The Term *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* (lit. "the verb which 'passes over' through a preposition") in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition[1]

ALMOG KASHER (Bar-Ilan University)

Abstract

Contrary to the categorization of verbs with regard to their *taʿaddin* which modern scholarship has customarily ascribed to the medieval Arab grammarians, the term *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* is generally not regarded by these grammarians as a subcategory of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī*. Furthermore, Arab grammarians do not restrict the application of the term *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* to constructions in which the prepopositions in question are governed; this has far-reaching repercussions on the notion of *ẓarf*. The grammarians' conception of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*, surveyed in this article, is explained both against the backdrop of the early transformations the term *taʿaddin* underwent, and within the grammarians' general theoretical framework.

1. Introduction

The following categorization of verbs according to their transitivity is commonly ascribed to the Arab grammarians:[2] all verbs belong either to the category of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī* (transitive verbs) or to that of *al-fiʿl al-lāzim* or *al-fiʿl ġayr al-mutaʿaddī* (also: *al-fiʿl al-qāṣir*) (intransitive verbs); transitive verbs are further subcategorized into *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-nafsi-hi* (verbs which are transitive through themselves, thereby assigning the accusative to an object) and *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ġayri-hi* (verbs which are transitive through something else) or *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*[3] (also: *bi-ḥarf jārr*, *bi-ḥarf xafḍ*, *bi-ḥarf xāfiḍ* and *bi-ḥarf ʾiḍāfa*) (verbs which are transitive through a preposition).[4] This division will henceforth be referred to as 'the standard categorization'. WRIGHT (1896–1898: II, 46) illustrates *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-nafsi-hi* with the sentence *balaġa-nī l-xabaru* ('the news reached me'), and *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* with the sentence *qadara ʿalā šayʾin* ('he was able to do something'). It is implied that the latter category consists of verbs

---

2 For this categorization (explicitly or implicitly), see WRIGHT 1896-1898: I, 30, II, 46; RECKENDORF 1977: 214; CANTARINO 1974-1975: II, 161-163; BOBZIN 1983: 101-102; OWENS 1988: 175.
3 This is the term which we shall use henceforth for this category of verbs.
4 It should be noted that in Sībawayhi's *al-Kitāb* the term *ḥarf* does not denote the part of speech 'particle' (the third part of speech, the other two being *ism* 'noun' and *fiʿl* 'verb'), as it does in later treatises, although it may refer to particles, including prepositions. See TALMON 2003: 214-219.

which govern[5] the prepositions in question, to the exclusion of prepositions which are not governed, such as *fī* in the sentence *kataba zayduni l-kitāba fī l-dāri* ('Zayd wrote the book in the abode').

These two traits ascribed to the category of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*, namely that it is a subdivision of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī*, and that its application is restricted to constructions in which the prepositions are governed, will be questioned in Sections 2 and 3, respectively. It will become evident that these two issues are interdependent.

2. The status of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*

2.1 Sībawayhi differs significantly from his followers with regard to the way he uses the term *taʿaddin* (lit. "passing over", viz. the subject). As LEVIN (1979: 209) has already noted, Sībawayhi applies the term *taʿaddin* to the relationship between verbs and accusative nominals only.[6] Occasionally, Sībawayhi regards the *taʿaddin* relationship as excluding prepositional phrases.[7] For example, he explains (*al-Kitāb*, I, 133) the unacceptability of **wahabtu-ka* (in the sense of 'I gave you [something]'), by contrast with *ʿadadtu-ka* ('I counted [something] for you'), *kiltu-ka* ('I measured [something] for you') and *wazantu-ka* ('I weighed [something] for you'), as follows: *li-ʾanna-hum lam yuʿaddū-hu* ('since they [sc. the Bedouins] do not make it engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship'); the acceptable construction is, therefore, *wahabtu la-ka*.[8] Moreover, Sībawayhi uses the term *taʿaddin* only when the accusative nominal in question is a *mafʿūl* (here in the sense of "direct object", but see KASHER 2012), to the exclusion of, for example, a *ẓarf* (a locative/temporal qualifier).[9]

Sībawayhi uses the root *w-ṣ-l* (connect, reach)[10] and the verb *ʾaḍāfa* (connect, join)[11] to designate the relationship between verbs and prepositional phrases. In an example of the use of the former, he states (*al-Kitāb*, I, 12) that verbs such as *ixtāra* ('he chose') are (basically) *ʾafʿāl tūṣalu bi-ḥurūf al-ʾiḍāfa* ('verbs connected/reaching through words/morphemes

---

5 The meaning of the term 'governed' in this regard will be dealt with in §3.2. In order to avoid confusion, the term 'govern' will not be used here to render the indigenous term *ʿamal*, i.e. syntactic effect (which is a disputable rendition in any case).

6 In fact, LEVIN's claim is somewhat stronger, which is nevertheless irrelevant to the main thrust of the present discussion.

7 As we shall see in §§2.4, 2.5, later grammarians (who do refer to the relationship between verbs and prepositional phrases as *taʿaddin*) also occasionally contrast *taʿaddin* with the relationship between verbs and prepositional phrases, the former applying only to direct objects; thus, such statements of Sībawayhi do not qualify, by themselves, as evidence for the exclusion of prepositional phrases from Sībawayhi's conception of *taʿaddin*.

8 See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 100.

9 I have dealt with this issue in detail elsewhere (KASHER 2006: 207-239). In all the passages where the term *taʿaddin* ostensibly designates the relationship between a verb and a *ẓarf*, the latter has undergone a process whereby it has become syntactically *mafʿūl*, as a case of *ittisāʿ* ('latitude'). See also LEVIN 1979: 195-196, fn. 11; OWENS 1990: 111-115; VERSTEEGH 1990: *passim*; KASHER 2012.

10 See LEVIN 1987: 357-361; TAHA 1993; *idem* 1995.

11 See LEVIN 1987: 358, 361.

of connection'), as in *ixtartu fulānan mina l-rijāli* ('I chose so-and-so from the men').[12] The latter is exemplified in a statement in which he says (*ibid*, I, 32), regarding the sentence *zaydun marartu bi-hi* ('Zayd, I passed by him'): … *wa-ʾuḍīfa l-fiʿlu ʾilay-hi bi-l-bāʾi wa-lam yūṣal ʾilay-hi l-fiʿlu fī l-lafẓi* ('the verb was connected to it [sc. *-hi* in *bi-hi*] by means of *bi-*, and was not connected to/did not reach it in form').[13] Incidentally, this statement demonstrates the application of the term *waṣala* also to the relationship between verbs and accusative nominals.[14]

The standard categorization of verbs was therefore quite irrelevant for Sībawayhi: according to his conception of the term *taʿaddin*, *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī* is identical with (what would later be referred to as) *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-nafsi-hi*, and hence the term *taʿaddin* simply cannot be applied to prepositional phrases.[15]

For al-Mubarrad, on the other hand, the term *taʿaddin* has a broader application. First, regarding accusative nominals, it no longer applies exclusively to *mafʿūl* (*bi-hi*), but also to other functions, e.g. *ẓarf*.[16] Second, and more importantly for our discussion, al-Mubarrad uses the root *ʿ-d-w*, albeit only once, with regard to a prepositional phrase: considering the acceptability not only of *daxaltu l-bayta* ('I entered the house'), but also of *daxaltu fī-hi* ('I entered it'), al-Mubarrad (*al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 337–339) puts *daxala* on a par with verbs such as *naṣaḥa* ('he advised'), which can take either a prepositional phrase (in this case, *li-*) or a direct object, both constructions conveying the same meaning; the former option is referred to by the words *fa-tuʿaddī-hi ... bi-ḥarfin* ('you make it engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship … by means of a particle'), the latter by the words *wa-ʾin šiʾta ʾawṣalta l-fiʿla* ('if you wish, you connect the verb [with it]/make it reach [it]').[17] Nevertheless, the roots much more frequently used for this end are also *w-ṣ-l* and *ḍ-y-f*.[18] In the absence of evidence, there is no point in conjecturing whether or not the standard categorization can be applied to al-Mubarrad.

A note is in order concerning the wording which grammarians chose with regard to the issues discussed here. The appellation *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* indicates a positive trait possessed by the verb to which it is applied, that is, the verb is regarded, at least *prima facie*, as *fiʿl mutaʿaddin*, albeit *mutaʿaddin* by means of a preposition, hence the ostensible inclusion of this category under *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī*. However, one finds in *al-Kitāb* and *al-Muqtaḍab* a 'negative' wording as well. For example, regarding *zayd* in the construction *marartu bi-zaydin* ('I passed by Zayd'), Sībawayhi (*al-Kitāb*, I, 37) says: … *wa-ʾin kāna l-fiʿlu lā yaṣilu ʾilay-hi ʾillā bi-ḥarfi l-ʾiḍāfati* ('although the verb is not connected with/does

---

12 See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 67, 108, 113, 393, 414, II, 334 (and the following discussion in this subsection).

13 See also *ibid*, I, 178, II, 146.

14 See also *ibid*, I, 108, 393.

15 Nevertheless, due to Sībawayhi's position as 'master' of the Arab grammarians, who follow in his footsteps with regard to the issues dealt with here, and even quote him, his statements and theories will be incorporated in the following discussions.

16 See BOBZIN 1983: 97; OWENS 1988: 167 ff.; KASHER 2006: 246 ff.

17 On the grammarians' discussions of the verb *daxala*, see §2.5.

18 See al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, II, 317-318, IV, 33, 136 (and the following discussion in this subsection). Note that for al-Mubarrad as well, the root *w-ṣ-l* also denotes the relationship between verbs and accusative nominals, see *ibid*, II, 320, 326, 341, IV, 330.

not reach it [sc. the *mafʿūl*] except through the word/morpheme of connection [sc. *bi-*]'). This wording, according to the context, emphasizes the distinction between the two categories: the verb is not connected to (or: does not reach) *zayd*, except by means of the preposition.[19] Unlike the term *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*, this 'negative' formulation does not necessarily imply that this category is to be subsumed under al-*fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī*; it may in fact imply the opposite. The importance of the distinction between the 'positive' and the 'negative' wordings will become manifest presently.

2.2 The roots *w-ṣ-l* and *ḍ-y-f* are also used in post-Mubarradian writings with reference to the relationship between verbs and prepositional phrases.[20] However, already in Ibn al-Sarrāj one encounters a frequent usage of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*. Since Ibn al-Sarrāj is known for his systematization of grammar,[21] it makes eminent sense to ask whether the standard categorization is in agreement with his theory, or more specifically, whether for him *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* constitutes a subcategory of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī*.

The following statement by Ibn al-Sarrāj (*al-Mūjaz*, 34–35) seems to hold the key to grasping the evolution of the concept of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*; it is therefore worth quoting in its entirety. In the chapter *al-mafʿūl bi-hi*, under the heading *ḏikr al-ʾasmāʾ al-manṣūbāt* ("the accusative nouns"), he says:

> *al-ʾafʿālu ʿalā ḍarbayni ḍarbin lā yataʿaddā ʾillā bi-ḥarfi jarrin wa-ḍarbin yataʿaddā bi-ġayri ḥarfin fa-l-ḍarbu llaḏī lā yataʿaddā naḥwu qāma zaydun wa-qaʿada ʿamrun fa-ʾin ʾaradta ʾan tuʿaddiya-hu qulta qaʿada ʿamrun ʾilā bakrin wa-ḏahaba zaydun ʾilā xālidin wa-l-mutaʿaddiyatu tanqasimu fī taʿaddī-hā ʾilā ṯalāṯati ʾaqsāmin min-hā mā yataʿaddā ʾilā mafʿūlin wāḥidin wa-min-hā mā yataʿaddā ʾilā mafʿūlayni wa-min-hā mā yataʿaddā ʾilā ṯalāṯati mafʿūlīna …*

> ('Verbs are of two types: those not engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship except through a preposition, and those engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship without any particle. Those not engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship are, for example, *qāma zaydun* ['Zayd got up'] and *qaʿada ʿamrun* ["ʿAmr sat down"]. If you wish to make it engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship, you say *qaʿada ʿamrun ʾilā bakrin* ["ʿAmr sat with Bakr'] and *ḏahaba zaydun ʾilā xālidin* ['Zayd went to Xālid']. [Verbs] engaging in a

---

19 See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 44, 112, 394; al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 330. Also: … *li-ʾanna l-fiʿla ʾinnamā yaṣilu ʾilā l-ismi bi-l-bāʾi wa-naḥwi-hā* ('… since the verb is connected to/reaches the noun only by means of *bi-* and its like') (Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 393).

20 See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 55, 269, 408, 414, 416, II, 13, 314, 345; al-Zajjājī, *al-ʾĪḍāḥ*, 93, 108-109, 128; Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 106, 341-342, II, 278, 312, 230; *idem, Sirr*, 122 ff., 143; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 88, 89, 172, 274-275, 592, 699, 710, 824, 846, 847, 850-851, 854, 968; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 63, 64, 202, IV, 137, 261, 269; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 142, 493. The 'negative' wording is also found in Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 214-215, II, 52. The root *r-b-ṭ* is also used for this end, see *ibid*, I, 42; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 246, 832. See LEVIN 1987: 358.

21 Yāqūt (*Muʿjam*, III, 2535) says: *wa-yuqālu mā zāla l-naḥwu majnūnan ḥattā ʿaqqala-hu bnu l-sarrāji bi-ʾuṣūli-hi* ('it is said that grammar used to be "insane", until Ibn al-Sarrāj "rationalized" it by [laying] its foundations [or by means of his book *al-ʾUṣūl*]'). See OWENS 1988: 4, 28-30; BOHAS, GUILLAUME and KOULOUGHLI 1990: 10-11; BAALBAKI 2007: xxxvii.

taʿaddin relationship are divided into three, with respect to their *taʿaddin*: those engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship with one, with two, and with three objects.')

