

A Descriptive Analytical Study to Case System of Standard Arabic from Traditional Grammarians Perspective

Bashir M. Al Najadat

Dept. of Linguistics, Aligarh Muslim University, India

PO. box 26810, Halawah, Ajloun, Jordan

Tel: 962-772-039-404 E-mail: bashir.najadat@yahoo.com

Received: February 5, 2013 Accepted: March 4, 2013 Published: April 22, 2013

doi:10.5296/ijl.v5i2.3226

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i2.3226>

Abstract

The study aims to briefly describe and analyze aspects of case marking in Standard Arabic (SA) traditionally, with highlighting some of the worthy and defective features of Case Structure in SA, and the approach the traditional grammarians adopted. Further it analyzes features based on Modern Linguistic Theory Principles.

Keywords: Standard Arabic, Case, Marking, Diacritic, Arabized

1. Introduction

Case system in Standard Arabic (SA) is peculiar inflectional since the major changes occur to the noun are morphologically pertinent-in some structures a coalition counterpart to structural case system of Modern Linguistic Theory, certain category as a governor e.g. particles contribute in assigning case to NP- indicates a grammatical function derived from the affixation or diacritical system of marker. The script of SA has miscellaneous diacritics such as 'i'jam-phonetic distinctions of consonants' e.g. al-hamzah as a glottal stop semi-consonant appears as a diacritic above and under letters. In fact, such feature used to distinguish similar consonant letters orthographic form. The focus mainly on the orthography of letters occurrence within words which latter developed into dots by Abu al-Aswad Al-Du'ali (603–688 CE). The further type of diacritic is known as 'tashkil-supplementary diacritics' which includes 'harakat- diacritics'. Tashkil main purpose is to provide phonetic aid of how must words pronounced, and underlying syntactic functions. It has been proposed by traditional Arabic grammarians: Al-Xalil bin Ahmad Alfaraheidi (786), Ibin Jeni (1002) and Ibrahim Mostufa (1992) that diacritics are originally vowels, but have been reduced to the present shape as they appear now. These original markers-as so-called diacritics- typically appear initially, medially, and finally above or under morphemes adopted crucially to determine different linguistic functions including case- definite nouns¹ constrains (must be deleted) the type of diacritic - of NP as NOM such as 'الْبِنْتُ' –the girl. , ACC such as 'الْبِنْتَ' and GEN such as 'بِ-الْبِنْتِ'. A morpheme in some constructions as in feminine and masculine plural- as alternative case marker in SA, typically presents in dual, masculine plural and the five nouns², functioning as case marker represented in affixation since the letter markers can be inserted to the root itself. So, the issue of case marker in SA seems dichotomous in terms of case marker. The complex system of noun declension on Arabic as a non-concatenative especially transfixation feature broadens the process of case assignment as a complex inflectional detailed process. The morphological richness in this sense is reflected as idiosyncratic property refers to both NPs and markers.

The various taxonomy of NP represented by declension, definiteness, dichotomy, pronominalization, its complicated miscellaneous inflection, occurrence of NP within structure, and other forms denoting nouns are all features require certain particular case marking process, and contribute in a conditioned and governed NP as Hassan (1960s) argued that:

Since nouns are different types; So, what can be a marker to this type can't be for another e.g. genitive marker- preposition in dragging 'al jer'-can't be a marker to nominative pronouns. Further nunation is unacceptable to most of declined Arabized³ nouns. Hence, the situation compelled a various marker as a result to multi- noun

¹ The type of noun in SA determines the required diacritic. Hence, if it is definite, it will take single diacritic e.g. Al walad-u الولد, but if it is indefinite, it will take double diacritic (tanween) e.g. walad-un – ولدٌ.

² Five nouns in SA are [أب-?bu-nn-father] [أخ-?xu-nn-brother] [حم- hamu-nn-father of husband or wife] [فو/ fu - mouth] [ذو-ðu- having certain characteristic / thing] are distinguished five nouns that are proposed by traditional grammarians to be parsed morphologically (NOM case is marked by waw-و, ACC is marked by alif-ي, and GEN is marked by ya-ي).

³ The word Arabization used as equivalent to parsing.

types.(p.29)

Noun is thus conditioned with some restrictions to have certain marker as previously mentioned .The (five nouns), exceptionally have their own distinct form for being constrained syntactically ,semantically and phonologically, are proposed to be marked by the three letters (NOM case is marked by waw-و ,ACC is marked by alif-ا, GEN is marked by yaa-ي), but they have to fulfill six conditions to be assigned via letters, otherwise ,if one condition is violated , they will be assigned via diacritics . First, the noun is to be singular. Thus dual and plural forms are marked by diacritics. Second requirement is to be indefinite, so definite noun of this group will be assigned by diacritics. Third one is to be in added to form except yaa of addresser. The fourth is not to be added to ‘yaa of addresser’. The fourth as restricted to the word ‘ذو-đu’ which must denote the meaning of owning not something else. Fifth, the noun ‘فو’ must appear without the additional morpheme (م) to be attached to. Sixth, the group shouldn’t be in diminutive form⁴.The sentences (1-6) shows(must be deleted) why they are ungrammatical due to violence of the rule of five nouns.

1. وله إخوةٌ

wa lah-u ?xwah-t-un

‘ And He has brothers’

The underlined noun of sentence (1) violates singularity condition of the five nouns .Hence, assigned by double diacritic marker as it exhibited at final letter.

