
RESEARCH ARTICLE

Accusative Nouns as Textual Intentions in the Structure of the Verbal Sentence

Dr. Mahmoud Sulaiman Al-Hawashah¹, Dr. Adnan Mohammed Bataineh², Ms. Sabra Muradjan Al Balushi³

¹Assistant Professor, University of Sohar: College of Education and Humanities, Department of Arabic Language, Oman

²English Language Lecturer, University of Buraimi, Buraimi, Oman

³English Language Instructor, University of Buraimi, Buraimi, Oman

Corresponding Author: Dr. Adnan Mohammed Bataineh, **E-mail:** adnan.m@uob.edu.om

ABSTRACT

In Arabic grammar, a sentence is essentially a predication to which adjuncts are regarded as surplus that can be dispensed with; however, in actuality, the sentence is built syntactically that has a meaning partially associated with the text in which it is placed, and adjuncts are the means through which the sentence is linked to its text—this is where the issue arises: is the core construction of a sentence predication alone or predication plus adjuncts? Old grammarians and most contemporary linguists still argue that predication is the sentence and that anything past that is simply non-compulsory adjuncts, which leads to the scenario of sentence-text separation and the profiling of Arabic grammar as sentence-bound instead of text-oriented. This study addresses this issue through a detailed explanation of the position of accusative nouns in sentences and texts, highlighting them as adjuncts: indispensable for sentence structure and the main textual element connecting sentence to text—particularly the absolute object, which is the foundation of sentence building and its deep semantic structure. Other accusative nouns and prepositional phrases function as textual modals; the subject commences text and sentence, while the verb has two components: the event (absolute object) and time, which are characteristic of both verbal and nominal sentences.

KEYWORDS

Accusative nouns, sentence, text, adjunct, structure

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 15 January 2026

PUBLISHED: 08 February 2026

DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2026.9.2.21

1. Introduction

The main research question is to reveal the textual structure in Arabic traditional grammar. It assumes that Arabic grammar is mainly focused on sentences, and all the syntactic and semantic analyses take place within the boundaries of the sentence. Most grammarians agree that the sentence is predication and regard everything outside it as unnecessary and trivial. This brings up a semantic question: How can we analyze and relate texts when the sentence is its own center and closes off with its constituents, modifiers, tails, redundancies, or appositives—all of which do not go beyond the limits of a sentence in terms of their definitions? The theory is that every structural addition conveys a meaning, and the way the structure is put together determines the interpretation to some degree.

The question is how, without the elements of the broader text, the meaning of one sentence can be transferred to another in such a way that cohesion and completeness of the text are guaranteed?

1.1 Research Problem

The primary source of the problem in the research study is the approach that regards the basic sentence structure as merely predication and nothing beyond that as necessary. Predication is an utterance without semantic meaning, and this view of the sentence corresponds poorly with the idea of text, which is based on a central theme. The current research tries to complete the link from sentence to text by looking into some syntactically relevant elements of the sentence that are usually ignored—

particularly, those objects in the accusatives that are labeled "adjunct" (Al-Faḍla) together with their corresponding prepositional phrases, thus clarifying their position in sentence structure and textuality.

1.2 Research Objectives

The purpose of the study is to make clear the syntactic place of the objects in the structure of the verbal sentence and to explain their semantic function in the textuality of the verbal sentence in Arabic grammar.

1.3 Research Questions

- Are objects an essential component in constructing the verbal sentence?
- Is predication sufficient to convey the intended meaning?
- What does the clarification of the intended meaning in the sentence rely on?
- Can objects be dispensed with?
- What is the role of objects in establishing the textuality of the sentence?
- What is the relationship between objects and textual intentionality?

2. Literature Review

Numerous studies address accusative nouns, but none focus on the actual problem. Consider, for example, a study titled 'The Absolute Object and Its Significance in the Holy Quran (A Syntactic-Semantic Study in Surah Al-Waqi'ah)' (2022), which examines the concept of absolute object and its significance in the Quran, more precisely applied to Surah Al-Waqi'ah, as mentioned in Semantic and case studies (Al-Baruni, 2022). Yet another study, 'Dependents of Verbs in the Holy Quran: A Syntactic Study' (2000), investigates the usage of mentioning and omission of verbal dependents in the structure of the sentence, the effect of the fronting and delaying of different types of sentential-syntactic process along with their all conditions that render their meaning possible within a sentence (Al-Arja, 2000).

