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Abstract

Arabic language is a flexible language and sometimes a role can be viewed from different angles. Therefore, the syntax scientists have paid a careful and deep attention to rhetorical issues and semantic implications in syntactic discussions. It means that there is a deep rational bond between syntactic issues and semantic implications that the type of role which a word has in a phrase influences on its semantic implication type. The meaning of multi-faceted in Arabic language is that a word based on its position in statement may have multiple roles, and every role may change the meaning or rhetoric of statement. So the semantic implication in multi-faceted combinations may seem very applicative and important. The aim of current article is evaluating the irab (role) and its definition from elders and syntactic scientists as a tool which shows the various roles and their corresponding meaning with oratory in Arabic language; and propose a scientific method to more than before take attention of professors and students of Arabic language to semantic implication and less be trapped in relationship between syntax with word, using applicative and practical examples.
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Introduction

The position of syntax and structure in language is very important and effective. In such a way that in Linguistics one of the fundamental features which attracted the attention of Linguists is the structure of language. Structure is the method of combining words and positioning them for conveying meaning, and has several research aspects. The role and position of words in structure of phrase and statement is sometimes clear and one-faceted and therefore its meaning also is one-faceted. But sometimes the role and position of words in phrases is multi-faceted and therefore its meaning is also multi-faceted and considered in fit with its role. This structural feature is one of features of Arabic language. The semantic value of roles in language is worth mentioning, which todays take low attention, in such a way that there is no attention to semantic relation between words and to relation of the role which it has in statement. The multiplicity of syntactic faces is wide-sparing, and could specify the speaker’s linguistic grammar and behavior. In this regard the relationship between semantic implications with role of words has attracted the attention of syntactic scientists from past, and syntactic scientists have various comments about the effectiveness of words’ role on semantic implication of them. Some of them do not believe in effectiveness of words’ role on meaning extracted from phrases, but many of them believe in effectiveness of words’ role on semantic implication; and the truth is that for clearing the meaning of phrases we must take attention to various grammatical roles of words.

For more clearing the subject we quote a story from Abuyousof and Kasae. The story is that one day Abuyousof and Kasae came to Rasheed. Abuyousof believed that Jurisprudence science have higher priority over syntax science for evaluation, and syntax science wastes time, and tried to pull down the syntax science in presence of Kasae. Then Kasae said him: “Hey Judge! If two people we bring to you and tell you “this is your slave and he/she killed your slave”, then which one of them will be captive by you and punished?” said Kasae. “Both of them” said Abuyousof. Rasheed who was aware of the role of the move in end of word (it means various Tanvin types) said: “but the first one must be captive not the second, because the second one did not murdered”. Suddenly the Abuyousof surprised and Kasae aware him that the Isme-Fael (the one who carried out the work) which in beginning of that lacks Alif-Lam (ـً) when be added to its object then it bode of past and shows that the murder happened, but when it comes with Tanvin (the moves in last letter of word as ـًـٍـ) and it make the object sign (Tanvin of ـٍ) on the last letter of the word which is it’s object and make it Mansoub, then shows the future and means that no murder happened up to now, therefore you can-not punish him/her. Then Abuyousof apologized and acknowledged the benefit of Irab and promised that never try to decrease the value of Irab and its effectiveness.

The above story well shows the role of Irab and semantic implication in multi-faceted combinations. It is obvious that this flexibility is one of unique properties of Arabic language which distinguishes it from other languages.

In this study we want to evaluate Irab and using applicative examples of syntactic multi-faceted combinations, explain their semantic implications to give Arabic language enthusiasts a new point of view.

In this research we will be able to answer some fundamental questions including: how the meaning of Irab changed from word to istihal?, and if semantic implications with various
justifications, have diversity and multiplicity or not?, and what theoretical benefits may be specified by many syntactic justifications?

The definition of Irab from word to meaning

Irab is a widespread topic and Arabs were aware of comprehensive relationship between Irab and meaning and also the role of Irab in interpretation of meaning. So in many cases understanding the language texts, the reader forced by syntax rules to distinguish Mubtada from Khabar and verb, subject and maf’ul bih with attention to dedication and delays in many of texts. So the move in last letter of word, which shows the grammatical role of the word and role of word in statement justifies the meaning and by changing the move of last letter of word, which shows the grammatical role of the word, the meaning also will be changed.

It is worth mentioning that there is some cases in which the certain grammatical aspects (multi-facet being) is famous and with various justification we could analyze them. But some of them are weak and some are not famous but because their relationship between rules or Arabic language, then considered as oratorical and it is a proof. Being multi-facet here is the same as various grammatical aspects (based on the move in last letter) which have their own semantic implications. In this regard, before showing applicative explaining and analyzing examples, we will define Irab from lexical point of view to reach to the meaning of the term.

Irab in word and meaning

Language books and dictionaries defined six aspect for transferring Irab from language to which is idiomatic between grammarians. These aspects are as follows:

1- Irab is clearing and clarifying. It was said as: “explaining, describing and enlightenment”: “the man explained his need” means he revealed it. In Lesan-ol-Arab said that: “Irab is syntax, clarifying meanings by words and it named Irab because shows the meanings”.

2- irab is good and beautiful saying. It was said that “اعربت الشيء اي خشتنا / اعربت الشيء اي حسنّة”, means that: I explained it in a beautiful and good manner”.