2. إنه الاخ الذي أريد

in?-h-u ?l -?x- u ?lδi ureid

‘He is the brother whom I want’

The noun of sentence (2) violates indefiniteness condition as it seems in the underlined noun, hence assigned via diacritics on final morpheme.

3.a. قال لي أبي

qal-a li ?bi

‘My father said to me.’

3.b. هذا أخ البنيت.

hað a ?x-u ?l bent-i

‘This is a brother of the girl’

The underlined is added to ‘yaa Almutkalim- yaa of addresser .Hence, it violates the rule-to be added to as in 3.b- and assigned via estimated diacritics.

4.a. شاهدتُ ذو قام

⁴. Diminutive form is formed in SA via putting dama[َ] at first letter and fat ha[ِ] on the second one .e.g , ذهب أخي , = ‘ my little brother has gone’.

shahadt-u ðu qam

‘I saw who stood.’

4.b. وأخو أجهاله في الشقاوه ينعم.

wa ?xu ?l- jahalat-i fi ? shaqawat-i yan?m-u

‘and the ignorant man interested with misery’

Here ‘ ذو ’ violates the meaning of owning, rather it functions as a relative pronoun. Hence ,it is built noun, and assigned via sikoon diacritic. In contrast,4 .b. matches the condition since ‘ ذو- ðu: ’ ‘ means owner of/having certain characteristic’

5. انه فمٌ

inh-u fam-un

‘It is a mouth.’

The sentence violates the fifth condition of that the letter ‘م’ in ‘ فم ’ must be deleted. Hence, it has been assigned via tanween[-].

6. قابلتُ أبي

gabalt-u ?b-i

‘I met my little father.’

In (6) the underlined noun is in diminutive form which deviates from the normal form of these five nouns. Therefore, case is marked via estimated diacritic due to phonological constraint in at the final part where both morpheme and overt diacritic sound similarly.

The previous examples about five nouns indicate the highly conditioning model that has been proposed by traditional grammarians, and further the refinement they were bearing, which enabled to form lots of rules for deviated forms/NPs and exceptions.

Case in SA is a complex structure in the sense that case marking extends to include all categories of SA .In English case in its syntactic and semantic form is confined to lucid NPs. Categories other than NP had not investigated with regard to case .In SA it seems that the complex structure morphologically and rhetorically play in creating a complicated system of grammar to consider each aspect. That is, case marking is within parsing which is a distinguished quality of SA that denotes the change of the diacritic of the final letter according to the position and the function of category. In addition to the three cases of noun in SA, Jazem ‘jussive’ case is the fourth one attributes verb proceeded by certain particle-لم- and ولن - never- and both had been taken as case assigners. Adjective⁵ is denoting noun, has the same case marker -assigned by default as a result to verb and particle absence- that the noun has⁶. Theoretically, case definition in SA includes other categories such as demonstratives, relative pronouns adverbs and categories since they semantically

⁵ . In Arabic, adjective comes after noun ,so it is a predicate adjective not attributive.

⁶ . In the inception sentence -طالبٌ مجتهدٌ - a hardworking student, the adjective-مجتهد- is assigned Nominative case by virtue of being the subject's governee.

denote or refer to entities. This seems trivial to other scholars of other languages, but when the theory of case marking is deeply restricting and specifying the all possible structures that relate to these categories, it becomes worthy to be elaborated.

In SA, three main cases are distinguished namely: nominative, accusative, and genitive. Accusative case includes other cases: dative, cognate, essive, locative, partative accusative, comitative, perlativ, vocative, and ablative. Such cases have been classified under accusative for the closely relatedness functionally and thematically. Further, they lack to some requirements for being main cases e.g. Vocative case is restricted to present tense-it doesn't appear in past constructions. Further it is assigned to null verb and agent, and both of them are obligatory covert in such construction.

2. Multi- Classification of NPs in SA

Not all nouns are permitted to parsing⁷ in SA. Hence, nouns are in dichotomous classification: Built and Arabized/parsed nouns. Arabized are those whose diacritic changes in response to their position and function performed in the construction. That is, this type of nouns are the target of nominal case of SA. In contrast, built nouns whose diacritics are stable, don't change in compliance to the position they occupy within a construction. Built nouns includes categories of demonstrative except dual ones⁸, relative pronouns except dual ones, conditional nouns such as 'أذا – if', question nouns such as 'مَنْ -who', and relative and non-relative pronouns. Typically, this group of noun has unchangeable diacritic at the final letter e.g. 'حيثُ -wherein', 'أينَ -where'. Hence they excluded from extensive focus for being lacking to changeable stigma of the final part due to the assumed syntactic features. This recalls subsidiary accusative cases namely dative, cognate, essive, locative, partative accusative, comitative, perlativ, vocative for unfulfilling main case requirements.

Taxonomy of noun in SA fulfils phi-features. That is, each noun is inflected with regard to number-singular, dual, and plural. Further dichotomy manifests to singular distinction definite from indefinite; consequently, each of which as a result to determine (must be deleted) case marker type. If it is definite, it must have a single diacritic marker. Otherwise, if it is indefinite, it will then bear double⁹ diacritic at the final letter as a marker as shown in 7-8 below.