It should be noticed, first, what this excerpt does *not* say: it does not classify verbs into *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-nafsi-hi* vs. *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*. As the heading *ḏikr al-ʾasmāʾ al-manṣūbāt* implies, Ibn al-Sarrāj's interest lies in accusative nominals, and accordingly, *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī* refers only to verbs taking such constituents. This category stands in contradistinction to [*al-fiʿl*] *llaḏī lā yataʿaddā*. What is striking here is that the former is also referred to here by the phrase [*fiʿl*] *yataʿaddā bi-ġayr ḥarf*, whereas the latter is also referred to by the phrase [*fiʿl*] *lā yataʿaddā ʾillā bi-ḥarf jarr*. The verb *qaʿada*, for instance, belongs to the category *allaḏī lā yataʿaddā* (e.g. *qaʿada ʿamrun*); but it is also [*fiʿl*] *lā yataʿaddā ʾillā bi-ḥarf jarr*: if the speaker nevertheless wishes this verb to engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship with some nominal, he or she must use a preposition (e.g. *qaʿada ʿamrun ʾilā bakrin*), but this does not contradict the categorization of the verb as [*al-fiʿl*] *allaḏī lā yataʿaddā*. In other words, *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* is not a category by itself, but is identical with *al-fiʿl ġayr al-mutaʿaddī*. Such categorization is in line with what was noted above regarding the 'negative' wording used by Sībawayhi and al-Mubarrad: *taʿaddin* by means of a preposition does not constitute a positive trait of verbs, and consequently verbs are not categorized, with regard to their *taʿaddin*, according to the preposition(s) they take. In his more comprehensive book, Ibn al-Sarrāj (*al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 172) does not even mention this category when he subcategorizes *al-ʾafʿāl al-mutaʿaddiya*, here also in the chapter which deals with *al-mafʿūl bi-hi* (ibid, I, 169 ff.), under the heading *ḏikr al-ʾasmāʾ al-manṣūbāt* (ibid, I, 158).[22] However, when Ibn al-Sarrāj in this book deals with prepositions which are not otiose,[23] he states: [... *li-ʾanna*] *l-ʾafʿāla llatī hiya ġayru mutaʿaddiyatin fī l-ʾaṣli lā tataʿaddā ʾillā bi-ḥarfi jarrin* ('verbs which do not engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship in their basic state do not engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship except through a preposition') (ibid, II, 65). Again, *taʿaddin* by means of a preposition is only an option, which has nothing to do with categorization of verbs.[24] The same conception is also expressed by Ibn al-ʾAnbārī (*ʾAsrār*, 37–38); after categorizing verbs, in his *bāb al-mafʿūl*, into *fiʿl mutaʿaddin bi-ġayri-hi* vs. *fiʿl mutaʿaddin bi-nafsi-hi*, he immediately explains the former as identical with *al-fiʿl al-lāzim*, which can, however, engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship by means of, *inter alia*, a preposition.

2.3 While al-Zajjājī and Ibn Jinnī seem to regard *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* as a category by itself, a closer examination shows that these grammarians, too, did not put *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* on a par with *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-nafsi-hi*:

In the chapter *bāb ʾaqsām al-ʾafʿāl fī al-taʿaddī* ('the classes of verbs with respect to *taʿaddin*'), al-Zajjājī (*al-Jumal*, 27 ff.) categorizes verbs into seven categories according to their *taʿaddin*:

(1) *fiʿl lā yataʿaddā ʾilā mafʿūl* ('verb not engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship with an object') (e.g. *qāma* and *qaʿada*);

---

22 See also Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, II, 266, 276-277.
23 See LEVIN 1987: 361-362; *idem* 1997: 146-147. See also §2.8.
24 For the 'negative' wording, see also Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 431, II, 50; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 448 (the word *illā* is missing in this edition, see Ibn al-Ḥājib, *al-Kāfiya*, I, 168).

(2) *fiʿl yataʿaddā ʾilā mafʿūl wāḥid* ('verb engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship with one object') (e.g. *ḍaraba* 'he hit');

(3) *fiʿl yataʿaddā ʾilā mafʿūlayni* ('verb engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship with two objects'), but: *wa-ʾin šiʾta qtaṣarta ʿalā ʾaḥadi-himā dūna l-ʾāxari* ('if you wish, you restrict yourself to one of them') (e.g. *ʾaṭā* 'he gave');

(4) *fiʿl yataʿaddā ʾilā mafʿūlayni*, but: *wa-lā yajūzu l-iqtiṣāru ʿalā ʾaḥadi-himā dūna l-ʾāxari* ('one is not allowed to restrict oneself to only one of them') (e.g. *ẓanna* 'he thought');

(5) *fiʿl yataʿaddā ʾilā ṯalāṯat mafʿūlīna* ('verb engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship with three objects') (e.g. *ʾaʿlama* 'he made [someone] know');

(6) *fiʿl lā yataʿaddā ʾillā bi-ḥarf xafḍ* ('verb not engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship except by means of a preposition') (e.g. *daxala* in *daxaltu ʾilā ʾaxī-ka* 'I entered upon your brother'[25] and *marra* in *marartu bi-zaydin*);

(7) *fiʿl yataʿaddā bi-ḥarf xafḍ wa-bi-ġayr ḥarf xafḍ* ('verb engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship either with or without a preposition') (e.g. *naṣaḥa* in *naṣaḥtu zaydan* and *naṣaḥtu li-zaydin* 'I advised Zayd').

What is of interest here is that al-Zajjājī differentiates between categories (1) and (6), thereby recognizing a category of verbs taking prepositional phrases distinct from totally intransitive verbs;[26] recall that Ibn al-Sarrāj does not differentiate between [*al-fiʿl*] *llaḏī lā yataʿaddā* and [*fiʿl*] *lā yataʿaddā ʾillā bi-ḥarf jarr*, and consequently subsumes the verbs *qāma* and *qaʿada* under a single category which merges al-Zajjājī's categories (1) and (6) together. This notwithstanding, it seems that al-Zajjājī does not intend to put forward a comprehensive categorization of verbs with regard to their *taʿaddin* by means of prepositions, whereas he does seem to intend to do so with regard to *taʿaddin* to accusative nominals. For instance, verbs which take both an accusative nominal and a prepositional phrase are not mentioned as a separate category; rather, a subcategory of these verbs is mentioned under (3), that is, verbs which basically take both an accusative nominal and a prepositional phrase, but the preposition may be elided, so that the verbs take two accusative nominals, e.g. *ixtāra* (see §2.1). This option is thus mentioned only for the sake of the discussion of accusative nominals.[27] Other options, such as verbs taking two prepositional phrases, are not mentioned at all.

Ibn Jinnī (*al-Lumaʿ*, 22) says: *al-fiʿlu fī l-taʿaddī ʾilā l-mafʿūli bi-hi ʿalā ḍarbayni fiʿlin mutaʿaddin bi-nafsi-hi wa-fiʿlin mutaʿaddin bi-ḥarfi jarrin* ('verbs are of two types, with respect to engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship with objects [lit. "passing over to the object"]: verbs engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship by themselves, and verbs engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship through a preposition'). The latter category is nevertheless marginal with respect to the former. First, similarly to Ibn al-Sarrāj (see §2.2), this statement appears in the

---

25 On grammarians' discussions of the verb *daxala*, see §2.5.

26 The 'negative' wording used in (6) might stem from his desire to contrast (6) with (7).

27 In line with this, one might even suggest (but not without difficulty) that category (6) is mentioned only for the sake of category (7).

chapter *bāb al-mafʿūl bi-hi*, under the heading *maʿrifat al-ʾasmāʾ al-manṣūba* (ibid, 20). The spotlight is thus on the accusative nominals. Second, right after illustrating the latter category, e.g. with the construction *marartu bi-zaydin*, he says (ibid, 22):

> *wa-law qulta marartu zaydan … fa-ḥaḏafta ḥarfa l-jarri lam yajuz ḏālika ʾillā fī ḍarūrati šiʿrin ġayra ʾanna l-jārra wa-l-majrūra jamīʿan fī mawḍiʿi naṣbin bi-l-fiʿli qabla-humā.*

> ('If you had said *marartu zaydan* … and elided the preposition, this would not have been allowed, other than as poetic license. Yet, the preposition [lit. "the operator of the genitive", sc. *bi-*] and the genitive nominal [sc. *zaydin*] together [sc. the prepositional phrase *bi-zaydin*] occupy the position of a [nominal in the] accusative [e.g. *zaydan*], due to the [syntactic effect of] the preceding verb [sc. *marartu*].')

This statement might suggest that Ibn Jinnī mentions this category not for its own sake, but rather as part of his discussion of the accusative nominals, to wit, the (extremely restricted) possibility of using these verbs without a preposition, so that they take accusative nominals, as well as the functioning of such prepositional phrases as if they were accusative nominal.[28] Third, Ibn Jinnī does not mention any other category of verbs with regard to prepositional phrases; he does not even mention the category of verbs such as *ixtāra* (as al-Zajjājī does); the entire discussion following the quoted statement is restricted to accusative nominals.

To recapitulate, although *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* is regarded as a distinct category for al-Zajjājī and Ibn Jinnī, it is nevertheless marginal vis-à-vis *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-nafsi-hi*; in contrast to the comprehensive categorization of verbs with regard to the number and type of accusative nominals they take, these grammarians (as well as others) put forward no parallel discussion of prepositional phrases.[29]

2.4 As for the other grammarians studied for this paper, we have found in their writings no categorization of verbs according to their *taʿaddin* which includes *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*. Al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 595), for instance, defines [*al-fiʿl*] *al-mutaʿaddī* as *mā naṣaba mafʿūlan bi-hi* ('what causes an object to take the accusative'), whereas *al-fiʿl ġayr al-mutaʿaddī* is defined as *mā lam yanṣib mafʿūlan bi-hi* ('what does not cause an object to take the accusative'). More explicitly, al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, IV, 135–136) holds that verbs such as *qaruba* ('he was/became near') are regarded as *mutaʿaddiya bi-l-ḥarf al-fulānī* ('engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship through such-and-such a particle'), whereas the term *al-mutaʿaddī* used without any expression restricting its meaning (*ʾiḏā ʾuṭliqa*)[30] does not apply to them; they are thus *lāzima*. That is, *taʿaddin* by means of a preposition is a trait, or an option, of verbs which are deemed *lāzim*, in contradistinction to verbs which are categorized as *mutaʿaddin*.[31]

---

28 This latter theory will be discussed in §3.1.
29 See BOBZIN 1983: 101.
30 For this meaning of *ʾaṭlaqa*, see LEVIN 1991: 920ff.
31 See also al-Zamaxšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal*, 341; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 451, II, 89, III, 428-429, 431, IV, 136-138; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 163, 499, 575. For cases in which *taʿaddin* (or *taʿdiya*) stands in contradistinction to taking prepositional phrases, see Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, II, 52; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 568, 622-623; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 243. It is also inferred from Ibn al-Sarrāj (*al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 211) that taking a prepo-

2.5   That the term *taʿaddin*, not only for Ibn al-Sarrāj but also for later grammarians, is basically applied with reference to the relationship between verbs and accusative nominals, is manifest also in the grammarians' discussions of the verb *daxala*. The problem which this verb poses is that the constructions *daxala l-bayta* and *daxala fī l-bayti* are both acceptable.[32] However, the problem as it is formulated by the grammarians is whether the verb is to be categorized, basically, as *mutaʿaddin* or as *ġayr mutaʿaddin* (also: *lāzim*). Ibn al-Sarrāj (*al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 170), for example, says: *wa-qadi xtalafa l-naḥwiyyūna fī daxala l-bayta hal huwa mutaʿaddin ʾaw ġayru mutaʿaddin* ('grammarians are at variance about whether or not [*daxala* in] *daxala l-bayta* is *mutaʿaddin*'). The basic construction is, according to Ibn al-Sarrāj and other grammarians, *daxala fī l-bayti* (or: *ʾilā l-bayti*), from which the construction *daxala l-bayta* is derived by eliding the preposition. The evidence which grammarians adduce for this end aims at proving that this verb is to be categorized as *fiʿl ġayr mutaʿaddin*. For example, al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 600) notes that the infinitive of this verb is *duxūl*, of the pattern *fuʿūl*, which, as he states, is characteristic of verbs which are *ġayr mutaʿaddin*.[33]

In a similar vein, Ibn al-Sarrāj (*al-ʾUṣūl*, III, 86 ff.) categorizes verbs of Form I as either *fiʿl mutaʿaddin ʾilā mafʿūl* or *fiʿl ġayr mutaʿaddin* with regard to their patterns (including their cognates); the verb *qaʿada*, for instance, is subsumed under the latter, with no mention of the fact that it can take a prepositional phrase (see §2.2).[34]

2.6   Sentences such as *marartu bi-zaydin* should thus be analyzed as constructed in two stages. At the first stage, *marartu* is constructed, the verb being *ġayr mutaʿaddin*, since it takes no accusative nominal. At the second stage, the verb nevertheless engages in a *taʿaddin* relationship with some constituent, but only by means of a preposition, since it cannot take accusative objects. This two-stage model is inferred from the above discussion, and is explicit in several passages in al-Jurjānī; for example, this grammarian says (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 699): *... ʾanna-ka taqūlu marartu fa-lā yataʿaddā fa-taʾtī bi-l-bāʾi*[35] *fa-taqūlu marartu bi-zaydin fa-tūṣilu l-bāʾu l-fiʿla ʾilā zaydin ...* ('that you say *marartu* and it does not engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship [lit. does not "pass over"]. And then you use the *bi-* and say *marartu bi-zaydin*, and the *bi-* connects the verb with/makes the verb reach *zayd* ...').[36]

---

sitional phrase is an option open for verbs generally.

32   Note that the accusative nominal *al-bayta* may not be parsed as *ẓarf makān* (locative qualifier), since it indicates a specific location.

33   WRIGHT (1896-1898: I, 113) says: "*fuʿūl* is the abstract noun from *intransitive* verbs of the form *faʿala* …". For the grammarians' discussions of the verb *daxala*, see Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 11, 68, II, 226; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 170-171, II, 53-54; al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, 31; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 599-603; al-Zamaxšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal*, 387-388; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *ʾAsrār*, 74; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 492-493, II, 369, IV, 136, 139; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 159, 351, 637, 728. For the opposite view, see al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 337-339.

34   Categorization of verbs according to their *taʿaddin* in a morphological context is found already in Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, II, 224 ff. See also Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 573-575.

