being pieces of gold "

in which bīdan and ^Caynan are circumstantial accusatives of the indefinite noun mi'atun. Furthermore, Yūnus claimed that some Arabs say

marartu bi-mā'in qi^Cdata rajulin

" I passed by water of the depth
of a man sitting "

and it is reported that Ru'ba said

hādhā ghulāmun la-ka muqbilan¹⁷

" this is a boy of yours coming. "

Nevertheless, as Sībawayhi further explains, the adjectives or nouns of the above examples are far-fetched as accusative because they are really descriptions of their preceding nouns.¹⁸ In principle, the description of an indefinite noun

can no more be made into a circumstantial accusative than the description of a definite noun. However, while it is clearly wrong to say

hādhā zayduni t-tawīla

the above examples show that in the case of the indefinite noun it is sometimes possible to make a description into a circumstantial accusative. Sībawayhi himself seems to accept as correct

hādhā ghulāmun la-ka muqbilan.¹⁹

It is clear from the above discussion that Khalīl and ^cIsā permit an indefinite noun to be ṣāhib al-ḥāl. However, as far as Sībawayhi's point of view is concerned, though he seems to have some kind of agreement with Khalīl's and ^cIsā's point of view, it is difficult to judge the opinion that he holds concerning this matter. In order to clarify Sībawayhi's view concerning this matter and to describe further his explanation about ṣāhib al-ḥāl, we shall present here another discussion of the Book.

In the chapter of what is accusative because it is ugly for it to be described by what comes after it or for it to be a predicate of what comes before it,²⁰ Sībawayhi explains that qā'iman in

hādhā qā'iman rajulun

" this one, standing up, is a man "

and

fī-hā qā'iman rajulun

" in it, standing up, is a man "

is accusative because on the one hand, it cannot be used to describe the noun rajulun which follows it and on the other, it cannot itself be the subject, as in

fī-hā qā'imun

"in it there is one standing up "

because the adjective should not be used in place of the noun.²¹ Sībawayhi further explains that the adjective qā'iman in the examples is a circumstantial accusative on the basis that it can be such when the indefinite noun precedes it as in

fī-hā rajulun qā'iman.

However, as he further explains, it is more common for an adjective to be a circumstantial accusative of an indefinite when it comes before the indefinite noun, because this will prevent what would otherwise be ugly.²²

Other examples of the circumstantial accusative of an indefinite noun are:

wa-tahta l-^Cawālī fi l-qanā mustazillatan
zibā'un 'a^Cārat-ha l-^Cuyūna l-ja'ādhiru
" under the tall spear, taking shelter under
the spear, are gazelles to whom the young
oryx have lent their eyes "

and

wa-bi-l-jismi min-nī bayyinan law ^Calimti-hi
shuhūbun wa-'in tastashhidi l-^Cayna tashhadi
" in my body, being manifest, if you were to
recognize it, is emaciation, and if you were
to call your eye to witness (it), it would "

and

li-^Cazzata mūhishan ṭalalun
" of ^CAzza, being desolate, there are
traces of habitation."

In these examples the adjectives mustazillatan, bayyinan and

mūhishan are circumstantial accusatives of the indefinite nouns zibā'un, shuhūbun and talalun, respectively, which come after the circumstantial accusatives. However, Sībawayhi explains that this occurrence, that is the occurrence of the circumstantial accusative before the noun to which it refers, is mainly found in poetry and is less common in everyday speech.²³

In conjunction with the above discussions, Sībawayhi explains that it is not possible for a circumstantial accusative governed by a prepositional construct (zarf) to precede its agent as in

qā'iman fī-hā rajulun

" standing up in it is a man "

as it would be if its agent were a verb as in

rākiban marra zaydun

" riding Zayd passed by."

This is because the prepositional constructs such as fī-hā and its sisters do not have the same capacity as a verb, nor are they verbs. They are simply placed in the place of what a noun requires in the absence of a verb.²⁴ On this basis it is not permissible, for example, to say

marartu qā'iman bi-rajulin

" I passed standing up by a man "

because qā'iman precedes its agent which is the particle bi-
which is attached to the noun rajulin.

In addition, it is incorrect to say

marartu bi-qā'iman rajulin

" I passed by standing up a man "

because it is not possible to separate a preposition from
its noun in a genitive construct. Sībawayhi does say that
if he were to approve of such occurrences, he would say that
they were equivalent to

fī-hā qā'iman rajulun

He nevertheless rejects them as ugly.²⁵

Notes

1- Sībawayhi, al-kitāb, vol. 1, p. 246, l. 1.

