ARTICLE

The Dichotomy of Declension and Prohibition: A Phonological Investigation

Lina Al-Jarrah [1] , *Raeda Ammari* [2] , *Tariq Mohammed Farghal* [2*] , *Malak Ismael* [3]

[1] *Department of Basic Sciences, Amman Arab University, Amman, Jordan*

[2] *Department of English Language and Translation, Amman Arab University, Amman, Jordan*

[3] *Department of Arabic Language Department, Al-Balqa Applied University, Al-Salt, Jordan*

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates a prominent grammatical topic that has garnered considerable attention among grammarians, specifically the "prohibition of declension." There is a widespread consensus among grammarians regarding certain words that do not undergo declension and instead function as comparative bases. The methodology employed in this study entails presenting perspectives from both ancient and contemporary grammarians on this subject. The researchers' primary objective is to substantiate that the occurrence or absence of declension cannot be attributed to the reasons commonly posited by grammarians but can be explained by the principle of linguistic economy. This principle encompasses phonetic reduction or assimilation through phonetic analysis. By examining the data of declension cases categorically and qualitatively, the study illustrates how different syntactic contexts determine the inflection status of declension, highlighting that this phenomenon is a form of impoverishment that subjugates the Case to its morphological requirements. The study also highlights that declension involves an interface between morphology, phonology, and syntax. This interface incorporates plurality, proper nouns, and morphological sensitivity on the one hand while catering to phonological alterations of the Case-ending market based on the syntactic position of the noun. Therefore, the study contributes to understanding the syntactic impoverishment of declension of Standard Arabic, highlighting that the non-application of a normative rule within grammar is universally mirrored in other cases in different languages, including over-generalization, irregularities, and idiosyncrasy. The study also delves into supporting the principle of economy, demonstrating that declension is economically

formed through choice vs. rejection of the optimal output within the syntactic context.

Keywords: Dichotomy; Grammar; Declension; Reduction; Morphology; Phonetic; Plural

1. Introduction

Arabic is one of the rich languages that has many derivations in various aspects of the language, such as nouns and verbs, to fulfill different meanings. One of these changes in a language is declension which means to turn something away from its original direction. Declension also means turning a person away from a direction he wants to go to another direction. Declension of something means using it differently, as if it is being turned away from one direction to another[1, 2]. In grammar, a declinable noun is a noun that is affected by the tanween (nunation) and the diacritic kasra (case ending) for necessity, lightness, or proportion[3–5].

As for what is not inflected with the diacritic kasra (case ending) and does not accept the tanween (nunation), the term "prohibited from declension" has become famous for it. Al-Tahanwi[5] mentioned that "The prohibited from declension is also called the forbidden and the prohibited as well because it is forbidden the diacritic kasra and the tanween. The word subjected to declension is called the inflected. The prohibited from declension is also called the non-inflected[5, 6]. It should be noted that dichotomy is permissible to inflect what is prohibited from inflection for two reasons:

(a) The rhythmic value of inflection and prohibition in Arabic. Taking care of balance is considered a cornerstone of harmony in Arabic. Arabic linguists have justified two phenomena with lightness and proportionality: first, the prohibition of what should be inflected, and second, the inflection of what should be prohibited. Inflection serves as a mark of the noun, indicating its competence.

(b) On the other hand, prohibiting inflection indicates that the noun, being lighter than the verb, does not deserve the addition of the inflectional pattern. Sibawayh stated, "I know that some words are heavier than others, and verbs are heavier than nouns because nouns are more competent, and thus, they are not accompanied by tanween (nunation)[7]".

However, grammarians encountered linguistic reality and found that the prohibited can be inflected and the inflected can be prohibited. Therefore, they sought a reason to explain this phenomenon and attributed it to proportionality. Ibn Asfur said, "What is inflected in poetry is more than can be counted. Al-Kasai and Al-Farra claimed that it is permissible to inflect anything that can only be inflected by a verb. Some Basri scholars even went so far as to say that anything that cannot be inflected is permissible to inflect, except when the last letter is 'alif'... and inflecting what cannot be inflected in speech is a linguistic phenomenon for some Arabs[8, 9].