It is the word of god: “Uruban atraba”, means the women which love their husbands [mellifluous and eloquent] and were with the same age by their husbands. Tabari in his interpretation from Quran said: “Uruban is plural of arub/عَرُب and arub is a cute and coquettish wife which loves her husband” and Beizavi said: “Uruban is plural of arub and they are who love their husbands”, and Haem believes that: “Al Emarat al arub is wife which loves her husband and obeys him”.

---

1 Ibn manzur, Mohammad: in Lisan al-Arab, in subset of “عَرُب”, First Edition, Lebanon, Dar Assadir, Unmatched, and many other dictionaries mentioned this meaning, for example: Al-Ayan and Al-Vasit.
2 Al-Khalil Ibn Ahmad, Al-Farahidi: (unmatched), Mojam Al-Ayan, in subset of "عَرُب", First Edition, Beyrut, Dar Al-Fikr/ and Also Ibn Manzur, Lisan Al-Arab, in subset of "عَرُب".
3 Holy Quran, Waqi’ah Soura, Aya 37.
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From the above examples we can conclude that the speaker using Irab and its role in clearing and clarifying the speech approaches to listener and this makes he/she popular with listener.

3- Irab is change, and in this meaning said that: /عَرِبَت المَعِدَةُ/”, means that the stomach got ulcers, and “عَرَبَ الرَّجُلَ عَرَبَ…” /أعربها الله”, means that it changed it. In Al-ayn it was said that: “عَرَبَ الرَّجُلَ عَرَبَ…” /أعربها الله”, which means that man got indigestion. In Lesan-ol-Arab it was said that: “عَرَبَ الرَّجُلَ عَرَبَ…” /أعربها الله”, which means that he got indigestion and his stomach got ulcers.

In this sample we can conclude that the speech because of confusion in meanings was rotted. But using role (Irab) and Alamat Al-Irab (the move which shows the role of word in statement) that rotting was removed. So Hamza in word Irab is used for removing, and in dictionaries there is a meaning for Irab which is antonym of meaning of praise: “recovery”. In Qamus-al-Mohit we see that “Al Emarat al arub” is a peat” and he related this belief to Ibn-e-Arabi because he believes that “Al Emarat al arub” is a wife which does not obey her husband and has betrayal of love and morally is corrupt.

The meaning which Ibn al-Arabi pointed to is not far from meaning of word Irab. In other words it has semantic similarity. Because when you say “عَرَبَت الشَّيءَ” /أعربها الله”, means that I corrected the book and removed its ambiguity. And the “role of word” is from the above examples, means the removing what is confusing, and not understanding will corrupt it and it was done using Irab modes.

4- Irab is circulating: /عَرَبَت الدابةُ اي جالَت وَي مرعاً/”, means that the pack animal cruised in his pasture. And /عَرَبَت الشَّيءَ/” /أعربها الله”, means that his owner cruised it. Ibn Manzour suggested three meaning for “rotating / turning, circulating” as follows:

- جال في البلاد : patrolled and did not stayed. From the fact that “Irab” like “Al-Binaa” does not established on a form and case, so it is changing between Raf and Nasb and Kasr and Sukoon, like it patrols between these cases. And Ibn Al Asfour pointed to this meaning: "الدواة في مراعاً/عَرَبَت”, “الدواة في مراعاً/عَرَبَت”, “الدواة في مراعاً/عَرَبَت”, “الدواة في مراعاً/عَرَبَت”.

- الإجالة (means throwing away) comes from "اجتالَ الرجَال الشَّيءَ” /أعربها الله”, means that destroyed that thing and discarded it and repulsed it. It is obvious that Irab removes the ambiguity of words and prevents happening. In the same way that if we say “ما أحسن “زيد” (means Zeyd is how good and nice) with the Noon (ن) letter in أحسن (ن) and Dal (د) in Zeyd, there is no movement and they are Sakin (resident), then it was not diagnosed as

1 Al-Farahidi, pg, in subset of "عَرَبَت".
2 It is worth mentioning that we used instead of Irab and Alamat Al-Iran (Al zaahir, Mahallai, Taqdiri) their Persian equivalents of role and role of view.
3 Al-Firuzabadi, Muhammad Ibn Yaghub (unmatched), Al-Qamus Al-Muheet, Beyrut, Dar Al-Fikr, under subsection of "عَرَبَت".
4 Muhammad Ibn Manzur, pg, under subsection of "عَرَبَت".
5 Pg, under subsection of "عَرَبَت".
asking from negating and amazing. But Irab shows every one of them and removes the ambiguity.

- "الإدارة" أجل النسهم "means circulating and moving, respectively. In gambling it was said that "أجل النسهم" means that move the nut. In this case also Irab moves the meanings and when Irab appears we could give priority to object than subject, but it is not possible in Binaa.

5- Irab is speaking in Arabic. Soyouti says that “أعرّب الرجل / a’arab al rajul” could be said when a man speaks by Arabic.

