

## The Accusatives in the Commentaries of Al-Durra Al-Alfiya by Ibn Al-Muati and Ibn Al-Khabbaz

Saad Ahmed Farhan<sup>1</sup> and Ahmed Khaled Mohammed<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

The research elucidates the permissibility of placing the object first to convey the meaning, as the notion that the pear is eaten comes to mind first. The study delves into the issue of whether the verb can extend to encompass inclusion, involving both the deaf and others, suggesting that it has extended to inclusion in the sentence when it is a type of inclusion, as well as in instances of returning and walking. The research asserts that the circumstantial accusative is in the accusative case because it resembles the direct object, being an adjunct. As Sibawayh stated: "The chapter on what is in the accusative among nouns that are neither adjectives nor verbal nouns, because it denotes the state in which the action occurs, thus it is in the accusative as it functions as an object. Some Arabs say: 'I spoke to him, his mouth to my mouth,' as if to say: 'I spoke to him, and this was his state.' Hence, it is the accusative because it describes the state in which the action occurred. The research underscores the importance of the representation adopted by the author and the commentator, demonstrating that the object must fulfill three conditions: it must be a noun, it must occur after a clause containing a verb or a word conveying the meaning of a verb and its particles, or it must follow the conjunction "و" indicating association, which signifies accompaniment. Thus, the object actually serves as a noun adjunct to the conjunction "و" denoting association. The study concludes that advancing transmission and analogy in differentiation is permissible. Regarding analogy, this is because the factor in differentiation falls into two categories: one being a solid noun and the other a transitive verb, with the differentiating factor being transitive.

**Keywords:** Accusatives, Commentaries.

### INTRODUCTION

The accusative case is considered the most intricate and diverse aspect of grammatical analysis. Al-Khalil described it as comprising fifty-one facets: accusative as the direct object, accusative from a verbal noun, accusative from a particle, accusative as a state, accusative as an adverbial modifier, accusative with "إن" and its equivalents, accusative with "كان" and its equivalents, accusative in explanation, accusative in differentiation, and accusative with exception.

Since accusatives themselves are eleven: "the absolute object, the object of a preposition, the object within a prepositional phrase, the object possessed, the object accompanied by, the circumstantial, the accusative of differentiation, the accusative of exception, the predicate of "كان" and its sisters, the noun after "إن" and its sisters, and the future verb when it has a nominative. The first five are real, and the six that follow are similar to the real object.

The Arab grammarians based their categorization of accusatives on the semantic roles represented by the diacritical marks. The *ḍammah* signifies *الضمّة* attribution, the *kasrah* signifies *الكسرة* genitive and apposition, while the *fatḥah* signifies the accusative as it is the lightest diacritic. They differentiated between the subject and the object in the accusative case because the subject is less prominent in speech than the object. Since a verb can extend to four entities, and the subject is less emphasized in speech than the object, they assigned the heavy diacritic to the subject and the light diacritic to what precedes in their speech to achieve equilibrium.

This perspective has led to the adoption of the notion that every accusative must necessarily be derived from the implications of the *fatḥah*, which signifies the accusative case. Ibn al-Hajjaban stated that the accusatives encompass the science of the accusative, which is why they classified every accusative in the language under what is known to them as the categories of the accusative case.

<sup>1</sup> College of Islamic Science, University of Baghdad. E-mail: saad.ahmed2103m@cois.uobaghdad.edu.iq

<sup>2</sup> College of Islamic Science, University of Baghdad. E-mail: ahmed.abd@cois.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Since there are five types of verbs, according to the Basrans, while the Kufans claimed that a verb only has one object, which is the direct object, and the rest of the elements are not objects but are analogous to the direct object.