2- The point that the force of a masculine word is more predominant than of a feminine word when they come together as a reference in a sentence is implicitly explained by Sībawayhi when he compares the sentence with the sentence:

hādhā rajulun ma^ca-hu mra'atun qā'imayni.

Ibid, p. 246, ll. 1-3.

3- Ibid, p. 246, ll. 1-3.

4- Ibid, p. 246, ll. 3-5.

5- Ibid, p. 258.

6- Ibid, p. 258, ll. 4-6.

7- Ibid, p. 258, ll. 8-10.

8- Ibid, p. 258, ll. 10,13,15.

9- Ibid, p. 273, ll. 1-3,5-6.

10- Ibid, p. 241.

11- Ibid, p. 241, ll. 10-14,16-17.

12- Ibid, p. 273, l. 4.

13- Ibid, pp. 271-273, 276-277.

14- Ibid, p. 271, ll. 3-7.

15- Ibid, p. 272, ll. 5,8-9.

16- Ibid, p. 272, ll. 9-11.

17- Ibid, p. 272, ll. 11-13,17.

18- Ibid, p. 272, ll. 13-14.

19- Ibid, p. 272, ll. 15-17, p. 273, ll. 5-6.

20- Ibid, pp. 276-277.

21- Ibid, p. 276, ll. 8-10.

22- Ibid, p. 276, ll. 12-13.

23- Ibid, p. 276, ll. 14-16, p. 277, l. 1.

24- Ibid, p. 277, ll. 1-4.

25- Ibid, p. 276, ll. 5-9.

CHAPTER SIX

THE AGENT

OF

THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE

The agent of the circumstantial accusative or ^Cāmilu l-hāl is the term used to refer to what governs a circumstantial accusative in a sentence. The discussion of the agent of the circumstantial accusative involves, for example, the question whether it is able to govern the circumstantial accusative which precedes it in the same way as it is able to govern it when it comes after it, and whether it may or may not be or must be omitted.

On the basis of the various discussions of the agent of the circumstantial accusative in the Book of Sībawayhi, we find that there are two distinct types of agent. The first is comprised of only a single word and the second is comprised of two or more words which are combined together to form a complete sentence which gives a verbal force to act as an agent.

An obvious first type of agent is the verb. This is singled out clearly by Sībawayhi in an example such as

darabtu ^Cabdallāhi qā'iman

" I beat ^CAbdullāh standing up "

in which he explains that the circumstantial accusative qā'iman is governed by the verb darabtu.¹ The verb as an

agent is the most flexible of all. It can govern a circumstantial accusative which follows it, as in the above example, as well as a circumstantial accusative which comes before it as in

rākiban marra zaydun²

" riding, Zayd passed by."

Furthermore, where a circumstantial accusative of an adjective or a noun takes the place of a verb, in which case they are treated like the verbal noun, the verb which actually governs the circumstantial accusative in such a case is elided. For example, in the sentences

'a-qā'iman wa-qad qa^cada n-nāsu

'a-tamīmiyyan marratan wa-qaysiyyan 'ukhrā

and

rāshidan mahdiyyan

" (go) rightly guided "

the adjective qā'iman, the nouns tamīmiyyan and qaysiyyan and the adjectives rāshidan and mahdiyyan are accusative because they are circumstantial accusatives governed by the elision of the hypothetical verbs 'a-taqūmu, 'a-tahawwalu, rashidta and hudīta. This is because those circumstantial accusatives replace their verbs in the same way as the

verbal noun saqyan replaces saqā-ka and the noun turban replaces taribta under the heading of the verbal noun (masdar).³ Similarly, a verb can also be elided when the circumstance in which the action takes place clearly indicates the sense of a verb. For example, if we are told that so-and-so said such and such, or someone recites us a piece of poetry, it is possible for us to reply

sādiqan wa-l-lāhi

" truthfully, by God "

because it is clear from the event that sādiqan is governed by the verb qāla-hu (he has said it). The same explanation is also applied to one's saying

mabrūran ma'jūran

" (go) (on the pilgrimage) with God's
approval and reward "

because the event shows that mabrūran and ma'jūran are governed by the verb 'idhhab (go).⁴ Furthermore, in the case where a circumstantial accusative is preceded by fa (or thumma), the omission of the verb is no longer optional. For example, in the sentences