In other academic studies, such as one titled "Accusative Nouns Between Rule and Rationale" published in 2014, scholars try to create a usable limit to the theoretical concept of 'rationale' (al-'illa) in grammar and how it is used. It handles an aspect of the theory – something that can be described in a rational manner one reason for the existence of the five accusative nouns while trying to identify the interrelatedness of the rule and the thinking that supports it and how far the rule is in sync or otherwise out of sync with that thinking (Al-Anzi, 2014). In a separate piece of research entitled "Accusative Nouns and What Resembles the Direct Object" published in 2021, such research looks at some of the five of the accusative nouns that's most closely crane to a direct object and its probable types of case (Al-Laban, 2021).

Another study, titled "The Extended Sentence through Accusative Nouns in the Mu'allaqat Poetry" (2019), presents a summary of the primary means of sentence extension, then examines how the sentence is extended and elongated via accusative nouns, along with the semantic implications of this elongation (Shahda, 2019).

2.1 Chapter One: Concepts of the Sentence and Accusative Nouns

2.1.1 First: The Concept of the Sentence

Since the study is about the structure and limits of the sentence, it becomes relevant to analyze the limits of sentences, and the meaning level is built into them. Sibawayh uses the term "jumla" meaning sentence, a total of five times in his book while for the sixth time it becomes "al-jumal" which is a plural form. These cannot be interpreted as a sentence consisting only of the predicate (al'umda) or predication plus adjunct (Abudl Salam, 1991).

Early grammarians have observed that despite the existing differences as to what constitutes a sentence, one common feature emerges: namely, predication acting as a sentence, making any additional components, if present, dispensable. And thereafter they expanded the definition of a sentence at the term, benefit to the sentence is supposed to convey a benefit without specifying what this benefit is or how it can be provided by predication alone without any adjunct.

Ibn Jinni states: "Every independent word that conveys meaning is what the grammarians term a sentence" (Annajar, 1955). Al-Mubarrid remarks: "The subject is in the nominative because it and the verb together form a sentence upon which silence is appropriate and which necessarily conveys benefit to the addressee. Thus, the subject and verb are akin to the topic and predicate, as in 'Zayd stood,' equivalent to saying 'The standing one is Zayd'" (Al-Mubarrid, 1382 AH: 1/8).

There is a lot of discussion regarding this point; nevertheless, Ibn Hisham's understanding is the most accurate when it comes to drawing boundaries between a sentence and an utterance. He categorizes a sentence whose predication has a benefit into small and large sentence types, adding that the words uttered, unlike a sentence, behave in another way as they are used to convey

the benefits: – “A condition and its ‘apodosis’ does not make an utterance as there is no benefit... An utterance is narrower than a sentence because regarding conditions of the former, usefulness includes loading which is not the case in the latter. It is for this reason that they speak of ‘conditional sentence’, ‘apodosis sentence’, or ‘relative clause sentence’ where none of them includes benefit loading and therefore they are not regarded as utterances’ (Ibn Hisham, 1985: 490).

An emergence of linguists in this regard is aligned with the traditional theory of sentences whereas the other aims to specifically enhance or replace existing understanding by introducing new concepts. In the latter category, there is Ibrahim Anis who considers a sentence as ‘in its simplest form, a practical utterance hitting an autonomous illocution on the interlocutor, either consisting of one or more words. As an example, a speech of a defendant can be a single word ‘Zayd’ when asked by a judge who was with him at the time of the crime (Anis, 1985: 276–277). Yet still, according to the author, new speech where does it exist; such speech which does not of necessity use inferences from narrative structure, from memory bound experiences. Such speech he argues at least should make some sense otherwise it is just talk for it serves no purpose (Anis, 1985: 276–277).