The Arabic noun morphology is a highly inflected category explained by Salih et al.[3], where the morphological framework of Arabic is extensive and intricate. Its structure consists of a combination of concatenative and nonconcatenative morphologies. Hardly any concatenation occurs in Arabic derivational morphology. It includes very intricate word-formation procedures, which consist of multiple stem-internal changes (such as umlauts, ablauts, infixations, metathesis, gemination, circumfixations, melodic overwriting, and adjustments to prosodic templates). Arabic features a complex inflectional morphology that often employs both prefixation and suffixation in a concatenative manner. For example, a noun can inflect according to one of the four inflectional categories: case, number, gender, or definiteness. Conversely, various scenarios may emerge; for example, derivational morphology utilizes the concatenative approach, while inflectional morphology uses the nonconcatenative approach. Derivational morphology, for instance, can utilize a significant concatenative method in the so-called nisbarelation, which generates relational adjectives by adding the suffix -iyy, whereas inflectional morphology demonstrates a nonconcatenative occurrence best represented by the formation of Arabic broken plurals. Additionally, there is the problem of the clitics that may attach to the root. Morphological dependencies that span great distances, in which the existence of one morpheme necessitates or prevents the occurrence of another, stem from the buildup of inflectional affixes and clitics. In addition to the intricacies of Arabic morphology, at least 12 rules are required to clarify the dif-

ferent morphophonemic processes, such as vowel harmony, assimilation, insertion, and deletion. The morphology of Arabic is intrinsically complex because of the many morphophonemic rules.

Saif[6] elucidated the types of nouns in Arabic. Proper (العلم) and common (الجنس) nouns, and countable (المعدود) and uncountable (غير المعدود) categories. Nouns are further divided into concrete (عين) and abstract (معنى) ones. Based on whether they vary or not via inflection, nouns are inflected (مبني), when they shift form according to case, prepositions, and attribution, or non-inflected (معرب), staying consistent. Another classification is based on derivation: primitive (جامد) nouns are not derivative, while verbal (مصدر) and derivative (مشتق) nouns are composed of active and passive participles, adjectives, and superiority, time, place, instrument, and relation nouns. Comparative and superlative adjectives show Aφعل pattern, while instrumental nouns are derived from trilateral roots (مفتاح for "key"). Relative adjectives (الأسماء المنسوبة) are formed by adding ي- to nouns, i.e., association with places, families, or qualities.

Elgobshawi[10] highlighted that the Arabic grammarians developed *Almizan Alsarfi*, a morphological scale based on triconsonantal roots, as most Arabic words follow this structure. This system, known as *wazn*, provides fixed prosodic templates that define morphosyntactic and semantic properties. These patterns interlock with roots and affixes to form stems, playing a crucial role in word formation. The segmentation process helps distinguish original root letters from affixes, with the pattern *f-ā-l* serving as a common template for verbs and nouns related to action. Arabic words share tonal and rhythmic qualities, unlike English and French, where affixation creates words without a unified musical structure.

2. Background

2.1. The Prohibited from Declension

In some cases, if a noun is defined with "*al*" (the definite article) or if it is added, it is customary to add the diacritic *kasra* (the short vowel sound) to it, as stated by Sibawayh[7] "Know that every noun that does not undergo inflection, the genitive case can be applied to it if you add it or introduce the letters 'alif' and 'lam' into it."

Al-Mubarrad[11] also refers to the grammatical position of the noun that is prohibited from declension if 'alif' and 'lam' are added or if it is introduced, causing its differentiation from verbs and the similarity to them to disappear. Consequently, it returns to pure nominal status because 'al' (*the definite article*) and the addition are specific to nouns. Therefore, it reverts to taking the diacritic *kasra*.

2.2. The Inflected and the Non-Inflected Nouns

The inflected and the non-inflected are terms used by the Kufans[12].

1. **The exclusion of declension:** This is used by Sibawai.[12].
2. **That which is non-inflected:** This term was used by Sibawayh[7], Al-Mubarad[11], Ibn al-Sarraj[13], and Ibn Jinni[14].
3. **That which does not undergo declension:** This term was used by Al-Mubarad[11], al-Zajjaji[15], among other names.

All of these terms are similar in terms of pronunciation, and they have the same meaning. The prohibited from declension, if not followed by "al" (*the definite article*), takes the diacritic *fat-ha* (*a short vowel sound*) as in the example: "مررت بأحمد" (I passed by Ahmad). However, if "al" (*the definite article*) is added or it is followed by "al," it takes the diacritic *kasra* (*another short vowel sound*) as in the examples: "مررت بأحمدكم" (I passed by your Ahmad) and "بالأحمد مررت" (I passed by the Ahmad).

The novelty of this research resides in offering phonological analysis of noun inflection in prohibition and declension. As opposed to traditional studies that focus on explaining phonological harmony or declension as utilized for stylistic reasons, including what they called "poetic necessity", this study delves into these phonological alterations and assimilation as originated from 'phonological necessities' extended by morphosyntactic requirements. The study paves the path for future researchers to examine Arabic linguistic phenomena which have carried historically a status quo grammatical perception to expand on utilizing modern linguistics in assessing language components of the item.