6- Irab extracted from “أعرّب الرجل / a’arab al rajul “, and it is when man have a child with Arabic face and color. And al-Qalqashandi in chapter “ما يحتاج إليه الكاتب من وصف النوع الإنساني” (means what a writer needs for describing type of people) said: “tawny color is favorite of many people and is the main color in between Arabs and the holy prophet said that “I was raised for red and black” and the meaning of red is non-Arab because the white is main color between them and the meaning of black is Arab because their color is mainly tawny.1

Soyuti added four other aspects to them2, including:

1- “الارب” is removing corruption. “أعربت الشيء أي أزلت عربته” /أعرّب الشيء أي أزلت غريته “ means I removed its corruption and this meaning as seems is near to change, so the همّزه in it used for removing.

2- Irab is extracted from a statement “صارت له خيال عربي” (he owned Arabic horses) and also “أعرّب الرجل / أعرّب الرجل / a’arab al rajul” / أعرّب الرجل / a’arab al rajul is when the man is owner of Arabic horses or Arabic camels or achieved them and his phrase is “موّر” means owner of Arabic horse.

3- Al-Irab extracted from “التكلم باللغة” means saying cuss, so “الراب و الأترب” means the cuss in speech and “أعرّب الرجل / a’arab al rajul” means cussed to the man.

4- Al-Irab in “أعطيت العربون / أعطيت العربون” (means I paid deposit to you) and عربون is earnest money or deposit.

In these four cases we can see that there is a proximity with past meanings, because in removing corruption and cussing and paying deposit, there is a type of change and transformation, and “صارت له خيال عربي” (he owned an Arabic horse) is content of “man who owns a child with Arabic face and color”.

Before evaluating the irab in phrase of grammarians, by good looking we could understand that grammarians in defining irab itself first focused on meaning of “explaining, describing and

2 Ibn Manzur, under subsection of "ع. ر. ب." and also Firouz Abadi, under subsection of "ع. ر. ب." .
clearing””, because its meaning contains other prescribed meanings, and keeps their differences and removes their ambiguity. So “the relationship between irab and meaning is strong”, and Arab knows its high importance. Because of this we could see that in Arabic language despite many efforts for removing it from past, it saved irab up to now.

**irab in grammarian’s phrase**

irab in grammarian’s phrase take several stages based on fundamental and meaning, which in short explained:

Sibevaih in chapter (positions of “end of words” in Arabic Language) confesses that irab is in raf and nasb and jarr and jazm which is specially for al asma al mutamakkin and present verbs 4.

Sibevaih in his definition from irab relates the irab and is specifying the role of word and also points to the removing the relationship between irab and change. In third century we could see the reflection of Sibevaih’s belief in mubarrad (in 285 hijri date). He believes that “morab” is “al ism al mutamakkin and present verbs”, and “irab asma” has three types, including: raf, nasb and jarr and there is no jarr in present verbs. In such a way that there is it not in asma jazm, because majrouj comes inside mozaf elayih and takes tanvin, and this does not exist in present verbs.

And second half of fourth century, the Abu-Ali Farsi clearly explains the speech about irab, he believes that: “irab is the difference of ending and near the end of words, because of differences in factors, and it has two types: one using movement, and the other by alphabets 5.

ibn jenni believes that: “irab in meaning is opposite of bina and in term is simmiliar to it, and their difference between them is removing irab for change and transferring the determinant of word’s role, while bina is required, may the determinant of word’s role changes or not”, and in khasaes defines bina as follows: “the end of word must be a case of sukoon and movement and no factor may created it”. Taking attention to the above definition which ibn jenni established for bina we could say that “irab is difference in end of word using sukoon or movement because of difference in factors, so he in his definition from bina followed the method and way of his professor, Abu-Ali Farsi.
In sixth century the hariri wrote some lyrics about irab. He says¹:

و وإن تُـرِد أن تَعـرِلإَ الإعرابا

If you want to know the Irab and moves of words / to speak in suitable manner

فائه بالرفع ثم الجر

These moves includes: Raafl, Jarr, Nasb and Jazm and all of them are locating on the words.

Two moves of Raafl and Nasb are sitting on first of noun and continuous verb (present time verb)

And the Jarr move effects on nouns and the Jazm (Sakin) move undoubtedly effects on verb.

The reader see that hariri defined irab like Sibiveih because in his belief the irab is raf and nasb which occurs on word and jarr is specially for nouns and jazm is specially for verbs.

And dr. ahmed Muhammad qasim and dr. faiz fares evaluated and interpreted this poem and defined irab as change in end of word cause of difference in factors occurred on it.

The definition which established by Abu-Ali Farsi from irab was dominant on syntactic research space. Zamakhshari (hijri 538 date) like Abu-Ali Farsi defined irab as: “difference in end of the word cause of difference in factors occurred on it”². The definition of Abu-Ali Farsi became registered in mind of grammarians and they provide it in their books and writings. In second decade of seventh century, the akbari defined it as: “difference in end of word cause of difference in its factor; which is verbal or predestined”³. But ibn hajib (hijri 646 date) believes that the “ism morab” is: “a noun which cause of difference in factors, has difference in its end and irab is what changes the end of ism morab”. And ibn asfoor in defining irab says: “changing the end of word cause of difference in factors occurred on it in verbal or predestined way”⁴.

And ibn malik (hijri 672 date) defines it as: “what used for explaining the requirement of factor including movement or letter or sukoon or removing”⁵.

As it seems, akbari, ibn hajib, ibn asfoor and ibn malik used the definition of Abu-Ali Farsi for irab. But their speech about verbal or predestined, is what Abu-Ali Farsi explained: “difference has two types: in verbal or in position” which pointed out before.

