

## The Accusative Case Suffixes in Standard Arabic: Where From?

Rashid Al-Balushi  
Sultan Qaboos University

### ملخص

ينصب جمع المؤنث السالم في اللغة العربية بالكسرة. وقد أوضح البلوشي (٢٠١٣) أن السبب في ذلك هو أن جمع المؤنث السالم ينصرف مثل باقي الأسماء غير المفردة (أي التي في المثنى و الجمع) فيما يخص علامة النصب، حيث أن جميع هذه الأسماء تنصب بما تجر به. وهذا الأمر يدل على أن هذه الأسماء غير المفردة ليست لها علامات نصب خاصة بها، و لذلك فإنها 'تستعير' علامات جرّها لتكون علامات نصب لها. في هذا البحث، سوف نبين بأن السبب في ذلك هو أن انضمام علامات النصب إلى أسماء اللغة العربية كان متأخراً (مقارنة بعلامات الرفع و الجر). و لذلك، و نتيجة لعوامل التطور اللغوي، فقد اكتسبت الأسماء المنصوبة علامات جديدة. حيث أن الأسماء المفردة 'استعارت' علامة نصبها من الفعل المفرد المنصوب. أما الأسماء غير المفردة فقد 'استعارت' علامات نصبها من الأسماء المجرورة المرادفة لها.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** جمع المؤنث السالم، علامات نصب الأسماء، علامات جر الأسماء، علامات نصب الأفعال، تشابه علامات الصيغ الصرفية.

### Abstract

Sound plural feminine nouns in Standard Arabic (SA) receive the same case suffix for their genitive and accusative cases. It has been shown (Al-Balushi 2013) that this is because all sound non-singular nouns have no independent accusative case morphology, which results in them 'borrowing' the genitive case suffixes of the nouns that bear the same number and gender features. This paper addresses the question of why these nouns (non-singular sound ones) do not have independent case morphology for the accusative case. It argues, in descriptive terms, that the accusative case morphology seems to have joined the Arabic nominal system late (after those of the nominative and genitive paradigms). Consequently, and as a result of language change and the desire for disambiguation (as well as standardization because of the Holy Quran), NPs in Acc-marked positions gained new case morphology. The singular NPs 'borrowed' their accusative case suffixes from the subjunctive (verbal) paradigm, and the non-singular ones 'borrowed' their accusative case suffixes from the genitive (nominal) paradigm.

**Key words:** Sound plural feminine nouns; accusative case suffixes; genitive case suffixes; subjunctive suffixes; syncretism.

## 1. Introduction

One intriguing fact about the nominal Case system of Standard Arabic (SA), being a morphologically rich language, is that sound plural feminine nouns receive the same case suffix for their Genitive (Gen) as well as Accusative (Acc) Case morphology (*kasrah* ‘-i’), a phenomenon known in language study as ‘syncretism’; I will refer to Case morphology as morphological case (m-case). Al-Balushi (2013) claims that this is the case because sound dual and plural (non-singular) nouns in SA have no Acc m-case suffixes of their own, which is why they surface with the Gen m-case suffixes of the nouns encoding the same number and gender features. Adopting a version of Testen’s (1994) account of the development of the Subjunctive (Sub) verb in SA and the origin of its suffixes, this paper provides an answer to the question of why SA non-singular Acc-marked nouns have no independent m-case suffixes, that is, why their Acc m-case suffixes are identical to their Gen m-case suffixes. It is argued that this is the case because the present-day Acc case morphology joined the SA nominal system after those of the Nominative (Nom) and Gen paradigms, as a result of ‘borrowing’ endings from other paradigms in the language; the singular Acc-marked nouns borrowed from the Sub paradigm, and the non-singular ones borrowed from the Gen paradigm.<sup>1</sup>

To motivate the proposed account, I will make a number of assumptions from both the generative and traditional literatures. First, I assume that m-case is the morphological realization of abstract Case (Vergnaud 1977, 1982, Chomsky and Lasnik 1977, Chomsky 1980, 1981, 2001, Legate 2008, among many others). In other words, Noun Phrases (NPs) get their abstract [Case] features valued in syntax (on an abstract level), and those valued features receive certain morphological realizations in the morphological component, which leads to the Phonological Form (PF). Chomsky’s (1980, 1981) Case Filter states that lexical NPs must have Case (or rather its phonetic realization, m-case) by PF, that is, by spell-out.

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank the editors of *IJAL* as well as three anonymous reviewers for valuable comments that led to improving this paper.

I use the following abbreviations: Acc: accusative, d: dual, Emph: emphasis, Ener: energetic, EV: epenthetic vowel, f: feminine, Fut: future, Gen: genitive, Impf: imperfective, Impr: imperative, Ind: indicative, Juss: jussive, m: masculine, Mod: modality particle, Neg: negative, Nom: nominative, p: plural, Pass: passive, Prs: present, Pst: past, s: singular, Sub: subjunctive, 1: 1<sup>st</sup> person, 2: 2<sup>nd</sup> person, 3: 3<sup>rd</sup> person. I will refer to structural/abstract Case as ‘Case’, and to default and lexical case as ‘case’. I also use SA and Arabic interchangeably; when the discussion is on the colloquial dialects, this will be made clear.

Vergnaud (1977) argues that ‘John’ is licit in the main clause of (1) because it is in a position (Spec, IP) where Nom Case is licensed, whereas ‘he’ and ‘him’ are illicit in the embedded subject position (Spec, IP<sub>[-tense]</sub>) because Case is not licensed there, which is why PRO (empty category) is the subject. Chomsky (1980) argues that only elements that can realize m-case (like lexical NPs and overt pronouns) can appear in positions where Case is licensed.<sup>2</sup>

1. John/He tried [*\*he/\*him*/PRO to read the book].

I also assume Aoun’s (1979) Visibility Condition which states that abstract Case (through its phonetic realization, m-case) is necessary to render arguments (e.g. subjects and objects) visible at the Logical Form (LF) for  $\theta$ -role assignment; that is, m-case helps distinguish agents from themes, for example. In addition, I assume Legate (2008) where it is argued that m-case represents abstract Case in the morphological component according to the Elsewhere Condition. This means that when a specific abstract Case value has no m-case morpheme of its own (to represent it at PF), an elsewhere m-case morpheme is used, which is basically the phenomenon that this paper is trying to account for in SA. While the Elsewhere Condition, as well as underspecification, is a theoretical tool aimed at accounting for syncretism theoretically, this paper provides a descriptive account of how and where from, the SA Acc paradigm acquired its current m-case suffixes.

I also follow Al-Balushi (2011) in that the so-called ‘mood’ suffixes in the SA imperfective paradigm (Wright 1898, vol. I: 51–52) do not make reference to mood/modality but rather to morphological verbal case (m-vc), on a par with m-case on nouns, revitalizing an old observation about SA verbs that they carry some form of case inflection (Sibawayhi 8<sup>th</sup> century, and associates). That these suffixes do not mark modality has been argued in Benmamoun (2000: 31) as well as in Fassi Fehri (1993: 163) who proposed that they mark Temporal Case (TCase).

Al-Balushi (2011: 122–161) argues that SA imperfective verbs encode a Verbal Case [VC] feature at an abstract level, and that this feature is responsible for licensing abstract/structural Case on NPs in SA.<sup>3</sup> To support this claim, he shows that Case is licensed in the absence of tense and agreement (p. 36–52). He also shows that Case is not licensed in the

---

<sup>2</sup> Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) proposed that PRO receives a form of Case called ‘Null Case’, which I do not assume; for arguments against Null Case, see Baltin and Barrett (2002) and Cecchetto and Oniga (2004).

<sup>3</sup> Roeper and Vergnaud (1980), Zagana (1982), Fabb (1984), and Roberts (1985a and 1985b) proposed that verbs (or VPs) receive Case, but none of them claimed a licensing relation between VC and structural Case.

absence of [VC] despite the presence of tense and agreement (p. 94–113). Al-Balushi argues that SA imperfective verbs carry one of three VC values, Ind, Sub, or Juss, signaled by the well-known morphological distinctions; these labels (Ind, Sub, Juss) are used as cover terms for the morphologically realized inflectional states (values assigned by the particles and appearing as suffixes) of the three verbal forms that convey several semantic functions or moods, comprising indicative, subjunctive, optative, jussive, imperative, conditional, and energetic. In other words, Ind, Sub, and Juss, as used in this paper, correspond to the traditional Arabic grammar terms *marfūʿ*, *manṣūb*, and *majzūm*, respectively, rather than to the well-known modality-related terms.

To argue that the relevant verbal suffixes mark abstract Verbal Case (VC) and not mood, Al-Balushi (2011: 88–94) shows that, like NPs, which are sensitive to syntactic context in the sense that they may not be licensed in certain positions, as (1) shows, verbs are also not allowed in at least one context in SA, which is verbless sentences, as (2-4) show; I assume no verbal equivalent to PRO. In other words, the fact that (4), which is verbless, is grammatical indicates that (2-3) are ungrammatical because [VC] is not licensed in this context/clause, and so the copular verb is illicit. This indicates that, like NPs, verbs also require abstract licensing.<sup>4</sup>

- |                         |                  |                     |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 2. * <i>ya-kūn-u</i>    | <i>r-rajul-u</i> | <i>saʿīd-an/-un</i> |
| Impf-be.3sm-Ind         | the-man-Nom      | happy-Acc/-Nom      |
| 3. *ʔ <i>ar-rajul-u</i> | <i>ya-kūn-u</i>  | <i>saʿīd-an/-un</i> |
| the-man-Nom             | Impf-be.3sm-Ind  | happy-Acc/-Nom      |
| 4. ʔ <i>ar-rajul-u</i>  | <i>saʿīd-un</i>  |                     |
| the-man-Nom             | happy-Nom        |                     |
- ‘The man is happy.’