For instance, Jalabneh[16] argues that this phonological assimilation with the morphosyntactic contexts is spell-out

survived to be assessed by the Logical Form according to the Extended X-bar theory. The findings of his study show that nunation seems to be in a lower rank position than non-nunation in the context of definiteness. His study further confirms that inflectional alterations due to phonological prohibition have phonological roots in how the hierarchy system is working according to the Principle of Economy [17]. Rifa'i [18] as well delves into the underlying phonological causes behind declension and prohibition among dibtotes in Standard Arabic. The originality of the study is expanding traditional perception to modern linguistic categorization and phonological examination of noun inflection in contexts of declension and prohibition within the syllabic make-up of nouns.

Hence, the prohibition from declension is viewed as a linguistic development based on the fact that there has been a transition from the occurrence of declension to prohibition in the Arabic language. Most Arabs have transitioned from inflecting most nouns to prohibiting some from declension. This trend has become part of the linguistic system, as evidenced by the explanation of Al-Akhfash: "We have heard from the Arabs those who inflect everything that does not have inflections, because the original state of nouns is declension, and the declension is left for exceptional cases [19]. This study aims to address the following research questions, focusing on the grammatical and phonetic dimensions of inflection in Arabic nouns:

1. What are the reasons for prohibiting certain nouns from inflection?
2. What are the reasons behind prohibiting inflection grammatically or phonetically?
3. How does the addition of the definite article "al" affect the inflection status of nouns?

The questions of the current study attempt to investigate the linguistic rules and conditions that govern this phenomenon. Also, it seeks to explore how the resemblance to verbs and the presence or absence of specific markers, such as nunation and diacritical *kasra*, influence inflection prohibition.

The second question explores whether the prohibition is rooted in grammatical considerations, such as noun resemblance to verbs, or whether phonetic factors, like rhythmic harmony and phonological aesthetics in poetry and the Quran, also play a significant role. Furthermore, the study detects

the definite article effect, which can revert a noun prohibited from inflection to an inflected state by reducing its resemblance to verbs. Finally, it seeks to unveil the linguistic mechanisms behind this change and the implications it holds for understanding nominal and verbal distinctions in Arabic grammar.

By addressing these questions, the study aims to provide a deeper insight into the principles and limitations that shape the prohibition of inflection in Arabic grammar.

3. Methodology

A qualitative approach was employed to examine the perspectives of both ancient and modern grammarians on the dichotomy of declension and prohibition in Arabic. The study aimed to highlight the causes and conditions influencing the prohibition of inflection in Arabic nouns. Rooted in a comprehensive analysis of classical Arabic grammar where the research focuses on linguistic structures and phonetic considerations. It ensures an in-depth approach and a strong understanding of the principles governing inflection in Arabic grammar.

The research methodology involved presenting the opinions of early Arab grammarians. Since these scholars primarily studied prohibited inflections from a grammatical perspective, this study adopts a phonetic approach, analyzing phonetic segments, phonetic harmony, and phonetic alleviation. This perspective aligns with modern linguistic research, particularly the study conducted by Al-Shayeb [20], which serves as a key reference.

The study examines reliable Arabic grammar texts to identify the rules governing inflection and its prohibition. Special attention is given to non-inflected nouns, particularly their similarity to verbs, the presence or absence of nunation, and the impact of diacritical marks such as *kasra*. For example, authentic examples from the Noble Quran and classical Arabic poetry, analyzing how grammatical rules were applied during the linguistic protest era (mid-second century AH to mid-fourth century AH) and comparing them with modern phonetic analyses. These sources also highlight deviations from standard grammatical rules, including cases where non-inflected nouns undergo inflection for rhythmic or aesthetic purposes.

Furthermore, the definite article "al-" plays a crucial

role in determining whether a noun is prohibited from in- flection. This study explores the grammatical behavior of nouns with and without the definite article, demonstrating how "al-" reduces their resemblance to verbs and restores their nominal case.

4. Discussion & Results

4.1. Reasons for the Prohibition of Declension Reduction of Pronunciation

Grammarians unanimously agree that nine reasons prohibit the declension of a noun:

1- Plural form	2- Feminine gender (
3- Proper nouns	4- Descriptive nouns
5- Justice nouns	6- Verb form
7- Mixed composition	8- Foreign nouns
9- The addition of the letters "alif" and "noon"	

These rationales are succinctly captured in the poet's verse:

Justice, description, and femininity, along with knowledge,

Augmented by a preceding "noon," and an "alif" after that,

Foreignness, followed by composition,

And the verb pattern, acknowledging the inher- ent approximation [22].

Furthermore, these reasons bring the noun closer to the verb, making them similar. Verbs do not undergo genitive case or take nunation. As the saying goes, "When I replicate its form, it adheres accordingly, manifesting resemblance in both phonetic articulation and semantic interpretation. Ir- respective of the specific letter chosen for emulation, the omission of declension becomes imperative, as the essence of likeness necessitates such exclusion."

Therefore, any noun that resembles the verb in form and meaning, such as those that exhibit the verb pattern, like "I saw Tadmur," "I passed by Ahmad," and "I traveled to Ta'izz," is exempt from declension. The remaining eight reasons are all semantic, including definiteness, description, justice, femininity, and others [11, 23].