35   The edition reads *bi-l-bābi*, which is obviously a copyist's or typist's error.

36   See also al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 172, 347, 565, 660.

Grammarians occasionally explain that such verbs are too 'weak' to take an accusative nominal, and therefore require the aid of a preposition.[37] For instance, Ibn Jinnī, discussing such constructions (*al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 341), says: *marartu bi-zaydin wa-mā kāna naḥwa-hu mim-mā yalḥaqu min ḥurūfi l-jarri maʿūnatan li-taʿaddī l-fiʿli* ('*marartu bi-zaydin* and similar [constructions containing] prepositions joining in order to aid the *taʿaddin* of the verb').[38] To this theory belongs also the use of the term *taʿdiya*, which means: causing a verb to be *mutaʿaddin*.[39] Grammarians occasionally state that there are three elements which have the effect of *taʿdiya*: Form IV, Form II and the preposition *bi-*.[40] This process has not only the effect of increasing the number of constituents, but also of 'causativization'.[41] However, it is sometimes stated that the process of *taʿdiya* is not restricted to the preposition *bi-*, since *taʿdiya* is a function of all prepositions.[42] For instance, al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 346ff.) discusses the three methods of causing a verb which is *ġayr al-mutaʿaddī* to be *al-mutaʿaddī*: *al-hamza*, i.e. Form IV, *al-bāʾ* and *al-taḍʿīf*, i.e. Form II, the second being illustrated with the construction *ḏahaba ʿamrun bi-zaydin* (''Amr went away with Zayd' or ''Amr made Zayd go away'); however, al-Jurjānī also remarks: *wa-kaḏā jamīʿu ḥurūfi l-jarri* ('and this applies to all prepositions'), a statement which he illustrates with the construction *ḏahabtu ʾilā zaydin* ('I went to Zayd') and *xarajtu mina l-baṣrati* ('I went out of Baṣra').[43] This corroborates our conclusion that taking prepositional phrases is not regarded by the grammarians as an inherent trait by which verbs are categorized, in contrast to accusative nominals.

---

37 See LEVIN 1987: 360. This notion also underlies the term *al-lām li-taqwiyat al-ʿāmil*, on which see WRIGHT 1896-1898: II, 61 ff.; RECKENDORF 1977: 247-249. See also e.g. al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, II, 203, III, 420, 464-467, IV, 284, 289; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 492, 599.

38 See also Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, III, 229; *idem*, *Sirr*, 123-126; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 248-249, 262; *idem*, *ʾAsrār*, 75, 81; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 491. This notion can also be inferred from al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 660; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, IV, 269, 288, 327.

39 The agent of the action indicated by the verb *ʿaddā* may be the speaker (see e.g. Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, II, 208, 310, 311; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 600, 623). Incidentally, this has a bearing on the question of the identity of the *ʿāmil*, i.e. the assigner of *iʿrāb*: is it a sentence constituent which assigns *iʿrāb*, or is it the speaker? On this issue see OWENS 1988: 63-65; BOHAS, GUILLAUME and KOULOUGHLI 1990: 58; PELED 1994: esp. 146-149.

40 See e.g. Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 248-249 (see also *idem*, *ʾAsrār*, 37-38).

41 On the preposition *bi-* as a 'causativizer', see WRIGHT 1896-1898: II, 159, 164; RECKENDORF 1977: 237-239.

42 Al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, IV, 280-281) discusses the ambiguity of the term *taʿdiya*: he says that although all prepositions are used *li-taʿdiyati l-fiʿli l-qāṣiri ʿan-i l-mafʿūli* ('in order to cause the verb which falls short of taking an object [viz. intransitive] to be *mutaʿaddin*'), this term has a specific meaning, which applies to the effect caused by the preposition *bi-*, as well as by the derivation of Forms II and IV.

43 Note that in another instance where he discusses these three methods, al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 592-595) mentions only the preposition *bi-*. On *taʿdiya* see also Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 341, III, 229; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 565, 602, 716, 968; al-Zamaxšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal*, 341; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 283; *idem*, *ʾAsrār*, 39, 81, 109; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, II, 30, III, 99, IV, 139-140, 261, 280-281; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 107-108, 142, 688 (note that Ibn Hišām [*Muġnī*, 576-581] does not include the preposition *bi-* in his list of seven (!) elements causing *taʿdiya*, since he restricts the application of this term in this specific discussion to accusative nominals only, see §2.5). For further discussions of this function of *bi-* (or of prepositions in general), albeit without mentioning of the term *taʿdiya*, see Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 65; al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, 83; Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 102, 106; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, IV, 137. See also OWENS 1988: 175ff.

2.7 This function implemented by prepositions, namely creating a syntactic link between verbs and nominals to which they do not assign the accusative, has a semantic aspect as well: in the constructions in which they appear, prepositions impose certain meanings,[44] to which grammarians dedicate lengthy discussions.[45] For example, al-Zajjājī (*Ḥurūf*, 47) says that in the construction *marartu bi-zaydin*, the preposition *bi-* imposes the meaning of *ʾilṣāq* ('attachment'), so that at the second stage (after this verb is regarded, at the first stage, as *ġayr mutaʿaddin*), the preposition *bi-* not only enables the verb to take the constituent at stake, but also determines the semantic relationship between the verb and this constituent, by imposing a certain meaning.

2.8 This is not to say, however, that every token of a preposition implements the function of connecting a verb (or a verb-like element) to a nominal. Grammarians hold that prepositions which are deemed otiose (*zāʾid*, *mazīd* or *ziyāda*) do not implement this function.[46] Moreover, Ibn Hišām (*Muġnī*, 493) states that exceptive prepositions, e.g. *xalā*, do not cause *taʿdiya*, due to their semantic significance: they do not connect the meanings of verbs with the following nominals, since they *preclude* the semantic connection between verbs to nominals which is a characteristic of prepositions causing *taʿdiya*.[47]

3. Restrictions on *taʿaddin* with respect to government

3.1 The grammarians frequently parse prepositional phrases, or their genitive nominal only,[48] as *mafʿūl* (*bi-hi*), and regard them as (virtually) taking the accusative[49] case.[50]

---

44 Note that post-Sībawayhian grammarians often interpret the term *ḥarf jāʾa li-maʿnan* ('a particle denoting a meaning'), which designates the part of speech 'particle', as referring to *ḥarf jāʾa li-maʿnan fī ġayri-hi* ('a particle denoting a meaning pertinent to something else'). See LEVIN 2000: 35-39 (also *idem* 1987: 352-353).

45 See Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 177-178, II, 331 ff.; al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 136 ff.; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 409 ff.; al-Zajjājī, *Ḥurūf*, *passim*; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr*, *passim*; *idem*, *al-Lumaʿ*, 30-31; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 822 ff.; al-Zamaxšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal*, 379 ff.; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *ʾAsrār*, 104-105; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, IV, 263 ff.; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, Part I.

46 See Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 283-284; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, IV, 136-137, 285; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 32, 142, 232, 491-493.

47 See also Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 142.

48 The former is Ibn Jinnī's (*Sirr*, 130-132) explicit stance, the latter – al-ʾAstarābāḏī's (*Šarḥ*, IV, 137). GLINERT (1989: 519 [ch. 15, n. 1]) says: "The object noun is often introduced by a preposition (a 'case marker'). Semantically speaking, this belongs to the verb; but in terms of syntactic movement and prosody it belongs with the object noun phrase, so the whole construction will sometimes be referred to as the 'object'." Similarly, HUDDLESTON (1984: 200-203) discusses the question of whether such prepositions belong with the preceding verb or with the following nominal.

49 The virtual accusative case is labeled by al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, I, 63) *al-ʾiʿrāb al-maḥallī* (on which see BOHAS, GUILLAUME and KOULOUGHLI 1990: 61-62; on the term *maḥall* (lit. "position") see VERSTEEGH 1978: 277-278; CARTER (ed.) 1981: 131-133, §5.51 n. 3). Note that prepositional phrases might be regarded as taking the nominative case, when they function as subjects of verbs in the passive voice, on which see §3.4.

50 See Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 37-38, 39, 65, 67, 126; al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, I, 145, 158, 320, IV, 33, 51,154; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 78, 80, 93, 168, 416, 424, II, 13, 52, 65; al-Zajjājī, *al-ʾĪḍāḥ*, 108-109, 128; *idem*, *al-Jumal*, 80; Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 102, 106, 341; *idem*, *Sirr*, 130-132, 136, 292-293;

Grammarians occasionally refer also to a semantic correspondence between these two types of constituent.[51] For example, al-Mubarrad (*al-Muqtaḍab*, I, 145) accounts for the syncretism between the accusative and the genitive forms of the sound plural – both the feminine and the masculine (e.g. *muslimātin* ('Muslim women') and *muslimīna* ('Muslim men'), respectively) – and between those of the dual (e.g. *rajulayni* 'two men'), first by pointing to the fact that this applies also to personal pronouns,[52] and second by claiming that both the accusative and the genitive nominals are *mafʿūl*, since the meaning of *marartu bi-zaydin* (representing here the genitive) is: *faʿaltu*[53] *hāḏā bi-hi* ('I did this [act] to him'). That is, since Zayd is the one to whom the action (designated by the verb) was done, *zayd* is the *mafʿūl bi-hi*.[54] In other words, the term *mafʿūl* (*bi-hi*) applies not only to direct objects, but also to genitive nominals introduced by prepositions, since they engage in the same semantic relationship with the verb.[55] al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, I, 333–334, IV, 135–136)

---

idem, *al-Lumaʿ*, 14, 22; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 234-235, 335, 353, 376-377, 613, 781, 814, 824, 830, 851, 1080; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *ʾAsrār*, 52, 69; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 62-63, 183, 204, 219, 221, 244, 503, II, 102, 190, 302, 425, III, 465, IV, 137, 261-262, 289, 327; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 465, 520-521; *idem*, *Šarḥ*, 267. This is inferred also from Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 393; Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 397; al-Zamaxšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal*, 343. See OWENS 1988: 176-177. On the status of prepositional phrases as one-word equivalents, see BAALBAKI 1999: 93 ff. Note, however, that prepositional phrases are a marked *mafʿūl*: Ibn Jinnī (*al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 397), for instance, while analyzing a poetic verse which includes both a nominal *mafʿūl* and a prepositional phrase, refers to the former, in contradistinction to the latter, as a *mafʿūl bi-hi ṣaḥīḥ* (i.e. "proper"). Al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, I, 333-334) holds, moreover, that the term *mafʿūl bi-hi*, as long as it is *muṭlaq* and not *muqayyad*, i.e. restricted by a restrictive expression (for the pair *muṭlaq* vs. *muqayyad*, see Levin 1991: 920 ff., and see §2.4), does not refer to prepositional phrases. Elsewhere this grammarian refers to a prepositional phrase as a *naṣb* which is not *ṣarīḥ* (*Šarḥ*, I, 195). See also *ibid*, III, 409, IV, 135-136, 265; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 465. An even more radical distinction is found where Ibn Hišām (*ibid*, 152) adduces a poetic verse from which a preposition is elided, and in consequence the genitive nominal becomes, according to him, *mafʿūl*. Note that it is this inclusion of prepositional phrases under *mafʿūl bi-hi* which leads al-ʾAstarābāḏī to his dissenting theory, which will be discussed in §3.5.

51 This correspondence is, however, not without exception, e.g. where grammarians explicitly distinguish between direct objects and prepositional phrases on semantic grounds, see Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 171; Al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 599-602, 613-614. This can also be inferred from al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, II, 271.

52 The illustration adduced here is that the form of the second person masculine singular is *-ka*, both in the accusative and genitive, e.g. *raʾaytu-ka* ('I saw you') and *marartu bi-ka* ('I passed by you'), respectively.

53 It is also plausible to read here: *faʿalta*, as if the grammarian is addressing the person performing the utterance *marartu bi-zaydin*.

54 The phrase *mafʿūl bi-hi* here constitutes what PELED (1999) labels a 'metagrammatical intuitive term', i.e. "… its semantic composition comprises components from the grammatical as well as from the nongrammatical everyday concept underlying it" (*ibid*: 58).

55 The same argument recurs in al-Zajjājī, *al-ʾĪḍāḥ*, 128. See also al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, II, 425. Interestingly enough, al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 186) accounts for these morphological phenomena by putting the accusative and the genitive nominals on a par (in a discussion resembling al-Mubarrad's in its wording), but nevertheless the equivalence for him lies in the fact that both the direct object, e.g. in *ḍarabtu zaydan* ('I hit Zayd'), and the prepositional phrase, e.g. in *marartu ilā l-baṣrati* ('I went to Baṣra') (later in this discussion he also mentions *marartu bi-*), are *faḍla*, that is, they are dispensable constituents: both *ḍarabtu* and *marartu* qualify as sentences, in contrast to verbs lacking a nominative nominal (i.e. a subject). Ibn al-ʾAnbārī (*ʾAsrār*, 22-23) accounts for the syncretism in the dual and the sound masculine plural by alluding to five or six factors; these include the dispensability of both the accusative and geni-

states that a purely semantic definition of the terms *mafʿūl bi-hi* and *mutaʿaddin*[56] entails parsing prepositional phrases as *mafʿūl bi-hi* and regarding verbs which do not take a direct object as *mutaʿaddin*. Although he himself does not adhere *prima facie* to a purely semantic criterion, he states that ... *wa-l-taʿaddī wa-l-luzūmu bi-ḥasabi l-maʿnā* ('*taʿaddin* vs. lack of it are determined according to the meaning [of the verb in question]').[57]

The parsing of prepositional phrases as *mafʿūl*s might constitute the flip side of the fact that grammarians regard the relationship existing in such constructions as *taʿaddin*, although it is found already in Sībawayhi, who does not regard this relationship as *taʿaddin* (see §2.1).

3.2 The question which now arises is whether this equivalence between prepositional phrases and direct objects is restricted to a defined subcategory of the former, i.e. those which are introduced by governed prepositions. But before tackling this question, some words regarding the concept of 'government' are in order.

There is no universally agreed upon definition of 'government' in this context, i.e. of prepositions governed by verbs, let alone an agreement on exactly which cases should be subsumed under this category. As Badawi, Carter and Gully (2004: 380) state, "[i]ndirectly transitive verbs using prepositions are largely a lexical matter ...". That is, a verb's entry in the lexicon includes not only information about the direct object(s) it takes (if any), but also about the preposition(s) which it governs (if it does at all), but not about prepositions introducing adjuncts.[58] The relationship between verbs and the prepositions they govern is close, "such that the verb determines the choice of preposition" (Huddleston 1984: 201), in contrast to adjuncts.[59] There is one facet, occasionally introduced by modern scholars as a criterion for deciding whether or not a certain preposition is governed by its verb, which is irrelevant as long as one discusses the Arabic grammatical tradition; Glinert (1989: 151) says that "[q]uite generally, object prepositions are intrinsically meaningless whereas adverbial prepositions are intrinsically meaningful ... [b]ut these are just the two extremes of a whole spectrum of meaningfulness in prepositions ... ".[60] As we have seen above (in §2.7), however, the Arab grammarians in general assign each preposition a meaning, or several meanings, which it imposes in the constructions in which it occurs, and this applies also to governed prepositions; moreover, many grammarians regard this imposition of meaning as the basic trait of the part of speech 'particle' (viz. *ḥarf jāʾa li-maʿnan fī ġayri-hi*).[61] Regarding obligatoriness (which is another trait occasionally introduced with this respect), since prepositional objects are deemed *faḍla*, they possess a

---

tive mominals (i.e. their being *faḍla*), the fact that accusative and genitive personal pronouns share the same form and the semantic equivalence between them.