Besides this ‘syntactic’ property of VC, which is licensing, the claim that SA verbs receive Case is supported by the ‘morphological’ fact that the three verbal forms (Ind, Sub, Juss) receive certain inflectional suffixes largely similar to those that appear on nouns (reflecting a perhaps similar function), and in roughly the same structural configuration, that is, when assigned

---

<sup>4</sup> Al-Balushi (2012), who argues against some of the available accounts of why (4) lacks a copula (Fassi Fehri 1981, Mouchaweh 1986, Benmamoun 2000, Soltan 2007), argues that it is verbless because a verb is not needed since structural Case, argued to be licensed by [VC], is not needed either, which is why a copula is not allowed, being superfluous. This is because the NP *ʔar-rajul-u* ‘the man’ is a topic, not a subject, which receives default Nom case at PF, and is visible at LF for  $\theta$ -role assignment by the feature [Topic]. The predicate *saʿīd-un* ‘happy’ satisfies the Case Filter by the same default case mechanism, and is not subject to the Visibility Condition.

by the relevant verbal particles. This approach to these suffixes is also supported by the fact that only verbs (but not nouns or adjectives) can follow the Sub- and Juss-assigning particles, indicating case assignment. Besides, the fact that certain particles assign certain VC values (and not others) means that only certain forms are allowed in certain contexts. These facts support the view that these suffixes which have long been considered as signs of modality, or as marking mood, do not mark modality but rather VC, that is, inflectional states of verbs.<sup>5</sup>

Furthermore, I assume a derivational relation ‘of some sort’ between SA nouns and verbs bearing the same number and gender features. Supported by the relevant facts, I will assume with Grande (2011: 407) that SA morphology is largely agglutinative, not fusional. I also assume that the features 3<sup>rd</sup> person, singular, and masculine are not marked in the relevant forms (Bejar 1998, Harley and Ritter 2002, Cowper 2005).<sup>6</sup> This is illustrated by the 3df, 2pm, 1s, and 2pf Ind forms in (5-8). While feminine and dual are marked in (5), 3<sup>rd</sup> person is not marked. Also, while 2<sup>nd</sup> person and plural are marked in (6), *masculine* is not marked. Likewise, the 1s form in (7) shows that both *singular* and *masculine* are not marked. However, as (8) shows, the 2pf form shows that

<sup>5</sup> I also assume that the perfective verb carries VC, since, like the indicative, it can appear without particles, as in (i), or following Sub-assigning particles like *ʔan* (the embedded clause introducer) and *hattā* ‘until’, as in (ii-iii), as well as Juss-assigning particles, like *ʔin* ‘if’ and *ʔayna* ‘where’, as (iv-v) show, where the m-vc suffix is similar to that of the Juss, ‘-Ø’. This extension accounts for their ability to license structural Case on arguments.

- i. qaraʔ-at-Ø            l-bint-u            l-kitāb-a  
Pst.read-3sf-**Ind**    the-girl-Nom    the-book-Acc  
‘The girl read the book.’
- ii. ʔaqlaqa-nī-Ø            **ʔan**            xasir-nā-Ø            l-mubārāt-a            l-ʔiftitāhiyyat-a  
Pst.worry.3sm-1s-Ind    Comp    Pst.lose-1p-**Sub**    the-match-Acc    the-opening-Acc  
‘It worried me that we lost the opening match.’
- iii. “kaḏālika    kaḏḏaba-Ø            laḏīna    min    qabl-i-him  
likewise    Pst.deny.3sm-Ind    those    from    before-Gen-them  
**hattā**    ḏāq-ū-Ø            baʔs-a-nā”            (6:148)  
until    Pst.taste-3pm-**Sub**    punishment-Acc-our  
‘Those before them denied (like them) until they tasted Our punishment.’
- iv. **ʔin**    najāh-ta-Ø            sa-ta-ḥsul-u            ʕala    l-waḏīfat-i  
if    Pst.pass-2sm-**Juss**    Fut-2-get.sm-Ind    on    the-job-Gen  
‘If you passed, you will get the job.’
- v. **ʔayna**    ḏahaba-Ø            l-walad-u  
where    Pst.go.3sm-**Juss**    the-boy-Nom  
‘Where did the boy go?’

<sup>6</sup> ‘Marked’ is used here to refer to the phonetic realization of morphosyntactic features.

2<sup>nd</sup> person, plural, and feminine are all marked. These forms thus show that only 1<sup>st</sup> person, 2<sup>nd</sup> person, dual, plural, and feminine are marked.<sup>7</sup>

5. ?al-bint-ān-i            ta-ktub-ā-n-i            l-wājib-a  
 the-girl-d.Nom-EV    f-write-d-Ind-EV    the-homework-Acc  
 ‘The two girls are writing the homework.’

6. ?antum    ta-ktub-ū-n-a            l-wājib-a  
 you.pm    2-write-p-Ind-EV    the-homework-Acc  
 ‘You.pm are writing the homework.’

7. ?anā    ?a-ktub-u            l-wājib-a  
 I            1-write-Ind    the-homework-Acc  
 ‘I am writing the homework.’

8. ?antunna    ta-ktub-na-Ø            l-wājib-a  
 you.pf    2-write-pf-Ind    the-homework-Acc  
 ‘You.pf are writing the homework.’

Finally, I assume that SA and Qur’ānic (Classical) Arabic are the same in terms of syntax and morphology (Holes 2004:4-5; Ryding 2005:4). Citing Fischer (1997:188), Watson (2002:8) states that “[a]lthough the lexis and stylistics of Modern Standard Arabic are rather different from those of Classical Arabic, the morphology and syntax [which include case positions and morphemes] have remained basically unchanged over the centuries”. Therefore, reference throughout the paper will be made to SA.

---

<sup>7</sup> The prefix *ta-* marks feminine in the 3df form in (5) but marks 2<sup>nd</sup> person in the 2pm and 2pf forms in (7) and (8), respectively; *ta-* marks feminine in the 3df form because 3<sup>rd</sup> person is not marked, which is why the Impf prefix (‘*ya-/yu-*’) appears in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person masculine forms (as well as in the 3pf form, due to feature movement – Plural in the suffix attracting Feminine in the prefix – as will be discussed in section 2. The same prefix is glossed as marking 2<sup>nd</sup> person in (7) and (8) (as well as in the other four 2<sup>nd</sup> person forms) because the gender distinction is also not established in the dual forms of the imperfective, as well as in other dual forms in the language, such as the 2dm and 2df perfective forms (*katab-tum-ā*) and the 2dm and 2df pronouns (*?ant-um-ā*), which supports the view (based on Noyer’s Universal Feature Hierarchy) that Person takes precedence over Gender, which gets to move to the suffix, as will be shown in section 2.

- I assume that the vowels at the end of the verbal forms in (5) and (6), as well as the one at the end of the preverbal NP in (5) are epenthetic vowels, since they appear in connected discourse only. This is because the ‘-a’ at the end of the verbal form in (6), *ta-ktub-ū-n-a*, is different from the ‘-a’ at the end of the verbal form in (8), *ta-ktub-na-Ø*, since the form in (8) is ungrammatical without ‘-a’ even as a pausal form, whereas the one in (6) is grammatical without it. In other words, the ‘-n-a’ at the end of the form in (6) and the ‘-na’ at the end of the form in (8) are not the same morpheme (Al-Balushi 2013).

Section 2 presents a background to m-case in SA, and shows why syncretism exists in the SA m-case system. Section 3 presents the relevant aspects of Testen (1994). Section 4 presents the proposed account, which is purely descriptive, without reference to or intended implications for any theoretical framework. Section 5 concludes the paper.

## 2. Syncretism in the Standard Arabic Case System

To approach the issue of why SA plural feminine nouns have *kasrah* (‘-i’) as their Acc m-case suffix, let us first address the issue of why they receive an m-case suffix associated with singular nouns. Table 1 presents the m-case suffixes in SA in the three Case values, Nom, Acc, and Gen.

Table 1

	<b>Singular</b>		<b>Dual</b>		<b>Plural</b>	
	<b>Masculine</b>	<b>Feminine</b>	<b>Masculine</b>	<b>Feminine</b>	<b>Masculine</b>	<b>Feminine</b>
<b>Nom</b>	-u	-u	-ān	-ān	-ūn	-u
<b>Acc</b>	-a	-a	-ayn	-ayn	-īn	-i
<b>Gen</b>	-i	-i	-ayn	-ayn	-īn	-i

This can be accounted for by the fact that, unlike all the other non-singular nouns in SA (dual masculine, dual feminine, and sound plural masculine nouns), sound plural feminine nouns do not have their number feature immediately followed by their m-case suffix. As Table 2 shows, when number is marked (as in duals and plurals), gender separates number from m-case only in plural feminine nouns.

Table 2

	<b>Noun</b>	<b>Example</b>	<b>Marked ϕ-features</b>	<b>Order of Suffixes</b>
1.	sm nouns	ʔal-mudarris-u	None	case
2.	sf nouns	ʔal-mudarris-at-u	Gender	gender-case
3.	dm nouns	ʔal-mudarris-ān	Number	number.case
4.	df nouns	ʔal-mudarris-at-ān	gender and number	gender-number.case
5.	pm nouns	ʔal-mudarris-ūn	Number	number.case
6.	pf nouns	ʔal-mudarris-ā-t-u	number and gender	number- <b>gender</b> -case

Thus the reason why sound plural feminine nouns receive m-case suffixes that are usually seen on singular nouns is that their number suffix is not fused into their m-case suffix. That this is on the right track is supported by the fact that broken plurals (both masculine and feminine), where the number morpheme is in the middle of the noun, that is, not immediately followed by the m-case suffix, receive the same m-case suffixes of singular nouns, as Table 3 shows.

Table 3

	<b>Noun</b>	<b>Nom</b>	<b>Acc</b>	<b>Gen</b>
1.	sm nouns	ʔal-bayt- <b>u</b>	ʔal-bayt- <b>a</b>	ʔal-bayt- <b>i</b>
2.	sf nouns	ʔal-yurfat- <b>u</b>	ʔal-yurfat- <b>a</b>	ʔal-yurfat- <b>i</b>
3.	pm nouns	ʔal-buyūt- <b>u</b>	ʔal-buyūt- <b>a</b>	ʔal-buyūt- <b>i</b>
4.	pf nouns	ʔal-yuraf- <b>u</b>	ʔal-yuraf- <b>a</b>	ʔal-yuraf- <b>i</b>

This state-of-affairs leads to the question of why plural feminine nouns, unlike singular and broken plural nouns, receive *kasrah* ('-i'), not *fathah* ('-a'), for Acc m-case. In other words, why are plural feminine nouns Acc-marked with their Gen m-case suffixes? A careful examination of the relevant facts shows that plural feminine nouns are not the only ones which are Acc-marked with their Gen m-case suffixes. As Table 4 shows, this is true of all and only the sound non-singular nouns in SA.

Table 4

		Acc-marked NPs	Gen-marked NPs
1.	sm nouns	kallam-tu-Ø Pst.talk-1s-Ind	l-mudarris-a the-teacher-Acc
			maʕa l-mudarris-i with the-teacher-Gen
2.	sf nouns	kallam-tu-Ø Pst.talk-1s-Ind	l-mudarris-at-a the-teacher-f-Acc
			maʕa l-mudarris-at-i with the-teacher-f-Gen
3.	dm nouns	kallam-tu-Ø Pst.talk-1s-Ind	l-mudarris- <b>ayn</b> the-teacher-d.Acc
			maʕa l-mudarris- <b>ayn</b> with the-teacher-d.Gen
4.	df nouns	kallam-tu-Ø Pst.talk-1s-Ind	l-mudarris-at- <b>ayn</b> the-teacher-f-d.Acc
			maʕa l-mudarris-at- <b>ayn</b> with the-teacher-f-d.Gen
5.	pm nouns	kallam-tu-Ø Pst.talk-1s-Ind	l-mudarris- <b>īn</b> the-teacher-p.Acc
			maʕa l-mudarris- <b>īn</b> with the-teacher-p.Gen
6.	pf nouns	kallam-tu-Ø Pst.talk-1s-Ind	l-mudarris-ā-t- <b>i</b> the-teacher-p-f-Acc
			maʕa l-mudarris-ā-t- <b>i</b> with the-teacher-p-f-Gen

In other words, all sound non-singular nouns in SA have no Acc m-case suffixes of their own, which is why they ‘borrow’ their Gen m-case suffixes for this purpose.<sup>8</sup> An alternative view of the boldfaced suffixes in Table 4 is that they are Acc m-case suffixes and that they are borrowed to also serve as the Gen m-case suffixes of the corresponding nouns (ones with the same number and gender features). That this alternative view is incorrect is shown by the fact that plural feminine nouns (where number is separated from m-case) receive *kasrah* for Acc, and if *kasrah* were the original Acc m-case suffix when number and m-case are not fused together, we would have seen it marking Acc on singular nouns (where number is not marked) as well as on broken plurals (where number is not immediately followed by m-case), but this is not the case, since those have *fathah* as the Acc m-case suffix. The adopted approach thus undermines the possible diptote-based alternative that would suggest that the non-singular nominal forms in table 4 are Gen-marked with their Acc m-case suffixes.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, the boldfaced suffixes are borrowed from the Gen paradigm.