However, this does not mean that every noun must pos- sess both characteristics to be exempt from declension. A noun can have a single characteristic that fulfills the role

The prohibition of declension in Arabic can be at- tributed to the reduction of pronunciation effort in two ways. **Firstly**, the absence of *tanween* (nunation) eliminates the need for additional vowel sounds, resulting in a simplified pronunciation. **Secondly**, in the accusative case, replacing the diacritic *fat-ha* (a short vowel sound) with the diacritic *kasra* (another short vowel sound) reduces the effort required for articulation. These phonetic changes contribute to linguis- tic development by prohibiting declension and facilitating a more efficient and streamlined pronunciation [21].

of both [14, 24]. This concept is supported by the majority of grammarians, as evident in the formulation of the plural form. This is further exemplified in the case of the plural form that results in the morphological makeup of *mufaʔil*, where the addition of the letter "alif" for femininity is not required.

4.2. Declension in Conjunction

Three things are prohibited in conjunction with declen- sion:

- The justice, as in the case of Umar and Saturn: It appears that their prohibition from declension is due to the princi- ple of syllable structure, as they consist of three segments, each one being a short open syllable (C V/C V/C V). In addition, there is another harmony: the second and third segments are completely symmetrical, as each end with the diacritic *fat-ha* (a short vowel sound).
- The verb form, as exemplified by Yathrib and Yazan, has been restricted from declension due to its resemblance to a verb. Furthermore, the syllabic structure also con- tributes to the prohibition of declension in these nouns. Consequently, when these nouns are prohibited from de- clension, at least the last two syllables become short and open, as in the case of Yathrib, while the entire segments may become short, as in Yazan.
- The addition of the letters "alif" and "noon" as in the case of Adnan: The actual reason for prohibiting these forms

from declension is that they treated them as dual forms and applied the same rules to them. Just as the dual form does not take a nunation, these forms were treated similarly. This was their perspective, as many of these forms include the dual form without any semantic indication. (755)

Three forms are prohibited in conjunction with proper nouns: Umar, Yazeed, and Marwan. Additionally, four other forms are prohibited: "إبراهيم" "العجمة" (foreignness) as in "إبراهيم" (Ibrahim), feminization as in "طلحة" (Talha) and "زينب" (Zainab), composition as in "معد يكرب" (Ma'd Yikrab), and the addition of the letter "alif" as in "أرطى"(Artah). Furthermore, two things are independently prohibited: the addition of the letter "alif" for femininity in all cases and the broken *mufaʔil*-based plural form

4.3. Declension in Nouns

Among those that do not undergo declension are nouns prohibited from declension in definite and indefinite forms. There are two types:

First: Nouns with a restricted "alif" for femininity, whether shortened or elongated. These nouns are prohibited from declension, whether they are in the indefinite form, such as "ذكرى" (memory) and "صحراء" (desert), or the definite form, such as "ليلى" (Layla) and "زكريا" (Zakaria). This applies to both singular and plural forms, such as "مرضى" (patients) and "جرحى" (wounded), "أصدقاء" (friends) and "علماء" (scholars). Whether it is in the form of nouns, as mentioned earlier, or in the form of adjectives, such as "حبلى" (pregnant), "صغرى" (young), and "كبرى" (elderly), "حمراء" (red), "عذراء" (virgin), and "حسناء" (beautiful)[20].

4.4. Justifications for Declension of Prohibition

The phonetic justification for prohibiting these characteristics, such as "حمراء" (red), lies in the similarity in the vowel sounds of the last two syllables. Before the prohibition, the structure consisted of three syllables: the first being a short, closed syllable, the second being a long open syllable and the third being a short, closed syllable. However, upon prohibition, the syllabic structure transformed into the first being a short, closed syllable, the second being a long open syllable and the third being a short open syllable. This

resulted in a symmetrical pattern in terms of vowel sounds in the last two syllables.

Second: The balanced plural form, equivalent to "مفاعل" (*mufaeil*) or "مفاعيل" (*mafaeil*), includes nouns such as "منابر" (pulpits), "مساجد" (mosques), "مدارس" (schools), "مصابيح" (lamps), "عصافير" (birds), and "تماثيل" (statues)[19].

Its defining characteristic is that it is a plural form where the initial letter is a *fat-ha* vowel, followed by an *alif* with the diacritic *kasra* vowel, and then two or three letters, with the middle letter being the diacritic *sukun* (a consonant), regardless of whether it begins with an additional *meem* or not. Examples of this form include "ضوارب" (socks), "قناديل" (lanterns), and "سلاطين" (sultans). This plural form is commonly referred to as "صيغة منتهى الجموع" (the form of the end of the plurals). This term means literally "Ultimate Plurals", in which this form of plural is restricted for its morphological make-up as *mfa:'il* and *mfa:'i:l*.[18] The prohibition of declension in the plural form that ends with a certain plural is also based on the syllabic structure. It consists of four syllables with a *fat-ha* vowel, as exemplified by the word 'مصابيح' (lamps): /m-a-s-a-b-i-h/.