7. ذَهَبَ الرَّجُلُ definite noun with single NOM diacritic on (ل)

ḏəhab-a ʔ rrajul-u

'The man has gone'

8. ذَهَبَ رَجُلٌ align to left like above one Indefinite noun with double NOM diacritic on(ل)

ḏəhab-a rajul-un

'A man has gone'

⁷ . Parsing means the change of the diacritic of the final letter of Arabized nouns regarding the position they occupy, the function, and thematic role they perform.

⁸ - Demonstratives and relative pronouns dual forms are declined in response to number, gender, and case.

⁹ - Diacritics in SA are either single such as - َ - if the single noun is definite ,or double (tanween) diacritic such as - ً - if the single noun is indefinite.

In dual noun, dichotomy represented in gender-masculine and feminine .In terms of dichotomy of marker as aforementioned that two case markers in SA: diacritics and letters. Letters used to mark dual NP case which clearly manifests the inflectional process of case marking in SA. Thus, we argue that a suffix is added to the dual form represented by morphemes (ان) or (ين)¹⁰ in compliance to case type as in 9-11. We suppose to keep in mind that in such form, diacritics have not to appear above and under the final letter. This explains the story of synthesizing diacritics to perform such function.

9. صَاحَ أَوْلَادَانِ Alif (ا) before noon is the NOM marker

saah-a ?lwaladan

‘The two boys shouted’

10. قَابَلْتُ الْوَالِدَيْنِ Ya? (ي) is the ACC case marker

qaplt-u ?l-waladyen

‘I met the two boys’

11. غُرْفَةُ الْوَالِدَيْنِ Ya? (ي) Is the case marker of GEN case

gurfat-u ?l waladayen

‘The room of the two boys.’

It’s evoked by some scholars such as Ibrahim Aneis¹¹ and others who come out with some observations about the role of diacritics and their grammatical function. That is, Arabic grammarians claim that diacritics are originally vowel letters, and have been reduced, and received their own present shape.

Plural form isn’t diacritically marked, but rather marked by letter (suffixes). Gender creates dichotomy to case marking. Thus, masculine plural nouns are marked via letters-nominative by ‘waw - و ’, accusative via ‘yaa - ي ’, and genitive by ‘yaa- ي ’ also. Both ACC a GEN counterpart in terms of marker, but the construction they occur with distinguishes them as in 12-14.

12. اِحْتَجَّ الْمَعْلَمُونَ waw- و is NOM marker to a regular masculine plural

ehtaj-a al mu?lmoun

‘The teachers protested’

13. قَابَلْتُ الْمُعَلِّمِينَ yaa - ي is ACC marker to regular masculine plural

qab?lt-u ?lmu?lmein

¹⁰ .If the dual noun is assigned as Nominative, it will end with (ان) morpheme as a case marker .But in case of ACC and GEN case, it will have the morpheme of (ين).We must consider that the final letter (ن) in both masculine and feminine isn’t a part of case marker.

¹¹ - Ibrahim Aneis (1978) in his book [*men Assrar ?lugah*] claims that “one of the most prominent differences between Latin nouns’ letters and our parsing diacritics is that the Latin letters absolutely don’t drop at nouns’ finals when we stop-means in spoken form- ,mostly this occurs to the parsing diacritics in our language ,which evokes to outweigh that such diacritics are not linguistic symbols that indicate nominative , accusative case, and so on.

‘I met the teachers’

غُرْفَةُ الْمُعَلِّمِينَ¹⁴

yaa- ى is ACC marker to regular masculine plural

gurf?t-u ?lmu?lmein

‘Teachers’ room’

The morpheme known as (nunation- ن) is not part of case marking nor an original letter in such previous sentences-See 9-14- in the sense that it supposed to be dropped in genitive construction when it is ‘added to’. Hence, it is added for a purpose consonance. Therefore, Tanween-double diacritics- in singular noun is a counterpart of that in dual and plural masculine.

In feminine regular plural nouns, case isn’t in the same process of that in masculine as being marked by letter namely waw and yaa. In contrast, feminine noun is marked by diacritics despite the suffix attached to.

15. تكلمت المعلمات.

takelamat ?lmu?lemat-u

‘The teachers-FEM,Plu ,NOM talked.’

16. رأيتُ المعلمات.

r?yet-u ?lmo?elmat-i

‘ I saw the teachers FEM,Plr ,ACC’

17. غرفةُ المعلمات.

gurfat-u ?lmu?lemat-i

‘Teachers’ FEM,Plr, GEN room.’

I modified the alignment of the selected part, because the previous is odd.

The question arises in the plural form is how two different markers appear at the same time and approximately hold the same position. This evokes also the idea of which one is stronger. However, it seems that letters despite being as secondary markers according to the classification of traditional grammarians, but in such constructions evident to be stronger or have a supremacy over diacritics. From other side, it seems that there is a constraint represented in the counterpart suffix (ات) that regular feminine plural forms usually have.

As apposite to regular nouns, irregulars are the group where pluralization occurs through affixation which manifests non-concanecative feature of SA clearly. Hence, they are not ended either with (ون or ين) as in masculine plural nor (ات) as in feminine plural.

Irregular/ broken nouns¹² are diacritically marked ,but again dichotomy regarding whether a diacritic is a single or double (tanween), is determined according to definiteness .If they are definite, it will be single diacritic as a case marker, or if it is indefinite, then nunation will be

¹². Broken nouns pluralization includes all three types of affixation respectively (ورقه .sing/paper – أوراق .plu-papers, طالب .sing-student – طلاب .plu-students , عالم .scientist- علماء .plu-scientists.

the marker. See from 18-20.