The nature of this study necessitated its organization into an introduction, five main sections, and a conclusion. In the introduction, we discussed the significance of the topic and the rationale behind its selection. The first section elucidated the concept of the direct object, while the second section expounded on the absolute object. The third section delved into the object of association, the fourth into the accusative of purpose, and the fifth into the adverbial accusative. The study concluded with a concise summary of our findings, aiming to provide a clear outline of this research, which can be scrutinized from various angles, with the hope that it will not be subject to superficial judgment.

## **The Researchers**

### **First Requirement: The Object**

#### **Ibn Al-Muati**

The third accusative marker governs only the object, and its placement at the end is not required, except to prevent ambiguity if reversed, as in the phrase, "Musaa visited eisaa."

The author discusses the object and elucidates the rules of precedence and postponement. According to Ibn al-Khabbaaz, the object is defined as "that upon which the action of the doer falls." It is mentioned after the verbal noun because the verb affects it in numerous instances, as in the examples: "I broke the vessel" and "I ate the food." Thus, it resembles the verbal noun more than anything else.

Al-Radi mentioned that "the most accurate way to describe the object is to say: it is what can be expressed by an unrestricted passive participle derived from its positive verb or the verb made positive." Dr. Fadel Al-Samarrai interprets this as the ability to derive an unrestricted passive participle from the verb of the object, without needing a preposition or anything else. For example, in the sentence "I honored Muhammad," one can say "Muhammad is honored." In contrast, with sentences like "He set off," it is incorrect to say "The setting off is set off," and with "I went out in the morning," it is not correct to say "The morning is gone out," but it must be restricted with a preposition, as in "The morning is gone out in."

One of the rules concerning the object is that the verb precedes the subject, and the subject precedes the object. However, there are exceptions where the object can precede the subject, which is what is meant by saying that "its placement at the end is not required." Nonetheless, it is necessary to place the subject before the object if there is a risk of confusion between them, or if the parsing of either of them is unclear, and there is no indication to differentiate between the subject and the object. Ibn Muati exemplified this by saying, "Musaa visited eisaa," where "musaa" must be the subject and "Eisaa" the object.

If the parsing is clear in either of them, or if there is an implicit or verbal indicator that clarifies the subject from the object, then it is permissible to change the order, such as in "Zaid struck Eisaa." The appearance of the nominative case in "Zaid" informs you that "Eisaa" is the object, and the parsing is not apparent. Similarly, if it is said, "Eisaa ate the apple," it is permissible to place the object first due to the clarity of meaning, indicating that the apple is eaten.

### **The Second Requirement: The Absolute Object**

Ibn Al-muati stated

The implied gerund for emphasis, akin to specifying the type or limitation, is placed in the accusative when it occurs, as in "I hoped, hoping fervently."

From specifying the type, Al-Qahqari provided an example, and the deaf man includes danger as he walks.

Indeed, I struck him with the severest of blows,

a thousand lashes or more, like this blow.

Ibn Muati intended by the gerund here the absolute object, because the gerund is the true object for all creatures, and the indication of the verb towards it is stronger than its indication towards others. This is the doctrine of Ibn Jinnī, who said: "The absolute object, which is the gerund, and know that the gerund is any noun indicating an event and an unspecified time, and its verb is derived from a single word. When you mention the gerund with its verb in the nominative case, you say: 'I stood up,' and 'I sat down.'"

Ibn al-Khabbaz mentioned that it was named the absolute object for that reason, "because it is not restricted by any prepositions, meaning unrestricted, unlike other objects." Ibn Aqil continued by saying, "And it is called an absolute object due to the truthfulness of its objecthood without any restriction by a preposition or the like, unlike other objects, as the object name is only applied to it when it is restricted, such as the direct object, the indirect object, and the object of possession."

Ibn Muati clarified the limit of the absolute object by stating that it is an erect gerund that serves three purposes, which is the doctrine of the majority of grammarians.

The emphasis on the verb, as exemplified by Ibn Muati with "I hoped, hoping fervently," and by Ibn al-khabbaz with "I stood up, standing."

Clarifying the type of the verb.