4.5. Examples of Declension

Starting with the Qur'an, there are instances where inflection is used to achieve a specific purpose of harmony and proportion. One example is the recitation of the verse: {"إِنَّا أَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِينَ سَلَاسِلَ وَأَغْلَالًا وَسَعِيرًا"} For the Rejecters we have prepared chains, yokes, and a blazing Fire. (Surah Al-Insan, 76:4). Here, the word "سَلَاسِلَ" (*chains*) is inflected to match the subsequent context[18]. Al-Qaysi stated, "Nafi', Abu Bakr, Hisham, and Al-Kisai recited it as 'سلاسلأ' with nunation, while the rest recited it without nunation... And the presence of the nunation is seen as evidence that it reflects the dialect of some Arabs." Al-Kisai mentioned that some Arabs inflect everything that can only be inflected using the pattern "أفعل منك" (*af'al minka*), which is an elative pattern in Arabic *grammar. Al-Akhfash stated, "We have heard from the Arabs those who inflect this and inflect everything that can be inflected.*[25]"

The second example of inflection for harmony is the following:

{For the Rejecters we have prepared chains,

yokes, and a blazing Fire.} " سَلَاسِلَ وَأَغْلَالًا وَسَعِيرًا

إِنَّا أَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِينَ" (*Surah Al-Insan, 76:4*).

Nafi', Abu Bakr, and Al-Kisai recited it as "سَلَاسِلًا" with nunation, while the rest recited it as "سَلَاسِل" without nunation. This is because the pattern "فَعَالِل" (faeall) does not undergo inflection. Additionally, every plural noun that has an "ألف" (alif) as its third letter, followed by a consonant of emphasis or two or more weak letters, does not undergo inflection in the definite or indefinite form. For example, the word "مساجد" (masajid) remains the same in both the singular and plural forms.

The argument put forth by those who advocate for the inflection can be attributed to two main factors. Firstly, Al-Farra mentioned: "Indeed, the Arabs follow what is not followed in poetic norms; if they introduced any mistakes in their any mistakes in their poetry, they would inflect accordingly." Thus, those who inflected "سلاسلا" (chains) followed a similar approach. Secondly, they adhered to the prescribed form of the Qur'an in terms of continuity and pause, even if it was not at the beginning of a verse. This is because it resembles the heads of the verses, as it is followed by "وسعيرا أغلالا" (chains, yokes, and a blazing Fire)[26].

Ibn Hisham attributes to Abu Hayyan the assertion that the use of nunation (tanween) in "سلاسلًا" (chains) is justified because it is a noun derived from nunation itself, allowing it to revert to its original form for the sake of consistency. Alternatively, it could be based on the linguistic practice of those who inflect what cannot be inflected categorically or on the condition that it is a reciprocal verb (مفاعل) or causative verb (مفاعيل). Al-Zamakhshari permits the substitution of nunation in place of the indefinite article (harf al-ittila') at the beginning of the verse. Furthermore, he establishes a connection between the structure of the pause and the affirmation of this stance in the word "قَوَارِيرَاْ" (qawariraa) [27].

{And amongst them will be passed round vessels of silver and goblets of crystal, Crystal-clear, made of silver: they will determine the measure thereof (according to their wishes)} "مَّن فِضَّةٍ وَأَكْوَابٍ كَانَتْ قَوَارِيرَا، قَوَارِيرَ مِن فِضَّةٍ (*Surah Al-Insan, 76:15*) قَدَّرُوهَا تَقْدِيرًا". وَيُطَافُ عَلَيْهِم بِآنِيَةٍ

Nafi', Abu Bakr, and Al-Kisai all recited "قواريرا قواريرا" (*Qawarira Qawarira*) repetitively, both of them

with nunation. However, when they paused, they paused on both of them with "*alif*" for an extended duration following the prescribed form in the Quran. This is because the first occurrence is the head of a verse, and they disliked altering between two words with the same meaning. Similarly, Al-Kisai recited the verse " كَفَرُ وا رَبَّهُمْ أَلَا بُعْدًا لِثَمُودَ كَأَنْ لَمْ يَغْنَوْا فِيهَا أَلَا إِنَّ ثَمُودَ " As if they had never dwelt and flourished there. Ah! Behold! for the Thamud rejected their Lord and Cherisher! Ah! Behold! removed (from sight) were the Thamud! (Surah Hud, 11:68).