<sup>8</sup> The term ‘borrow’ is used here in an informal sense. It basically means that a specific m-case morpheme is ‘replaced with’ another one, or that a certain abstract Case value is ‘realized by’ an m-case morpheme that is relevant to another abstract Case value, which leads to the observed syncretism.

<sup>9</sup> Diptotes are nominal forms whose Nom-marked forms realize Nom m-case suffixes, but whose Gen-marked forms (as well as Acc-marked ones) realize Acc m-case suffixes, and which do not realize nunation/tanwīn, as (i-ii) show; but this applies to indefinite NPs only. As (iii-iv) show, once the NPs are definite, they realize the expected (position-relevant) m-case suffixes.

i. raʔay-tu      ṣahrāʔ-a/\*ṣahrāʔ-an  
Pst.see-1s    desert-Acc  
‘I saw a desert.’

This approach is further supported by facts from the SA verbal system. To illustrate, as Table 5 shows, this ‘borrowing’ is also witnessed between Sub and Juss non-singular verbal forms. The singular Sub forms have *fathah* (‘-a’) as their morphological verbal case (m-vc) suffix, whereas the non-singular forms have the corresponding Juss suffix (‘-Ø’) as their Sub m-vc. This pattern is violated only in the forms in 2 and 4, that is, the 1p and 2sf forms. The same two forms also contradict the same expectation in the indicative (Ind) paradigm. In other words, one expects the 1p form *nu-darris-u* to have ‘-n’ as its Ind m-vc suffix, just like the other non-singular verbal forms, and the 2sf form *tu-darris-ī-n* to have ‘-u’ as its Ind m-vc suffix, just like the other singular verbal forms. There is also the issue of why, unlike the other non-singular Ind forms, the plural feminine ones, both 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person forms, do not have an overt m-vc suffix. To address these issues, I will adopt Al-Balushi’s (2013) analysis of the SA imperfective paradigm, which is based on the assumptions in (9-12). The discussion in the remainder of this section resolves the discrepancies in Table 5, which is also relevant for the proposed account in section 4.

- 
- ii. tuh-tu            fī    ṣahrāʔ-**a**/\*ṣahrāʔ-**i**/\*ṣahrāʔ-**an**  
Pst.get.lost-1s    in    desert-Gen  
‘I got lost in a desert.’
- iii. raʔay-tu        ṣ-ṣahrāʔ-**a**  
Pst.see-1s    the-desert-Acc  
‘I saw the desert.’
- iv. tuh-tu            fī    ṣ-ṣahrāʔ-**i**  
Pst.get.lost-1s    in    the-desert-Gen  
‘I got lost in the desert.’

Therefore, plural feminine nouns are not diptotes since their m-case does not change based on (in)definiteness, as (v-vi) show.

- v. raʔay-tu        mudarris-ā-t-**in**  
Pst.see-1s    teacher-p-f-Acc  
‘I saw female teachers.’
- vi. raʔay-tu        l-mudarris-ā-t-**i**  
Pst.see-1s    the-teacher-p-f-Acc  
‘I saw the female teachers.’

Table 5

		<b>Indicative Forms</b>	<b>Subjunctive Forms</b>	<b>Jussive Forms</b>
1.	1s	ʔu-darris- <b>u</b> 1-teach-Ind	ʔu-darris- <b>a</b> 1-teach-Sub	ʔu-darris- <b>Ø</b> 1-teach-Juss
2.	1p	nu-darris- <b>u</b> 1p-teach-Ind	nu-darris- <b>a</b> 1p-teach-Sub	nu-darris- <b>Ø</b> 1p-teach-Juss
3.	2sm	tu-darris- <b>u</b> 2-teach-Ind	tu-darris- <b>a</b> 2-teach-Sub	tu-darris- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-Juss
4.	2sf	tu-darris- <b>ī-n</b> 2-teach-f-Ind	tu-darris- <b>ī-Ø</b> 2-teach-f-Sub	tu-darris- <b>ī-Ø</b> 2-teach-f-Juss
5.	2dm	tu-darris- <b>ā-n</b> 2-teach-d-Ind	tu-darris- <b>ā-Ø</b> 2-teach-d-Sub	tu-darris- <b>ā-Ø</b> 2-teach-d-Juss
6.	2df	tu-darris- <b>ā-n</b> 2-teach-d-Ind	tu-darris- <b>ā-Ø</b> 2-teach-d-Sub	tu-darris- <b>ā-Ø</b> 2-teach-d-Juss
7.	2pm	tu-darris- <b>ū-n</b> 2-teach-p-Ind	tu-darris- <b>ū-Ø</b> 2-teach-p-Sub	tu-darris- <b>ū-Ø</b> 2-teach-p-Juss
8.	2pf	tu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-pf-Ind	tu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-pf-Sub	tu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-pf-Juss
9.	3sm	yu-darris- <b>u</b> Impf-teach-Ind	yu-darris- <b>a</b> Impf-teach-Sub	yu-darris- <b>Ø</b> Impf-teach-Juss
10.	3sf	tu-darris- <b>u</b> f-teach-Ind	tu-darris- <b>a</b> f-teach-Sub	tu-darris- <b>Ø</b> f-teach-Juss
11.	3dm	yu-darris- <b>ā-n</b> Impf-teach-d-Ind	yu-darris- <b>ā-Ø</b> Impf-teach-d-Sub	yu-darris- <b>ā-Ø</b> Impf-teach-d-Juss
12.	3df	tu-darris- <b>ā-n</b> f-teach-d-Ind	tu-darris- <b>ā-Ø</b> f-teach-d-Sub	tu-darris- <b>ā-Ø</b> f-teach-d-Juss
13.	3pm	yu-darris- <b>ū-n</b> Impf-teach-p-Ind	yu-darris- <b>ū-Ø</b> Impf-teach-p-Sub	yu-darris- <b>ū-Ø</b> Impf-teach-p-Juss
14.	3pf	yu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> Impf-teach-pf-Ind	yu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> Impf-teach-pf-Sub	yu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> Impf-teach-pf-Juss

9. Prefix+STEM+Suffix.

Person            Number

Gender

10. Person >> Number >> Gender.

11. 1<sup>st</sup> person > Plural > Feminine.

12. Feature Deletion Constraint: no verbal form in SA may *phonetically* realize more than three verbal features with the root.

I will also assume that the post-root domain (suffix) can phonetically realize two features only, whereas the pre-root domain (prefix) can phonetically realize one feature only, unless the other one is attracted, as what happens in the 1p form. The template in (9), from Bejar (1998: 26), states that the person and gender features are base-generated in the prefix of verbal forms, and that the number feature is base-generated in the suffix. The relation in (10), Noyer's (1997) Universal Feature Hierarchy (UFH), puts "... person above number above gender ..." (p. xxii). This hierarchy indicates that Person takes precedence over Number and Gender, and that Number takes precedence over Gender. The relation in (11) is a primacy relation from Al-Balushi (2013: 56); this relation states that 1<sup>st</sup> person is more primary than Plural, and so it can attract it, and that Plural is more primary than Feminine, and so it can attract it. He provides evidence from the SA verbal and pronominal systems to support the inclusion of 1<sup>st</sup> person and plural in this relation as primary features and the exclusion of 2<sup>nd</sup> person and dual, respectively (while 3<sup>rd</sup> person and singular are unmarked). Together with Noyer's hierarchy, this relation accounts for feature attraction as well as for voluntary movement. The constraint in (12) states that a verbal form in SA is not allowed to phonetically realize more than three verbal features with the root; 'verbal features' here refers to  $\phi$ -features (agreement), tense/aspect, and m-vc features. Morphemes related to futurity, causation, intensification, passivization, and inchoativity, as well as object clitics do not count since they are not part of the neutral (basic) form of the verb.<sup>10</sup>

Assuming this system, the 1p Ind form is *nu-darris-u*, with '-u' as the Ind m-vc suffix (when '-n' is expected to be the one) because 1<sup>st</sup> person attracts the plural feature to the prefix, according to the primacy relation in (11). When the long vowel which marks plural, '-ū', moves from the suffix of the abstract intermediate form *ʔu-darris-ū-n*, the '-n' becomes no longer phonologically compatible with the last consonant in the root, which calls for the introduction of '-u', the other allomorph of the Ind morpheme.

---

<sup>10</sup> With regard to how time (tense/aspect) is marked in the SA verb, I will assume Al-Balushi (2013: 62–63) where it is argued that 'tense/aspect marking in SA verbs is established by the position of the person affix in relation to the root.' In other words, while the imperfective form has the order Person-Stem, the perfective form has the order Stem-Person. This approach is supported by the fact that while present tense (imperfective) prefers the SVO order, past tense (perfective) prefers the VSO order; evidence for these observations comes from Ferguson's (1983) God-wishes, as well as from idioms and Qur'an data (Al-Balushi 2012); see Benmamoun (2000: 58–62) for discussion on the unmarked word orders for the two tenses; see Al-Balushi (2013: 62–63) for arguments against the view that tense/aspect is marked by vocalic melody. Therefore, time is marked in the SA verb, but *without* an independent morpheme.

Likewise, the 1p Sub form is *nu-darris-a*, when it is expected to have ‘-Ø’ as its m-vc suffix, because the 1<sup>st</sup> person feature attracts the plural feature to the prefix. This removes the long vowel ‘-ū’ from the post-root domain of the intermediate form *?u-darris-ū-Ø*, which makes its post-root domain similar to that of singular forms, which, in turn, allows ‘-a’ to appear as the Sub m-vc suffix.

This way, the 1p Ind form looks as in Table 6, where its m-vc suffix is identical to the m-case suffix of the corresponding noun (Nom-marked plural masculine), as well as to the m-vc suffix of the other non-singular verbal forms. The 1p Sub form, which has clearly borrowed the corresponding Juss m-vc suffix, corresponds to a nominal form (Acc-marked) which has also borrowed the corresponding Gen m-case suffix; the Sub 1p m-vc suffix is also identical to that of the other non-singular Sub forms. This morphological correspondence obtains before feature attraction takes place.