Al-Munsif Ashur remains within the bounds of predication, viewing the simple sentence as self-sufficient predication, either nominal or verbal (Al-Munsif, 1991). Among modern scholars who have discussed sentence boundaries are Al-Mukhzumi, Al-Wa'ir, Muhammad Abd al-Mu'talib, Boumaaza, and others.

2.1.2 Second: The Status of Accusative Nouns in Sentence Structure

There is a minority of scholars who argue that the adjunct (al-faḍla) is a crucial element in the structure of a sentence, it is inevitable and not removable at all; few references can be found though nothing, however, suggests any serious consideration regarding its pole position other than the semantic one. The whole establishment of the text and sentence is based on the role of semantic conveyance. Ibn Jinni claims that this predominance holds true because: “Benefits are derived from relatively few core constituents, with the rest being auxiliary elements. Often, even these supplementary elements than embellishing the sentence are the ones that unpleasantly, even cripplingly arrest its development. If you said, ‘Zayd, Hind stood,’ for instance, the sentence is still fragmented. But, adding an adjunct it becomes as for example, ‘Zayd, Hind stood in his house, with him, because of him, for his magnanimity, and hence he honored her, and so on; the problem is solved as the pronoun goes back to the subject of the sentence in question” (Nasif & Shalabi, 1999).

What needs to be emphasized here is inter-sentence cohesion and it is not an exaggeration of linking or yes group adjunct phrases and hence what remains is the question – through linking particles or adjuncts? Inter-sentence connections among the sentences are not opposed to every type of linking particles and this inhibiting factor includes foresight e.g., coordination; a rhetorical consideration, inter-sentence connections are made through distance, considering the mutual context of the clauses. Does cohesion then depend solely upon inter-sentential particles? How may particles be functional in the absence of any adjunct structure and particularly the ones like accusative noun or its kind? Is it tenable to claim:

“Do not give me..... rather give me”

This verse has been composed except for an adjunct; only predication with particle remains in this item—Does it give any meaning? Is it possible? Moreover, do listeners who hear the verse understand it? Can one access the verse without the appeal to the adjunct sufficing lower than excessive predication? And now, let us consider this verse with the adjunct present.

“Do not give me the cup of life with humiliation; rather, give me the cup of colocynth (bitter gourd) with honor/dignity”

There is no meaning which the predication provides in the absence of the context, internal or external, nor function of aspects; therefore, nothing, thus this does not take away the need of the adjunct in ensuring coherence, with the accusative noun in question, being covered broadly in this research paper. An illustration of this appears in the sentence structure of the conditional particle “inna” along with its subject and predicate, as in Al-Akhtal's verse:

“Whoever enters the church one day will find in it, gazelles and female deer” (D.T. 198)

It remains semantically incomplete without the adjunct (“gazelles and deer”) (Qubawah, 1983: 24).

Within the structure of a sentence, references and remarks must rest on something or someone, an adjunct, to make any sense. The grammarians' principle of benefit (fayda) helps explain the situation better. In any instance where fayda is supposed to present itself, there is also the presence of the adjunct, and without it, one cannot talk about what that sentence means. Ibn Hisham however, even while explaining how one can useful place in a text a sentence that trees, gives examples of sentences containing adjuncts without restricting predication only to the verb – so it is possible to do it for minor and major structures of sentences. For instance, she illustrates a minor and a major sentence in the following way: Zayd [is such that] his father [is such that] his servant is leaving.’ All of this makes up only a major proposition; his servant is leaving’ alongside being an accusative noun poses a minor sentence because it is in fact a predication; and ‘his father [is such that] his servant is leaving’ is a major sentence (Ibn Hisham, 1985: 497).

Al-Istrabadi emphasizes the foundation of the absolute object within the structure of the verbal sentence when he says that “a verb does not exist without an absolute object” (Al-Istrabadi, 1978: 1/296). Moreover, this injunctive complement is known as the

absolute object because it conveys the object of the action without any adjunct or the like (Ibn Aqil, 1980: 2/169) and comes after the verb to perform various functions as well (Al-Mukhzumi, 1966: 106). Consequently, when there is basically no accusative noun in the verbal sentence, one should appear with the absolute object and it is, in principle, how the meaning is formed; one cannot simply say that he stood, that is, bent that Zayd stood or simply, Zayd stood without a reason. There is no predication sentence without its absolute object in it.