Therefore, he altered the second word due to its proximity to the first. Ibn Kathir also recited " قواريرا قواريرا" (*Qawarira Qawarira*) with nunation and recited "من فضة قوارير " (*Qawarira min Fidda*) vessels which are [made] of silver without nunation, and this is the preferred choice because the first occurrence is the head of a verse, while the second one is not.

Thus, whoever recites " قواريرا قواريرا" (*Qawarira Qawarira*) by pronouncing both with nunation, he will have three justifications: One of them is to say that the first one has nunation because it is the head of a verse, and the heads of the verses are pronounced with nunation. Therefore, the nunation of the first one is to harmonize between the heads of the verses and the nunation of the second one next to the first. The second justification is that the Arabs employ a structure uncommon in much of their speech, specifically in poetry. The third justification is following the copies of the Qur'an, as all of them in the copies of the people of the Hijaz and Kufa have the "alif" included [26].

In addition, Abu 'Amr, Ibn 'Amir, Hamzah, and Hafs all recited (*Qawarir Qawarir*) without nunation, which is purely following the Arabic language. This is because the verb (*Qawarir*) does not undergo inflection for definiteness or indefiniteness. They paused on the first occurrence with an "*alif*" because it is the head of a verse, and its sign is the "*alif*". They paused on the second occurrence without an "*alif*" because it is not the head of a verse. Hamzah paused without an "*alif*" in both occurrences.

It appears that the inflection of the first occurrence of "*Qawariran*" is for the sake of harmony, meaning it is in line with the rest of the heads of verses in terms of nunation and elongation. Moreover, replacing the "alif" with a pause (waqf) relies on refined linguistic taste. This is because if the nunation were omitted, the beauty of the description

would be severely disrupted. As for the second occurrence of "*Qawarir*," nunation was given to match the first occurrence following the heads of the verse.

> The verse {And they have said (to each other), 'Abandon not your gods: Abandon neither Wadd nor Suwa', neither YaguthnorYa'uq, nor Nasr';-} (Surah Nuh, 71: 23) وَنَسْرًا قَ تَذَرُنَّ اِلْهَتَكُمْ وَلَا تَذَرُنَّ وَدًّا وَّلَا سُوَاعًا وَّلَا يَغُوْثَ وَيَعُوْ وَقَالُوْا لَا.

Abu Hayyan al-Andalusi said, "The majority recited it as ' وَلَا يَغُوْثَ وَيَعُوْقَ ' (*Wala Yagootha Wa Ya'uqa*) without nunation. If they were Arabs, the inflection is prohibited due to the scientific nature and the verb pattern. If they were non-Arabs, it would be due to their non-Arabic language and scientific nature. As for the Ash'hab, they recited it as وَلَا يغوثا ويعوقا ' (*Wala Yagootha Wa Ya'uqa*) with nunation [28].

The author of Al-Lawameh said, 'They made them into verbs, hence the inflection.' As for the majority, they consider them as adjectives of ' الغوث والعوق ' (*Al-Ghawth wa Al-'Auwq*) with the verb form, and they are definite, so the inflection is prohibited due to the combination of two verbs that serve as a definition and are similar to the future verb. This concludes the confusion. As for the first point, they can't be verbs because the subject ' مادة ' (*substance*) is missing for ' يغث ' (*Yaguth*) and ' يعق ' (*Ya'uq*).

As for the second point, they are not two adjectives of ' الغوث والعوق ' (*Al-Ghawth wa Al-'Auwq*) because they do not come as a noun or an adjective, but instead they are prohibited from inflection for the reasons mentioned. Ibn 'Atiyyah said, 'Al-A'mash recited it as ' وَلَا يغوثا ويعوقا ' (*Wala Yagootha Wa Ya'uqa*) with inflection, and that is an illusion because the definite article is necessary along with the verb pattern. This concludes the matter. This is not a mere illusion, and Al-A'mash is not the only one who recited it this way. Still, he was also supported by Ash-Shahab Al-'Uqayli in this regard. It can be justified in two ways: Firstly, it came in the language of those who inflect everything that is not inflected by the majority of Arabs, and this is a language that Al-Kisai and others have narrated. Secondly, it was inflected based on the context before and after it, as in the case of ' سلاسلا ' (*Salasla*) and قَوَارِيرَا قَوَارِيرَا (*Qawarira Qawarira*)" It becomes clear that " يغوثا ويعوقا are inflected verbs that conform to the principle of alignment, specifically alignment with the following noun according to the law of following with adjacent definite nouns, specifically in the case of " نسرا " (*Nasr'*a).

It is observed from these recitations that they serve as evidence for the permissibility of inflecting what should not be inflected, taking into consideration harmony and proportionality. This is one of the concessions that allows for the inflection of what is typically prohibited in order to enhance prose. The inflection here is not due to necessity. Instead, it is done in consideration of the context and to maintain the beautiful rhythm that gives a pleasant melody and rhythm when reciting these noble verses. If the nunation and inflection were omitted, it would disrupt the beauty of the description.