Table 6

	VC	Verbal forms <u>before</u> feature movement	M-case on the Corresponding NPs	Known Verbal forms (after feature movement)
1.	1p Ind	?u-darris- <b>ū-n</b> 1-teach-p-Ind	?al-mudarris- <b>ūn</b> the-teacher-p.Nom	nu-darris- <b>u</b> 1p-teach-Ind
2.	1p Sub	?u-darris- <b>ū-Ø</b> 1-teach-p-Sub	?al-mudarris- <b>īn</b> the-teacher-p.Acc	nu-darris- <b>a</b> 1p-teach-Sub

The 2sf Ind form is *tu-darris-ī-n*, when ‘-u’ is expected to be the m-vc suffix. This is the case because the gender feature (‘-ī’), base-generated in the prefix of verbal forms according to (9), is lower than person (‘tu-’) on Noyer’s UFH in (10). This leads to the voluntary movement (not attraction) of the gender feature from the prefix to the suffix because the person feature wins the prefix slot. The presence of the long vowel ‘-ī’ in the suffix calls for the introduction of the ‘-n’ allomorph, instead of ‘-u’, as the Ind m-vc suffix (for phonological considerations).

Likewise, the 2sf Sub form, *tu-darris-ī-Ø*, which is expected to be *tu-darris-ī-a* (being singular), that is, with ‘-a’ as the m-vc suffix, is not as expected because the person feature takes precedence over the gender feature and so it wins the prefix position. This allows the gender feature ‘-ī’ to move voluntarily to the suffix domain, which is allowed since number is not marked. In other words, the 2sf form should have been *tu-ī-darris-a*, and when the long vowel marking feminine moves to the suffix, the *fathah* ‘-a’ disappears since it is not phonologically compatible with a long *kasrah*, that is, cannot follow ‘-ī’.

As Table 7 shows, the singular feminine Nom-marked noun and the 2sf Ind form have the same suffixes before feature movement applies. Likewise, the singular feminine noun has ‘-a’ as the Acc m-case suffix, just like the 2sf form which has ‘-a’ as the Sub m-vc suffix, at some point in the derivation.

Table 7

	VC	Verbal forms <u>before</u> feature movement	M-case on the Corresponding NPs	Known Verbal forms ( <u>after</u> feature movement)
1.	2sf Ind	tu-ī-darris- <b>u</b> 2-f-teach-Ind	ʔal-mudarris-at- <b>u</b> the-teacher-f-Nom	tu-darris-ī- <b>n</b> 2-teach-f-Ind
2.	2sf Sub	tu-ī-darris- <b>a</b> 2-f-teach-Sub	ʔal-mudarris-at- <b>a</b> the-teacher-f-Acc	tu-darris-ī- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-f-Sub

The main goal of the preceding discussion of the relevant aspects of the SA verbal system has been to show that the nominal m-case suffixes are identical (at least at some point in the derivation) to the m-vc suffixes of the verbs that encode the same number and gender features. This relationship will be vitally important for the proposed account in section 4.

This correspondence between m-case and m-vc seems to be incomplete since the Ind plural feminine forms, both 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person forms, have ‘-Ø’ as their m-vc suffix, but the corresponding nouns, plural feminine, have ‘-u’ as the Nom m-case suffix, as Table 8 shows, which requires an explanation. This issue does not arise in the Sub and Acc forms since the verbal m-vc suffix is borrowed from the Juss paradigm (‘-Ø’) and the nominal m-case suffix is borrowed from the Gen paradigm (‘-i’).

Table 8

		Ind-marked pf Verbs	Nom-marked pf Nouns
1.	2pf	tu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-pf-Ind	ʔal-mudarris-ā-t- <b>u</b> the-teacher-p-f-Nom
2.	3pf	yu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> Impf-teach-pf-Ind	ʔal-mudarris-ā-t- <b>u</b> the-teacher-p-f-Nom

To resolve this issue, Al-Balushi argues that the Ind plural feminine verbal forms (unlike their Sub and Juss counterparts) in fact have an overt m-vc suffix, ‘-u’, but that this suffix gets deleted due to the constraint in (12), let alone the impossibility of a *ḍammah* ‘-u’ following a *fathah* ‘-a’ on the same form (‘-na’). Basically, since plural in the suffix of these two forms attracts feminine from the prefix, according to (11), the post-root domain has three features,

plural, feminine, and m-vc. The observation that unlike plural and feminine, which are important for meaning and interpretation, m-vc only has a morphosyntactic value, and since the post-root domain cannot phonetically realize more than two features, m-vc is sacrificed. The deletion of the m-vc feature may also be because after feature attraction, the feminine feature attaches to the plural one and separates it from m-vc, as what happens in plural feminine nouns, which makes the m-vc suffix the peripheral one, hence subject to deletion.

To support the feature deletion constraint, Al-Balushi provides evidence from the fact that the 2<sup>nd</sup> person dual masculine (2dm) and the 2<sup>nd</sup> person dual feminine (2df) forms, which both are *tu-darris-ā-n*, are identical, that is, gender is not marked. In these two forms, what happens is that the gender feature in the 2df, which is base-generated in the prefix (according to 9), does not get to move voluntarily to the suffix position according to (10) since the post-root domain already has two features, number (‘-ā’) and m-vc (‘-n’); this is different from the 2sf form, where there is a vacant slot in the suffix since number is not marked in the singular forms. Moreover, the gender feature in the 2df form does not get attracted to the suffix position by dual since neither is a member of the primacy relation in (11). So what happens in the 2df form is that the feminine gender feature vanishes in the prefix, losing to the person feature, according to the hierarchy in (10). Thus the gender distinction is not established in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person dual forms due to this feature deletion constraint.

That this is on the right track is supported by the fact that the gender distinction is established in the corresponding 3<sup>rd</sup> person forms, *yu-darris-ā-n* for the masculine and *tu-darris-ā-n* for the feminine, taking advantage of the fact that 3<sup>rd</sup> person is not marked, as assumed earlier. Thus, feminine gender is marked in the feminine form, and ‘yu-’, which marks imperfective aspect (Al-Sayyid and Al-Najjar 1996: 116), is marked in the masculine form.

Additional support for this constraint comes from the fact that the perfective paradigm verbs also do not phonetically realize more than three verbal features, as Table 9 shows.

Table 9

		<b>Perfective Verb Forms</b>	<b>Number of phonetically realized features</b>
1.	1s	daras-tu-Ø study-1-Ind	1
2.	1p	daras-nā-Ø study-1p-Ind	2
3.	2sm	daras-ta-Ø study-2-Ind	1
4.	2sf	daras-t-i-Ø study-2-f-Ind	2
5.	2dm	daras-t-um-ā-Ø study-2-p-d-Ind	2
6.	2df	daras-t-um-ā-Ø study-2-p-d-Ind	2
7.	2pm	daras-t-um-Ø study-2-p-Ind	2
8.	2pf	daras-t-un-na-Ø study-2-p-pf-Ind	3
9.	3sm	darasa-Ø study-Ind	0
10.	3sf	darasa-t-Ø study-f-Ind	1
11.	3dm	daras-ā-Ø study-d-Ind	1
12.	3df	darasa-t-ā-Ø study-f-d-Ind	2
13.	3pm	daras-ū-Ø study-p-Ind	1
14.	3pf	daras-na-Ø study-pf-Ind	2

All these facts indicate that the Nom and Ind suffixes are identical, at least at some point in the derivation of verbal forms. This morphological similarity makes reference to the label that the traditional grammarians of Arabic (Sībawayhi 8<sup>th</sup> century) assigned to both verbal and nominal forms, *marfūʿ*.

Similarly, these facts indicate that the Sub m-vc suffixes are identical to the Acc m-case suffixes (for the nouns and verbs that encode the same number and gender features, at some point in the derivation) when the former are overtly marked, that is, with ‘-a’. When the Sub m-vc suffixes are not overtly marked, that is, when they borrow the corresponding Juss m-vc suffixes (‘-Ø’), the nouns with the same number and gender features borrow the corresponding Gen m-

case suffixes. The morphological correspondence between Sub and Acc forms makes reference to the label used in the traditional grammar for both verbal and nominal forms, *manṣūb*.

### **3. The Origin of the SA Subjunctive Suffixes**

Testen (1994) looks into the issue of where the Arabic Sub forms came or evolved from. The fact that the Arabic “[s]ubjunctive mood occurs only in subordinate clauses” and that “[i]t indicates an act which is dependent upon that mentioned in the previous clause, and future to it in point of time” (Wright 1898, vol. II: 24) prompted Testen to argue that the SA Sub does not correspond to the Biblical Hebrew cohortative, with a final ‘-â’, or to the Ugaritic verbal forms with a final ‘-a’, or the Akkadian request-and-desire verbal forms, with a final ‘-a’. Therefore, he concludes that the SA Sub has no cognates in other Semitic languages, which led him to look for its origin in SA itself.

Testen explored the possibility that the SA Sub has evolved from the ‘lightened energetic’ form whose suffix is ‘-an’. SA also has a ‘heavy energetic’ verbal form as well, whose suffix is ‘-anna’; Table 10 illustrates both energetic forms.

Table 10

		<b>Lightened Energetic</b>	<b>Heavy Energetic</b>
1.	1s	?u-darris- <b>an</b> 1-teach-Ener	?u-darris- <b>anna</b> 1-teach-Ener
2.	1p	nu-darris- <b>an</b> 1p-teach-Ener	nu-darris- <b>anna</b> 1p-teach-Ener
3.	2sm	tu-darris- <b>an</b> 2-teach-Ener	tu-darris- <b>anna</b> 2-teach-Ener
4.	2sf	tu-darris-i- <b>n</b> 2-teach-f-Ener	tu-darris-i- <b>nna</b> 2-teach-f-Ener
5.	2dm		tu-darris-ā- <b>nni</b> 2-teach-d-Ener
6.	2df		tu-darris-ā- <b>nni</b> 2-teach-d-Ener
7.	2pm	tu-darris-u- <b>n</b> 2-teach-p-Ener	tu-darris-u- <b>nna</b> 2-teach-p-Ener
8.	2pf		tu-darris-na- <b>anni</b> 2-teach-pf-Ener
9.	3sm	yu-darris- <b>an</b> Impf-teach-Ener	yu-darris- <b>anna</b> Impf-teach-Ener
10.	3sf	tu-darris- <b>an</b> f-teach-Ener	tu-darris- <b>anna</b> f-teach-Ener
11.	3dm		yu-darris-ā- <b>nni</b> Impf-teach-d-Ener
12.	3df		tu-darris-ā- <b>nni</b> f-teach-d-Ener
13.	3pm	yu-darris-u- <b>n</b> Impf-teach-p-Ener	yu-darris-u- <b>nna</b> Impf-teach-p-Ener
14.	3pf		yu-darris-na- <b>anni</b> Impf-teach-pf-Ener

Since the Sub refers to “an event occurring (or, to be more precise, construed as occurring) subsequent to the event indicated in the main clause” (Testen 1994: 160), it is quite possible that it has evolved from the energetic form which is invariably associated with future time reference (Testen 1993). This is because *ya-ktub-an* and *ya-ktub-anna* imply that ‘someone is going to write something’, compared to the indicative *ya-ktub-u*, which indicates that ‘someone always writes something, or is writing it now’.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Testen states that, unlike subordinate clauses with Sub-marked verbs, which have future time reference, ones with Ind-marked and perfective verbs do not have future time reference, as (i) from Testen (1994) shows.