In eighth century the Ibn Hisham Ansari (hijri 761 date) defined irab in three of its compilations¹ as follows: “it is the apparent or predestined effect which factor attracts it, in the end of asma mutamakkin and present verbs”.

⁵. 102, Sharh Jumal al-Zajjaj, ibn asfoor, pg.

http://www.ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/index
The remarks of grammarians could be summarized as the irab is a verbal and apparent or predestined effect in end of word and also a mental change which attracted by difference in factors.

The above definition in fact explains the multi-facet nature of word by taking attention to irab in syntax which shows different semantic implications in accordance with that irab.

The viewpoint of scientists about effect of irab on meaning
As we saw in definition of irab, the irab process could be considered as the most important property of Arabic language, and maybe it is cause of the fact that Arabic language is the language of showing and clearing and irab is one of the instruments which shows the oratory using relationship between words and their positioning. But despite the importance and valuable position of irab and combinations and multi-facet discussions which cleared in between our discussions, some scientists deny the role of irab in statement in Arabic language, and it results in showing the relationship between syntax with term, and then the relationship between syntax with meaning will be forgotten, and the originality of Arabic language will be under question. In this regard, the grammarians are categorized in two categories:

- The group which deny the role of irab. One of them is qutrub. He believes that Arab does not use irab of speech for implicating on meanings, because there is nouns which are confederate in irab but different in meaning. In such a way that there is nouns which are different in irab but confederate in meaning. For example “Indeed the Zayd is your brother, and perhaps the Zayd is your brother, and it seems that Zayd is your brother” which are similar by irab and different by meaning. And like “ما زيد قائمًا و / ما زيـد قـاـئـم / mA zaydon qaiman and mA zaydon qaimun” (Zayd did not sitting) which have difference in irab but the same in meaning. If we remove the irab in Arabic language, or every one do irab on a statement, then the high amount of this original and old language disassembles and the right of rhetoric and eloquence was not done. In this study using applicative example proved that irab and multi-facet are features of Arabic language which distinguishes it from other languages and makes it more precise and complete.

- The second group which their number is not low, believe that irab effects on meaning, and in other words they accepted the multi-facet nature and semantic implications of Arabic language. Some of them are Farra, Ibn Qutayba, zajaji, abu saeid sirafi, ibn jenni and ibn fares.

The vote of prescribed scientists in their definition from irab which evaluated in this research, explains the unbreakable bond between irab and meaning in Arabic language. For example Farra believes that “every problem which have compatibility between irab with meaning and meaning

---

1. Awdah al-Masalik ila Alfiyat Ibn Malik:ibn hisham
2. Sharh Shudhur al-Dhahab fi Ma'rifat Kalam al-'Arab:ibn hisham and .1984,43• United Company for/ Distribution •Damishq•
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with irab is correct, and in Arabic language and poem of famous poets there is nothing but in that meaning is in match with irab and irab is in match with meaning”.

It is require to … using applicative examples in …

Case study from semantic implications in multi-faceted combinations

Every change in irab results in change in meaning, and shows the semantic implication. Because if there is no aim for implication, the speech appeared in a fixed grammatical method, and in this case the most rhetoric and flourish speech based on the conditions of place and context never created. So we could acknowledge that change in irab is for reaching to a goal, that effects in mind and inner aspect of human. So the aim of irab is precision in explaining the meaning, because the implication of speech based on the slight difference in meaning is multiple. Cause this multiplicity made using change in irab between one meaning and the other one, although the main meaning is the same. For example in “a good and nice patience and for a good and nice patience” the main meaning is the same and both phrases spoke about good patience which is without complaint; but in the first phrase it speaks about permanent and long term patience, but in second an unstable patience discussed. Because the first statement by taking attention to its irab is a Jumla Ismia and implies the fixing, and the second statement by taking attention to its irab is a Jumla Fa’eliya. Also like the Aya in Azzariat Sura in Quran which replied greetings in best method: “when they came in front of him and said hello, he said hello “2. Because the Jumla Ismia implies on fixing news and documents and musnad is in relation with musnad ilayh becomes like a non-changeable adjective. Like the long and short adjectives and implying the news which is fixed and non-changeable, and it against Jumla Fa’elieya which implies on renewing and non-fixing. If we see in a good manner, raf is something other than nasb because the verb is in case of having the Nasb move and is Āmil.

And nasb implies on verb, against the raf which implies on fixing.

And now by providing some examples from Quran and fundamental Arabic sources we explain and analyze their aspects based on meaning and rhetoric:

“Indeed we gave a gift from ours to David; Hey Mountains! Become symphonious with him and (Hey) birds! (accompany with him); and we made soft the Iron for him 3 “.

zajaj says: “in marfoo naming of al-tayr there is two options and in mansoub naming is three options4. In the first case (marfouei), al-tayr is atf on yâ and its meaning is, means that “hey mountains, say the rosary with him and birds (hey mountains say rosary with him by birds) or it is atf on the word of “mountains” on taqdir to “ya jibal va al tair”, means hey mountains and hey birds. In second case (mansoubi) al tayr focused on special gif, which means that in “Indeed we gave a gift from ours to David”, focused on appreciation and “captured the birds for him” which quoted from Abu Omar Ibn Ala also permitted to be mansoob بنا بـر Munāda. It seems that mountains and birds were invited to collaboration with vocals and called them. And also it is permitted that waaw be of waaw of concomitance type and mansoob based on meaning of »
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With « and as we will discuss later we will say “I stooded and also Zayd” meaning that “I stooded with Zeyd” and in this case “became symphonious with him and (hey) birds accompany with him”.