As for the poetic evidence regarding the prohibition of inflecting what should not be inflected or vice versa, it is more abundant in Arabic than can be counted. Abu al-Barakat al-Anbari addressed two issues in his book "*Kitab al-Insaf*": "Is it permissible to inflect in cases of necessity using the elative pattern ' أفعل منك ' (*af'al minka*)?" and the matter of "Omitting the inflection of what should be inflected." [29].

An example of inflecting what is normally prohibited from inflection is found in the words of the poet:

<div dir="rtl">

تَبَصَّرْ خَلِيلِي هَلْ تَرَى مِنْ ظَعَائِنٍ   سَوَائِكَ نَقْبًا بَيْنَ حَزْمَيْ شَعَبْعَبِ

</div>

"O my dear friend, look closely, do you see any signs?
Of your footsteps, a path between the two stones of Sha'ba'b'ee." [30]

In this verse, the poet inflected " مِن ظَعَائِنٍ " (any signs) by adding the diacritic *kasrah* (short vowel) to " ظعائن " and marked it with tanween (double short vowel), even though it is in the form of a plural of pluralized forms. This practice is widespread and accepted by both the Basri and Kufi scholars [22].

Sibawayh stated, "Yunus addresses a woman whom he refers to as a judge, saying, 'I passed by a judge of contentions *Qaylo* (قيلُ),' *referring to what people say that causes conflict between them* (مررتُ بقاضيَ قيلُ), and 'I passed by someone who is even blinder than you are (منك مررتُ بأعيمي). Then, Al-Khalil stated, "If they had used these expressions, they would have been obligated to adhere to the appropriate grammatical case and inflection, just as they did when they were compelled to do so in poetry and adhered to the original form." The poet Al-Hathli said:

أَبِيتُ على مَعَارِي وَاضِحَاتٍ   بِهِنَّ مُلَوَّبٌ كَدَمِ الْعِبَاطِ.

"I spent the night upon sheets exposed,

Upon them fragrances of freshly spilled blood,

Resembling the pure blood of slaughtered prey."[31].

And Al-Farazdaq said:

فَلَوْ كَانَ عَبْدُ اللهِ مَوْلَى هَجَوْتُهُ   وَلَكَنَّ عَبْدَ اللهِ مَوْلَى مَوَالِيَا

"If Abdullah were a follower (*supporter of my opponents*), I would have satirized

him, but Abdullah is a supporter of my (*own*) supporters."[32].

When they were obliged to do so in a position where there was no choice but to add a vowel, they deviated from the original form[7]. Al-Mubarrad[11] approved the inflection of what cannot be inflected because the original principle for things is that they should be inflected. Al-Mubarrad mentioned "So when they were compelled to add a broken *ya* (vowel) before it (the noun) in case of elevation and lowering, they did so because that is the original principle." As Ibn Qais al-Ruqayyat said:

لا بَارَكَ اللهُ في الْغَواني هَلْ   يُصْبِحْنَ إلاَّ لَهُنَّ مُطَّلَبُ

"May Allah not bestow His blessings upon the prostitutes.

Do they wake up except with desires?"[33].

The evidence in the preceding verses substantiates the assertion pertaining to the inflection of the term "ظعائن" (signs), which is inherently prohibited from inflection due to its status as a plural form that does not permit such grammatical modifications. However, it is noteworthy that this term assumes the inflected form of "معاري" (revealed) in the genitive case while concurrently adopting the plural form of the masculine definite noun, referred to as "مجرى السالم" (*the course of the plural of the masculine definite noun*). Additionally, in the accusative case, the term "ظعائن" manifests as "معار" (revealed). Conversely, the term "موالي" (loyal) adheres to its original form due to grammatical necessity. Furthermore, the movement of the letter "ياء" (*ya*) within "الغواني" (prostitutes), along with its subsequent inflection, harmoniously aligns with the original form, dictated by grammatical requirements.

Some grammarians indicate that certain Arabs do not prohibit anything from inflection, as they do not have a noun that is inherently prohibited from inflection. However, the prohibition of inflection for the inflected noun due to necessity is found in Arab poetry, as exemplified by the poetic words of Abbas ibn Mardas Al-Sulami:

وما كانَ حِصْنٌ ولا حَابِسٌ   يفوقَانِ مِرْدَاسَ في مَجْمِعِ

"And there was neither 'Hisn' nor 'Habis,'

That surpasses Mirdas's in its entirety."[34]

This prohibition applies to "Mirdas," which is the inflected noun. Some people permitted it, while others prohibited it, with the majority being from Basra. Those who prohibited it cited the following verse as evidence:

ذُو الطولِ وَذُو العَرْضِ   وَممَّنْ وَلَدوا عَامِرُ

"Among those born was (*the tribe of*) Aamir,

Of length and breadth (*body's greatness, breadth, and strength*"[32].