56 As does Ibn al-Ḥājib, the author of the treatise of which al-ʾAstarābāḏī's book constitutes a commentary.

57 For further cases where such a semantic correspondence is mentioned, see Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 37, 67, 108; Al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, I, 145, IV, 337-339; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, II, 13, 65; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr*, 130; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 235, 352, 353, 824; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *ʾAsrār*, 23. This is inferred also from al-Zajjājī, *al-ʾĪḍāḥ*, 108-109.

58 See also Beeston 1970: 87; Huddleston 1984: 178, 180, 203; Glinert 1989: 520 (ch. 15, n. 12).

59 See also Huddleston 1984: 177, 224; Glinert 1989: 153 ff.

60 See also Huddleston 1984: 203; Glinert 1989: 151-152.

61 See fn. 44.

certain degree of dispensability. However, LEVIN (1995) has already shown that the *mafʿūl bi-hi* occupies an intermediate position between totally indispensable constituents, viz. *ʿumda*, and totally redundant constituents.[62] Several points raised in the following discussion shed some light on the status of prepositional phrases in this respect.[63]

In the present section, the term 'prepositional object' will designate a prepositional phrase introduced by a governed preposition. I refrain from the term 'indirect object', occasionally used in this meaning,[64] since it is often used to designate nominals associated with the semantic role of recipient.[65] For the same reason, I also refrain from using the term 'oblique object'.[66] The term 'direct object' is thus used here to designate any accusative nominal object, irrespective of the semantic role it possesses.

It seems that the standard categorization takes into consideration only direct and prepositional objects, to the exclusion of prepositional phrases which are adjuncts. That is to say, the term *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* cannot apparently be applied, according to the standard categorization, when the preposition in question is not governed.

Now, although, as noted, the line separating governed from non-governed prepositions is extremely blurred and depends on one's linguistic theory, the restriction of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* to governed prepositions can nevertheless be rejected, even by taking into consideration only clear-cut cases, while excluding problematic cases from the discussion.[67]

The very fact that the grammarians do not restrict their assertion that prepositions cause *taʿdiya* (so that the verb in question is *mutaʿaddin* by means of the preposition in question) by criteria of government, is a very strong *argumentum ex silentio*. However, there is also explicit evidence for the lack of such criteria, namely instances where grammarians apply the term *taʿaddin* to prepositions which can by no means be regarded as governed by the verbs. The most clear-cut cases are the following:

Al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 715–716) asserts that sentences such as *ʾatā-nī l-qawmu ḥāšā zaydin* ('the people came to me, except Zayd'), in which *ḥāšā* is a preposition (*ḥarf jarr*), are cases of *taʿaddin* by means of this preposition; being a preposition of exception (*istiṯnāʾ*), it is not governed by any verb.[68]

Al-Zamaxšarī (*al-Mufaṣṣal*, 380) refers to the verb which takes *ḥattā* as *al-fiʿl al-muʿaddā bi-hā* ('the verb which is made to engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship through it').[69]

---

62 See also OWENS 1988: 173-175.

63 Interesting is Ibn al-Sarrāj's (*al-ʾUṣūl*, II, 349-350) discernment of a rather different shade of meaning of the verb *marra* (which constitutes, when taking a prepositional phrase introduced by *bi-*, one of the most frequent illustrations for *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr*) if used without such a prepositional object: *lā turīdu ʾanna-ka mararta bi-šayʾin wa-ʾinnamā turīdu maḍaytu* ('you do not mean that you passed by something, but rather you mean "I went"'). Cf. HUDDLESTON 1984: 178-179.

64 E.g. BEESTON 1970: 87. Cf. GLINERT 1989: 159 ff.

65 Cf. HUDDLESTON 1984: 195-200.

66 Cf. *ibid*: 203.

67 Such problematic cases are, for example, verbs denoting motion, e.g. *ḏahaba + ʾilā* ('he went' + 'to') and *xaraja + min* ('he went out' + 'of'). Note that *bi-* functioning as a 'causativizer' (see §2.6) will be regarded here as governed by its verb. Cf. BADAWI, CARTER and GULLY 2004: 382-383.

68 Note that although Ibn Hišām disagrees with the ascription of the function of *taʿdiya* to these prepositions (see §2.8), he does not base this view on the notion of government.

69 See also al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, IV, 277. This is inferred also from Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 424.

al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, I, 189) refers to the prepositional phrase in the sentence *qataltu bi-ʾaxī-hi zaydan* ('I killed Zayd due to his brother' or 'by means of his brother') as [*… mim-*]*mā yataʿaddā ʾilay-hi l-fiʿlu bi-ḥarfi l-jarri* ('with what the verb engages in a *taʿaddin* relationship [lit. "what the verb passes over to"] through a preposition'). This *bi-* conveys the meaning of reason (or, alternatively, an instrumental meaning).

al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*ibid*, II, 148), in similar fashion, regards the verb *qatala* as *mā ʿuddiya bi-ḥarfi l-jarri* ('what is made to engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship through a preposition') in: *al-marʾu maqtūlun bi-mā qatala bi-hi ʾin sayfin fa-sayfin* ('a man is killed with what he killed with, if he [killed with] a sword, [he is killed with] a sword'). Here it conveys an instrumental meaning.

Finally, al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*ibid*, IV, 261) regards the preposition *li-* in the constructions *zaydun ʿinda-ka li-ʾikrāmi-ka* ('Zayd is at your place out of respect for you') and *zaydun fī l-dāri li-ʾikrāmi-ka* ('Zayd is in the abode out of respect for you') as *muʿaddin li-l-fiʿli l-muqaddari ʾaw li-šibhi-hi* ('making the underlying verb or semi-verb be *mutaʿaddin*'), viz. *istaqarra* ('he stayed') or *mustaqirrun* (the active participle thereof), respectively;[70] this preposition, conveying the meaning of purpose, can here by no means be deemed to be governed by the verb *istaqarra*.[71]

3.3 On the other hand, there is no doubt that the grammarians were aware of the fact that certain verbs govern certain prepositions, and that not every preposition can be construed with every verb. We have seen above (in §2.3) that grammarians occasionally categorize verbs as *mutaʿaddin bi-ḥarf jarr*, where this appellation seems to refer to an inherent trait of the verb to which it is applied. This is manifest, first and foremost, in al-Zajjājī's categorization of verbs according to their *taʿaddin*; recall that al-Zajjājī differentiates between *fiʿl lā yataʿaddā ʾilā mafʿūl* and *fiʿl lā yataʿaddā ʾillā bi-ḥarf xafḍ*, thus regarding *fiʿl mutaʿaddin bi-ḥarf jarr* as a category by itself. Now, since every verb may take certain prepositions which it does not govern, if the latter category had been inclusive (as it is in Ibn al-Sarrāj, see §2.2), there would have been no reason to differentiate between the two categories. Hence it must consist of only a subcategory of verbs not taking accusative nominals, and it is safe to assume that a certain criterion of government is at stake here.

The notion that certain prepositions occur with certain verbs is most explicitly expressed in Ibn Jinnī's (*Sirr*, 124) following statement: *wa-xuṣṣa kullu qabīlin min hāḏihi l-ʾafʿāli bi-qabīlin min hāḏihi l-ḥurūfi* ('every class of these verbs was exclusively assigned with a class of these particles'). Note also the following discussions where grammarians allude to this notion:[72] Ibn al-Sarrāj (*al-ʾUṣūl*, II, 352) states that syndetic relative clauses of the configuration:

---

70 On the *istaqarra*/*mustaqirrun* hypothesis, see PELED 2009: 152-155.

71 See also al-ʾAstarābāḏī's (*Šarḥ*, IV, 289) discussion of *rubba*, where he regards its relationship with its verb as *taʿaddin*, if it is classified as a preposition, whereas he himself classifies it as an *ism* (see also Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 493). A less clear-cut case is the view mentioned by Ibn Hišām (*Muġnī*, 111-112), to the effect that the verb *masaḥa* ('he wiped') engages in a *taʿaddin* relationship, by means of the preposition *bi-*, with a constituent referring to the *muzīl* ('remover'), e.g. water; it is inferred that in such constructions this preposition conveys the meaning of *istiʿāna*, i.e. an instrumental meaning.

72 See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, 12-13.

relative pronoun + verb I (+ accusative nominal or prepositional phrase) + conjunction particle + verb II,

where the latter verb's accusative nominal or prepositional phrase is covert, are acceptable only if the two verbs are identical with regard to their *taʿaddin*. It is therefore permissible to say *allaḏī ḍarabtu fa-ʾawjaʿtu zaydun* ('that whom I hit and pained is Zayd'), since they both take a direct object, the underlying structure of the relative clause being thus *allaḏī ḍarabtu-hu fa-ʾawjaʿtu-hu*. In the same fashion, it is also permissible to say *allaḏī ʾaḥsantu ʾilay-hi wa-ʾasaʾtu zaydun* ('that toward whom I acted well and meanly is Zayd'), since both verbs are identical with respect to the preposition they take, viz. *ilā*. On the other hand, it is impermissible to say *allaḏī ḏahabtu ʾilay-hi*[73] *wa-kafaltu zaydun* ('that to whom I went and for whom I was answerable is Zayd'), since the latter takes a different preposition, viz. *bi-*. This condition is formulated in the following way: *ʾiḏā kāna l-fiʿlāni muttafiqayni fī l-taʿaddī wa-fī l-ḥarfi llaḏī yataʿaddayāni bi-hi* ... ('when the two verbs agree with respect to *taʿaddin* and the particle through which they engage in a *taʿaddin* relationshop …'). Some notion of government seems to pertain to this discussion.

Another such case is al-Jurjānī's (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 615) reference to the verb *ixtāra* (on which see §2.1) as ... *mawḍūʿan ʿalā l-taʿaddī bi-ḥarfi l-jarri fī l-ʾaṣli* ('… coined originally as engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship through the preposition').

Ibn al-ʾAnbārī's (*ʾAsrār*, 109) wording, with regard to the relationship between *bi-* on the one hand, and *ʾaqsama* and *ḥalafa* ('he swore'), on the other, is striking in this respect: in order to substantiate the view that *bi-* is the *ʾaṣl* (lit. "root") of prepositions of oath, i.e. the basic, cardinal one,[74] he states that the verb which is elided in constructions such as *bi-llāhi la-ʾafʿalanna* ('by God, I shall act') is *ʾuqsimu* or *ʾaḥlifu* ('I swear'), and that the preposition causing *taʿdiya* to the oath verb – which is *lāzim* – is *bi-*: *li-ʾanna l-bāʾa huwa l-ḥarfu llaḏī yaqtaḍī-hi l-fiʿlu* ('since *bi-* is the particle which the verb requires').[75]

Finally, al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, IV, 360) says, regarding the verb *šahida*, that [... *ʾanna*] *ʾaṣla šahidtu ʾan yataʿaddā bi-l-bāʾi*.

Sporadic cases in which grammarians refer to prepositions which verbs typically take are ubiquitous.

Interesting are also cases in which grammarians exclude certain verbs from engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship with phrases introduced by certain prepositions. For instance, Ibn Hišām (*Muġnī*, 362) excludes the verb *katama* ('he concealed') from engaging in a *taʿaddin* relationship by means of *min*. The very exclusion of certain verb + preposition combinations from membership in the club of *taʿaddin* is very strong evidence for its exclusiveness.

Consequently, grammarians find it necessary to explain cases in which verbs take prepositions which they do not regularly take (as an inherent trait they possess, i.e. governed prepositions). Such cases are occasionally accounted for as *taḍmīn*, 'implication of meaning'.[76] Ibn Jinnī (*al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, II, 308ff.) maintains, for instance, that when one verb conveys

---

73 The prepositional phrase is lacking in one of the manuscripts.

74 The preposition *wa-* is its *farʿ* (lit. "branch"), and the preposition *ta-* is the *farʿ* of *wa-*, and therefore the *farʿ al-farʿ* of *bi-*. For this usage of the terms *aṣl* and *farʿ* see BAALBAKI 1979: 16, fn. 60; OWENS 1988: 213. On this pair of terms see also BAALBAKI 1988; SULEIMAN 1999.

75 This is explained on semantic grounds, i.e. this preposition's meaning of *ʾilṣāq* (see §2.7).

76 See GULLY 1997.

the meaning of another, the former is sometimes used with the preposition governed by the latter instead of its own (Ibn Jinnī here uses the term *taʿaddin* with regard to the relationship between the verbs and their respective prepositions).[77] Ibn Jinnī refers to the preposition in question as *al-ḥarf al-muʿtād maʿa mā huwa fī maʿnā-hu*, to wit, the preposition which is habitually used with the verb whose meaning is implied by the verb which takes this preposition in the problematic construction. This is exemplified by the following Qurʾānic verse: *uḥilla la-kum laylata l-ṣiyāmi l-rafaṯu ʾilā nisāʾi-kum ...* (Q 2:187) ('Permitted to you, on the night of the fasts, is the approach to your wives' (ALI 2000: 23)). The verb *rafaṯa*, says Ibn Jinnī, does not (usually) take the preposition *ilā*, but either *bi-* or *maʿa*.[78] The use of *ʾilā* in this case is accounted for by the semantic correspondence between *rafaṯa*, in this verse, and *ʾafḍā + ʾilā*; the close relationship between *ʾilā* and *ʾafḍā* is referred to by the statement: *bābu-hu l-ʾifḍāʾu* ('the "category" to which it belongs is *ʾifḍāʾ*'). The same Qurʾānic verse is discussed in a similar fashion also by Ibn Hišām (*Muġnī*, 762–764), who adduces it as a case of *taḍmīn*: *ḍummina l-rafaṯu maʿnā l-ʾifḍāʾi*. That is, the occurrence of the preposition *ilā* in this verb is explained by the fact that the verb *ʾafḍā* governs it,[79] whereas *al-rafaṯ* basically governs the preposition *bi-* (*wa-ʾinnamā ʾaṣlu l-rafaṯi ʾan yataʿaddā bi-l-bāʾi*).[80] The following case also points in the same direction. Al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 614–616) opposes the common view that the verb *istaġfara* ('he asked [someone] to forgive') basically governs the preposition *min*, which may be elided. Since, for him, *istaġfartu [llāha]* means *saʾaltu llāha ʾan yaġfira* ('I asked God to forgive'), in accordance with one of the meanings of Form X (viz. *al-ṭalab wa-l-suʾāl* 'demanding and asking'), the change in transitivity here is identical with the change in transitivity when using Form IV, whereby only one direct object is added, while all other objects are kept intact. Thus, if *istaġfara* had taken *min*, *ġafara* should also have taken this preposition, which is not the case. In order to account for the (derivative) use of *min* with *istaġfara*, al-Jurjānī resorts to the explanatory tool *al-ḥaml*[81] *ʿalā al-maʿnā wa-l-naẓīr* ('making [something] accord with [its] meaning and [its] like'):[82] *lammā kāna fī-hi maʿnā tubtu wa-ʾanabtu ʿuddiya bi-min* ('since it conveys the meaning of *tubtu* and *ʾanabtu* [sc. I repented], it is made to engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship with *min*'). That is to say, since the verb *tāba*, for example, governs the preposition *min*, *istaġfara*, conveying the same meaning, also takes this preposition, by analogy.