‘We shall drag (him) by the forelock.’

15. “qāla la-ʔa-qtul-Ø-anna-ka” (5:27)

Pst.say.3sm Emph-1s-kill-Juss-Ener-you

‘He (Cain) said, I shall kill you (Abel)’.

That this approach is on the right track is supported by the fact that the suffixes of the energetic forms also appear on the imperative verb, which denotes the future, since commands are carried out after they are issued, that is, in the future. The negative imperative (prohibitive) constructions in the Qur’ānic verses in (16-17) illustrate this; (18), from Wright (1898, vol. II: 379), illustrates the lightened energetic form in imperatives. This further indicates that the energetic suffixes are compatible with future time reference.

16. “wa lā ta-kūn-Ø-anna min-a l-mušrik-īn” (6:14)

and Neg.Impr 2-be.sm-Juss-Ener from-EV the-polytheist-p.Gen

‘Do not ever be of the polytheists!’

17. “wa lā ta-mūt-u-Ø-anna ʔilla wa ʔant-um muslim-ūn” (3:102)

and Neg.Impr 2-die-pm-Juss-Ener except and you-pm muslim-p.Nom

‘Do not die except as Muslims (in submission to God)!’

18. ʔiḍrib-Ø-an ʕan-ka l-humūm-a ʔin ʔaraqa-t!

Impr.hit-Juss-Ener from-you the-concerns-Acc if Pst.come-3sf

‘Drive away sad thoughts from you, if they come by night!’

To show that the Sub forms evolved from the corresponding lightened energetic forms, Testen presents the two sets of suffixes, as in Table 11. The similarity between the two sets of suffixes is striking. Whenever the energetic form has ‘-a’ in the suffix, the corresponding Sub form has ‘-a’ as the m-vc suffix. Similarly, the energetic forms that have no ‘-a’ in the suffix correspond to Sub forms that have ‘-Ø’ as the m-vc suffix. Testen (1994: 162) states that the “subjunctive forms may be related to the energetic [or energetic] forms by a simple rule: the subjunctive consists of the energetic forms without the final -n.”

Table 11

		<b>Lightened Energetic Forms</b>	<b>Sub Forms</b>
1.	1s	ʔu-darris- <b>an</b> 1-teach-Ener	ʔu-darris- <b>a</b> 1-teach-Sub
2.	1p	nu-darris- <b>an</b> 1p-teach-Ener	nu-darris- <b>a</b> 1p-teach-Sub
3.	2sm	tu-darris- <b>an</b> 2-teach-Ener	tu-darris- <b>a</b> 2-teach-Sub
4.	2sf	tu-darris-i- <b>n</b> 2-teach-f-Ener	tu-darris-ī- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-f-Sub
5.	2dm		tu-darris-ā- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-d-Sub
6.	2df		tu-darris-ā- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-d-Sub
7.	2pm	tu-darris-u- <b>n</b> 2-teach-p-Ener	tu-darris-ū- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-p-Sub
8.	2pf		tu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> 2-teach-pf-Sub
9.	3sm	yu-darris- <b>an</b> Impf-teach-Ener	yu-darris- <b>a</b> Impf-teach-Sub
10.	3sf	tu-darris- <b>an</b> f-teach-Ener	tu-darris- <b>a</b> f-teach-Sub
11.	3dm		yu-darris-ā- <b>Ø</b> Impf-teach-d-Sub
12.	3df		tu-darris-ā- <b>Ø</b> f-teach-d-Sub
13.	3pm	yu-darris-u- <b>n</b> Impf-teach-p-Ener	yu-darris-ū- <b>Ø</b> Impf-teach-p-Sub
14.	3pf		yu-darris-na- <b>Ø</b> Impf-teach-pf-Sub

This accounts for the 1s, 1p, 2sm, 3sm, and 3sf forms. This thus indicates that the Sub forms ‘inherited’ ‘-a’ from the lightened energetic paradigm in the singular forms only (1s, 2sm, 3sm, and 3sf, as well as the 1p form whose post-root domain is singular-like, as a result of the movement of the plural feature ‘-ū’ to the prefix, but not the 2sf form, whose post-root domain is not singular-like as a result of the movement of the gender feature ‘-ī’ to the suffix). Therefore, for our purposes, these are the singular forms. We will come back to this point in section 4.

As for the 2sf, 2pm, and 3pm forms, Testen states that “the disappearance of the -n [in the resulting Sub forms] and the resulting opening of the final syllable allows the length, which is lost in the closed syllable” (p. 162). In other words, since the ancestral energetic forms have no ‘-

a', the resulting Sub forms have no '-a' as their m-vc suffix. Testen seems to assume that these three Sub forms inherited the m-vc endings, or rather the forms, from the Juss paradigm, the ancestor of their ancestor, since he states that they "contain an underlying long vowel" (p. 162), -ī for 2sf and -ū for 2pm and 3pm. Nonetheless, Testen's system leaves unexplained the remaining six forms in the Sub paradigm, namely the 2dm, 2df, 2pf, 3dm, 3df, and 3pf. In other words, he does not say how these six Sub forms obtain, assuming implicitly that they are just 'imported' from the ancestral Juss paradigm.

Therefore, assuming with Wright (1898, vol. I: 61) that the energetic (as well as the imperative) is derived from the Juss form of the imperfective, I would like to propose that the remaining nine Sub forms (2dm, 2df, 2pf, 3dm, 3df, and 3pf, as well as 2sf, 2pm, and 3pm) are derived from the Juss, by simply importing the corresponding Juss endings or even forms, due to either the lack of '-a' in the energetic suffix, which applies to the 2sf, 2pm, and 3pm forms, or the lack of a corresponding energetic form, which applies to the 2dm, 2df, 2pf, 3dm, 3df, and 3pf forms. This is because if the 2sf, 2pm, and 3pm forms were derived from the energetic, the Sub paradigm would not have had the 2dm, 2df, 2pf, 3dm, 3df, and 3pf forms, but it does. This means that the 2sf, 2pm, and 3pm Sub forms may not have been derived from the energetic by lengthening the vowel, as Testen suggests, but rather have been imported from the Juss paradigm, like the other six non-singular forms.

To sum up, assuming that the Sub evolved from the lightened energetic form, as Testen argues, or from both the lightened energetic and Juss forms, as we are assuming, and since the energetic form is derived from the Juss form (Wright 1898, vol. I: 61), I would like to argue that the singular Sub forms evolved from the corresponding lightened energetic forms by dropping '-n', and that the non-singular Sub forms (where the '-a' of the lightened suffix is not available) come directly from the Juss paradigm. Table 12 illustrates this correspondence. We will come back to this in section 4; the remainder of this section will provide support for the proposal of final '-n' deletion, which resulted in the Sub paradigm.

Table 12

		<b>Juss Forms</b>	<b>Sub Forms</b>	<b>Lightened Energetic Forms</b>
1.	1s	ʔu-darris-Ø 1-teach-Juss	ʔu-darris-a 1-teach-Sub	ʔu-darris- <b>an</b> 1-teach-Ener
2.	1p	nu-darris-Ø 1p-teach-Juss	nu-darris-a 1p-teach-Sub	nu-darris- <b>an</b> 1p-teach-Ener
3.	2sm	tu-darris-Ø 2-teach-Juss	tu-darris-a 2-teach-Sub	tu-darris- <b>an</b> 2-teach-Ener
4.	2sf	tu-darris-ī-Ø 2-teach-f-Juss	tu-darris-ī-Ø 2-teach-f-Sub	tu-darris-i- <b>n</b> 2-teach-f-Ener
5.	2dm	tu-darris-ā-Ø 2-teach-d-Juss	tu-darris-ā-Ø 2-teach-d-Sub	
6.	2df	tu-darris-ā-Ø 2-teach-d-Juss	tu-darris-ā-Ø 2-teach-d-Sub	
7.	2pm	tu-darris-ū-Ø 2-teach-p-Juss	tu-darris-ū-Ø 2-teach-p-Sub	tu-darris-u- <b>n</b> 2-teach-p-Ener
8.	2pf	tu-darris-na-Ø 2-teach-pf-Juss	tu-darris-na-Ø 2-teach-pf-Sub	
9.	3sm	yu-darris-Ø Impf-teach-Juss	yu-darris-a Impf-teach-Sub	yu-darris- <b>an</b> Impf-teach-Ener
10.	3sf	tu-darris-Ø f-teach-Juss	tu-darris-a f-teach-Sub	tu-darris- <b>an</b> f-teach-Ener
11.	3dm	yu-darris-ā-Ø Impf-teach-d-Juss	yu-darris-ā-Ø Impf-teach-d-Sub	
12.	3df	tu-darris-ā-Ø f-teach-d-Juss	tu-darris-ā-Ø f-teach-d-Sub	
13.	3pm	yu-darris-ū-Ø Impf-teach-p-Juss	yu-darris-ū-Ø Impf-teach-p-Sub	yu-darris-u- <b>n</b> Impf-teach-p-Ener
14.	3pf	yu-darris-na-Ø Impf-teach-pf-Juss	yu-darris-na-Ø Impf-teach-pf-Sub	

To support his proposal that the singular Sub forms/suffixes evolved from the lightened energetic forms/suffixes by dropping the final ‘-n’, Testen (1994) provides some examples of final ‘-n’ deletion in SA. One case is illustrated by the Juss form of the copula *kāna*, as in *ya-ku*, *ta-ku*, and *na-ku*, from *ya-kun*, *ta-kun*, and *na-kun*, respectively. These forms are documented in the Qur’ānic verses in (19-21).

19. “ʔinna ʔibrāhīm-a kāna-Ø ʔummat-an qānit-an li-llāh-i  
 Comp Abraham-Acc Pst.be.3sm-Ind nation-Acc obedient-Acc to-God-Gen  
 hanīf-an wa lam ya-ku-Ø min-a l-mušrik-īn” (16:120)  
 serene-Acc and Neg.Pst Impf-be.3sm-Juss from-EV the-polytheist-p.Gen

‘Indeed, Abraham was a leader, devoutly obedient to Allah, inclining toward truth, and he was not of the polytheists’.

20. “ʔinna Allāh-a lā ya-ḏlim-u miθqāl-a ḏarrat-in wa  
 Comp God-Acc Neg Impf-wrong.3sm-Ind amount-Acc atom-Gen and  
 ʔin ta-ku-Ø hasanat-an yu-ḏāʕif-Ø-hā wa  
 Comp f-be.3s-Juss good.deed-Acc Impf-multiply.3sm-Juss-it and  
 yu-ʔti-Ø min ladun-hu ʔajr-an ʕaḏīm-ā” (4:40)  
 Impf-give.3sm-Ind from bounty-his reward-Acc great-Acc

‘Indeed, Allah does not do injustice, even as much as an atom's weight; and if there is a good deed, He multiplies it and gives a great reward’.