In Al-Istrabadi's opinion, the absolute object is the essential compound in a sentence, as it stands on both syntactic and semantic grounds, while additional accusative nouns are added to position and define the subject, as well as the absolute object or direct object—in the likeness of other accusatives and the prepositions that accompany employment of nouns in almost every language, meaning the employment of nouns with a purpose given by the verb. In accordance with Al-Istrabadi's views as well as the argumentative line followed and the analysis of the accusative noun and its distribution particularly the absolute object, the following is proposed:

- One of the fundamental aspects of the framework of the syntactic structure of the verbal sentence is the underlying abstract absolute object, which itself exists within the deep syntax of the sentence even when not used explicitly since the semantics of the sentence require some form of structure in which they can be expressed.
- Other accusative nouns — except for the absolute object — function to direct or specify the absolute object and its subject much like other accusative and prepositional phrases. They therefore cannot occur in context-free useful constructions, although they can be ellipted within a context with evidential cues rather than true omission, a feature inherent in the verb's structure.
- Accusative nouns, particularly the absolute object, represent the primary intended semantics in sentence structure; the subject's presence in the verbal sentence aims to effect the event—the absolute object—while other accusative nouns direct the sentence: the direct object as the entity affected by the event, the circumstantial object as the event's context, the object of purpose as the event's cause, and the comitative object as indicating accompaniment.
- The subject and the absolute object are required to be concomitant – they should comply with each other, while all accusative nouns following and any prepositional phrases (complementing either one of them or both) make allowance for their textual connotation.
- The reason why we refer to it as the absolute object is that it is independent of everything except for its operator, or the subject, and elementarily useful elements of the sentence. The presence of an absolute object within a sentence is absolute because it is not restricted in the semantic construction of the verbal sentence, the sentence is constructed around it, representing the true action of the subject.
- Based on the preceding inference, the absolute object in text-oriented grammar represents the deep semantic structure or deep semantic nucleus: the generative focus and transformational pivot, the stimulus eliciting the primary response, akin to behaviorist theory.
- In a verbal sentence, most grammatical structures, be they semantic or functional, refer to accusative nouns and other adjuncts, the most remarkable one being the absolute object, which is a purpose of the verbal sentence construction. If no argument is present, then the verb becomes devoid of an agent, hence any action being unthinkable without an actor, the actor comes first with its own agency preceded by accusative nouns and other accusative and prepositional phrases which also follow due to their dependence on the agent's event.

2.2 Accusative Case and Intentionality in the Sentence

Ibn al-Tarawah (Al-Banna, 1990: 74) holds a significant view on accusative nouns and adjuncts in general, assigning them their textual status by governing them through intentionality. The operator "intention toward it" represents a novel semantic operator innovated by Ibn al-Tarawah. In his view, certain governed nouns and events receive specific case markers, such as the accusative, without deliberate stylistic choice. The case marker in "Subhan Allah" (Glory be to God) signals majesty, as the intention falls upon mentioning the word unrestricted by time or circumstances; hence, its accusative is obligatory, as with any entity intended for mention, such as "Iyyaka" (Thee alone), "Wayl" (Woe), and "Wayhahu" (Woe to him) (Hamza, 2004: 184–185).

The usage of the absolute object, that is, the accusative nouns and prepositional phrases with respect to intentionality and neutralization, shows that in the hierarchy of meanings for constructing sentences and texts, any language unit should have a purpose and benefit; accordingly, any text contains an idea and there is no useful sentence that is void of textual conceptualization. The functional position of the words in sentences makes it rational to construe sentences with positions allowing demarcation of accusative and prepositional adjuncts intentionality.