18. تَكَلَّمَ الْأَوْلَادُ Broken definite plural- NOM case marked by single diacritic ُ -

takalam-a ?l?ulad-u

‘The boys talked.’

19. عَلَّمْتُ الْأَوْلَادَ Broken definite plural-acc case assigned by single diacritic َ -

?llmt-u ?l?ulada

‘I taught the boys.’

20. رَأْيُ الْأَوْلَادِ Broken definite plural- gen case assigned by single diacritic ِ -

ra?y-u ?l?ulad-i

‘Students’ opinion’

In case of indefinite broken nouns, they have (tanween) as a case marking. Thus, in case of replacing the previous definite nouns with indefinite in such examples, they will be- أولادٌ -NOM, أولادٍ -ACC, أولادٍ -GEN.

Irregular nouns in SA have other group includes three distinguishable types known as shortened, defective, and extended .The group has a special process of declension. Shortened nouns ¹³are marked by an estimated¹⁴ diacritic. They take tanween alfateh [َ] placed before the last letter not on the last itself .Extended noun is ended with extended alif-attached or separate - followed by hamzeh (ء) .The singular is marked by estimated diacritics , whereas dual and plural are marked by letters .Defective nouns are that ended with(ي / ي).Table(1) below explains how case is marked in this type of nouns.

Table (1). Irregular Nouns Case Marking.

Irregular Noun	Singular	Dual	Plural
Shortened	Typically marked by estimated single diacritics- if they are definite and by tanween if they are indefinite. Estimated u [ُ] for NOM , e [َ] for ACC, and I [ِ] for GEN.	If the noun is three letters, it doubled_ through returning alif to its origin e.g. فتى-فتيان. This form is marked by letters according to its distribution.	Plural is formed via deleting the final Alif, and marking the letter before with diacritic َ, then adding plural form, usually (ون or ين) e.g. مصطفى-مصطفون This form is marked via letters according to their distribution

¹³. Shortened nouns are those which ended with shortened Alif in either ى or ا.

¹⁴ .Diacritics are two types in terms of appearance, either apparent or estimated.

Extended	Extended noun is that one which ends with extended alif-connected or separated - followed by hamzeh (ء). Case is marked via these apparent diacritics. Hence, ُ is for NOM, َ is for ACC and GEN.	If alif is original in the noun, then dual forms added (ان or ين). If [ء] is additional for feminine, then changed into [و] then adding dual form حمراء-حمراوان. But if [ء] is original [و] or ي, then dual form is added with no change e.g. دواء-دواوان. This form is marked via letters according to their distribution.	If alif is origin in the noun, then plural forms added (ون or ين). If [ء] is additional for feminine, then changed into [و] then adding plural form حمراء-حمراوات. But if [ء] is original [و] or ي then plural form is added with no change e.g. دواء-. This form is marked via letters according to their distribution
Defective	Whether the [ي] is apparent or deleted for the purpose of tanween, the nom case is marked via estimated diacritic ُ, and َ for GEN. ACC case is marked via letters because they are apparent.	Dual form is formed by adding [ان or ين]. Here alif [ا] is the marker of NOM case, and ya [ي] is the maker of ACC and GEN case.	To form plural, we delete [ي], then add [ون] and make the letter before [و] with ُ in NOM case. In ACC case, we add [ين] and mark the letter before [ي] with َ.

The note from the table indicates a missed unifying/standardization of modeling to case marking which can be ascribed to richness of morphology and diversity of NPs in SA. However, regardless the estimated diacritic proposed for shortened noun, apparent 'fatha- َ' permitted to appear for being light as in رأيتُ الداعي. Again phonology is integrated with syntax in outlining both functions. The same occurs to extended where 'fatha- َ' used to mark the genitive case instead of 'kasrah- ِ' to prevent it from being triptote. Thus extended nouns are diptote due to a constraint represented in the nature of the final morpheme, being ended with (ء) where alif argued to be additional. But again the same rule isn't applied to all -alif as a second or third in extended nouns argued to be original which attributes such type as triptote. Shortened nouns are arabized / parsed via estimated diacritic to the three cases which opens the claim why such type is not classified as built. The answer is that in both dual and plural the marker is apparent letter, which is not a feature of built noun, being bearing different markers and pluralized as well.

The detailed explanation of case in such types and others as well reflects aspect of obstacles a

native and foreigner learners confront. From one side, it of course, indicates the eloquence of SA, and the refinement of founders of grammar who were able to introduce the evidence for each tiny issue. But from modern model style, it still represents a model integrated too, with lots of exceptions, and required to be revised with clear and unified terminology and minimal rules.

3. Distribution as a Major Requirement of Case Type Determination

Arabic case system isn't totally determined morphologically, but syntactically also. Case is determined to the NP according to the function it performs within a sentence. Thus, holding certain position in sentence identifies the case that an NP receives. However, the notion seems vague due to evidences that revising subject-comment inception sentence and VSO or SVO subject position doesn't entirely change case of the NP as shown in (19 and 20).

19.a. رجلٌ كريمٌ

Rajul-un. kareem-un

Man.NOM generous.NOM

'a generous man'

b. كريمٌ الرجلُ

Kareem-un.NOM ?rajl-u. NOM

Generous.NOM man.NOM'

'a generous man'

20.a. نامٌ عليٌّ

nam-a ?lyi-un.NOM.