It seems that every case have a meaning different than other ones though the main meaning was the same, because the implication of ِraf ِis other than nasb and also implication of the direction which raf or nasb was its founder. For example in holy Aya in »al tair« the implication of nasb as Munada is different than implication of nasb as a’atf from rhetorical and meaning aspects, cause the first one invites to cooperation in happening, and the second is not cooperation.

«الحمد لله رب العالمين» “thanks to the god of universe”

The al-hamd word has two aspects: raf and nasb. In marfoo case the statement is ismia (mubtada and khabar) and from rhetorical and meaning aspects implicates on fixing the Gloria for god. In mansoob case the mafool mutlaq/ Cognate Adverb is predestined for verb (و wa nahmadun hamda(تَحمَدَ الَّذِينَ آتَتْهُمْ مَثَّلًا) and is explaining the emphasis, or is considered as the mafool bihi ilzamoo al hamda(إِلَّا مَعَ الْمَمْلَكَة). These two statements are Fa’eliya and from rhetorical or meaning aspects implies on happening or change. In other words the interpretation from Jumla Ismia means fixing the Gloria from eternity to eternity and also before praise of prayers and after it. So the “Gloria for god” is fixed, if they pray it or not. Zamakhshari in alkishaf about this subject wrote that: “the raf of al hamd means fixing and establishment and nasb means happening and change”.

Now we give some examples from sources other than Quran:

For example about involvement:
خالدًا اكرمتـه ب خالـد أكرمتـه (I cherished Khalid and Khalid, I cherished him).

The خالد/ Khalid in first phrase came as mansoob and in second phrase as marfoo. In both of statements the irab of the mentioned word effects on meaning and aim of the statement. In first case mansoob, the speaker is the axis of speech and giving notice carried out around it, but in second case the marfoo, the خالد/ Khalid on ism Mutaqaddim (the name of “Khalid” which came in beginning of the statement) is axis of speech and giving notice carried out izaharound it. In this subject in the book » al idah fi elal al nahw « from abol-abbas quoted that: “the difference between ضربتُ زـيـداً ب زـيـد  ضـربته (I beat the Zayd and Zayd, I beat him) is that in first statement the speaker notices from himself which carried out the beating action, but in the second he aims to say that zayd beatet”.

From the speech of zajaji we could conclude that khalidan ism mansoob was come first to speak about it with a lower amount and degree from mubtada, because principally the mubtada is axis

References:
1. Al-Fatiha.
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of speech, in opposition of mashquol anh which is not the axis of speech. So we could say that in raf case or « خالد اكرمتُه » (Khalid, I cherished him), from rhetorical and meaning aspect the axis of speech is خالد and is focused from this aspect which noticing happened around it, and in nasb case or « خالدَ اكرمتُه » (I cherished the Khalid), the khalid came first to gain emphasis with lower amount and degree than mubtada, because the axis of speech is speaker and the ism mansoob was gain priority because of specialty. In other words in raf case the emphasis and base of speech is only on mubtada, in opposite of nasb case, in which the axis of speech is both musnad ilayh and also the name which come in beginning of speech.

About tahzir and iqra, like: “Beware! The Lion and the Panter!

The above phrase have two aspects: if they used as mansoob, they considered as Jumla Fa’eliya, and implies the renewing and happening, in this way that the lion word is mafool for the omitted verb, ihzar (beware), and the word Panter is mafool bihi for the omitted al-Fe’l al-Amr /imperative verb (ٍ=beware) and its meaning is: I premention you about lion and panther, and nasb implies prohibition. But if it become marfoo, then lion is khabar for omitted mubtada and Panter is ma’atoof and marfoo. So by change in irab the meaning also changed. And also in the الجذ الجذ (try many times) phrase if they used as mansoob, it will imply the renewing and interpreted as iqra، but if they used as marfoo, it will imply the noticing and implies on fixing.

About al-Mafool ma’a-hu/ the adverb of accompaniment; for example: “مازال خالد و زيدَ زيداً حتى كتب الرسالة.» maazal khalidun wa zaydun zaydan hatta kataba alrisala

zayd has two aspects: raf and nasb. When it was mansoob, it means that khalid continuously tried to force zayd for writing up to end of writing letter, and waaw is waaw of concomitance and implies companionship, and when it was marfoo, it concluded that continuity was from both of them, though the waaw al atf concludes the companionship in happening.

About nidaa; for example: /ya rajulon- ya rajulan (hey man! be responsible)

If rajul comes with Damma only the audience aimed, and raf from rhetorical and meaning aspects concludes assignment, and if it was mansoob then it is universal and comprehensive and uses for every man and nasb from rhetorical and meaning aspects concludes publicity.