21. “qāl-ū-Ø lam na-ku-Ø min-a l-muṣall-īn” (74:43)  
 Pst.say-3pm-Ind Neg.Pst 1p-be-Juss from-EV the-praying-p.Gen  
 ‘They said, we were not of those who prayed’.

Another example is provided by the fact that a final ‘-n’ is dropped in pausal forms and replaced with ‘-a’, as in the pausal form of a singular noun in the Acc Case, like *rajul-an*, which is *rajul-ā*; this does not obtain in the Nom and Gen cases, *rajul-un* and *rajul-in*, respectively. Also, the pausal form of an energetic verb undergoes this change, as in *ya-nām-an* which becomes *ya-nām-ā*. This suggests some connection between Acc and Sub forms. The same pattern is observed in the Qur’ānic verse in (22). Most Qur’ān interpreters argue that the long vowel ‘-ā’ is not for dual, but rather from the lightened energetic suffix ‘-an’.

22. “ʔalqiy-Ø-ā fī jahannama kull-a  
 Impr.throw.Juss-Ener in Hellfire.Gen every-Acc  
 kaffār-in ʕanīd-in” (50:24)  
 disbeliever-Gen obstinate-Gen

‘Allah will say, throw into Hellfire every obstinate disbeliever’.

Testen provides other examples of final ‘-n’ deletion from words followed by hamzatu-l-waṣl, as in (23) (p. 164), as well as ‘in personal names before the bn- of the patronymic’, as in (24).

23. fa-ʔalfay-tu-Ø-hu yayra mustaʕtib-in wa lā  
 and-Pst.find-1s-Ind-him neither seeking.favor-Gen and Neg

ḏākir-i llāh-a ʔilla qalīl-an (ḏākir-in)  
 mentioning-Gen God-Acc except little-Acc

‘And I found him not seeking God’s favor, and seldom thinking upon God’.

24. Muḥammad-u bnu Rāshid-i bnu ʕaliyy  
 (Muḥammad-un bnu Rāshid-in bnu ʕaliyy)  
 Muhammad-Nom son.of Rashid-Gen son-of Ali  
 ‘Muhammad son-of Rashid son-of Ali.’

#### 4. The Proposal

What Testen says about the origin of the SA Sub form suggests that the Arabic imperfective paradigm once had two forms only, Ind, most probably used in present deictic, present generic, and progressive contexts, and Juss, used in future, imperative, conditional, and energetic moods, as well as in subordinate clauses. The form of the Juss used in subordinate clauses is the lightened energetic, which is also used in other future contexts (imperatives and oaths). Due to factors effecting language change/drift/shift (like language contact and geographical division resulting in identity-related issues, or the introduction of a holy text whose language is perceived as a normative grammar), the speakers of at least some Arabic dialects began using ‘sa-’ and *sawfa* for future, and also dropping the final ‘-n’ from the lightened energetic form used in subordinate clauses. This resulted in the present-day Sub paradigm (whose non-singular forms are imported from the Juss paradigm).<sup>13</sup>

By the same token, one may propose that Arabic once had two nominal Case forms, Nom and Gen, that apply to all NPs in all contexts, and that Acc, as a concept (a Case-form that marks NPs in object position and in all or some of the present-day positions where an Acc Case/case value is licensed), was invented later, and then the Acc-marked NPs gained their m-case suffixes. Or alternatively, one can propose that the Acc paradigm (as a concept/licensed Case value) had already been available, co-existing with the Nom and Gen paradigms from the early times of Arabic, but that its present-day morphology (m-case suffixes) was invented (or borrowed) later.

<sup>13</sup> Even when used in main clauses, as in (i), the subjunctive is still associated with future contexts.

i. lan ya-qaʔ-a l-walad-u l-kitāb-a  
 Neg.Fut Impf-read.3sm-Sub the-boy-Nom the-book-Acc  
 ‘The boy will not read the book.’

Despite the fact that the first view depicts the process of creating the Sub paradigm, I believe that the second view is more plausible, for two reasons. First, that the Acc paradigm appeared at the same time as did the Nom and Gen paradigms is supported by the fact that the Acc-marked NPs occur in contexts that are distinct from those occupied by subjects (Nom) and objects of prepositions (Gen). In other words, there is a clear distinction in the positions in which each of the three Case values is licensed/assigned. To illustrate, the Nom form was used in citation forms, as in *bayt-un* ‘a house’ and *ʔal-bayt-u* ‘the house’, in pre-predicate contexts, as in (25-27), and on nominal and adjectival predicates of verbless sentences like (26); this Nom is called ‘default’ Nom case since it is not assigned by a verb. Nom was also found in subject position, as in (28-29); this Nom is called ‘structural’ Nom Case since it is assigned by a Case assigner in a specific structural configuration. The Nom on nouns in clauses with *kāna-and-sisters* is of the latter type since the NP is the subject of *kāna*. The Nom on nominal and adjectival predicates with *ʔinna-and-sisters* is default Nom, like the one on the predicate in (26) since these particles do not assign Nom case (Al-Balushi 2011: 136–157); it is also maintained in the traditional grammar that, unlike verbs, particles can only assign case to one element (Sībawayhi 8<sup>th</sup> century), which is the topic, which receives Acc.

25. ʔal-ʔawlād-u      qaraʔ-ū      l-kitāb-a  
the-boys-**Nom**    Pst.read-3pm    the-book-Acc  
‘The boys read the book.’

26. ʔal-walad-u      marīd-un  
the-boy-**Nom**    sick-**Nom**  
‘The boy is sick.’

27. ʔal-walad-u      ʕārif-un      l-xabar-a  
the-boy-**Nom**    knowing-Nom    the-news-Acc  
‘The boy knows (is knowing) the news.’

28. qaraʔa            l-ʔawlād-u      l-kitāb-a  
Pst.read.3sm    the-boys-**Nom**    the-book-Acc  
‘The boys read the book.’

29. quriʔa                    l-kitāb-u  
Pst.Pass.read.3sm    the-book-**Nom**  
‘The book was read.’

Also, the Gen form was used in the construct-state (*ʔiḏāfa* construction) as well as following prepositions and locative and temporal adverbials (*ḏurūf-u l-makān-i wa z-zamān*), as (30-33) respectively show.

30. kitāb-u      l-walad-i      jadīd-un  
 book-Nom    the-boy-**Gen**    new-Nom  
 ‘The boy’s book is new.’
31. ʔal-walad-u      fī      l-madrasat-i  
 the-boy-Nom    in      the-school-**Gen**  
 ‘The boy is in the school.’
32. ʔal-kitāb-u      fawqa      ʔ-ṭāwilat-i  
 the-book-Nom    above      the-table-**Gen**  
 ‘The book is on the table.’
33. sāfara              r-rajul-u              qabla      l-fajr-i  
 Pst.travel.3sm    the-man-Nom    before    the-dawn-**Gen**  
 ‘The man traveled before dawn.’

Unlike Nom- and Gen-marked NPs, the Acc-marked forms occurred following verbs (main verbs including *ḏanna-and-sisters* and *kāda-and-sisters*, as well as *kāna-and-sisters*) and nominal particles (*ʔinna-and-sisters*, and generic/absolutive Neg *lā*), as well as in adverbial (*ḥāl*), adverbial of specification (*tamyīz*), vocative (*munādā*), and exemption (*mustaḥnā*) contexts. Structural Acc Case is assigned by main verbs to arguments (themes), whereas lexical Acc case is assigned by particles and verbs like *ḏanna* and *kāna* (and their sisters) to non-arguments.

The second reason why I would lean to the second view is that (as pointed out by an *IJAL* reviewer) some of the “[p]re-Islamic dialects show the use of nominative case in the place of an accusative case in Classical Arabic in some positions in the sentence”. And since a subject (agent) position is distinct from that of an object (theme), I believe that the concept of Acc co-existed with Nom and Gen, but that its morphology is relatively new. Now, since “Classical Arabic was based primarily on the language of the western Hijazi tribe of Quraysh [which is pre-Islamic], with some interference from pre-Islamic poetic koiné and eastern dialects [and that this] ... language was codified in the Qur’an, the holy book of Islam” (Watson 2002:8), it is not unreasonable to assume that CA used the Nom case morphology for Acc-marked NPs. This is clear in some of the readings of the Qur’ānic verses in (34-35), which might have percolated from

the pre-Islamic dialects; *hāḏāni* ‘these two’ in (34) realizes Nom m-case but is in a position to which *ʔinna* assigns Acc case, and *muʔmināni* ‘two believers’ in (35) realizes Nom m-case though it is in a position where *kāna* assigns Acc case.

34. “ʔinna hāḏ-ān-i la-sāhir-ān-i” (20:63)

Comp this-d.Nom-EV la-magician-d.Nom-EV

‘Indeed, these two are magicians.’

(Other readings include “ʔin hāḏ-ān-i ...” and “ʔinna hāḏ-ayn-i ...”)

35. “ʔamma l-yulām-u fa-kāna ʔabaw-ā-hu muʔmin-āni” (18:80)

and the-boy-Nom fa-Pst.be.3sm parent-d.Nom-his believer-d.Nom

‘And as for the boy, his parents were believers.’

(Another reading is “... fa-kāna ʔabaw-ā-hu muʔmin-ayni ...”)

This, therefore, provides good evidence that the Acc case morphology joined the Arabic nominal case system after those of the Nom and Gen paradigms. This is because the use of Nom m-case on Acc-marked NPs was a source of ambiguity that naturally led to the borrowing of case endings from the other m-case and m-vc systems in the language. Therefore, and to distinguish the Acc-marked NPs from the Nom- and Gen-marked ones, Acc-marked NPs received the same case inflection that the Sub-marked verb has; here, labels play no role in this process since it was effected by the language users, not the grammarians. Of course, we do not expect the borrowed Acc m-case suffixes to apply to all the relevant contexts at the same time, since grammatical forms and markers evolve and assume functions over a period of time.<sup>14</sup> Now, since ‘-a’ marks Sub m-vc on singular verbal forms, it became the Acc m-case suffix for singular nominal forms. However, since the Sub paradigm has no independent suffixes for the non-singular forms (it borrows those from the Juss paradigm), the non-singular Acc-marked nouns would have no Acc m-case suffixes (‘-Ø’), which is undesirable, especially in a language where nominal, adjectival,

---

<sup>14</sup> This scenario is supported by the fact that SA, the language of the Holy Qur’ān, was not spoken by all Arabs in Arabia when Qur’ān was revealed to Prophet Muhammad (PBUH). What most of the Arabs spoke around that time was a number of Bedouin dialects (Fleisch 1994). The SA that is the subject of this article is based on Sībawayhi’s *Kitāb*, a grammar written to document the grammatical forms of the Qur’ān. Thus SA differs, to varying degrees, from the various dialects that had been spoken in Arabia in terms of word order variation and Case marking. On the relationship between SA and the colloquial and Bedouin dialects, see Ferguson (1959), Versteegh (1984), and Blau (1988).

adverbial, and verbal forms appear with case inflection. Therefore, they, too, borrowed the corresponding m-case suffixes from the Gen paradigm. Table 13 illustrates this correspondence.