'akhadhtu-hu bi-dirhamin fa-sā^cidan

" I got it for a dirham or more "

and

'akhadhtu-hu bi-dirhamin fa-zā'idan

" I got it for a dirham or more "

the verb which is the agent of $\dot{s}\bar{a}^c$ idan and zā'idan is always omitted. This is because, according to Sībawayhi, it is a common and unambiguous expression. The particle fa- makes it clear that $\dot{s}\bar{a}^c$ id is not governed by bi- . It would in the first place be ugly to say

'akhadhtu-hu bi- $\dot{s}\bar{a}^c$ idin

because $\dot{s}\bar{a}^c$ id is an adjective not a noun. Neither could one say

'akhadhtu-hu bi-dirhamin wa- $\dot{s}\bar{a}^c$ idin

because one does not wish to say that the dirham together with a $\dot{s}\bar{a}^c$ id was the price of the thing as in one's saying

bi-dirhamin wa-ziyādatin

" for a dirham and something more "

However, by uttering such a sentence, one wishes to state firstly the lowest price of all and then suggests one amount

after another to give different prices.⁵

Other single words which stand as agents of the circumstantial accusative are the verbal noun, participles, verbal adjectives, and the comparative adjective. This can be deduced from the occurrence of the examples

'ammā ^Cilman fa-lā ^Cilma la-hu

" as for being knowledgeable, he has no
knowledge "

'ammā ^Cilman fa-^Cālimun

" as for being knowledgeable he is
knowledgeable "

'ammā simanan fa-samīnun

" as for being fat, he is fat "

and

hādhā busran 'aṭyabu min-hu ruṭaban

" these (dates) are better as unripe dates
than as ripe dates"

in which Sībawayhi explains that the circumstantial accusatives of the first three of the above examples are governed by what comes after them⁶ and the circumstantial accusatives of the fourth example are governed by the comparative adjective 'aṭyabu.⁷

As for the question of how flexible these agents are, it is obvious from the examples that the verbal noun, participle, and verbal adjective may govern the circumstantial accusative which comes before them, and the comparative adjective may govern both circumstantial accusatives which come before and after it at the same time. Apart from what we have already mentioned, however, no further explanation concerning these agents is given by Sībawayhi.

The second type of the agent of the circumstantial accusative is a proposition. This proposition consists of a subject and a predicate one of which, or the combination of both of which gives the meaning of a verb. This type of agent can be discussed in two separate discussions. The first discussion includes the proposition in which a demonstrative pronoun or a personal pronoun stands as the subject, and it also includes the interrogative sentence, while the second discussion contains the proposition in which a definite noun is the subject.

The examples of the first discussion are such cases as

hādhā^c abdullāhi muntaliqan⁸

and

huwa zaydun ma^crūfan⁹

Sībawayhi explains, regarding these examples, that they are as if you say

'unzur 'ilay-hi muntaliqan¹⁰

and

'intabih 'ilay-hi 'aw 'ilzam-hu ma^crūfan¹¹

respectively. It is clear from Sībawayhi's explanation that the proposition of this type which consists of a subject and a predicate contains a verbal meaning and therefore governs the circumstantial accusative which comes after it. This is further proved by an occurrence of the example

hādha r-rajulu muntaliqan

" this is the man departing "

in which Sībawayhi explains that muntaliqan is accusative because the subject hādha governs what comes after it, which is the predicate ar-rajulu, and gives the meaning of alerting and defining.¹² Furthermore, this becomes absolutely clear by the occurrence of the examples

mā sha'nu-ka qā'iman

" what is it with you, standing up?"

man dhā qā'iman bi-l-bābi

" who is that standing by the door?"

and

huwa bnu ^cammī dinyan

" he is the son of my paternal uncle,
very close "

in which Sībawayhi explicitly says that qā'iman, of the first example, is governed by mā sha'nu-ka, that the agent of qā'iman, of the second, is equivalent to hādhā ^cabdullāhi, and that dinyan, of the third, is governed by the preceding proposition which is huwa bnu ^cammī in the same way as 'anta r-rajulu governs ^cilman in

'anta r-rajulu ^cilman¹³

" you are the man in knowledge."