'Ali slept'

b. عليٌّ نامٌ

?lyi-un nam-a

'Ali slept'

I modified the alignment to the selected part, because the last is inappropriate

The forms manifests SA flexibility of order and since NP thematic role is maintained after reverse, the case is maintained due to that. However, the topic might be clear with other structure where it is governed by the constituent comes before and after. The counterpart structural cases of English in SA genitive case known as 'genitive construction or construct state' where each component of the construction supposed to occur in a specified position with specified features to avoid case filter and attain legibility in the position it holds.

NPs parsing in the way of SA grammarians whereby they give priority to the function of the NP determined by the position they occur in, hence, they propose for example, in a sentence

like (الكتابُ مفيدٌ—the book is useful), book is a raised/nominative subject via damah- u- ُ. So, they pay much attention and importance to the positions of NPs occurrence wherein they marked to X- case. To explain, an NP to be marked nominative case, it must occur in one of the following positions within a construction.

1. Subject e.g. الكتابُ مفيدٌ -book is useful.
2. Adjectival predicate of NP subject: e.g. الشمسُ جميلة - The sun is beautiful.
3. Agent attributed to the intransitive verb: e.g. جاءَ الرجلُ – The man has come.
4. Subject of passive construction¹⁵: e.g. كُسرَ الكأسُ -The glass was broken.
5. Subject of kana[كانَ]particle and its sisters¹⁶: كانَ الولدُ محطناً - The boy was mistaken.
6. Predicate of (إن) and its sisters: إنَّ الجوَّ غائمٌ -The weather is cloudy.
7. Adjective of noun: هذا طالبٌ ذكيٌّ .This is an intelligent boy. Or a conjunctive noun of a nominative noun: السياسةُ والإقتصادُ مهمان -policy and economy are important.

These seven positions where NPs can occur as nominative recalls Chomsky (1981-1986) model of government and binding in such condition of case system of SA. The particle إن?inna proceeding both الجو and assigned it ACC and غائمٌ as NOM plays the same role of transitive verb and preposition of English as governors and assigner to accusative case .In such sentence case assignment in SA enters a very vague process that requires to clarify the notion of marking and case. Is it the particle or the position it(delete) or the diacritics or a sort of coalition of all assigning case to the nominals ? It seems a step towards revising the notion of case assignment .A step of a further model of case determination, such as the advance of English from GB model into minimalism unified checking model(1991-1995) based on the idea that case isn't assigned successfully via governor notion of GB. That is, a lexical case as a governed and hence assigner X-case seems to be unpersuasive idea .Rather a process of checking-features can be more plausible.

4. Genitive Case

In SA there is no overt morpheme that is added to NP to indicate genitive case such as possessive ('s) or (of/for)¹⁷.Such prepositions indicate genitive case. Construct State¹⁸ , the process that is followed to form genitive construction by the means of two NPs contribution. SA grammarians propose that the added noun in [addition state] must be indefinite, from other side, the added to noun is either definite or indefinite which is assigned genitive case accordingly, marked by ـ or ـهـ ± definiteness. See 21,23.

21.*البابُ الغُرفه.

¹⁵ . When agent is deleted in passive construction, the subject of the passive performs the function of agent when the verb turned into passivized form.

¹⁶ .This particle used in past forms where if one particle comes at first ,then the subject will be nominative and attributed as Kana's noun ,and the NP in predicate will receive accusative case which is attributed as Kana's predicate .See other sisters of Kana particle.

¹⁷ .In genitive construction a particle like [of] can be predicted to occur between added and added to .Also some prepositions like (إلى or لـ) indicate genitive case distribution ,but not as a part of it.

¹⁸ .Construct state-Edafah-in English known as annexation, the process legalized by SA syntacticians to construct genitive construction which is typically consists of two NPs the first is called 'added-modaf and the second is the added to- modaf eliyh'. This feature is common to Semitic languages such as [Hebrew](http://www.macrothink.org/ijl) and [Syriac](http://www.macrothink.org/ijl).

?l bab-u ?l gurfat-i

‘The room’s the door’

بابُ غُرفهٖ 22

bab-u gurfat-en

‘A door of a room.’

بابُ الغُرفةِ 23.

bab-u ?lgurfat-i

‘The door of the room.’

Sentence (21) is ungrammatical because the added noun (ألبابُ) appears definite which violates the rule .In (22) which is absolute as both nouns-added and added to – appear in indefinite state. Sentence (23) is the normal construction of construct state where the added is indefinite and the added to is definite. Three states of the added to NP: definite, indefinite, and absolute .Further, the added to can be declined with regard to both number and gender as explained in 24-27.

مُعَلِّمًا أَلْعَرَبِيَّةِ 24.

mu?lm-a –Indf-Dul-Masc ?l -?rabiati

‘The two teachers of Arabic.’

مُعَلِّمُو أَلْعَرَبِيَّةِ 25.

mu?lm-u Indf-Plur –Masc ?l -?rabiati

‘The teachers of Arabic.’

مُعَلِّمَتَا أَلْعَرَبِيَّةِ 26.

mu?lemt-a Indf-Dul-fem ?l ?rabiati

‘The two female teachers of Arabic.’

مُعَلِّمَاتُ أَلْعَرَبِيَّةِ 27.

mu?lemt-u –Indf-Plr-Fem ?l ?rabiati

‘Females teachers of Arabic.’