The notion of "intentionality" meaning *al-qasdiyya* coined by Ibn al-Tarawah is equivalent to predication given that the accusative and prepositional case can be regarded as semantic case intentions i.e. case meanings primary in the structure of a sentence. This perspective is supported through analogy to the endings of sentences in case; thus, adjuncts in the verbal

sentence are endowed with a textual intentionality. To my mind, without attributing interpretive standards through individual grammatical terms, this case marking for accusative and prepositional phrases quite rightly discloses the textual dimension in the sentence, which is affected by the subject's intentionality. The absolute object compels the agency in the verbal sentence while the accusatives and prepositional phrases associated with it are directing the sentence toward its text, thereby, linking it with other sentences under the master textual idea.

Accusative nouns and accusative and prepositional phrases in general are conceived to be part of the sentence under the concept of "guides" or intent, thus linking to the textual conceptualization by presupposing what they attach to between preceding and subsequent sentences in the text. So, the primary function of the accusative nouns is to link their textual ideas with the structure of the sentence, while the accusatives and prepositional phrases point the sentence to its associated text depending on the meaning they embody and connect to. The subject still retains its dominant role as the influencer, not the influenced one, and chooses the accusative and prepositional phrases that are appropriate to orient the sentence meaning.

2.3 Chapter Two: Role of Accusative Nouns in Linking Sentence to Text

2.3.1 Role of Accusative Nouns in Textual Intentionality

Since the text constitutes an integrated idea, all its parts collaborate to complete the textual meaning; any defect in sentence structure weakens textual semantics and leads to its collapse. Lack of harmony between textual purposes in the sentence and the text's central idea undermines the text, with accusative nouns—along with other accusatives and prepositional phrases, known as adjuncts (al-fadla), topped by the absolute object—serving as the semantic intentions suited to the text's idea. These represent semantic purposes varying in roles and importance, linking the sentence to the text; hence, the term "guides" (al-muwajjahat) is applied to adjuncts, as they orient sentence meaning to align with its semantic environment in micro- and macro-structures, which in turn form the overall structure, that is, the text.

Thus, the selection of accusative nouns in the sentence occurs based on the text's central idea and what serves it; both predication and adjuncts are governed by the text's idea. The central point of the text is the main factor that influences the construction of the sentence, which is formed with a nucleus that connects either directly or indirectly with this point. The nucleus of the sentence is the absolute object in the verbal sentence—the event that is intended—connects to which all the elements of the sentence are meaning-wise governed. This meaning, whether in minor or major sentence as categorized by Ibn Hisham, or micro-structure per text grammar terminology, is the result of the absolute object, which is supported by all accusative and prepositional phrases as textual guides.

Accusatives and any adjuncts can be mentally represented through contextual presupposition, although not overtly present in the sentence—this is equally true for predication, thus making them non-dispensable and equivalent in mention or omission. Therefore, predication and adjuncts are always important grammatical parts not only in the verb sentence structure but also in the overall textual structure.

In the light of the foregoing, the components forming the nucleus of the verbal sentence clause or its deep structure at the levels of syntactical and semantic processes will entail the following:

- **The Subject:** An essential constituent, as no verb exists prior to its subject, nor evidence of the subject without the event and its attachments; semantically inseparable yet syntactically distinct in sentence structure, the subject initiates the event through the verb. It forms the first logical element in sentence construction, unaffected by operators, and is distinguished by nominative case due to its foundational role.
 - **The Event:** The verbal noun, functioning as the semantic center around which the whole sentence is built. It is associated with the temporal conditions to create the logical constituents of the verbal statement, as every event happens in time and place. The time condition is inherent in the verb according to its tense (past, present, future), while the place condition is different and not defined in the verb's structure like fixed time; therefore, the place condition needs to be estimated from the context, which is determined by the intended meaning in text and sentence.
- In the nominal sentence, Sibawayh cites the adverb: "Know that the subject must have something built upon it that is itself, or a place or time. These three are mentioned after the subject" (Abdul Salam, 1991: 2/127). The deep syntactic structure in the verbal sentence is represented by the verb and the subject, where the event is combined with the temporal adverb under the verb's label; each event has its adverb attached to it, being described together, while the subject is still distinct in name and rank and has its own characteristics.
- **Modals:** These are adjuncts in the verbal sentence, which consist of accusative cases and prepositional phrases, and they affect the verbal sentence according to the meaning intended—apart from the absolute object, which is rigid and cannot be detached from the verbal sentence, whether implicit or explicit. The other adjuncts (modals) can be both overt or implicit depending on the context and thus guide the sentence to its text as they are variable and mobile.