The frequency of the action, as exemplified by Ibn Muati with "I struck him with the severest of blows, a thousand lashes or more," and by Ibn al-khabbaz with "I struck him a blow, or two, or a hundred lashes."

As for his example, "Al-Qahqari returned and the deaf man included danger as he walks," it illustrates that the verb extends beyond the action to what it represents of the event, even if it is not derived from its literal meaning. This is similar to saying, "Al-Qahqari returned," and "the deaf man included," because "included" extends to the inclusion that encompasses the deaf man and others. It has extended to the inclusion in the sentence when it was a form of inclusion, and the same applies to "returned" and "walked." These same examples were mentioned by Sibawayh and Ibn al-Siraj al-Zamakhshari in the requirement

### **Third Requirement: Accusative of Accompaniment**

Ibn Al-Muati stated

Then, what is called the object of possession is placed like "I came to Zaid to kill him,"

Comparing to the verb to the doer's action is broader,

Not with the agent's name but with a verbal noun that answers the question "why"

Without being specified by "lām"

to avoid confusion.

The Basran grammarians, including Ibn Muati and Ibn al-Khabbaz were keen to elevate all or most of the accusative nouns to the status of objects of possession. They did so by interpreting or extracting meanings to enable them to apply their general rule, which is that the accusative case indicates the objecthood.

Perhaps a clearer explanation for the causative verb, termed by Ibn Muati as the object of possession or the object for the sake of which, can be found in the three terms introduced by grammarians: the object of possession, the object for the sake of which, and the object because of which. This is because the object is a consequence, and this is its cause. Naturally, the cause precedes the consequence; it is its origin and the origin of the agent performing it. As Ibn al-Khabbaz explains: "The reason for the verb's occurrence is the possibility of the doer's action to exist, so it must lean towards one of its two options: existence or non-existence. This is illustrated in your statement: 'I visited you hoping for your blessing,' where hope is the reason for the visit, justified by

As for Ibn Muati's example, "I came to Zaid to kill him," Ibn al-Khabbaz criticized it for not meeting the conditions of the accusative case, which are:

That it should be a verbal noun, and this verbal noun can be definite or indefinite. Sibawayh said: "This is a chapter concerning what is erected from verbal nouns, because it is an excuse for the occurrence of the command. It is erected because it is subject to it, and because it explains what came before it: why it happened? It is not in the manner of what came before it or from it... 'And I did that for such and such a reason.' All of this is erected because it is the object of possession, as if it were said to him: 'Why did you do such and such?' and he said: 'For such and such a reason,' but when he omitted the lam he acted upon what preceded it.

It should be a verb of the heart, meaning an action of the heart, such as desire, fear, or wish. This condition was uniquely emphasized by Ibn al-Khabbaz, and it is the basis for his critique of Ibn Mu'atṭa's example, except for the interpretation of omitted possession, with the meaning being "intending to kill him."

Should be a vowel

It should be contemporaneous with its doer in time and the subject, because an action does not necessitate another's action in reality.

It should be without the verb's particle. This condition was transmitted by Ibn al-Khabbaz from Ibn Jinni who said: "Know that the object of possession is only a verbal noun, and the doer in it is a verbal noun without its particle. The object of possession is mentioned because it is an excuse and a cause for the occurrence of the action."

Summary of the preceding: The object of possession or the object for the sake of which or because of which is a Basran term that applies to every verbal noun justified for a shared event in time and by the agent. It is the cause for undertaking the action and is its justification. It is every verbal noun that is assigned to the verb or what is implied by it, with the understanding that the cause is omitted. It is similar to the absolute object in its conditions, but differs in its rationale and in being without the verb's particle.

#### **Fourth Requirement: Accusative of Purpose**

Ibn muati stated

Then, what is called the object of co-occurrence is assigned to it when preceded by a conjunction like with. For example, "the water level reached the surface of the house," "Zaid's fault and committing the crime," and "you and this statement." The accusative case in the latter is more appropriate.