About ta'ajjub/ Exclamation; for example: / ma ahsana zaydan (how good is Zayd)

The Exclamation style comes with rhythm of ما أفعل وما a’f’ala and there is three grammatical aspects which meaning changes for every one of them, and ibn fares said about not having irab in “ma ahsana zaydan” statement: “using irab the meanings were distinguished and diagnosed and we will know the aim of speaker, because without irab the goal will not be reached”¹. From the example of ibn fares we understand that listener does not understand that statement and without irab could not realize its goal. So if semantic implication or meaning in that statement was

---

¹ ibn fares :al-Ṣahibī fi fiqh al-lughah• research: sayed ahmed saqr• First Edition •al halabi Press• pg.310 ,
surprising, then “/mā/ مـا/ how much” is mafool bihi and zayd comes as mansoob; ma ahsana zaydan
Means “Zayd is strangely good”. And if the aim is denying, then zayd comes marfoo and “مـا/ mā” negates the speech about good action of zayd: ma ahsana zaydun
Means “Zayd is not good”. Also in this case the semantic implication and rhetorical aim changes using irab and the statement became eloquence, and in other words the statement is not ambiguous. Based on the third case if goal is asking something then “مـا/ mā” is mubtada and the statement is Jumla Ismia and zaydun becomes majroor: mā ahsanun zaydin means “what good thing is in Zayd?” It means that “مـا/ mā” in this statement comes for removing the ambiguity and ahsanun in opposition of previous two cases comes as marfoo and clearly we have different roles in accordance with their related meanings.

About Exception/ istisna; for example: “the smart people succeed except the one who is lazy”
It is other than adawat istisna / Particles of Exception and the above phrase has two cases: nasb and raf. In first case it is Except of badal and implication of badal points to directly and without intermediaries to recording the happening for it is aimed; “the smart people who are not lazy succeed” means memorizing who was not tired were won. In second case based on not being exceptional it is mansoob and concludes differentiation, implies that after it is opposite of before it from meaning point of view. “the smart people succeed but the lazy people are in conflict with them” means that memorizing will be successful but not the tired ones. It seems that in raf of not tired ones (slackers) there is no certain rule, but in nasb of it there is one certain rule that says tired ones (slackers) will not won, and in other words the success assigned entirely to memorizers and disconnected from tired individuals.

About tamyiz ; for example: فاطمـة أكـرم امـا و أشرف زوجـا و فاطمـة أكـرم أـم و أـشرف زوجـا (Fatima as a mother is the dearest mother, and as a wife, is the most honorable wife, and the Fatima is the dearest mother and the most honorable wife).
tamyiz comes after Af’aal O Ta’zeel/ Augmentative and has two cases: in first case the tamyiz comes as mansoob and its meaning is praising for Fatima’s wife and mother, so it means فاطمـة أكـرم أـم و أشرف زوجـة (the mother of Fatima cherished and his husband gained honor).
Therefore the aim is removing the ambiguity. And in second case it comes as majroor and its meaning is the praise is only assigned to Fatima, means that she is the best one and aim is assignment. It seems that changing irab completely changed the meaning of statement.

About tamyiz of the number ; for example: کم كتاباً عندك and کم كتابان indak/ (how much book is with you, and how many book is with you?)
The tamuiz of kam in the above statement has two cases: if it comes as mansoob then concludes as understanding and its aim is giving news and asking for awareness, but if it comes as majroor then it changes in implication and rhetorical aspects, meaning that concludes proliferation and is a jumla khabaria, means that how much books are in front of you.
About tamyiz zat; for example: 
(I have a bushel of wheat and a bushel of wheat is with me)
tamyiz zat or a tamyiz which its identifier is malfoozi, like the above statement occurs after values (area, weight) and it permitted to be mansoob based on tamyiz and also it permitted to be majroor as a mozaf elayih. In nasbi case the indi qafizun burran means that amount of wheat which fills the wheat container (bushel), but in jarr case the indi qafizu borrin the meaning and aim changes, and it means the wheat container is in front of speaker, without taking attention to existence of wheat.

About atf on zamir majroor; for example: 
« ولكن الراسمون في العلم منهم و المؤمنون يؤمنون بما أنزل إليك وما أنزل من قبلك و المقيمين الصلاة »1 (but the some of them who are serious in science, and the believers in what plummet to you, and plummeted to [prophets] before you, who are believing in you, they are setting up the prayer”
In al insaf2 we see that: “muqimin” in beliefs of Kufi scholars has two cases: first case in jarr position using atf on kāf in “ilayk / إليك” and taqdir of it we have: و يؤمنون بما أنزل إليك و إلى المقيمين الصلاة (they believe to what plummeted to you and the ones who setting up the prayer” which means holy prophets, and also it permitted that atf on kāf be in قبلك qablik and its taqdir is as follows ”from the ones who setting up the prayer” means that before your nation. But in school of basri scholars the atf on majroor’s Pronoun is not permitted, because jar and majroor are considered as one, and when atf on majroor’s Pronoun happens, methinks that atf of ism on the jarr’s letter/ “noun on the Jarr letter” happened, but atf of the name on the letter is not permitted. Therefore basri scholars analyze its two cases as follows: “al muqimin” is in place of nasb, based on praise, and in this case the aim is that the verb is in taqdir because Arabs when repeating the atf or vasf based on praise will be mansooob the word. Or it is marfoo based on the isti’nāf and its taqdir is: و هم المقيمين / و هم المقيمين الصلاة / (they believe to what plummeted to you and the ones who setting up the prayer” which means holy prophets, and also it permitted that atf of the name on the letter is not permitted in praise and in taqdir because the poet made it mansooob for repeating by aim of praising. And it is like the following two couplets:3:
لا يُعَدَن قَمء الَّذِيََّ ذُم العداة و آوة الجهر
“do not banish my people, who are the best defiant against enemies and a disaster for the sacrificial meat (the corpses of enemy’s army)”
الثَّازِلُون يَكُن مُعَتَركِي و الطَّيِبَين مُعَاقَذُ الأزر
“they enter in every battleground while they are completely ready and yet they are chaste people”
The examples in these two couplets is the “chaste people” adjective, which disconnected from mosouf means “my people” from raf to nasb and has two cases: it is permitted to be mansoob based on praise by taqdir because the poet made it mansooob for repeating by aim of praising. And also it permitted to become marfoo based on isti’nāf, means “ and they are from chaste people”, which in this case the aim is describing their purity.