The nucleus of the deep structure, or deep sentence, is made up of these three elements both in terms of lexicon and meaning. Some argue that the deep structure or nuclear sentence comprises only meaning, not syntax; still in practical use, meaning is not separable from structure, and the difference between meaning and form is only an issue in theoretical discussions and analytical schools.

So, in the process of idea formation, the subject has to come first, then the verb, its adverb, and modals – which are not realizable without a particular form, no matter what the form is.

The previous explanation shows that the use of accusative nouns in text intentionality is very clear. In the opinion of Dressler and Beaugrande, a text can only be considered a real text if it has the elements mentioned in their definition of text as "a communicative event whose textuality arises from seven criteria: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, stativity, and intertextuality" (Al-Buhayri, 1997).

2.4 Dressler and Beaugrande's Textuality Criteria

First: Grammatical Cohesion. The surface-level text elements—words in particular—are linked through signs of the language, which depend on grammatical relations. The application of this criterion extends to both the sentence and the text.

Second: Semantic Coherence. The user's mental activities bring about the functions that are responsible for the building of the text world constituents. The sentence is the smallest unit of meaning or the primary building block, while the accusative nouns are the semantic links that connect the sentence and the text.

Thirdly: Intentionality. The author's viewpoint in creating a unified and understandable text as a means of knowledge or accomplishing a set purpose. Intentionality is initiated at the level of sentences through modal expressions—accusatives and prepositional phrases—as the semantic intent that connects a sentence to the text including accusative nouns.

Fourthly: Acceptability. The audience's expectation of a text that is cohesive and coherent. When sentences are coherent, they create a text that is acceptable, which is the result of the use of modal expressions (adjuncts), including accusative nouns.

Fifth: Informativity. Informativity is the extent to which text elements are either predicted or not, known or not, or ambiguous. Informativity starts developing at the level of the sentence through textual modals (adjuncts), with meanings connecting from one sentence to another, and the operation of sentence links to present the elements of expectation clearly as the text ends.

Most of these elements materialize in the sentence; failure to realize them results in the text's growth stalling from the outset, preventing fulfillment of these criteria—including textual intentionality—without adjuncts and accusative nouns. These form the syntactic structure in the verbal sentence bearing the intended semantics linked to text construction. As the foundational building block of text, the sentence must embed adjuncts as modals directing it toward its text; stripping any text of adjuncts would dismantle it.

3. Conclusion

Based on the preceding discussion of the role of accusative nouns in the verbal sentence and adjuncts generally, accusative nouns form an essential component of the syntactic and semantic structure in the verbal sentence, indispensable and irremovable. They constitute the textual element in sentence construction, directing the sentence toward its text; through them, the text to which predication belongs is identified, as predication alone lacks purpose for mention and holds no meaning outside context. Adjuncts, however, possess independent meaning beyond context and indicate the text to which they may belong, even when predication is omitted from the syntactic structure formally.

Accusative nouns and adjuncts generally realize textual intentionality in the sentence, opening the sentence to the text and enabling links to connect sentence to text; they serve as the bridge over which the sentence crosses to its text. The absolute object constitutes the semantic basis in the formation of the verbal sentence, the core of the deep structure: the indispensable part of the verb, presenting the subject's action, with the tense of the verb determining its time.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3888-4759>