The underlined NP in (24) inflected for dual masculine, and in (25) is inflected for plural .From other side, both (26 and 27) are inflected for feminine dual and plural. However, the added to NP assigned to three cases which depends on the construction and the function it performs. In (28) it is NOM case ,in (29) it is ACC case ,and in (30) it is in GEN case as underlined.

تَكَلَّمَ مَعَلِّمُ أَلْعَرَبِيَّةِ 28.

takalam-a mu?lem-u- sig-Nom-mas ?l ?rabiati

‘The Arabic Teacher has talked.’

رأيتُ مُعَلِّمَ الْعَرَبِيَّةِ 29

r?yit-u mu?lem-a-Sng-ACC- Masc ?l- ?rabiati-i

‘I saw the Arabic teacher’

مُعَلِّمُ الْعَرَبِيَّةِ مُجَدُّ 30.

mu?lem-i-Sng-Gen-Masc ?l ?rabiati-i mujed-un

‘The Arabic teacher is hardworking.’

5. The Technique of Exceptions in SA

In contrast to the Modern Linguistic Theory, adopted to replace a model with another due to violation of some structures from English or other languages¹⁹, Arabic scholars in past and present have adopted the same approach of Arabization. They determined the markers of cases based on deduction, observations, and conceptions. So, they tackled deviated constructions with special rules, and found new concepts and rules with seemingly logical and persuasive manner. Zuhayr Zahed states “They tried to make their grammar steady, and the deviated constructions in use had been tackled by their own means such as deductive analogy, justification, and interpretation.”²⁰ .To explain, the subject of complementizer (نَ) supposed to be nominative, but they make it accusative analogizing the direct object proceeded by particles in some constructions.

They determined the boundaries of case based on different aspects where each has its own requirement to marking NP, so definiteness ,number, gender, function ,and type of noun are aspects which are indispensable for case explanation .Special nouns-defective ,shortened ,and extended -can be considered to be the favorite example of exception approach that traditional grammarians followed .They were conscious of marked group of nouns that have a special process of form and case marking, hence ,they form the rules which detained them within the general model.

Extended singular noun has been excluded of being marked by estimated diacritic. Such noun is marked by apparent diacritic, which seems that the final part of these nouns acts as a constraint of allowing or disallowing these markers to appear. Singular defective noun receives tanween in a condition of deleting (yaa ‘ي’), but doesn’t receive apparent diacritics which is approximately a clear indication of the phonological constraint that such type governed by.

6. Rules within Rules

As aforementioned in the structure of the group of defective, shortened, and extended nouns, have a different process of marking in response to their own form. We come to the point that other rules made by grammarians to control the all possible deviated forms, miscellaneous types and categories may not be compatible with the general rule. They empirically examined each possible structures through applying the rule, and if incompatible, they explain the

¹⁹ .There might be an excuse to permit Modern Linguistic Theory to change and replace since abandoning a model isn’t only due to violations of English.

²⁰ . Arabic language Institute magazine .Damascus. Vol, 79,section 4.pg.15.

reason why and revise the rule or construct a new for the purpose of inclusiveness. Therefore, markers have taken different forms: diacritical, morphological, default, lexical and structural as well. Furthermore, each form has undergone sub-taxonomy into further types in response to virtual structure e.g. estimated diacritic is adopted as the marker due to phonological reasons. But another rules emerged with, in terms of dual and plural of irregular nouns. Therefore, they are now marked via letters according to their distribution.

Shortened singular noun has another rule regarding definiteness. If it is definite, it is normally marked according to the common rule-via estimated diacritics. But if the noun is indefinite, then is marked by (tanween) which is placed on the letter before the last one. Thus the term 'iff' is broadly used to whys and whats of NPs of SA case marking. Why an NP tackled in such way, and what NPs occur and must be tackled in the way. Again other rule emerged out of the general solely to explain and detain a deviant form.

7. Disputation about Diacritics.

Recalling Saussure's signifier and signified –the relation between symbol and object in the real world- where he claims that no actual relationship between them. Some scholars of Arabic such as Ebin Jeni, Ibrahim Mostufa, and Ibrahim Aneis doubt about the role diacritics to indicate a syntactic function. Their claim is based on some historical and phonological observations such as that Holy Quran has been descended in the dialect of Mecca, the claim of some western scholars²¹ who argue that diacritics perform a phonetic function rather than syntactic one. For that, Ibrahim Aneis²² proposes that:

Parsing diacritics have no syntactic indication, and they don't recognize the meaning in the mind of ancient Arabs. They are no more than a diacritics that are needed to link words together.”.(p.158)

Aneis builds his idea on the disappearing of such diacritics when a speaker stops. The phenomenon known to traditional grammarians (Taskeen), means to show sekoon diacritic (◌ْ) over the final letter of the word for two reasons: one when speech is complete, and second to avoid mistakes of showing the appropriate diacritic supposed to be there.

Ebin Jeni (11th century) accounts diacritics to indicate a syntactic function based on Al-Xalil bin Ahmad Alfarahidi (8th century) who argues that “Al fat ha ‘short -a َ, al kasra ‘short i ِ, and damah ‘short u ُ are additional, and they accompanied letter for the purpose of connection”²³. But this observation is illogical or incorrect, because Alfarahidi seems to mean by additional that they are not original letters, and they actually don't perform the main function as those of letters; further the idea which can be deduced that he is convinced of the

²¹ .See Johann Fück (1955): Die Arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. karl Vollers (1895)) The Modern Egyptian Dialect of Arabic.