The examples of the second discussion are:

fī-hā zaydun qā'iman

" in it is Zayd standing up "

and

la-ka sh-shā'u shātan bi-dirhamin

shātan bi-dirhamin

" the sheep are for you, at one sheep for
a dirham, one sheep for a dirham "

Sībawayhi explains that these two examples are equivalent to

'istaqarra zaydun qā'iman

" Zayd settled, standing up "

and

wajaba sh-shā'u

" the sheep are due "

respectively.¹⁴ On this account, it is fairly clear that what contains the verbal meaning is the prepositional constructs fī-hā and la-ka. Furthermore, on one occasion, Sībawayhi explains that fī-hā is equivalent to a verb such as marra (he passed).¹⁵ However, should a prepositional genitive construct which is proved to have a verbal meaning independently govern a circumstantial accusative?. To answer this question, Sībawayhi explains that in the example

^cabdullāhi fī-hā qā'iman

" ^cAbdullāh is in it standing up "

qā'iman is accusative because fī-hā intervenes between the subject ^cAbdullāh and the circumstantial accusative qā'iman, and fī-hā is required by the subject to form a proposition. Therefore, since qā'iman is not the predicate of the subject of the sentence, the subject governs it only indirectly in

the same way as in

hādhā zaydun qā'iman¹⁶

similarly, in the example

fī-hā zaydun qā'iman fī-hā

" in it is Zayd, standing up in it "

qā'iman is accusative because the first fī-hā, combined with the subject zaydun, forms a complete proposition. The second fī-hā is added only for emphasis and has no governing force.¹⁷

On the basis of what we have said, it is unlikely that the prepositional constructs fī-hā and la-ka could independently govern the circumstantial accusative. It is, therefore, more probable, as far as Sībawayhi's view is concerned, that the circumstantial accusative in such a proposition is governed by the combination of both the subject and the predicate. However, the question arises whether a proposition can govern a circumstantial accusative which comes between its subject and its predicate as in

hādhā qā'iman rajulun

" this standing up is a man "

or

fī-hā qā'iman rajulun¹⁸

" in it standing up is a man."

Sībawayhi says it is not permissible for a circumstantial accusative to come before its agent if the agent is not a verb. For example, the reason

marartu qā'iman bi-rajulin¹⁹

" I passed standing up by a man "

is incorrect is, according to Sībawayhi, that the circumstantial accusative, qā'iman comes after its agent, bi- . Similarly,

qā'iman fī-hā rajulun²⁰

" standing up in it is a man "

and

qā'iman hādhā rajulun²¹

are incorrect. It therefore seems that hādhā and fī-hā of the two examples mentioned above independently govern the circumstantial accusative. There are two plausible explanations of this particular problem. Firstly, if we consider that the agents of the circumstantial accusatives of these sentences are the propositions, we may suggest

that, on the basis of such occurrences, the circumstantial accusative which is governed by a proposition may intervene between its subject and its predicate but may not precede them both. Secondly, the agents of qā'imān in the sentences are the words which contain the verbal meaning which are hādihā and fī-hā.

In conclusion, Sībawayhi describes the government of a proposition upon a circumstantial accusative as the same as the government of a verb.²²

Notes

- 1- Sībawayhi, 'al-kitāb, vol. 1, p. 20, ll. 14-15, 20-21.
- 2- Ibid, p. 277, l. 2.
- 3- Ibid, p. 171, ll. 6-8,11-13, p.173, ll. 6-8, p. 137, ll. 8-10.
- 4- Ibid, p. 137, ll. 11-16.
- 5- Ibid, p. 147, ll. 1-5.
- 6- Ibid, p. 192, ll. 1-11, see above, chapter two, p. 55, notes, 8.
- 7- Ibid, p. 199, ll. 13,16-17.
- 8- Ibid, p. 256, l. 15.
- 9- Ibid, p. 256, l. 24.
- 10- Ibid, p. 256, ll. 19-20.
- 11- Ibid, p. 257, l. 2.
- 12- Ibid, p. 260, ll. 9,12-13.
- 13- Ibid, p. 247, ll. 21-24, p. 248, ll. 1-2, p. 274, l.24, p. 275, ll. 1-2.
- 14- Ibid, p. 197, l. 23, p. 198, ll. 2-3.
- 15- Ibid, p. 277, ll. 2-3.
- 16- Ibid, p. 261, ll. 5,17, p. 262, l. 1.
- 17- Ibid, p. 277, ll. 16-17.
- 18- Ibid, p. 276, ll. 8-9.
- 19- Ibid, p. 277, l. 5.

20- Ibid, p. 277, l. 1.

21- Ibid, p. 277, l. 6.