1.62/al nisa .
In mode of hāl/case; for example: (Zeynab is a writer woman, and more than it is active in poetry field”).

The words kātiba and shāira in the above statement have two cases: one case is they are mansoob based on hāl/case, and in this case in Nahw al-wafi we see that one of cases which the hal jamid does not concludes as mushtaq is that: “a statement have two hāl/case, they be united in meaning, the af’aal factor was tafzeel and implies that sāhibu-l-hāl in one of its cases have superiority on itself or on other ones”. It is clear that sāhibu-l-hāl which is zaynab have various conditions which some of them are writing and composing poetry, and in writing case she has superiority on herself in composing poetry, and the area of superiority is exhilaration and activity. It is worth mentioning that the aim of superiority is absolute extra not the advantage or being flawless. Therefore it speaks about two case of zaynab conditions, and from implicational and rhetorical views the aim is absolute extra in one thing. And the other case is that the words become marfoo, in which the meaning changes and will be about two writer and poet and the aim is superiority of a poet woman on writer (zaynab), so from rhetorical and implicational views the absolute extra is not the aim of statement, but prioritizing the poet woman against writer (zaynab) will be shown. As it seems every case has its own meaning and rhetorical aspects.

About style of waw; for example: (do not eat fish and do not drink milk”)

“waw” in the above statement has the ability of having different cases based on the aim of speaker, and based on that cases the tashrib verb also have different irabs, and these various styles of irab will semantically change implications. So if we make tashrib verb as majzoom, then the waw becomes waw al-‘atifah and semantically the atf on لفظ/word carried out and aim is proscribing from eating fish and drinking milk, because atf on لفظ/word means common thing. And it we use it as mansoob case as » tashrib « then the waw is The Waw of Company and atf on meaning carried out and means inhibiting from eating fish with drinking milk altogether and vice versa. Because the Waw of Company means companionship in the same time. And if we use it in marfoo case of » tashrib « then the statement is Jumlah Musta’nafah and waw is letter of isti’nāf and the meaning is inhibiting from eating fish but there is no barrier against drinking milk and implies ibaha “Promiscuity”. We see that the prescribed statement has three type of irab and every type made a sensible change in meaning and rhetoric of statement, in such a way that speaker must precisely transfer the meaning.

About hatta; for example: (when I was young, I tried to be calm in old days”)

The “ (I rest) verb has two aspects: marfoo and mansoob. If aim is resting in aging time, then the aim of speaker is present time, and the “ (I rest) come as marfoo, because he is resting now because of his efforts in past. And even in these conditions “cause of the fact that the meaning is not “ (until) nor “إلى أن “ (until), it exits from letters of nasb

2. ibn hisham al ansari :moqni al labib •Beyrout •dar al fikr, 2007/1427 Hijri, 452.
and as “إذا” and what is similar is from حروف 1ibtida”. If aim of resting is a goal and target in future, the prescribed verb comes as mansooob and in fact the resting does not started yet. And in this situation “the speaker when announces the news, describes the verb as impetus of doing in future, so the verb after “hatta/حتى” in its relation with time has the future meaning and comes as 2mansooob”.

It seems that from the rhetorical and meaning aspects we can clearly understand the difference between two prescribed aspects. Because in marfoo case the “hatta/حتى” is al huroof Al Ebtaida’ia and in mansooob case the “even for explaining the extremity” and every one of them has their own special meaning, and this implication does not understood, but when the “irab” of verb after “hatta/حتى” unfolds.

About when “da”/‌ذا comes after them. For example: ماذا ألفت؟ (what did you granted? Who did you saw”)
Sometimes “ذا”/da comes in a composition which may be mosoula and before it there is the istifham, or with “من” (someone) and “ما” (something) there is a word for istifham3. So there is two cases: rasf and nasb. In mansooob case, all of “ذا ذاتا”/ماذا “what thing that” and “من”/من ذا «ماذا» (who) (the onw who) of a word is for istifham, which in this case are mafool bihi was came in beginning of the statement in nasb position, and when the object comes first it comes in the beginning of the statement. And in marfoo case the «ماذا»/ماذا “what thing” and «من»/من (who) (he is Zohair or his brother?) respectively. Its meaning is also apparent in t’abi (a subsidiary and dependent word). Because if all of «ماذا/ماذا» (what) were a word as istifham, then the t’abi (a subsidiary and dependent word) is as Instead of the location for «ماذا»/ماذا “what thing” and «من»/من (who) and comes as mansooob, and it could be said that: a dirhaman am dinaran? أ زهيراً أم ديناراً؟ (it is Dirham or Dinar?) and a zuhayran am akhahu? أ زهيراً أم أخاه؟, (he is Zohair or his brother?) which their meaning is “what did you donated? A dirham or a dinar” and “who do you cherished? zuhayr or his brother?”, respectively. And if mā «ماذا»/ماذا (what thing) and mā «من»/من (who) are only one word for istifham and “ذا ذاتا”/ذا ذاتا “what) is mosoul, then the t’abi (a subsidiary and dependent word) as Instead of «ماذا»/ماذا and a zuhayrun am akhuhu? أ زهيراً أم أخاه؟», which means that “what was that you donated? A dirham or a dinar?” and “who was that you cherished? zuhayr or his brother?”