Note also that the constructions used by the grammarians in order to illustrate *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* include prepositions which are governed by the verbs in question

---

77 According to Ibn Jinnī this is a case of *ittisāʿ*, on which see VERSTEEGH 1990; LEVIN 1997: 155-157.

78 Note that *maʿa* is not regarded as a preposition by the grammarians, but as an *ism*, see LEVIN 1987: 345, 354-355; *idem* 2007: 135. It is nevertheless integrated in discussions of prepositions, see e.g. Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, II, 306ff.

79 For this Ibn Hišām adduces Q 4:21.

80 See Gully 1997: 471. See also al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, III, 163, IV, 138, 329; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 111-112, 118-119, 575, 731.

81 The edition reads *al-jaml*.

82 Ibn Jinnī (*al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, II, 435) similarly discusses this phenomenon in a chapter entitled *faṣl fī al-ḥaml ʿalā al-maʿnā*. He also uses with this respect the phrase: *... ḥamlan li-l-šayʾi ʿalā naqīḍi-hi kamā yuḥmalu ʿalā naẓīri-hi* ('... out of making something accord with its opposite, just as it is made to accord with its like') (*ibid*, II, 311). See also Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 630-631.

(or, at least, may be regarded as such); for instance, one of the most frequent constructions used by grammarians in order to demonstrate their arguments is *marra + bi-*.

Grammarians also mention cases of ambiguity in verbs, taking into consideration the types of constituent the verbs take in each meaning they convey. For example, al-Mubarrad (*al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 96) lists three meanings of the verb *wajada*: (1) *wajadtu ʿalay-hi*,[83] derived from the infinitive *mawjida*, i.e. to be angry with; (2) *wajadtu*, in the sense of *wajadtu l-ḍāllata* (taking one direct object), i.e. to find; (3) *wajadtu*, in the sense of *ʿalimtu*, i.e. to find out, as in *wajadtu zaydan karīman* ('I found Zayd noble') (taking two direct objects, as a cognitive verb).[84]

Two passages in al-ʾAstarābāḏī's treatise have expressions indicating notions which seem to be close to that of government. First, according to this grammarian (*Šarḥ*, I, 218–219), the subject of a passive verb[85] must be *min ḍarūriyyāt al-fiʿl* (lit. "one of the indispensable things of the verb"), just like the *fāʿil* (the subject of the active verb) and the *mafʿūl* of verbs which are categorized as *mutaʿaddin*. Similarly, he says, the prepositional phrase is *mafʿūl bi-hi*, though by means of a preposition. From this semantic criterion he concludes that prepositional phrases which are not *min ḍarūriyyāt al-fiʿl* are not allowed to implement this function, for example prepositional phrases introduced by *li-* denoting *taʿlīl*, i.e. indicating the reason, since there are actions which are performed for no purpose. Therefore, from the active *jiʾtu-ka li-l-samni* ('I came to you for the clarified butter') one cannot derive *jīʾa li-l-samni. Note, however, that the class of constituents fulfilling the condition of *min ḍarūriyyāt al-fiʿl* is significantly broader than the one dictated by the notion of government, since the former includes also nominals denoting time and place, as well as the *maṣdar*.[86]

Elsewhere he asserts (*ibid*, III, 25–26) that it is permissible to elide the resumptive pronoun in syndetic relative clauses where the pronoun follows a preposition (in which case the preposition is also elided), but only if this preposition is *muʿayyan* (lit. "individuated, particularized"), lest the addressee posit a different preposition. The illustrations al-ʾAstarābāḏī adduces for this concept of *taʿyīn* include *ʾamara + bi-* ('he commanded [someone] + to') and *ḥajja + ʾilā* ('he performed the *ḥajj* + to'); for example, the Qurʾānic expression *ʾa-nasjudu li-mā taʾmurunā* (Q 25:60) ('Shall we adore that which thou commandest us?' (Ali 2000: 299)) means ... *taʾmurunā bi-hi*, *hi* constituting the resumptive pronoun. The concept of *taʿyīn* is nevertheless not identical with that of government. First, al-ʾAstarābāḏī states that it applies also to cases such as *marartu bi-llaḏī mararta* ('I passed by that whom you passed by'), meaning ... *mararta bi-hi*, where a preposition which is not *muʿayyan* (see in what follows), yet identical with the elided preposition, precedes the relative pronoun in question.[87] This concept thus seems to pertain also to the environment in which the verb in question occurs, which is not the case with the notion of government. Second, al-ʾAstarābāḏī adduces the construction *allaḏī marartu*

---

83 Note that al-Mubarrad classifies *ʿalā* as an *ism*, not a preposition (see Kasher 2006: 159-160; for a different interpretation cf. Levin 1987: 357, fn. 105). Yet *ʿalā*, similarly to *maʿa* (see fn. 78), behaves, with regard to the issues at stake here, as a preposition.

84 See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 7; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 92.

85 These constructions will be discussed in §3.4.

86 Moreover, as we shall see in §3.4, al-ʾAstarābāḏī on another occasion permits a prepositional phrase to function as the subject of a passive verb which does not govern its preposition.

87 Incidentally, al-ʾAstarābāḏī's description of such constructions is more complex.

zaydun, from which the prepositional phrase *bi-hi* is elided, in order to illustrate his contention that although some prepositions do not fulfill the condition of *taʿyīn* (*wa-ʾin lam yataʿayyan*), they nevertheless can be elided along with the resumptive pronouns; the lack of *taʿyīn* stems from the fact that it is permissible to posit other prepositional phrases here, e.g. *maʿa-hu*[88] and *la-hu*. The principle of *taʿyīn* thus entails that the addressee can posit only one possible preposition, whereas a verb may govern more than one preposition.[89]

3.4 In light of the previous subsection, why did the grammarians not restrict the extension of the term *taʿaddin* to cover only some of the combinations of verb + preposition, according to a criterion of government?

The main reason seems to be that the term *taʿaddin* came to acquire an inclusive meaning, and denote (after Sībawayhi) the relationship between verbs and every constituent to which they assign the accusative (overtly or covertly), without any exception (see §2.1). Furthermore, the two-stage model of *taʿaddin* by dint of prepositions (see §2.6) can also account for the unrestricted application of *taʿaddin* to prepositions: according to this model, each verb not taking a direct object is basically *ġayr mutaʿaddin*, and becomes *mutaʿaddin* only secondarily, by means of a preposition; what is of relevance for the present discussion is that this model applies to all prepositions, irrespective of whether or not they are governed. It thus applies to *bi-* in *marartu bi-zaydin* in the same sense that it applies to *ḥattā*. It also seems that the grammarians' semantic conception of the prepositions (see §§2.7, 3.2) plays a crucial role in this lack of distinction, since prepositions governed by verbs do not differ semantically from those which are not.

There may well be a syntactic reason for the lack of differentiation between prepositions governed by verbs and those which are not, namely, the fact that the syntactic behavior of these two classes appears to be identical, or at least very similar. In other words, if there had been some syntactic feature common to both direct and prepositional objects, but not to prepositional phrases which are adjuncts, there would have been a syntactic basis for singling out prepositional objects from all other prepositional phrases. But since this is not the case, there is no solid syntactic motivation to restrict the extension of *taʿaddin* in such a way.

Accordingly, grammarians occasionally regard prepositional phrases which are adjuncts as taking (virtually) the accusative case (see §3.1). Thus, al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 1080) regards prepositional phrases introduced by *ḥattā* as *fī mawḍiʿ naṣb*, just like those occurring in the sentences *ḏahabtu ʾilā zaydin* and *marartu bi-zaydin*. In addition, al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, I, 449) refers to the prepositional phrase in *ʾa-bi-l-sawṭi zaydan ḍarabta-hu* ('was it with the whip that Zayd [acc.], you hit him?') as *al-manṣūb maḥallan*.[90]

What I would like to show now is that the four syntactic features which prepositional objects are found to share with direct objects are also shared by prepositional phrases which are adjuncts.[91]

---

88 On *maʿa* as a semi-preposition, see fn. 78.

89 See also al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, IV, 137-139.

90 See also al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 452-453. It is inferred from *ibid*, IV, 265 that al-ʾAstarābāḏī regards such a prepositional phrase as *mafʿūl*. See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 39.

91 The only exception found is the distinction which al-ʾAstarābāḏī draws, as has been shown in §3.3, between prepositional phrases which are *min ḍarūriyyāt al-fiʿl* and those which are not, a distinction

(1) The syntactic equivalence between prepositional phrases and direct objects is manifest, first and foremost, in constructions displaying a conjunction between a prepositional phrase and a direct object, i.e. constructions of the configuration:

> verb + prepositional phrase + conjunctive particle + accusative nominal.

These are adduced by grammarians in order to demonstrate the equivalence between prepositional phrases and direct objects. The accusative case of the latter is occasionally explained as stemming from the virtual accusative case of the prepositional phrase; alternatively, grammarians posit an underlying structure in which a verb, conveying the same meaning of the verb in the surface structure, but which is directly transitive, precedes the accusative nominal and assigns it this case. These two explanations are sometimes seen as two sides of the same coin. For example, al-Mubarrad (*al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 154) explains the accusative of *ʿamr* in *marartu bi-zaydin wa-ʿamran* in the following fashion: *li-ʾanna maʿnā-hu ʾataytu fa-ḥamala-hu ʿalā l-maʿnā ʾiḏ kāna qawlu-ka bi-zaydin baʿda marartu fī mawḍiʿi naṣbin* ('since its meaning is *ʾataytu* [sc. I came to], so he [sc. the speaker] made it accord with its meaning, as *bi-zaydin* following *marartu* occupies the position of a [nominal taking the] accusative'). This embraces the two explanations above: first, the prepositional phrase functions as if it were an accusative nominal, therefore a nominal conjoined to it can also take the accusative; second, an underlying verb, viz. *ʾataytu*, is posited, whose meaning is similar to the meaning of the verb in the surface structure.[92]

However, In order to illustrate this phenomenon, Ibn al-ʾAnbārī (*al-ʾInṣāf*, 333–335) adduces, *inter alia*, the following poetic verses:

> *kašḥan ṭawā min baladin muxtārā min yaʾsati l-yāʾisi ʾaw ḥiḏārā*
> ('he departed from a land, preferring this, out of desperation of the desperate or out of caution'),
>
> *fa-ʾin lam tajid min dūni ʿadnāna wālidan wa-dūna maʿaddin …*
> ('if you find no father after ʿAdnān and Maʿadd)
>
> and
>
> *… ʾiḏā mā talāqaynā mina l-yawmi ʾaw ġadā*

---

which has syntactic implications, i.e. with regard to the possibility to function as a subject of a passive verb (see below). Yet, as we have seen, this distinction is far from identical with the one based on government. Moreover, even this grammarian, as we shall see below, on another occasion permits a prepositional phrase which is an adjunct to function as the subject of a passive verb.

92　See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 38, 130; al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 111, 153; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, II, 13-14, 64-65; Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 102-103, 106-107, 341-343; *idem*, *Sirr*, 130-131; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 327, 331; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 63, IV, 137, 261. See OWENS 1988: 176-177. For a similar analysis of a similar construction, see Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 217; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr*, 131. Ibn Hišām (*Muġnī*, 525-526), however, poses for these constructions the condition that the presence of the preposition in question should not be obligatory. Hence, whereas constructions such as *laysa zaydun bi-qāʾimin wa-lā qāʿidan* ('Zayd is neither standing nor sitting') are acceptable, since it is permissible to omit the preposition *bi-*, *marartu bi-zaydin wa-ʿamran* is unacceptable, for him, since it is impermissible to say *marartu zaydan.

('... when we meet today or tomorrow'),[93]

in each of which *min* is not governed.[94]

(2) The equivalence between prepositional phrases and direct objects is also discussed with regard to the *ištiġāl* (lit. "being occupied") phenomenon.[95] In the basic *ištiġāl* constructions an accusative nominal is followed by a verb (in which the subject is incorporated) with an accusative personal pronoun, this latter co-referring with the accusative nominal, e.g. *ʿabda llāhi ḍarabtu-hu* ('Abdallāh [acc.], I hit him').[96] This notwithstanding, grammarians discuss also constructions of the configuration:

accusative nominal + verb + preposition + genitive personal pronoun

(the latter co-referring with the first nominal), e.g. *zaydan marartu bi-hi* ('Zayd [acc.], I passed by him').[97] Now, with regard to the basic construction the grammarians can easily posit an underlying verb, identical with the verb in the surface structure, preceding the accusative nominal and assigning it its case, i.e. (for the example above) **ḍarabtu ʿabda llāhi ḍarabtu-hu* ('I hit ʿAbdallāh, I hit him').[98] Positing an underlying verb identical with the verb occurring in the surface structure is obviously precluded with regard to the second construction, since the verb in the surface structure takes a prepositional phrase, whereas the underlying verb should assign the accusative to the first nominal, this being its *raison d'être*.[99] Grammarians thus posit a different underlying verb, which is semantically identical with (or, at least, akin to) the verb in question, but is *mutaʿaddin* by means of itself, i.e. (with regard to the example above) **juztu* (or: *laqītu*) *zaydan marartu bi-hi* ('I passed by [or: encountered] Zayd, I passed by him').[100]

However, al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 237) in this context adduces the Qurʾānic verse *yudxilu man yašāʾu fī raḥmati-hi wa-l-ẓālimīna ʾaʿadda la-hum ʿaḏāban ʾalīman* (Q 76:31) ('He will admit to His Mercy whom He will; but the wrongdoers – for them has He prepared a grievous Penalty (ALI 2000: 517)).[101] Just as al-Jurjānī accounts for the construction above by positing the underlying structure **juztu zaydan marartu bi-hi*, so he accounts for the latter by positing the underlying structure **wa-yuʿaḏḏibu l-ẓālimīna ʾaʿadda la-hum ʿaḏāban ʾalīman* (lit. "but He will torment the wrongdoers, He has prepared a grievous torment for them"), although the verb *ʾaʿadda* does not govern the preposition *li-*

---

93 Elsewhere, Ibn al-ʾAnbārī (*al-ʾInṣāf*, 376) ascribes to al-ʾAxfaš a different analysis of this verse, according to which *min* here is otiose.