²² .Men Asras alugah- Ebrahim Aneis. pg 218-219. See also pg 29.

²³ .Al-Xalil bin Ahmad Alfarahidi in “Al kitab” chp 4, pg.241-242.

importance and presence of such markers and their virtual role to case and distinguishing categories .

Ibrahim Mostufa argues against Ebin Jeni's view "As for fat ha ' short a ' ,it is neither a parsing marker nor indicates something like that ,but rather is a weak diacritic, favorite to Arabic speakers ,a tendency to words to be ended with .It looks like (sikoon) in the informal language."²⁴.It is clear that the majority of those anti-diacritic role scholars established their view of the role of diacritics on phonological base, which is right ,but to say that they don't have the logic of being marker or functional seems unreasonable ,because the thought is in its broader meaning undermines the idea of grammar development process .In a supposition to recall the role of letters as a several syntactic functions affixes as they are related to number, gender , and case and no clear cut idea to whether such affix meant to distinguish gender or number. .Ebin Faris(992.161) supporting the conception of the role of diacritics claiming that parsing distinguishes meanings and functions meant by speakers, and Arab in such idiosyncratic feature has what others don't : they are –by diacritics – distinguish meanings.

In modern standard Arabic (MSA) there is a consensus among scholars who agree the thematic role and function of diacritics, the widespread use and appearance on each word of formal language. Further the need to them stems from a purpose of distinguishability. However, not all of the nouns are targeted e.g. .built nouns are excluded but still exhibit fixed ones.

In his book 'Al kitab' Sebawayeh(7th century) proposes "The three letters-means the diacritics-are widespread ,and no letter is used without them or some of them....and no additional thing with such much use in language". This evokes the idea that such markers are indispensable despite the phonological requirement they are initiated via.

The observation is that forming such markers in natural language is universal natural linguistic process to language development through history where some features or aspects undergo forming, modifying, and changing. Al-Xalil ben Ahmed Alfaraheidi(8th century) has replaced the dots that invented by Abu Al aswad Adu'li (7th century) with these diacritics when he noticed that a further shape would be more distinguishable and functional. Hence, no logic in cancelling any feature when it is adopted, and become common feature in any language. In English, we see how transition of orthography from old English (450-700A.D.) to modern (1500-), and how some grammatical and orthographic system aspects have been modified and replaced by new ones .In the seventeenth century ,as a prose feature, it was common to use the inflectional form (eth) as in (cometh)²⁵ ,then the form (-s) has been borrowed from colloquial speech to replace the old one- eth. However, no manuscript survived from the Roman alphabetical up to English of today .Old English manuscripts have shapes are not found of the present edition e.g. word-division was unknown to Anglo-Saxons. The letters (j& v) were not used in old English. The phoneme (j) was represented by (g).Hence, crucial changes in the essence of the structure occurred, but the phenomenon is not considered as defectiveness of language .English today is universal, bears unique

²⁴ .Ebrahim Mostufa "Ehya;a A nahu"^{2nd} ed.1992,Cairo.

²⁵ . In his play" Merchant of Venice", Shakespeare uses such form as in "It blessed him that gives and him that takes"

characteristics: fascinating, important, fun, beautiful, useful and existed as stated by Crystal (1994:3). The fact is opposite to Aitchison (2000:ix) second choice of here questioning of "Is language change a symptom of either progress or decay?", to prove that change doesn't mean inevitably decay or imperfection.

As a reply to some western scholars who insist that Holy Qura'an has been descended in the script of Mecca, and no diacritics were used during the period. We deem that such diacritics used commonly in the spoken form and little attention paid to writing at that time, and within short period-see dots of Adu'li(603-688) to diacritics of Al-faraheidi (718-789) within less than 60 year a crucial development occurs to transition the written form of Arabic in comparison to the form of e.g. middle English ended 12-15 century with no crucial change to the orthography- of time the orthographic system had been developed and stabilized on the present form of today. Further, language development is a natural process counterparts the linguistic theory development where the model of today might be replaced with certain modified model of tomorrow as a response to the view of scholars who believe that a further adequate explanatory feature or form might be more plausible and inclusive.

8. Conclusion and Observations

Morphological cases e.g. genitive in English is easy account for due to the overt morpheme attached to NP bearing case function. In contrast, syntactic cases of government model produced several violations when applied universally and low credibility in empirical practice, further sterile to account for case in some constructions such as passive. However, language of rich morphological system as seen SA is easy to determine the all boundaries of case based on detailed taxonomy and forming rules for each NPs categories and possible occurrences. But both of English and SA lack to a unified concise model to case assignment e.g. Nominative case in English has nothing regarding government, and a governor in SA might be absent such as particle '?inna' or precedence property undermined when structure is reversed –as in inception sentence-and still canonical and grammatical.

The rich morphology in SA stems from the double or triple functions a certain morpheme performs. For example, the morpheme [و ن] functions three functions : gender determination, number as a plural, and the letter [و] as a case marker. That is why in my paper I refer to letter not morpheme to avoid a multi-function morpheme since case marker is one portion of it.