22- Ibid, p. 197, ll. 22-23.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

One of the most striking characteristics of the Book of Sībawayhi is that it contains and presents a multitude of types of pattern of speech which are not frequently found in other Arabic grammar books and which are used and discussed by Sībawayhi at great length. Moreover, on many occasions, those patterns of speech are used by Sībawayhi as the starting point from which he begins to explain the relevant grammatical categories. That is, the studying of grammar in the Book is primarily introduced with examples and then it proceeds to the studying of the relevant grammar or rather deducing grammatical principles from those examples.

On the basis of what we have already mentioned, it seems that Sībawayhi had advanced one step further than the earlier Arab grammarians. That is, he not only collects and presents samples of Arabic speech but makes a great effort to produce grammatical principles of Arabic. However, it also suggests that Arabic grammar, during Sībawahi's time, was still in its earliest developing stages. This is evidently true, not only because, as far as the circumstantial accusative is concerned, the Book is lacking in systematic explanations of the subject with which it deals, but also because it bears many other premature

features.

The most outstanding premature feature of the Book is that of the terminology, which leads to great confusion. It seems from the use of words such as khabar and ḥāl, that the establishment of the terminology is not yet completed. This is added to the fact that the subject with which it deals is left undefined and, sometimes, it is not differentiated from others. Above all, however, the subject is badly presented. Not only are its discussions not concentrated in one place, they are, sometimes, embedded in the discussions of other subjects. It is as though it were presented in public teaching rather than in a book.

Despite what we have said, however, Sībawayhi manages to produce, as far as the circumstantial accusative is concerned, a large number of principles which are still in use in our present time. Furthermore, Sībawayhi presents a unique method of explaining the subject. For example, a word in a sentence is a circumstantial accusative not only because it takes the accusative case but also, according to Sībawayhi, because it is prevented by other words from being other than that. For example, a word, in a verbal sentence, is a circumstantial accusative because it is prevented by the fā^cil or maf^cūl from being a fā^cil or a maf^cūl, respectively, and a word, in a nominal sentence, is a

circumstantial accusative because it is prevented by the predicate from being a predicate.

In addition, in the discussion of the agent of a circumstantial accusative, Sībawayhi invents an outstanding but simple view about the agent of a circumstantial accusative which occurs in a nominal sentence. According to Sībawaihi, a nominal sentence, which is comprised of a subject and a predicate, could well be the agent of a circumstantial accusative as a verb could. This is because the meaning which is conveyed by it contains the meaning of a verb. That is, for example: hādhā^C abdullāhi contains the meaning of 'unzur 'ilay-hi, huwa^C abdullāhi contains the meaning of 'i^C rif-hu etc.

It is clear from what we have already mentioned that the agent of the circumstantial accusative of a nominal sentence is, as far as Sībawayhi's view is concerned, the nominal sentence itself, not, as regarded by many later Arab grammarians, the verb which is understood to exist after the predicate of the sentence. It seems that Sībawayhi's view is more interesting and simpler than that of the later Arab grammarians.

In conclusion, despite the fact that the Book is lacking with respect to both technique and material, one cannot fail to render one's appreciation to its author who makes a generous contribution to the development of Arabic grammar and whose Book is one of the richest records of the Arabic language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a-Main Source

Sībawayhi, al-Kitāb, Būlāq 1898, vol. 1, pp. 20, 124, 130-138, 171-174, 186-189, 192-201, 241-248, 256-263, 271-278.

b-Other Sources

- 1- W. Wright, A grammar of the Arabic language, third edition, Cambridge, 1967.
- 2- Muḥammad Muhyiddīn ^CAbd al-Ḥamīd, Sharḥ ibn ^CAqīl, n.d., vol. 1.
- 3- 'Abū Muḥammad Yūsuf ibn 'Abī Sa^Cīd al-Sīrāfī, Sharḥ 'abyāt Sībawayh, ed. Muḥammad ^CAlī Sultānī, Dār al-Ma'mūn li-t-Turāth, Damascus and Beirut, n.d., vols. 1&2.
- 4- ^CAbbās Ḥasan, al-Nahw al-Wāfi, fourth edition, Dār al-Ma^Cārif, Cairo, n.d., vol. 2.
- 5- Fu'ād Ni^Cma, Mulakhkhaṣ Qawā^Cid al-Lugha al-^CArabiyya, seventh edition, Cairo, n.d.
- 6- Muḥammad ibn ^CAlī al-Ṣabbān, Ḥāshiyat al-Ṣabbān ^Calā Sharḥ al-'Ashmūni ^Calā 'Alfiyyat ibn Mālik, Dār 'Ihyā' al-Kutub al-^CArabiyya, Cairo, n.d., vol. 2.