Table 13

		<b>Acc-marked NPs</b>	<b>Sub-marked Verbs</b>	<b>Gen-marked NPs</b>
1.	sm	ʔal-mudarris- <b>a</b> the-teacher-Acc	yu-darris- <b>a</b> Impf-teach-Sub	
2.	sf	ʔal-mudarrisa-t- <b>a</b> the-teacher-f-Acc	tu-darris- <b>a</b> f-teach-Sub	
3.	dm	ʔal-mudarris- <b>ayn</b> the-teacher-d.Acc		ʔal-mudarris- <b>ayn</b> the-teacher-d.Gen
4.	df	ʔal-mudarrisa-t- <b>ayn</b> the-teacher-f-d.Acc		ʔal-mudarrisa-t- <b>ayn</b> the-teacher-f-d.Gen
5.	pm	ʔal-mudarris- <b>īn</b> the-teacher-p.Acc		ʔal-mudarris- <b>īn</b> the-teacher-p.Gen
6.	pf	ʔal-mudarris-ā-t- <b>i</b> the-teacher-p-f-Acc		ʔal-mudarris-ā-t- <b>i</b> the-teacher-p-f-Gen

In other words, the Acc paradigm took its singular suffixes from the Sub paradigm (verbal) and its non-singular suffixes from the Gen paradigm (nominal). One possible question is why the Acc paradigm did not borrow m-vc suffixes from the Ind paradigm. For one thing, the Ind and Nom paradigms are almost identical with regard to their suffixes, m-vc and m-case, respectively. Thus borrowing from the Ind paradigm would have made no difference; that is, the subject (agent/doer) and the object (theme/done to) would end up with the same suffixes, as the hypothetical sentence in (36) shows. In other words, if the Acc paradigm borrowed m-case suffixes from the Ind paradigm, upon hearing (36), the listener would not know which NP is the subject and which is the object, since Arabic allows VSO, as well as VOS, as the Qur’ānic verse in (37) shows.

36. qābala-Ø                      l-mudarris-**ūn**-a                      l-muwaḏḏaf-**ūn**(-a)  
Pst.meet.3sm-Ind    the-teacher-p.**Nom**-EV    the-employee-p.**Acc**(-EV)

37. “ʔinna-mā                      ya-xša-Ø                      Allāh-a  
Comp-Emph    Impf-fear.3sm.Ind    Allah-**Acc**  
min    ʕibād-i-hi                      l-ʕulamāʔ-u”                      (35:28)  
from    servants-Gen-his    the-scientists-**Nom**

‘Only those fear Allah, from among His servants, who have knowledge.’



Third, while *ʔan* assigns Sub to verbs, *ʔanna* assigns Acc to nouns, as (41-42) respectively show. Assuming the present account to be on the right track, this is not unexpected because *ʔan* and *ʔanna* may intuitively be regarded the same particle, with ‘n’ geminated when before nouns.<sup>15</sup> Now the connection between Sub and Acc is clear since, like *ʔan*, which is used to introduce subordinate clauses (the main purpose behind the creation of the Sub paradigm), *ʔanna*, too, is used to introduce subordinate clauses, as (42) and the Qur’ānic verse in (43) show, but not main clauses, as (44) shows.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Testen (1999:148-149), who rejects the germination-based relationship, suggests that the heavy and lightened forms (*ʔVnna* and *ʔVn*) were created out of the same ancestral shape via two different phonological operations. Either way, what is relevant here is that the two forms, *ʔan* and *ʔanna*, are related, especially that *ʔan* may replace *ʔanna* in some contexts/under certain circumstances (Lane 1968).

<sup>16</sup> The proposed connection between *ʔan* and *ʔanna* raises the question of why *ʔin*, which assigns Juss VC, does not assign Sub (or alternatively why *ʔinna*, which assigns Acc Case, does not assign Gen). I think that the unexpected state-of-affairs has to do with the fact that Arabic has more than one *ʔin* particle. Testen (1999) states that while *ʔanna* has one lightened form, *ʔan*, which, like *ʔanna*, appears only in subordinate clauses, *ʔinna* has more than one lightened form (*ʔin*) but only one of them is the alternate form of *ʔinna*. This form of *ʔin* does not occur in subordinate clauses, but only in main clauses (Testen 1999), as (i-ii) show. This lightened form of *ʔinna* co-occurs with ‘la-’, which is called *ʔal-lām al-fāriqah* ‘the distinguishing I’, since it helps identify this *ʔin* as the alternate form, since *ʔinna*, too, may co-occur with it, as (iii) shows; unlike *ʔanna*, *ʔinna* may also introduce main clauses, as (19-20) above show. Like *ʔinna*, the alternate *ʔin* may also assign Acc to the following NP, as in one of the readings of the Qur’ānic verse in (iv).

- i. “wa ʔin kāna ʔaṣḥāb-u l-ʔaykat-i la-ḏālim-īn” (15:78)  
and *ʔin* Pst.be.3sm companions-Nom the-wood-Gen *la*-wrongdoer-p.Gen  
‘And the people of the Wood were also wrongdoers.’
- ii. “wa ʔin na-ḏunn-u-ka la-min-a l-kāḏib-īn” (26:186)  
and *ʔin* 1p-believe-Ind-you *la*-from-EV the-liar-p.Gen  
‘And indeed we think you are a liar!’
- iii. “wa Allāh-u ya-ʔlam-u ʔinna-ka la-rasūl-u-hu” (63-1)  
and Allah-Nom Impf-know.3sm-Ind Comp-you *la*-messenger-Nom-his  
‘And Allah knows that you are indeed his messenger.’
- iv. “wa ʔin kull-an la-mā la-yu-waffiy-anna-hum  
and *ʔin* all-Acc *la*-Emph Emph-Impf-repay-Ener-them  
rabb-u-ka ʔaʕmāl-a-hum” (11:111)  
lord-Nom-your deeds-Acc-their  
‘And verily, your Lord will repay everyone their deeds.’  
(Another reading is “wa ʔinna kullan lammā ...”)

This form of *ʔin* is different from the one that occurs in conditional clauses and assigns Juss to the following verbs, as in (v). Besides these two *ʔins*, there is also the negating *ʔin*, as in (vi).

- v. *ʔin* tu-ḏākir-Ø ta-njah-Ø  
if 2-study.sm-Juss 2-pass.sm-Juss  
‘If you study, you pass.’
- vi. “ʔin hāḏā ʔillā malak-un karīm-un” (12:31)  
Neg this but angel-Nom noble-Nom  
‘This is not but a noble angel!’

41. *yu-rīd-u l-walad-u ʔan ya-lʕab-a bi-l-xārij-i*  
 Impf-want-Ind the-boy-Nom Comp Impf-play.3sm-Sub with-the-outside-Gen  
 ‘The boy wants to play outside.’
42. *qāla-Ø l-walad-u ʔanna ʔab-ā-hu qad waʕala-Ø*  
 Pst.say.3sm-Ind the-boy-Nom Comp father-Acc-his Mod Pst.arrive.3sm-Ind  
 ‘The boy said that his father has arrived.’
43. “*qāla-Ø ʔa-ʕlam-u*  
 Pst.say.3sm-Ind 1s-know-Ind  
*ʔanna Allāh-a ʕalā kull-i šayʔ-in qadīr-un*” (2:259)  
 Comp Allah-Acc on every-Gen thing-Gen capable-Nom  
 ‘He (Uzayr/Ezra) said, I know that Allah is over all things competent.’
44. \**ʔanna l-walad-a mujtahid-un*  
 Comp the-boy-Acc hardworking-Nom

Fourth, the language users were probably tempted to borrow the suffixes of the Sub forms for the Acc forms because both forms, Acc and Sub, are found in complement positions of other elements (verbs and particles). This context-based resemblance was another reason why the Arab grammarians (whose analyses were synchronic) assigned both forms the same label, *manṣūb*. Edzard (2006:562) states that “[t]he common terminology is meant not only to capture the similar vocalic pattern but also, more importantly, to reflect the observation that nominative and indicative, and accusative and subjunctive, have a syntactically comparable function, namely that of independent position vs. complement position respectively”.

The current account (where Sub and Acc borrow suffixes from Juss and Gen for their non-singular forms) indicates that Juss and Gen are the elsewhere m-vc and m-case suffixes that take over when m-vc and m-case representatives are not available. This, in turn, may suggest that Juss and Gen indicate the absence of m-vc and m-case morphology, respectively. If on the right track, this may provide an explanation to m-case facts in languages that do not mark m-case and m-vc overtly, like the modern colloquial dialects of Arabic. The following examples are from Omani Arabic (OA). Basically, regardless of the abstract Case value that the NP has (known from its position, subject, or object, or object of preposition), the m-case suffix is always the Gen one, as (45-53) show; it must be noted, however, that the suffixes on the singular forms appear only in poetic and slow speech; this is true of many current Bedouin dialects in Arabia.

45. gā-Ø-na                      ðēf-**in**              wāhad  
Pst.come.3sm-Ind-1p    guest-Nom    one  
‘One guest came to us/we had one guest.’
46. šift-Ø-i                      zēn-**in**              šall-ə              galb-i  
Pst.see.1s-Ind-EV    beauty-Acc    Pst.take.3sm-EV    heart-my  
‘I saw a beautiful girl that attracted me.’
47. sakan-Ø-na              f    bēt-**in**              zēn-**in**/zēn  
Pst.live-Ind-1p    in    house-Gen    nice-Gen  
‘We lived in a nice house.’
48. sār-Ø-u                      l-mdarrs-**in**  
Pst.go-Ind-3pm    the-teacher-p.Nom  
‘The teachers left.’
49. kallam-Ø-na              l-mdarrs-**in**  
Pst.talk-Ind-1p    the-teacher-p.Acc  
‘We talked to the teachers.’
50. sallam-Ø-na              ʕa    l-mdarrs-**in**  
Pst.greet-Ind-1p    on    the-teacher-p.Gen  
‘We shook hands with the teachers.’
51. sār-Ø-u                      l-walad-**en**  
Pst.go-Ind-3pm    the-boy-d.Nom  
‘The two boys left.’
52. kallam-Ø-na              l-walad-**en**  
Pst.talk-Ind-1p    the-boy-d.Acc  
‘We talked to the two boys.’
53. sallam-Ø-na              ʕa    l-walad-**en**  
Pst.greet-Ind-1p    on    the-boy-d.Gen  
‘We shook hands with the two boys.’