94 See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, 26; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr*, 130-131; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, IV, 137; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 526.

95 On *ištiġāl* see BAALBAKI 1979: 7 ff.; OWENS 1988: 188; LEVIN 1997: 144-145.

96 See e.g. al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 233.

97 See e.g. *ibid*, 234. Note that al-Jurjānī (*ibid*, 233-234), for instance, discusses another type of *ištiġāl* construction which is irrelevant for the present discussion, on which see CARTER 1985: *passim*.

98 See e.g. al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 233.

99 As al-Jurjānī (*ibid*, 234) puts it: *fa-l-fiʿlu l-muḍmaru nāṣibun wa-l-muẓharu mutaʿaddin bi-l-jārri* ('the covert verb assign the accusative and the overt one engages in a *taʿaddin* relationship through the preposition').

100 See e.g. *ibid*, 235. On this type of *ištiġāl* construction, see also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 32, 33, 37-39, 41-44, 45-46; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 438 ff; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 499, 682; *idem, Šarḥ*, 267-268.

101 See also al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, 40.

, conveying here the benefactive meaning. Note that al-Jurjānī's (*ibid*) explanation of this reconstruction is the same as his explanation of *zaydan marartu bi-hi*, assigning to the verb *ʾaʿadda* the attribute of *mutaʿaddin* by means of a preposition: *li-ʾanna ʾaʿadda qad taʿaddā ʾilā ḍamīri l-ẓālimīna bi-l-jārri wa-l-fiʿlu l-muḍmaru nāṣibun* ('since *ʾaʿadda* engages in a *taʿaddin* relationship with the pronoun of [sc. referring back to] *al-ẓālimīna* through the preposition, while the covert verb assigns the accusative').

Examples of this sort are found already in Sībawayhi (*al-Kitāb*, I, 42–43): amidst his discussion of such a construction introduced by the interrogative particle *ʾa*, one can find the following two sentences: *ʾāl-sawṭa ḍuriba bi-hi zaydun* ('the whip [acc.], was Zayd hit with it?') and *ʾāl-xiwāna ʾukila l-laḥmu ʿalay-hi* ('the table [acc.], was the flesh eaten on it?'),[102] alongside *ʾa-zaydan summīta bi-hi* ('Zayd [acc.], were you named so?'). Whereas *bi-* in the latter is governed by the verb,[103] this is the case in neither the first nor the second sentence: in the first, the preposition *bi-*, conveying an instrumental meaning, is not governed by the verb *ḍaraba*; in the second, *ʿalā* conveys a locative meaning and is not governed by the verb *ʾakala*. Yet, Sībawayhi maintains that the prepositional phrase (or the genitive nominal alone) is *fī mawḍiʿ naṣb*, since if *ʾāl-sawṭa ḍuribta* had been acceptable, the nominal introducing it would have been in the accusative, just like the pseudo-sentence *ʾa-zaydan marartu*.[104]

(3) Although the unmarked choice for the constituent in an active sentence which is to function as the subject of the corresponding passive sentence is a direct object, e.g. *ḍuriba zaydun* ('Zayd was hit') (corresponding to e.g. [my illustration] *ḍaraba ʿabdu llāhi zaydan* ("Abdallāh hit Zayd")),[105] grammarians also discuss constructions where it is a prepositional phrase, a *ẓarf* or *al-mafʿūl al-muṭlaq*, i.e. cognate accusative[106] (in the corresponding active sentence), which assumes this function (on conditions which will not be discussed here). The paradigmatic illustration for the first is *sīra bi-zaydin* ('Zayd was made to go').[107]

However, the following discussion by al-Mubarrad (*al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 51–52) shows that this is not restricted to prepositional objects. He states, first, that when a preposition is attached to the *mafʿūl*, which precludes it from functioning as a subject, a *ẓarf* or a *maṣdar* may assume this function (which is impossible if the *mafʿūl* is an accusative nominal). Such

---

102 These two sentences (with occasional minor changes) are discussed also in al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 449-453. Note that for Sībawayhi, *ʿalā* is an *ism*, not a preposition (see LEVIN 1987: 357; KASHER 2006: 156-158), yet it is treated as a preposition with regard to the issues discussed here (see fn. 83). Al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, IV, 323), on the other hand, classifies it as a preposition, unless preceded by *min*.

103 On this *bi-* see Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 12-13.

104 Several manuscripts lack the last statement, regarding *ʾa-zaydan marartu*. On these constructions see Owens 1988: 298-299, n. 220.

105 See e.g. al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 50.

106 On *al-mafʿūl al-muṭlaq*, see LEVIN 1991.

107 See al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, II, 52, IV, 332; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 78, 168, 202-203; al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, 80-81; Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr*, 131-132; *idem*, *al-Lumaʿ*, 14; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 352-355; al-Zamaxšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal*, 343-344; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *ʾAsrār*, 41, 79; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 64, 218-221, II, 302, III, 427, 429; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ*, 262-263. See OWENS 1988: 182-183. Note that al-Mubarrad (*al-Muqtaḍab*, IV, 332) accounts for the possibility of prepositional phrases to function as subjects by putting the constructions *sīra bi-zaydin* on a par with *ḍuriba zaydun*

is, for example, the construction *sīra bi-zaydin sayrun šadīdun* ('Zayd was made to go ve-hemently [nom.]') (or: *yawmu l-jumʿati* 'on Friday'). Another illustration of this principle is *ḍuriba bi-zaydin ʿišrūna sawṭan* ('twenty [nom.] whip strokes [nom.] were struck due to Zayd'), whose prepositional phrase is explained as *bi-sabab zayd* or *min ʾajli-hi*. On the other hand, a few lines later, al-Mubarrad does allow the genitive nominal to function as the subject of a passive verb, notwithstanding its preposition, illustrating this with the sen-tence *sīra bi-zaydin farsaxan* ('Zayd was made to go a parasang'). One may readily infer from this discussion that the possibility for such constituents to assume this function ap-plies also to the preposition *bi-zaydin* in the sentence *ḍuriba bi-zaydin*, in which the prepo-sition *bi-*, conveying the meaning of reason, is not governed by the verb *ḍaraba*.[108]

In a similar vein, Ibn Jinnī (*al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 397) adduces the following poetic verse as a case in which a prepositional phrase (viz. *bi-ḏālika l-jirwi*)[109] functions as the subject of a passive verb, although the sentence includes also a *mafʿūl bi-hi ṣaḥīḥ*,[110] viz. *al-kilāba*:

> *wa-law waladat qufayratu jirwa kalbin la-subba bi-ḏālika l-jirwi l-kilābā.*
> 'had Qufayra given birth to a whelp, the dogs would have been reviled because of that whelp'

This *bi-*, here also conveying the meaning of reason, is not governed by the verb *sabba*.[111]

Finally, in a discussion of the preposition *min* conveying the meaning of *tabʿīḍ* ('indicating division into parts'), al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, IV, 265) proves his contention that in the construction *ʾaxaḏtu mina l-darāhimi* ('I took [some] of the dirhams'), from which the direct object (*al-mafʿūl al-ṣarīḥ*), e.g. *šayʾan*, is elided,[112] the preposition *min* 'depends'[113] on the verb (rather than functioning as an attribute to the direct object), by adducing the construction *ʾuxiḏa mina l-darāhimi* ('[some] of the dirhams were taken'), in which the prepositional phrase functions as the subject,[114] this notwithstanding the fact that this *min* cannot be regarded as governed by the verb.[115]

(4) The equivalence between accusative nominals and prepositional phrases is manifest also in cases where verbs can take either a direct object or a prepositional phrase, while the meaning is kept intact. Of such verbs, some are said to be basically directly *mutaʿaddin*, although an otiose preposition might be added, e.g. *xaššantu bi-ṣadri-hi* ('I exasperated him') (according to Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, II, 63); some are said to take a prepositional

---

108 See also Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 79.

109 Or: *jarw* or *jurw*.

110 See fn. 50.

111 Note that such a construction, in which a prepositional phrase functions as a subject notwithstanding the existence of a nominal *mafʿūl bi-hi*, is deemed by Ibn Jinnī *min ʾaqbaḥ al-ḍarūra* ('of the most ugly type of poetic license'); however, the fact that the preposition is not governed by the verb has nothing to do with this judgment.

112 Also in: *axaḏtu mina l-darāhimi hāḏā* ('I took of the dirhams, this'), where the direct object is definite.

113 *Mutaʿalliqa*. See CARTER (ed.) 1981: 135, §5.82 n. 6; LEVIN 1987: 360, 362; KOULOUGHLI 1999: 48-49.

114 It may be inferred that this argument is based on the assumption that only (but not all) constituents 'depending' on an active verb may function as the subject of the equivalent passive verb.

115 Recall, however, al-ʾAstarābāḏī's distinction, in this context, between two types of prepositional phrase, discussed in §3.3.

phrase, although the preposition might be elided, and in consequence the verb assigns the accusative to the (originally genitive) nominal, e.g. *ixtāra* (see §2.1);[116] and some are said to be free to take either an accusative nominal or a prepositional phrase, e.g. *naṣaḥa*, which can take either a direct object or a prepositional phrase introduced by *li-* (according to al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, 31).[117]

However, while one may readily hold that the preposition *li-* is governed by the verb *naṣaḥa*, al-Zajjājī (*al-Jumal*, 31) adduces two verbs which behave in the same fashion, yet, claiming that they govern the preposition *li-* seems to be rather forced; these are *kāla* and *wazana*.[118]

It thus follows that the difference between governed and non-governed prepositions has no bearing on the theory of *ʿamal*, the main pivot around which the whole Arabic grammatical tradition revolves.[119]

To recapitulate, these syntactic phenomena, which are common to both prepositional phrases and direct objects, are not restricted, with respect to the former, to prepositional objects. The linguistic facts do not furnish a solid syntactic foundation for distinguishing between governed and non-governed prepositions.

3.5 Parsing every prepositional phrase as a *mafʿūl bi-hi* results in a theoretical difficulty with regard to the category of *ẓarf*, since grammarians generally classify as *ẓarf*s not only accusative nominals, but also prepositional phrases conveying locative or temporal meaning. Sībawayhi (*al-Kitāb*, I, 241), for example, refers to *fī-hā* in the sentence *inna fī-hā*

---

116 Note incidentally that the elision of a preposition might be a case of irregularity, of poetic license or even of a hypothetical construction.

117 See e.g. Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 12-13, 37, 67, 68, 167, II, 226, 230; al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, II, 34-36, 83, 320, 325-326, IV, 330-331, 337-339; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 171, 177-180, 432-433, II, 14; al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, 28, 31, 72; Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, I, 284, II, 211-212, 278; *idem*, *Sirr*, 122, 124, 133 ff.; *idem*, *al-Lumaʿ*, 22, 30-31, 73-74; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 89, 376-377, 567-568, 603, 613 ff., 622-623, 660, 710, 814, 867-868; al-Zamaxšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal*, 347, 367-368, 382, 387-388; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 283-284, 375-376; *idem*, *ʾAsrār*, 69, 84; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 189, 198, 220, 296, 334, 503, II, 190, 369, IV, 136-139, 285; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 32, 115-116, 237-238, 242-243, 491-492, 526, 579, 637, 682. See OWENS 1988: 298, n. 219. One should not infer that the grammarians were in unanimous agreement on the categorization of verbs into these three categories. It is also not certain that all grammarians even distinguish between these three categories. Al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, IV, 136), for instance, subsumes the third category under the first, averring that wherever the two options, i.e. with and without the preposition, are equally used, the preposition is deemed otiose.

118 Al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 616; see also al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, IV, 285), however, subsumes these verbs under the second category. To these two he also adds the verb *kasaba* ('he earned'), although he maintains that when *li-* is elided here the meaning alters. Similarly, Ibn Hišām (*Muġnī*, 242-243) adduces *kāla* and *wazana* as verbs which take accusative nominals as a result of the elision of the preposition *li-*. To these he adds more such cases (in which the constituents in question possess the benefactive meaning), e.g. *janā* ('he gathered [fruits etc.]'). Admittedly, this syntactic feature is less clear-cut, with regard to the prepositions' not being governed, than the first three, since it may be suggested that the very possibility of such verbs to take the same nominals as direct objects and in prepositional phrases results in regarding the latter as objects too

119 Cf. BOBZIN 1983: 100. KOULOUGHLI (1999: 48-49) contends that the theory of *ʿamal* has nothing to say about the relationšip between verbs and prepositions, and that Arabic grammatical theory has recourse, in this case, to the concept of *taʿalluq* (see above).

ʿabda llāhi[120] qāʾiman ("ʿAbdallāh is in it [sc. the abode] standing') as a *ẓarf*. Al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, I, 243) explicitly refers to the grammarians' practice of labeling prepositional phrases as *ẓarf*s: commenting on Ibn al-Ḥājib's words *wa-mā waqaʿa ẓarfan* …, al-ʾAstarābāḏī says that Ibn al-Ḥājib means both *ẓarf*s and prepositional phrases, and that the reason for not mentioning the latter is that their syntactic behavior is just like the *ẓarf*s', to the extent that *ẓarf* is occasionally used as a term covering also prepositional phrases.[121] The corollary from this practice, on the one hand, and from the discussion in previous subsections, on the other, is that prepositional phrases are entitled to be parsed both as *mafʿūl bi-hi* and as *ẓarf*, these two being, however, two terms denoting totally distinct functions.

To complicate things even further, grammarians frequently classify as *ẓarf*s prepositional phrases which do not convey any locative or temporal meaning. Ibn al-Sarrāj (*al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 205) explicitly treats as *ẓarf*s prepositional phrases which do not designate locations: *wa-ʾiḏā kāna l-ẓarfu ġayra maḥallin li-l-ʾasmāʾi* … ('and when the *ẓarf* does not denote a location of [the referents of] the nouns'). This class is exemplified by the sentences *fī-ka ʿabdu llāhi rāġibun* ('you ʿAbdallāh desires'), *min-ka ʾaxawā-ka hāribāni* ('from you your two brothers are running away') and *ʾilay-ka qawmu-ka qāṣidūna* ('towards you your people are going').[122] The problem of 'double identity' pertains thus to all prepositional phrases.