Ibn al-Khabbaz defined the object of co-occurrence as "everything you do something with, like saying 'I stood و "wa" Abdullah,' meaning 'with him.'"

Later grammarians also defined it as "a noun following a conjunction و 'with,' intended to specify the accompanying entity, preceded by a verb or what contains its letters and meaning, like 'I broke with the Nile,' and 'I walked with the Nile.'

The illustration used by the author and the commentator indicates that three things must be present in the object of co-occurrence:

The object of co-occurrence must be a noun, as in "I stood و with Abdullah." This rule is applied in phrases like "Do not eat fish and drink milk," and "I walked while the sun was rising," where the conjunction "and" connects a verb in the first example and a phrase in the second.

The object of co-occurrence must occur after a clause containing a verb or a verb-like meaning, with its letters intact. For example, "I walked while the road," where "walked" is a noun representing the action, and its letters are present.

The object of co-occurrence must come after the conjunction "with," which indicates companionship and specifies the accompanying entity. Thus, the object of co-occurrence is, in fact, a noun following the conjunction "with," specifying the co-occurring entity.

One of the main challenges that grammarians face regarding the object of co-occurrence is the issue of coordination and companionship, i.e., when should the noun following the conjunction "with" be considered coordinated with the preceding noun and when should it be considered the object of co-occurrence.

Ibn Al-Khabbaz explained the coordinating "waaw" و and the non-coordinating "waaw." He mentioned a general condition for the coordinating "waaw," which is that its inclusion with the first noun should make sense in the action. The "waaw" is originally a coordinating conjunction, as in your example: "Zaid and Amr stood," where each of them could stand before the other, or they could stand together. He concluded that it is not correct to say: "Zaid spoke and the stone."

The commonality between the conjunction " و" of coordination and the conjunction " و" of accompaniment lies in the combination of the preceding and following nouns, albeit with a difference in meaning. The noun after the conjunction of coordination shares the verb with the noun preceding it. Conversely, this is not the case with the conjunction of accompaniment. Ibn Jinni elaborated on this matter, stating, "Regarding the conjunction ' و' with the object of the verb, as in 'I stood with Zaid,' here the function of the conjunction relates to the course of conjunction and indicates that the Arabs never used it to mean 'with' except in the context where if it were used for coordination, as you see, if you say 'I stood with Zaid,' it would have been permissible for you to say 'I stood and Zaid,' thus coordinating Zaid with the subject. Similarly, when they say 'Had I left the she-camel and her foal, it would have suckled it,' it would have been permissible for you to coordinate, saying 'and her foal,' thus coordinating with the conjunction " و".

The conclusion is that (accompaniment) is when two things are together, whether they share the same ruling or not, while (coordination) is when they share the same ruling, whether they are together or not... So, in the example "I walked with Zaid," Zaid is participating with the speaker in walking at the same time, meaning their walking occurred together. In your statement, "I walked, I and Zaid," with coordination, Zaid is participating with coordination in walking, but it does not imply that both walks happened at the same time.

### **Fifth Requirement: Adverbial Accusative**

Ibn Muati Stated

There are two types of adverbs: the first pertains to the time in which an action is performed, for example, in an indefinite sense, one might say, "I traveled for ages," whereas in a more specific sense, one might declare, "I traveled for a month."

The author spoke in the two verses about the adverb of time and place, which he termed as an adverb. The commentator, Ibn al-Khabbaz, defined the adverb as "any noun of time or place intended to convey the meaning of 'in,' though it is not explicitly stated in the word itself. The term 'adverb' is a convention used by the Basri grammarians. This terminology is not accepted by the Kufians, who, following Al-Farra and his disciples, refer to it as 'mahallan' (location). As for Al-kisaie, he designates adverbs as 'descriptions.