Likewise, all the verbs in OA, imperfective and perfective, appear with a zero m-vc suffix, which is similar to the Juss m-vc suffix ‘-Ø’, as Table 14 shows. As is well known about the colloquial dialects of Arabic, they do not mark dual in the verbal system.<sup>17</sup>

Table 14

		<b>Imperfective Verb Form in all VC Values</b>	<b>Perfective Verb Form</b>
1.	1s	ʔa-dris-Ø 1-study-VC	daras-t-Ø study-1-VC
2.	1p	ni-dris-Ø 1p-study-VC	daras-na-Ø study-1p-VC
3.	2sm	ti-dris-Ø 2-study-VC	daras-t-Ø study-2-VC
4.	2sf	t-dirs-i-Ø 2-study-f-VC	daras-t-i-Ø study-2-f-VC
5.	2pm	t-dirs-u-Ø 2-study-p-VC	daras-t-u-Ø study-2-p-VC
6.	2pf	t-dirs-in-Ø 2-study-pf-VC	daras-t-in-Ø study-2-pf-VC
7.	3sm	yi-dris-Ø Impf-study-VC	daras-Ø study-VC
8.	3sf	ti-dris-Ø f-study-VC	dars-it-Ø study-f-VC
9.	3pm	y-dirs-u-Ø Impf-study-p-VC	dars-u-Ø study-p-VC
10.	3pf	y-dirs-in-Ø Impf-study-pf-VC	dars-in-Ø study-pf-VC

The present view of the Acc Case supports Al-Balushi’s (2013) view that each one of the three SA Case values has two roles. While Nom is a structural Case value as well as being the

<sup>17</sup> One counterargument to this view comes from the fact that some Arabic dialects in the Gulf region have plural verbal forms that end with ‘-n’, corresponding to the Ind forms; so the 3pm form of ‘study’ is y-dirs-ū-n. While this argument may be a threat to the view that when m-case marking disappears, m-vc disappears, one may argue that this final ‘-n’ is not the Ind suffix. For one thing, there is no corresponding Ind marker on the singular forms (yi-dris). Also, this final ‘-n’ appears on both imperfective and perfective verbal forms in the Dhofāri (southern) dialect of OA, as (i-ii) show. Thus it is obvious that an account of this final ‘-n’ in the Dhofāri as well as the Gulf dialects requires an investigation of the contexts in which it appears, which goes beyond the scope of this paper. For lack of a principled account, I leave this here.

- i. ʂ-ʂyēr-in                      y-laʕb-ū-n  
the-child-p.Nom    Impf-play-3pm-Ind  
‘The children are playing.’
- ii. g-ū-n-uh                      /g-ū-h                      ʕyāl                      bint-uh  
Pst.come-3pm-N-him/Pst.come-3pm-him    children                      daughter-his  
‘His daughter’s children came to him.’

default case specification in SA (when nouns are not in the scope of Case assigners), Acc is a structural Case value as well as being the lexical case specification in SA (assigned by lexical elements like *ʔinna* and copulas), and Gen is both a structural Case value (assigned by the P head in PPs, and the D head in the construct-state) as well as being the elsewhere case specification in SA.

To sum up, like the Sub, which joined the Arabic verbal system late and so had to borrow suffixes, the Acc case morphology seems to have joined the Arabic nominal system late and so had to borrow suffixes. But why did Acc have to borrow suffixes, that is, why didn't it just acquire or invent those from the language? One answer to this question could go along the following lines. Basically, since Nom uses '-u', '-ā', and '-ū', and Gen uses '-i' and '-ī' (as well as '-ay'), then Acc is left with only '-a' (since Arabic has 6 vowels only, and assuming that only vowels are allowed to be m-case suffixes in SA), which is used for singular nouns, on a par with what happens in the Sub paradigm. As for the non-singular nouns, the Acc paradigm had to borrow them from the Gen paradigm, but not from Ind (or Nom), for reasons that we mentioned earlier.<sup>18</sup> The present account has also accounted for the syncretism between the Sub and Juss paradigms, seen in the non-singular forms, and also for the syncretism between the Acc and Gen paradigms, also seen in the non-singular forms.

## 5. Concluding Remarks

This paper has argued that the SA non-singular Acc-marked NPs have no independent m-case suffixes because their case endings were borrowed from the corresponding Gen-marked NPs, whereas the singular Acc-marked NPs have *fathah* '-a' because they were modeled after or borrowed the suffix of the singular Sub verbal forms, which were derived from the corresponding energetic forms, as Testen argues. The morphological similarity between the singular Sub and Acc forms prompted the traditional grammarians of Arabic to assign the same label to both the verbal and nominal forms, *manṣūb*. Thus Arabic first had Sub-marked verbs and then Acc-marked nouns. This is actually one view of the main facts in this paper.

---

<sup>18</sup> It is noteworthy that the final '-n' in the post-root domain of non-singular nouns in SA is not part of the m-case system, since Case is marked on the long vowels. This orthographic '-n' behaves like the tanwīn/nunation '-n' (diacritic), since both disappear when the nominal forms, singular and non-singular, are followed by a possessive pronoun, as in *mudarris-u-hu* 'his teacher', *mudarris-ā-hu* 'his two teachers', and *mudarris-ū-hu* 'his teachers' (Peter Hallman p.c.).

The other possible view is that Arabic first had the Acc case morphology and then the Sub forms were created based on the corresponding Acc-marked forms. To motivate this alternative view, however, we need to find an origin for the Acc suffix(es) in the nominal system of Arabic; as far as I know, there is none. By contrast, Testen (1994) offers a plausible view on the origin of the Sub paradigm from the SA verbal system, which makes it a possible ancestor for the Acc suffixes.

## References

- Al-Balushi, Rashid. 2011. *Case in Standard Arabic: The Untraveled Paths*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Al-Balushi, Rashid. 2012. Why Verbless Sentences in Standard Arabic are Verbless, *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 57:1, 1–30.
- Al-Balushi, Rashid. 2013. Verbal and Nominal Case Suffixes in Standard Arabic: A Unified Account, *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics*, 5:1, 35–82.
- Al-Sayyid, Abdel-Hamid and Latifa Al-Najjar. 1996. *Fī al-Nahw al-Arabi*, vol. I. Beirut.
- Aoun, Joseph. 1979. On Government, Case-marking and Clitic Placement. Ms. MIT. Cambridge, MA.
- Bahloul, Maher. 2008. *Structure and Function of the Arabic Verb*. London: Routledge.
- Baltin, Mark, and Leslie Barrett. 2002. The Null Content of Null Case. Ms. New York University.
- Bejar, Susana. 1998. *Markedness and Morphosyntactic Representation: A Study of Verbal Inflection in the Imperfective Conjugation of Standard Arabic*. M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto.
- Benmamoun, Elabbas. 2000. *The Feature Structure of Functional Categories: A Comparative Study of Arabic Dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blau, Joshua. 1988. *Studies in Middle Arabic and its Judaeo-Arabic Variety*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press and the Hebrew University.
- Cecchetto, Carlo, and Renato Oniga. 2004. A Challenge to Null Case Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 141- 149.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1980. On Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:1–46.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. 1977. Filters and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 425–504.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. 1993. The Theory of Principles and Parameters. In *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, ed. by Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld and Theo Vennemann, 506–569. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cowper, Elizabeth. 2005. The Geometry of Interpretable Features: Infl in English and Spanish, *Language*, 81:1, 10–46.
- Edzard, Lutz. 2006. Declension. In *Encyclopaedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics Vol 3, Lat-Pu*, edited by Versteegh, K., Elgibali A., Woidich M., and Zaborski, A., Brill, Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 559–564.
- Fabb, Nigel. 1984. *Syntactic Affixation*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Fassi Fehri, Abdelkader. 1981. *Linguistique arabe: forme et interpretation*, Publications of the Faculty of Letters, Rabat.
- Fassi Fehri, Abdelkader. 1993. *Issues in the Structure of Arabic Clauses and Words*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ferguson, Charles. 1959. The Arabic koine. *Language* 35:616–30.
- Ferguson, Charles. 1983. God Wishes in Syrian Arabic, *Mediterranean Language Review*, 1, 65–83.
- Fischer, Wolfdietrich. 1997. Classical Arabic. In *The Semitic Languages*, ed. by Robert Hetzron, 187–219. London: Routledge.
- Fleisch, Henri. 1994. Arabic Linguistics. In *History of Linguistics: The Eastern Traditions of Linguistics*, ed. by Giulio Lepschy, 164–184. New York: Longman Publishing.
- Grande, Francesco. 2011. *Copulae and Classifiers in the Arabic Noun Phrase*. Doctoral Dissertation. Università di Pisa.
- Harley, Heidi, and Elizabeth Ritter. 2002. Person and Number in Pronouns: a Feature-Geometric Analysis, *Language* 78:3, 482–526.
- Holes, Clive. 2004. *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions, and Varieties*. Georgetown University Press.
- Holy Qur’ān (Arabic): <http://quran.com/>

- Lane, Edward William. 1968. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2008. Morphological and Abstract Case, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 39:1, 55–101.
- Mouchaweh, Lubana. 1986. *De la syntaxe des petites propositions*, Third Cycle Thesis, Paris VIII.
- Noyer, Rolf. 1997. *Features, Positions, and Affixes in Autonomous Morphological Structures*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Roberts, Ian. 1985a. *The Representation of Implicit and Dethematized Subjects*. Doctoral Dissertation, USC, LA.
- Roberts, Ian. 1985b. Agreement Parameters and the Development of English Modal Auxiliaries. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 3.1:21–58.
- Roeper, Thomas, and Jean-Roger Vergnaud. 1980. The Government of Infinitives. Ms. Umass, Amherst.
- Ryding, Karin. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge University Press
- Šibawayhi, Abū Bišr ‘Amr bnu ‘Uthmān bnu Qanbar. 8<sup>th</sup> Century. *al-Kitāb*. Cairo: MaTba‘at Būlāq. (1938 edition).
- Soltan. Usama. 2007. *On formal feature licensing in minimalism: Aspects of Standard Arabic morphosyntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Testen, David, 1993. On the Development of the Energetic Suffixes. In *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics 5*, ed. by Mushira Eid and Clive Holes, 293–311. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Testen, David. 1994. On the Development of the Arabic Subjunctive. In *Perspectives of Arabic Linguistics 6*, ed. by Mushira Eid, Vicente Cantarino, and Keith Walters, 151–166. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Testen, David. 1999. On ?inna, ?anna, et alia. In *Perspectives of Arabic Linguistics 12*, ed. by Elabbas Benmamoun, 141–160. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger. 1977. Letter to Noam Chomsky and Howard Lasnik on ‘Filters and Control’. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistics Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud* (2008), ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 3–15. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger. 1982. *Dependances et niveaux de representation en syntax*. These de Doctorat d'Etat, Universite de Paris VII.
- Versteegh, Kees. 1984. *Pidginization and Creolization: The Case of Arabic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Watson, Janet. 2002. *The Phonology and Morphology of Arabic*. Oxford University Press: UK
- Wright, William. 1898. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. 2 volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (first published in 1859).
- Zagona, Karen. 1982. *Government and Proper government of Verbal Projections*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Washington.