Moreover, grammarians contend that nominal *ẓarf*s are underlyingly prepositional phrases. For instance, Ibn al-Sarrāj (*al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 190) states that the preposition *fī*, labeled *ḥarf al-ẓarf* ('the *ẓarf*'s particle'), occurs in the underlying structure of sentences such as *qumtu l-yawma* ('I stood up today') (in which *al-yawma* is *mafʿūl fī-hi* designating time), which is the reason for labeling such constituents as *ẓarf*s.[123] The problem, therefore, extends also to nominal *ẓarf*s, and thus jeopardizes the very distinction between *mafʿūl bi-hi* and *ẓarf* (viz. *mafʿūl fī-hi*).

We have also mentioned in §2.1 that whereas the term *taʿaddin* applies in Sībawayhi's *al-Kitāb* only to the relationship between a verb and a *mafʿūl* (*bi-hi*), in later treatises it acquires a double meaning: in the more restricted meaning it applies only to *mafʿūl bi-hi*, while in its more general meaning it applies also to constituents implementing other functions, e.g. *ẓarf*. If we consider the grammarians' conception of *taʿaddin* with regard to prepositional phrases, that is, that the basic function of prepositions is the *taʿdiya* of verbs to constituents with which they cannot engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship directly, then *fī* introducing locative or temporal prepositional phrases is no exception, and the term *taʿaddin* conveys the same meaning with regard to it as it does with regard to all other prepositions. This type of *taʿaddin* is on a par with the *taʿaddin* of verbs to direct objects, that is, it conveys the restricted significance. The inclusion of this *fī* as an ordinary member

---

120 The sentence, as a matter of fact, includes *zayd*; however, in the course of the discussion Sībawayhi 'renames' him *ʿabd allāh*.

121 See also al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, I, 289-290. See KASHER 2006: 39-47; LEVIN 2007: 135. Henceforth, every such prepositional phrase will be treated as a *ẓarf*, even when it is not explicitly classified as such by the grammarian dealt with.

122 It is not certain that Sībawayhi regards such prepositional phrases as *ẓarf*s, although there is evidence pointing in this direction. For further discussion see KASHER 2006: 47ff.

123 See OWENS 1989: 230-232; KASHER 2006: 131-136.

of the club of prepositions is conspicuous in the discussions grammarians dedicate to prepositions, where they refer to their functions and meanings (see §2.7). For instance, Ibn Jinnī in a chapter entitled *bāb ḥurūf al-jarr* (*al-Lumaʿ*, 30–31), after presenting a list of prepositions, including *fī*, asserts: *fa-hāḏihi l-ḥurūfu tajurru mā tattaṣilu bi-hi wa-tuḍāfu ʾilay-hi* ('these particles assign the genitive to what [sc. the noun which] they are connected with'). This is followed by an illustrated list of prepositions and their meanings; the discussion of *fī* immediately follows *min* and *ʾilā*: *wa-maʿnā fī l-wiʿāʾu wa-l-ẓarfiyyatu taqūlu zaydun fī l-dāri wa-l-mālu fī l-kīsi* ('the meaning of *fī* is a receptacle and of place/time qualification ["*ẓarf*-ness"; note that *ẓarf* also means 'receptacle'], e.g. *zaydun fī l-dāri* ['Zayd is in the abode'] and *al-mālu fī l-kīsi* ['the money is in the bag']').[124] That is to say, the syntactic behavior of *fī* is identical with that of other prepositions, and the meaning it conveys is deemed just another meaning of a preposition. On the other hand, the classification of these prepositional phrases as *ẓarf*s entails that the term *taʿaddin*, when applied to them, conveys the same meaning it does when applied to nominal *ẓarf*s, i.e. the general significance.[125]

Moreover, grammarians occasionally put prepositional phrases conveying locative meaning, and consequently are to be parsed as *ẓarf*s, on a par, regarding their syntactic behavior, with prepositional phrases which are not so parsed. For instance, the occurrence of the preposition *fī* in prepositional phrases designating specific locations, e.g. *al-masjid* ('the mosque'), is explained by al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 643) in line with the two-stage model discussed above: since verbs which cannot engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship with nominals such as *zayd* are also unable to engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship with nominals such as *al-masjid*, a preposition comes to the rescue, so instead of the ungrammatical **qaʿadtu l-masjida*, one says *qaʿadtu fī l-masjidi* ('I sat in the mosque'), just as one says *qaʿadtu ʾilā zaydin* ('I sat with Zayd'). In the same vein, al-Jurjānī (*ibid*, 274–275) explains that *ẓarf*s functioning as predicates are, in fact, clauses, due to the fact that the preposition *fī* (e.g. in *fī l-dāri*) needs some verb to 'depend' on (*tataʿallaqu bi-hi*, see §3.4) since the function of prepositions is to connect (*li-tūṣila*) verbs to nominals, as they do in the sentences *qumtu ʾilā zaydin* ('I stood up to be by Zayd') and *ḏahabtu min dāri-ka* ('I went out of your abode').[126]

Illustrations including locative or temporal prepositional phrases are also adduced in discussions pertinent to the four syntactic phenomena discussed in the previous subsection:

(1) Conjunction constructions: After al-Jurjānī (*ibid*, 234–235) discusses the sentence *marartu bi-zaydin wa-ʿamran*, putting forward the two explanations mentioned above

---

124 Al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, IV, 261) introduces such a discussion of prepositions, including *fī*, by explicitly pointing to their function as *taʿdiya* of verbs to genitive nominals, these latter being referred to as *mafʿūl bi-hi*. It is also inferred from his discussion that the preposition *fī* causes such a *taʿdiya*. However, as will be shown below, this grammarian puts forward an extremely unorthodox theory with regard to the relationship between *mafʿūl bi-hi* and *ẓarf*

125 This problem, too, pertains also to nominal *ẓarf*s, due to the theory that these are, underlyingly, prepositional phrases (see above). In other words, due to the reduction grammarians initiate of nominal *ẓarf*s to prepositional phrases introduced by *fī*, theoretical problems the latter pose apply also to the former.

126 See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 237-238, 241-242; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl*, I, 244-245, 255, 437; al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 231-233, 632, 850-851; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 246; *idem*, *ʾAsrār*, 73; al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, III, 465 (on this grammarian's exceptional theory see below); Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 493. This is inferred also from Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf*, 263.

(while opting for the verb *juztu*, instead of *ʾataytu*), he adduces, for the same end, the following poetic verse:

> *yaḏhabna fī najdin wa-ġawran ġāʾirā*
> ('they travel in Najd [a high land] and in a low land [sc. Tihāma]'),

accounting for the accusative of *ġawr* in the following manner: *fa-ka-ʾanna-hu qāla yaslukna najdan wa-ġawran.*[127] The verb is regarded as *al-muʿaddā bi-l-jārr*, and the accusative is accounted for on the ground that the genitive nominal is *mafʿūl* with regard to *al-maʿnā*. This construction, it should be noted, is adduced in order to explain the *ištiġāl* construction, e.g. *zaydan marartu bi-hi.*[128]

(2) *Ištiġāl* constructions: In the chapter following Sībawayhi's (*al-Kitāb*, I, 32) discussion of *ištiġāl* constructions with prepositional phrases, entitled *hāḏā bābu mā yajrī mimmā yakūnu ẓarfan hāḏā l-majrā* ('this is a chapter on *ẓarf*s behaving likewise [i.e. in the same constructions discussed in the previous chapter]'), he discusses (*ibid*, I, 33–35), *inter alia*, *ištiġāl* constructions in which the preposition in question and the nominal introducing the sentence are *ẓarf*s. He states that it is permitted to say, for instance, *yawma l-jumʿati ʾātī-ka fī-hi* ('on Friday [acc.], I shall come to you then [lit. "in it"]'), as it is permissible to say *ʿabda llāhi marartu bi-hi*. The nominal here is a *ẓarf*, and the underlying structure is **ʾalqā-ka yawma l-jumʿati [ʾātī-ka fī-hi]* ('I shall encounter you on Friday, [I shall come to you then]').

In the same vein, after Ibn Hišām (*Muġnī*, 499) discusses *ištiġāl* constructions in which there is no other choice but to posit a verb different than the verb in the surface structure (e.g. *zaydan marartu bi-hi*, to which he posits the verb *jāwaza*), he asserts that when verbs may take either a direct object or a prepositional phrase, a verb identical with the verb in the surface structure may be posited, and hence the verb posited in the construction *zaydan šakartu la-hu* ('Zayd [acc.], I thanked him') is also *šakartu*: *li-ʾanna šakara yataʿaddā bi-l-jārri wa-bi-nafsi-hi* ('since *šakara* engages in a *taʿaddin* relationship either through an operator or the genitive [sc. the preposition *li-*] or through itself'). Immediately afterwards, he points out that this applies also to the *ẓarf*, as in the construction *yawma l-jumʿati ṣumtu fī-hi* ('on Friday [acc.], I fasted then [lit. "on it"]') (it is inferred that the underlying verb is also *ṣumtu*): *li-ʾanna l-ʿāmila lā yataʿaddā ʾilā ḍamīri l-ẓarfi bi-nafsi-hi maʿa ʾanna-hu yataʿaddā ʾilā ẓāhiri-hi bi-nafsi-hi* ('since the operator does not engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship with [lit. "does not pass over to"] the pronouns of *ẓarf*s through itself, whereas it does so with overt *ẓarf*s').[129]

(3) Prepositional phrases functioning as subjects of passive verbs: al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, I, 221) discusses the conditions which a *ẓarf* must fulfill in order to implement this function. The illustrative constructions adduced in his discussion include *ʿind*, *fī l-dāri* and *fī-hā*.[130]

---

127 See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 38.
128 See also Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 526.
129 Note the use of *taʿaddin* in this discussion. See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 43, 45.
130 Al-ʾAstarābāḏī also adduces in this context a Qurʾānic verse which includes a prepositional phrase introduced by *ʿan*, but this stems from the general meaning of the term *ẓarf*, which covers all prepositional phrases. Note that for this grammarian, *ʿan* is a preposition, unless preceded by *min* (see al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ*, IV, 323).

(4) Verbs taking either a prepositional phrase or a direct object: al-Jurjānī (*al-Muqtaṣid*, 646) states that basically verbs of the category *al-fiʿl ġayr al-mutaʿaddī* engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship with nominals designating specific locations by means of a preposition, so that constructions lacking such a preposition are explained as cases of elision of the preposition.[131] For instance, the underlying structure of the poetic verse

> … *kamā ʿasala l-ṭarīqa l-taʿlabu* ('… as the fox ran on the way shaking')

is … *kamā ʿasala fī l-ṭarīqi [l-taʿlabu]*, since *al-ṭarīq* designate a specific location.[132]

This problem of the double-identity of prepositional phrases reaches its peak in al-ʾIsfarāʾīnī (*al-Lubāb*, 84–85). This grammarian distinguishes between two types of *al-mafʿūl bi-hi*, direct and prepositional. The former separates *al-mutaʿaddī* from *ġayr al-mutaʿaddī* while on the latter he remarks: *wa-yusammā ẓarfan ʾayḍan* ('and it is also termed *ẓarf*'). However, elsewhere (*ibid*, 81–83) he regards the *ẓarf* (= *mafʿūl fī-hi*), in line with grammatical tradition, as a separate category of *al-manṣūb*.[133]

Of the grammarians we examined, the only one who tackled this problem is al-ʾAstarābāḏī, who attributed to his predecessors a consistent theory with regard to the relationship of *mafʿūl bi-hi*, *ẓarf* and prepositional phrases, and propounded an alternative, extremely unorthodox, theory of his own on the matter.

A few lines after his assertion that the term *ẓarf* may apply also to prepositional phrases, in his discussion of the operator of *ẓarf*s (here only nominal *ẓarf*s are intended) and prepositional phrases functioning as predicates, he ascribes (*Šarḥ*, I, 244) to the Baṣrans the view that the *ẓarf* in these constructions takes the accusative as a *mafʿūl fī-hi*, just as it does in cases such as *xarajtu yawma l-jumʿati* ('I went out on Friday') (that is, where the verb is overt), whereas the prepositional phrase takes a virtual accusative as a

---

131 This is a case of *ittisāʿ*.

132 See also Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 11; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *ʾAsrār*, 73-74; Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 579, 637. A similar case is the problematic verb *daxala* (e.g. in the construction *daxala fī l-dāri*, see §2.5), which is occasionally discussed together with the also problematic *ḏahaba l-šāma* ('he went to Syria'), this latter construction being interpreted as stemming from the elision of *ilā* (see e.g. Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, 11; Ibn al-Sarrāj, I, 171). However, grammarians do not parse *fī l-dāri* here explicitly as *ẓarf*, and occasionally even posit *ilā* as the elided preposition (see e.g. al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid*, 600). Only two cases were found which could perhaps be taken as evidence that this prepositional phrase might be regarded (at least by the respective grammarians) as a *ẓarf*. First, al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ*, I, 492) asserts that *daxala* assigns the accusative to any nominal as a *ẓarf*, including in *daxaltu l-dāra*, which is explained as a case of elision of *fī*. One infers *a fortiori* that the underlying prepositional phrase is also a *ẓarf*. Incidentally, he attributes this view also to Sībawayhi (See also *ibid*, II, 369). The second instance is Ibn Hišām's (*Muġnī*, 159) discussion of a construction in which the verb *wanā* takes the preposition *ʿan*, said to convey in this case the meaning of *ẓarfiyya*: *li-ʾanna wanā lā yataʿaddā ʾillā bi-fī* ('since *wanā* does not engage in a *taʿaddin* relationship except through *fī*'). The sentence *wanā fī-hi* is interpreted as *daxala fī-hi wa-fatara* ('he entered upon it but was remiss', *wanā ʿan-hu* meaning, for him, 'he passed from it, not entering upon it'). However, in addition to the fact that this evidence is extremely convoluted, the term *ẓarfiyya* may be used here in a more general, non-technical, meaning. (On Ibn Hišām's classification of *ʿan* as a preposition, probably in all cases except when preceded by *min* or *ʿalā*, see LEVIN 1987: 356-357; KASHER 2006: 169-171.)

133 Incidentally, the same definition of *al-mafʿūl bi-hi* (with extremely similar wording) appears in al-Jurjānī, *al-Taʿrīfāt*, 241, yet this does not prevent the next entry in this book of definitions to be *al-mafʿūl fī-hi* (*ibid*, 242).

mafʿūl bi-hi, just as it does in cases such as *marartu bi-zaydin* (that is, here also, where the verb is overt). In other words, prepositional phrases (both locative/temporal and non-locative/temporal, it is inferred) are, in fact, to be parsed as *mafʿūl bi-hi*, although they are occasionally referred to as *ẓarf*s, but only due to their syntactic behavior.