References

- Abdul Salam, M. H. (1991). *Kitab Sibawayh* [Ed. A. al-S. M. Harun] (1st ed.). Dar al-Jil, Beirut.
- Al-Anzi, Y. M. S. (2014, February). *Al-Mafa'il bayna al-Qa'idah wa al-'Illah* [Accusative nouns between rule and rationale]. *Journal of Dar al-Ulum College, Cairo University*. <https://search.mandumah.com/Databasebrowse/Tree?searchfor=&db=&cat=&o=0675&page=1&from=>
- Al-Arja, J. Y. (2000). *Muta'alliqat al-Fi'aliyyat fi al-Qur'an al-Karim: Dirasah Tarkibiyyah* [Dependents of verbs in the Holy Quran: A syntactic study] (Doctoral dissertation). [Supervisor: Dr. Kamal Muhammad Bishr].
- Al-Banna, M. I. (1990). *Abu al-Husayn Ibn al-Tarawah wa Atharu fi al-Nahw* [Abu al-Husayn Ibn al-Tarawah and his impact on grammar]. Dar al-I'tisam.
- Al-Baruni, S. (2022/1444 AH). *Al-Ma'ful al-Mutlaq wa Dalalatu fi al-Qur'an al-Karim (Dirasah Nahwiyyah Dalaliyyah fi Surah al-Waqi'ah)* [The absolute object and its significance in the Holy Quran (A syntactic-semantic study in Surah Al-Waqi'ah)] (Master's thesis, Sultan Sharif Qasim Islamic State University, Riau).
- Al-Buhayri, S. (1997). *Ilm lughat al-nass: Al-mafahim wa al-ittijahat* (1st ed.). Maktabat Lubnan; al-Sharikah al-Misriyyah al-Alamiyyah li-l-Nashr Longman, Beirut.
- Al-Istrabadi, R. A. (1978). *Sharh al-Radi ala al-Kafiiyyah* [Ed. & comm. Y. H. Umar]. Qaruyun University. (Original work published 1398 AH)
- Al-Laban, A. M. A. (2021). *Al-Mafa'il wa ma yutashabahu bi-l-Ma'ful bihi* [Accusative nouns and what resembles the direct object]. *Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Arts, Damietta University*, 10(2), 167–188.
- Al-Mukhzumi, M. (1966). *Fi al-nahw al-Arabi: Qawa'id wa tatbiq ala al-minhaj al-ilmi al-hadith* [In Arabic grammar: Rules and application to the modern scientific method]. Mustafa al-Babi al-Halabi wa-Awladuhu, Egypt.
- Al-Munsif, A. (1991). *Bunyat al-jumla al-Arabiyyah bayna al-tahlil wa al-nazariyyah*. Manubah, Publications of the Faculty of Arts. Publications of the Faculty of Arts, Manubah.
- Anis, I. (1985). *Min asrar al-lughah* [Secrets of language] (7th ed.). Anglo Egyptian Library.
- Annajar, M. A. (1955). *Al-Khasa'is* Dar al-Kutub al-Misriyyah, Cairo.
- Hamza, M. (2004). *Nazariyyat al-'amil fi al-nahw al-Arabi: Dirasah ta'siliyyah wa tarkibiyyah* [The theory of the operator in Arabic grammar: Foundational and structural study]. Al-Najah al-Jadidah Press.
- Ibn Aqil, A. ibn A. al-R. al-A. al-H. al-M. (1980). *Sharh Ibn Aqil ala Alfiiyyat Ibn Malik* [Ed. M. M. al-D. A. al-H.] (Vol. 2, 20th ed.). Dar al-Turath; Dar Misr li-l-Tiba'ah.
- Nasif, A. A. & Shalabi, A. (1999). *Al-Muhtasib fi tabyin wujuh shawadhir al-qira'at wa al-idah anha*. Lajnat Ihya' Kutub al-Sunnah, Cairo.
- Qubawah, F. (1983). *I'rab al-jumla wa ashbahuha* (4th ed.). Al-Afaq al-Jadidah Publications, Beirut.
- Shahda, A. F. (2019). *Al-Jumla al-mumaddah bi-l-mafa'il fi shi'r al-mu'allaqat* [The extended sentence through accusative nouns in Mu'allaqat poetry]. *Faculty of Arts Journal, Cairo University*, 8(4), 85–102. https://hermes.journals.ekb.eg/issue_9964_17033.html