---

1 Pg. Sibevaih :al kitab · volume.130 · 4
1386,344·Esteghlal Press ·Tehran ·Fifth Edition ·Mawsu’at al-nahw wa-al-sarf wa-al-i’rāb ·mil badi yaqub .
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About adding isim fa’il. for example:hada qatilu akhi (this is the murderer of my brother)
The isim fa’il which was in present or future time is permitted to be added to its ma’amoul or ma’amoul make itself as mansoo 1. for example: «هذا قاتل أخي» (This is the murderer of my brother). In that statement the isim fa’il has the ability of being two cases: with or without tanvin. If it comes with tanvin – in case of «قاتِـلُ أخـي» (killed my brother) it implies on the murder which does not occurred yet. But if it comes with tanvin – in case of «قاتلُ أخِي» (killed my brother-) means that the murder happened.

If seems that removing the tanvin and becoming added implies on happening in past, and saving tanvin and the act of effecting the ismi fa’il on its object, in opposite of previous case means the event will occur in the future, and if the above statement does not spell correctly and the irab does not completely be specified, then it will make judgment on plaintiff and defendant a difficult task. So every irab case made its own implication.

About mubtada vasfi. for example: أقـائم  زـید. A qaimun zaydun / (does the zayd stooded?)
The mubtada vasfi if is in accordance with what comes after it in single mode and is permitted to have two cases: one is being the description of mubtada and after it is fa’il and the barrier in reaching to khabar (news), and second case is description of khabar muqaddam and after it is mubtada muakhar 2.

The A qaimun zaydun / (if the Zayd is standed?) phrase in every case is different from rhetorical and implicational aspects. In such a way that if “qaim” mubtada باشَد and “zayd” the fa’il implies this meaning that هل القائم زيد أم رجل آخر؟/ (if the one who standed is is Zayd or the other one?) or “if zayd is standing or other one?” then the emphasis of question is only on the standee one, and the answer is muhammadun or zaydun زیدة يـا «عـمرو» or other one. But if the qaim القائم is khabar muqaddam and “zayd” is mubtada muakhar, then implication is hal zaydun qaimun? or “if the zayd was standee?” and the question only allocated to zayd and the answer is yes or no. It seems that every case has its own meaning.

About ma’atuf. for example: زید لـَقیث ابابة و عمراً و عمروً. In this composition the amr عمرو word has the ability of accepting two cases: marfoo and mansoo. In every one of cases the rhetoric and implication of statement changes in accordance with irab. In this subject the Sibevaih book says 3: “when the aim is that the zayd’s father and amr had interviewed, then it comes as mansoo of “amran”ا و عمرو را and if the aim is that you interviewed with the father of amr and you interviewed with the father of zayd and did not interviews zayd nor amr, then it comes as the marfoo of “amrun”.

If irab is subsidiary to meaning or meaning is subsidiary for irab?

---

2. Pg. 88.
In the end of this research it is worth mentioning that by taking attention to previous examples we could answer to the question that if meaning creates irab and effects on it or irab is creator of meaning.

In this subject in grammar books of Arabic language, the widespread opinions of scientists shows that irab is subsidiary to meaning. Its justification is that the meaning is base and fundamental and irab is subsidiary and caused, and irab creates after meaning. But some others believe that meaning is subsidiary to irab and the irab orders meaning, and if it removed, the meaning will be ambiguous. It is clear that both of meaning and irab have their own roles in originality and solidarity of Arabic language. I believe that both of the above ideas are correct, mean that irab is subsidiary to meaning and otherwise, and its interpretation is that speaker based on the meaning in his/her mind, inevitably must use the correct irab for it, and in this research it could be found that there is a deep bonding between irab and meaning and there is no transposition between them. It must be mentioned that this issue could void the belief of past and present grammarians who do not believe in role of irab in meaning.
Result:
- There is no doubt that multi-faceted combinations have the proper rhetorical implications with them which must be focused by Arabic language graduates.
- It is impossible to be independent from irab, unless it includes a very simple speech.
- The vast majority of grammarians believe in role of irab in creating meaning and purpose.
- There is an unbreakable bonding between irab and meaning, which shows that there is no transposition between them.
- The goal of irab in grammarian’s term is revealing and clearing and eloquence. And by taking attention to the dilation in it, it could cover both the composition of words in statement, and also the irab marks.
- The final conclusion is that in between Arabic language graduates, students and professors, the relationship between grammar and spelling is more focused than relationship between grammar and meaning, and it caused in forgetting implicational elegances and it is an important risk for Arabic language, which necessitates the more attention to implicational relationship and applicative usage of it.
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