His own theory is expressed elsewhere (*ibid*, I, 502–505). Here al-ʾAstarābāḏī discusses the grammarians' theory that the *ẓarf* may' become *mafʿūl bi-hi*, while keeping its meaning intact.[134] This new status acquired by the *ẓarf* entails that its syntactic behavior is identical with a regular *mafʿūl bi-hi*. For example, when it undergoes pronominalization, it is not preceded by *fī* anymore, e.g. *yawma l-jumʿati ṣumtu-hu* ('on Friday [acc.], I fasted then [lit. "it"]').[135] The climax of his discussion is reached when he states that the *ẓarf*[136] always possesses this status: the underlying structure of the sentence *xarajtu yawma l-jumʿati* is *xarajtu fī yawmi l-jumʿati*, in which the prepositional phrase is *mafʿūl bi-hi* by means of a preposition, so that after its elision, *yawma l-jumʿati* becomes *mafʿūl bi-hi* by means of no preposition, while keeping its (here: temporal) meaning intact. This is the same process of preposition elision which results in the construction *istaġfartu llāha ḏanaban* (see §3.3). The *mafʿūl fī-hi* (=*ẓarf*) is thus subsumed under *mafʿūl bi-hi*. According to this theory, the problem portrayed above, of whether one should parse prepositional phrases as *mafʿūl bi-hi* or as *mafʿūl fī-hi*, does not even arise.

4. Conclusion

The findings discussed in the present article show that what was termed here 'the standard categorization' of verbs according to their *taʿaddin*, ascribed to the Arab grammarians, is inaccurate:

First, the term *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* does not, in most cases, constitute a sub-category of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī*. Rather, it denotes the possibility of verbs to be connected, by means of prepositions, with constitutents with which they do not engage in a direct *taʿaddin* relationship. The preposition is regarded as an aid, enabling the verb to engage in such a *taʿaddin* relationship, as well as imposing a certain meaning on this relationship.

Second, the applicability of the term *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* is not restricted to cases where the preposition at stake is governed. Rather, the basic function of all preposi-tions is regarded as 'transitivizing' verbs to constituents with which they do not engage in direct *taʿaddin*, irrespective of whether or not the preposition in question is governed by the verb; this notwithstanding the fact that grammarians were aware of the linguistic phenome-non of government of prepositions by verbs.

It was demonstrated how detrimental the lack of differentiation between governed and non-governed prepositions, with respect to the application of the terms *taʿaddin* and *mafʿūl bi-hi*, is to the notion of *ẓarf*.

The findings of the present article are based on grammatical treatises. A fuller picture of the notion of *al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī bi-ḥarf jarr* could perhaps be obtained by studying lexico-

---

134 On this case of *tawassuʿ*, see fn. 9.

135 In contrast with *yawma l-jumʿati ṣumtu fī-hi* (an illustration which does not occur in this context).

136 He maintains that this analysis pertains also to *mafʿūl la-hu*, i.e. the accusative of reason.

graphical writings as well, especially since lexicons are expected to provide information on the prepositions each and every verb governs.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* = [Raḍī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-ʾAstarābāḏī]: *Šarḥ al-Raḍī ʿalā al-Kāfiya*, ed. Y. Ḥ. ʿUMAR. n.p. n.d.

al-Jurjānī, *al-Muqtaṣid* = ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī: *Kitāb al-Muqtaṣid fī šarḥ al-ʾĪḍāḥ*, ed. K. BAḤR AL-MARJĀN. Baghdad 1982.

al-Jurjānī, *al-Taʿrīfāt* = ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Šarīf al-Jurjānī: *Kitāb al-Taʿrīfāt*, ed. G. FLÜGEL. Beirut 1990.

Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *ʾAsrār* = Kamāl al-Dīn ʾAbū l-Barakāt ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Saʿīd al-ʾAnbārī: *Kitāb ʾAsrār al-ʿarabiyya*, ed. C. F. SEYBOLD. Leiden 1886.

Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *al-ʾInṣāf* = Kamāl al-Dīn ʾAbū l-Barakāt ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Saʿīd al-ʾAnbārī: *al-ʾInṣāf fī masāʾil al-xilāf bayna al-naḥwiyyīna al-baṣriyyīna wa-l-kūfiyyīna*, ed. M.M. ʿABD AL-ḤAMĪD. [Egypt] 1961 [4th ed.].

Ibn al-Ḥājib, *al-Kāfiya* = Jamāl al-Dīn ʾAbū ʿAmr ʿUṯmān ibn ʿUmar al-maʿrūf bi-Ibn al-Ḥājib: *Kitāb al-Kāfiya fī l-naḥw ... šaraḥa-hu Raḍī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-ʾAstarābāḏī*, Beitut n.d.

Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Mūjaz* = ʾAbū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Sarrāj: *al-Mūjaz fī l-naḥw*, ed. M. AL-ŠUWAYMĪ and B. DĀMIRJĪ. Beirut [1965].

Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-ʾUṣūl* = ʾAbū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Sahl ibn al-Sarrāj: *al-ʾUṣūl fī l-naḥw*, ed. ʿA. AL-FATLĪ. Beirut 1988 [3rd ed.].

Ibn Jinnī, *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ* = ʾAbū l-Fatḥ ʿUṯmān ibn Jinnī: *al-Xaṣāʾiṣ*, ed. M. ʿA. AL-NAJJĀR, Beirut n.d. [2nd ed.].

Ibn Jinnī, *al-Lumaʿ* = ʾAbū l-Fatḥ ʿUṯmān ibn Jinnī: *Kitāb al-Lumaʿ fī l-naḥw*, ed. H. M. KECHRIDA. Uppsala 1976.

Ibn Jinnī, *Sirr* = ʾAbū l-Fatḥ ʿUṯmān ibn Jinnī: *Sirr ṣināʿat al-ʾiʿrāb*, ed. Ḥ. HINDĀWĪ, Damascus 1985.

Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* = Jamāl al-Dīn ibn Hišām al-ʾAnṣārī: *Muġnī al-labīb ʿan kutub al-ʾaʿārīb*, eds. M. AL-MUBĀRAK and M. ʿA. ḤAMD ALLĀH, 2nd ed. [Damascus] n.d.

Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ* = ʾAbū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh Jamāl al-Dīn ibn Hišām al-ʾAnṣārī: *Šarḥ qaṭr al-nadā wa-ball al-ṣadā*, ed. M. M. ʿABD AL-ḤAMĪD. Cairo 1966 [12th ed.].

al-ʾIsfarāʾīnī, *al-Lubāb* = al-ʾIsfarāʾīnī: *al-Lubāb fī ʿilm al-ʾiʿrāb*, ed. Š. AL-MAʿARRĪ. Beirut 1996.

al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab* = ʾAbū l-ʿAbbās Muḥammad ibn Yazīd al-Mubarrad: *al-Muqtaḍab*, ed. M. ʿA. ʿUḌAYMA. Cairo AH 1386–1399 [2nd ed.].

Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb* = Sībawayhi: *al-Kitāb*, ed. H. DERENBOURG. Paris 1881–1889 [repr. Hildesheim 1970].

Yāqūt, *Muʿjam* = Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī al-Rūmī: *Muʿjam al-ʾudabāʾ: ʾIršād al-ʾarīb ʾilā maʿrifat al-ʾadīb*, ed. ʾI. ʿABBĀS. Beirut 1993.

al-Zajjājī, *al-ʾĪḍāḥ* = ʾAbū l-Qāsim al-Zajjājī: *al-ʾĪḍāḥ fī ʿilal al-naḥw*, ed. M. AL-MUBĀRAK. Beirut 1986 [5th ed.].

al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal* = ʾAbū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʾIsḥāq al-Zajjājī: *Kitāb al-Jumal fī l-naḥw*, ed. ʿA. T. AL-ḤAMAD. Beirut 1985 [2nd ed.].

al-Zajjājī, *Ḥurūf* = ʾAbū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʾIsḥāq al-Zajjājī: *Kitāb Ḥurūf al-maʿānī*, ed. ʿA. T. AL-ḤAMAD. Beirut 1986 [2nd ed.]

al-Zamaxšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal* = ʾAbū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd ibn ʿUmar al-Zamaxšarī: *al-Mufaṣṣal fī ṣanʿat al-ʾiʿrāb*, ed. ʿA. BŪ MULḤIM. Beirut 1993.

Secondary Sources

ANGHELESCU, Nadia / AVRAM, Andrei A. (eds.). 1995. *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Linguistics, Bucharest, August 29 – September 2, 1994*. Vol. I. Bucharest.

BAALBAKI, Ramzi. 1979. "Some Aspects of Harmony and Hierarchy in Sībawayhi's Grammatical Analysis." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 2: 722.

— . 1988. "A Contribution to the Study of Technical Terms in Early Arabic Grammar – The Term *ʾaṣl* in Sībawaihi's *Kitāb*." In: IRVINE / SERJEANT / SMITH (eds.) 1988: 163–177.

— . 1999. "Coalescence as a Grammatical Tool in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*." In: SULEIMAN (ed.) 1999: 86–106.

— (ed.). 2007. *The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition*. Aldershot.

— . 2007a. "Introduction: The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition." In: BAALBAKI (ed.) 2007: xiii–l.

BADAWI, Elsaid / CARTER, Michael G. / GULLY, Adrian. 2004. *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London.

BEESTON, A. F. L. 1970. *The Arabic Language Today*. London.

BOBZIN, Hartmut. 1983. "Zum Begriff der 'Valenz' des Verbums in der arabischen Nationalgrammatik." In: VERSTEEGH / KOERNER / NIEDEREHE (eds.) 1983: 93–108.

BOHAS, Georges / GUILLAUME, Jean P. / KOULOUGHLI, Djamel E. 1990. *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*. London.

CANTARINO, Vicente. 1974–1975. *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose*. Bloomington.

CARTER, Michael G. (ed.). 1981. *Arab Linguistics: An Introductory Classical Text with Translation and Notes*. Amsterdam.

— . 1985. "The Term *sabab* in Arabic Grammar." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 15: 53–66.

DÉVÉNYI, Kinga / IVÁNYI, Tamas / SHIVTIEL, Avihai (eds.). 1993. *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Lexicology and Lexicography (C.A.L.L.), Budapest, 17 September 1993*. Vol. I. Budapest. (= *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic*, vol. 67).

DITTERS, Everhard / MOTZKI, Harald (eds.). 2007. *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics: Presented to Kees Versteegh on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Leiden.

GLINERT, Lewis. 1989. *The Grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge.

GULLY, Adrian. 1997. "*taḍmīn*, 'Implication of Meaning,' in Medieval Arabic." *Journal of American Oriental Society* 117: 466–480.

HUDDLESTON, Rodney. 1984. *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge.

IRVINE, A. K. / SERJEANT, R. B. / SMITH, G. Rex (eds.). 1988. *A Miscellany of Middle Eastern Articles: In Memoriam Thomas Muir Johnstone, 1924-83*. Harlow.

KASHER, Almog. 2006. *The ẓarf in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*. [Hebrew]. Ph.D. dissertation, Bar-Ilan University.

KAYE, Alan S. (ed.). 1991: *Semitic Studies: In Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of his Eighty-Fifth Birthday, November 14th, 1991*. Vol. II. Wiesbaden.

KOULOUGHLI, Djamel E. 1999. "Y a-t-il une syntaxe dans la tradition arabe?" *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 21/2: 45–64.

LEVIN, Aryeh. 1979. "The Meaning of *taʿaddā al-fiʿl ʾilā* in Sībawayhi's *al-Kitāb*." In: *Studia Orientalia Memoriae D.H. Baneth Dedicata*. Jerusalem, 193–210.

— . 1987. "The Views of the Arab Grammarians on the Classification and Syntactic Function of Prepositions." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 10: 342–367.

— . 1991. "What is Meant by *al-mafʿūl al-muṭlaq*?" In: KAYE (ed.) 1991: 917–926.

— . 1995. "The Status of the Direct Object in Early Arabic Grammar." In: ANGHELESCU & AVRAM (eds.) 1995: 195–199.

— . 1997. "The Theory of al-*taqdīr* and its Terminology." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 21: 142–166.

— . 2000. "The Meaning of *ḥarf jāʾa li-maʻnan* in Sībawayhi's al-*Kitāb*." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 24: 22–48.

— . 2007. "Sībawayhi's View of the *ẓarf* as an *ʻāmil*." In: DITTERS & MOTZKI (eds.) 2007: 135–148.

OWENS, Jonathan. 1988. *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Amsterdam.

— . 1989. "The Syntactic Basis of Arabic Word Classification." *Arabica* 36: 211–234.

— . 1990. *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory: Heterogeneity and Standardization*. Amsterdam.

PELED, Yishai. 1994. "Aspects of Case Assignment in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 84: 133–158.

— . 1999. "Aspects of the Use of Grammatical Terminology in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition." In: SULEIMAN (ed.) 1999: 50–85.

— . 2009. *Sentence Types and Word Order Patterns in Written Arabic: Medieval and Modern Perspectives*. Leiden.

RECKENDORF, Herrmann. 1977. *Arabische Syntax*. Heidelberg [2nd ed.].

SULEIMAN, Yasir. 1999. *The Arabic Grammatical Tradition: A Study in taʻlīl*. Edinburgh.

— (ed.). 1999. *Arabic Grammar and Linguistics*. Richmond.

TAHA, Zeinab A. 1993. "The Term *ṣila* in Early Arab Grammatical Theory: The Case of Ibn as-Sarrāj." In: DÉVÉNYI / IVÁNYI / SHIVTIEL (eds.) 1993: 233–244.

— . 1995. *Issues of Syntax and Semantics: A Comparative Study of Sibawayhi, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarraaj*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgetown University.

TALMON, Rafi. 2003. *EighthCentury Iraqi Grammar: A Critical Exploration of Pre-Ḫalīlian Arabic Linguistics*. Winona Lake.

VERSTEEGH, Cornelis H. M. [= Kees]. 1978. "The Arabic Terminology of Syntactic Position." *Arabica* 25: 261–281.

— / CARTER, Michael G. (eds.). 1990. *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April – 1 May 1987*. Amsterdam.

— . 1990a. "Freedom of the Speaker? The Term *ittisāʻ* and Related Notions in Arabic Grammar." In: ID. & CARTER (eds.) 1990: 281–293.

— / KOERNER, Konrad / NIEDEREHE, Hans J. (eds.). 1983. *The History of Linguistics in the Near East*. Amsterdam.

WRIGHT, William. 1896–1898. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. Cambridge [3rd ed.].

Almog Kasher, Dept. of Arabic, Faculty of Humanities, Bar-Ilan University, Israel

◄ Almog.Kasher@biu.ac.il, almogk@gmail.com ►