It seems that letters and diacritics are unequal in strength and value when occur simultaneously. That is, we notice how in feminine plural form, a letter has been given priority to be the marker despite being categorized as secondary marker. This can be justified in such type for the presence of a constraint resulting three cases marked by the same suffix (ات). This again reveals that both diacritics and letters can't distinguish case without an overlook to the construction. See sentences (16-17)

Estimated diacritics proposed to have undergone certain phonological constraint for the occurrence of a phonological counterpart morpheme in the same position where a supremacy given to morpheme , recalling the claim that diacritics have been reduced from vowels .From

other side, constraint occurs to avoid inconsonance where some diacritic must disappear over and under some specified morpheme such as indefinite singular shortened noun ألفتى –young man, where no diacritic is allowed to appear on the final vowel part due to the previous two reasons.

Exceptions as a result of refinement and empirical outcomes, and the success of eloquent syntacticians to determine certain marker to such forms of certain construction instead of replacing the theory reflects a consensus to the theory in spite of some peculiar forms which tackled under the theory with plausible explanation. However, such techniques linguistic attitude has not been followed in English. In Government and Binding model (1981-1986), categories of verb and prepositions proposed to assign accusative case adopted to be assigners lacked to optimality and universality due to certain languages and constructions inapplicable, hence the Minimalist Program (1991-1995) was as a result to such exceptions.

It is evident that case marking in SA is governed by a various features; some stems from lexical categorization, others from inflectional role, and some determined by syntactic distribution of NPs. Hence, SA case system isn't entirely inflectional.

The exclusion of 'Built Nouns' results from being inflexible as much as Arabized nouns for showing certain diacritic in response to the function proposed, interference of a syntactic feature²⁶, and the position it occurs in. This can be claimed to be a motive for obtaining alternative marker to case of built nouns since they lack features that determine the type of marker such as definite article, receiving 'tanween'. On the other hand, built nouns constraint motivates the idea of reviewing the current adopted marker and proposing aspects of marking such as position and governor instead.

Acknowledgement

I deeply value the guidance and instructions of Prof. Khateeb S, Mustafa, Chairman of the department of Linguistics, AMU, India with his valuable enlightening notes, and acquainting me to right way for doing such work, Prof. Imtiaz Hassanein with his valuable lectures of doing research, Prof. Anjani kumar Sinha, the distinguished Emeritus professor, Delhi University, India, with his precious and valuable lectures in syntax. I also thank Prof. Ali Fatehi –Director of Center of Comparative studies, AMU, India for the encouragement and helping in indicating current research issues. Lots of thanks to Dr. Hatem Salem, Dept. of Computer Science, AMU, India, for being helpful by his experience in the matter.

References

AITCHISON, J. (2001). *Language change: Progress or decay?* (3rd ed.). UK. Cambridge University Press.

Alhamadi, Y, A shenawi, M., & Ata, M. (1994). *Alqwaed Al assaseyah Fi A nahu wa assarf*. Cairo: The public board for governmental prints. Retrieved from

²⁶ .We recall the notion of government where some cases to NPs in SA, are determined by a governor such as the complementizer 'Einna& anna'

www.waqfeya.com/book.php?bid=3517

Anies, E. (1978). *Men Asrar Alugah*, 6 ed .Egypt: Anglo Egyptian Library. Retrieved from lisaanularab.blogspot.com/2012/03/blog-post_7398.html

Aoun, J, Benmamoun, E., & Choueiri. (2010). *The Syntax of Arabic*. UK. Cambridge University Press.

Arabic Online. *Free Comprehensive Resources of Arabic Grammar*. Retrieved from November 8, 2011, <http://Arabic.tripod.com/index.htm/>

Aramali,M. (1996). *Al Arabia wal wada' ef A nahwyeh*, Egypt :Daru alma' refah aljameyeh. Retrieved from www.almostafa.info/data/arabic/depot2/gap.php?file=015200.pdf

Assaeid, A. (2006). *Gawaedu alugah Alarabia Al mubasatah* (3rd ed.). Retrieved from www.makbtna2211.com

Changes in the Language since Shakespeare's Time: § 4. Changes in grammar.” The Cambridge History of English and American Literature in 18 Volumes (1907–21). The Victorian Age, Part Two. www.bartleby.com/224/1505.html.

Crystal, D. (1994). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of The English Languauge*.Uk: Cambridge University Press.

Haegeman, L. (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory* (2nd ed.). UK, OXFOR and USA, Massachusetts. .Black well Publishers Inc.

Hassan, A. (1966). *Annhu Alwafi*. (3rd ed.). Al m'aref Inc. Egypt. Retrieved from islamport.com/w/lqh/Web/3322/1.htm.

Hogg, R. (1992). *The Cambridge History of the English Language, 1*. The beginning to 1066. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mohammed, A., Omer, A., & Zahran, M. (1997). *A nahu al assasi*,Cairo: Daru alfiker Al arabi. Retrieved from www.waqfeya.com/book.php?bid=1001.

Mostafa, E. (1992). *Ehyaa Annhu*. Dar Ehyaa A turath Al arabi. Cairo. Retrieved from www.voiceofarabic.net/index.php?option...id

Prince, A., & Smolensky, P. (2004). *Optimality Theory*, USA: Blackwell.

W. Wright. (1967). *A Grammar of The Arabic Language* (3ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Zahed, Z. Al e'rab wa harakatuhu fi al arabiah. *Arabic Language Institute Magazine*, 79(4), 703-734. Retrieved from www.mohamedrabeea.com/books/book1_242.pdf