Sibawayh addressed this in his book in the chapter on "What is in the accusative case from places and times, because they are adverbs in which things occur and exist, and thus they take the accusative because they occur and exist in them, and what precedes them governs them, just as knowledge governs the noun in the phrase 'You are the knowledgeable man' and as 'twenty' governs the noun in 'twenty dirhams.' Similarly, they are governed by what follows and precedes them."

This means that grammarians do not call nouns of time and place adverbs unless they imply the meaning of 'in' as an adverb of place or time. For instance, in "I walked to your right," the walk occurred in the direction of the right, and in "I arrived this morning," the arrival was in the morning. Hence, 'right' was an adverb for the walk, encompassing it as a container holds water, and 'morning' was an adverb for the arrival, encompassing it as a vessel holds its contents.

## THE CONCLUSION

After this auspicious journey, it is imperative to take a moment for contemplation and review of the objectives accomplished and the findings derived from this research. Therefore, we conclude:

It is permissible to place the object first due to the clarity of meaning, as it is immediately understood that the pear is to be eaten.

If the verb extends to encompass what includes both the silent and otherwise, it extends to the overall inclusion in the sentence if it involves a type of inclusion, as is the case with returning and walking.

The adverbial clause must be in the accusative case because it resembles the direct object by being an adjunct. Sibawayh stated: "In the chapter on nouns that are in the accusative case, which are neither adjectives nor verbal nouns because they are states in which the action occurs, they take the accusative as they are treated as direct objects. Some Arabs say: 'I spoke to him face to face,' as if to say: 'I spoke to him while his face was close to mine,' meaning, I spoke to him in this condition...it takes the accusative because it is a state in which the action occurred."

The representation employed by the author and the commentator indicates that three conditions must be met for the accusative object and its accompanying verb to occur: the object must be a noun, the verb must occur after a clause containing a verb or a verb-like meaning, and its prepositions, or the object must occur after the conjunction *و* and denoting accompaniment, which signifies specifying the accompanying entity. Therefore, the accusative object is essentially a noun adjunct to the conjunction *و* and denoting accompaniment.

The permissibility of precedence for analogy and deduction in differentiation is due to the fact that the elements of differentiation are of two types: one is a fixed noun, and the other is a verb in a passive form, which is what the element of differentiation was subjected to.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, W. M. Z. B. W., Zainudin, W. N. R. A. B., Ismail, S. B., & Zia-Ul-Haq, H. M. (2022). The Impact of Microfinance Services on Malaysian B40 Households' Socioeconomic Performance: A Moderated Mediation Analysis. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 17(6), 1983–1996.
- Anne Karani Iswan, Dr. Robert Arasa, D. J. N. (2020). The Role of Financial Literacy in the Growth of Women Owned Micro Enterprises: A Case Study of Busia County, Kenya By. *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies (JAIS): ISSN 2523-6725*, 4(12), 16–27.
- Bernard, D. T. K. (2020). Entrepreneurial Success for Women through Microfinance and Effect of Education: Evidence from Sri Lanka. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 3(3).
- Carlos, J., Mejía, U., Gutierrez, L. H., & Rodríguez, P. (2023). Financial inclusion and business practices of microbusiness in Colombia. *Eurasian Business Review*, (0123456789).
- Hair, Joe F, Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2018). The Results of PLS-SEM Article information. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24.
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24.
- Hammawa, Y. M., & Bappi, U. (2019). Towards Improving the Performance of Women Entrepreneurs in Micro Enterprise in Nigeria, 3(1), 47–65.
- Megan Lang, J. S. (2022). The Economics of Women's Entrepreneurship, 1–45.
- Sawad, B. (2022). Effect Of Microfinance On Entrepreneurship Development: A Case Study Of Kanchanpur District By:, (8.5.2017), 2003–2005.
- Tarisha, A., Ardi, K. H., Fatkhurrahman, I. N., & Margaretha, F. (2021). Financial Literacy on Saving Behavior in MSMEs with Social Influence as an Intervening Variable. *Oktober*, 5(2), 24–37.