'Aamir' was banned from inflection while there is nothing in it except the proper noun[18].

The previous examples with their justifications would be sufficient evidence to attest to the duality of declension and prohibition, as the evidence in poetry is abundant. Moreover, "it is widely acknowledged among grammarians that poets are granted the license to employ in poetry whatever remains undeclined, for poetry is a domain of necessity,

wherein the difficulties of poetic expression allow for much that is proscribed in prose. The utilization of what is normally impermissible finds acceptance within the realm of poetic choice and linguistic flexibility."[20].

Sibawayh[7] stated: "Know that it is permissible in poetry what is not permissible in speech, such as the declension of what is not inflected. They liken it to the inflected nouns, 'because they are nouns (أسماء) just as they are nouns (أسماء)'"

Ibn Ya'ish justified the declension of what is not normally declined in poetic necessity, saying: "Since it is permissible to decline what is not declined in poetry in order to complete the rhyme and establish its meter by adding *tanween* (nunation), and this is one of the best necessities because it returns to the original form. There is no disagreement in that, except for when it ends with the letter short '*alif*' of femininity, it is not permissible to decline it for necessity because it does not benefit from its declension, as it does not fulfill a poetic requirement in the verse."[35].

It seems that grammarians used to justify, based on poetic necessity, anything that did not conform to their rules and measurements. Al-Shayeb[20] explained the reason for clarifying: "And the reason for this, in my opinion, is their reliance on rules and adherence to analogy, which had a strong influence over them... The correct approach is that linguistic reality is the decisive factor in linguistic matters."[20].

Moreover, it becomes clear that declension for the sake of proportion differs from declension for necessity. Necessity finds its place in poetry to establish the meter, while declension for proportion, as mentioned in the previous Quranic verses, is for the sake of harmony, coherence, and completing the adornment of rhythm. It is not a matter of necessity, as there is no necessity in the Quran. It similarly prevents what deserves to be declined in order to achieve the rhythmic goal and establish the meter in language. Moreover, rhythmic proportion envelops the context with harmony in the rhythmic structure of the verse, meaning that the segments are consecutive and not conflicting.

The frequent usage leads to the declension of what is not typically declined in prose, such as feminine proper nouns with a middle consonant cluster like (هند) "Hind" and (دعد) "Da'd." This is done for the sake of lightness and proportion between the segments of the word. Ibn Ya'ish said, "Know that if the middle consonant of a feminine tri-consonantal noun is a proper noun, it is prevented from declension due to

the convergence of two reasons (proper noun and femininity). However, some may decline is due to its lightness with a middle consonant cluster as if the lightness resisted one of the reasons, so only one reason remained, and it is declined by them."[35].

The declension of these proper nouns leads to a similarity and proportion between the first and second segments. The first segment is short and closed (S-H-S), and upon declension, the second segment becomes short and closed (S-H-S):

"Hin/du" (هِنْدُ) is prohibited from declension.

"Hin//dun" (هِنْدٌ) is declined.

In that, pronunciation is light and effort-saving. This is evidence that grammarians were not negligent about the value of rhythm and harmony in declension.

4.6. Disliking the Consecutive Similarities in Arabic

This section is different from the previous ones, addresses the issue of concession for various of reasons; specifically in this study, the data shows that the phonological spectrum of Arabic is cautious when dealing with consecutive phonetic similarities and resorts to shortening or assimilation strategies that remedy the situation.

Prominent scholars of the Arabic language have related the consecutive similarities to the movement of a restrained tongue, as it holds a significant place in linguistic expressions. Regarding linguistic sounds, it is akin to raising the tongue and returning it to its position. Some have even compared it to repeating a speech twice. As Sibawayh stated, "The lightest of sounds for them is to be in the same position. Don't you see that they did not produce anything from the three examples, like 'darabab' (ضربب)... This is because it burdens them to use their tongues from one position and then return to it..."[7].

The phenomenon of succession in proverbs in language, although it is discussed in linguistic studies by advanced scholars of the Arabic language in the context of describing consonants linguistically, its actuality is not limited to two consecutive silent sounds. Rather, it can occur between consecutive similar movements and also between linguistic units. Just as succession in proverbs in consonants are disliked, so are consecutive similarities in movements and linguistic units disliked. Therefore, the language employs

similar methods to avoid consecutive similarities in consonants, movements, and units. Abd al-Tawab stated, "The Arabic language tends to avoid consecutive similarities in linguistic units. It eliminates one of them... This is what Arabic linguists call consecutive similarities... Moreover, Arabic tends to avoid similar sounds, whether movements or silent sounds, even if the units are not similar."[36].

Perhaps the closest connection to the phenomenon of consecutive similarities is the prohibition of what should be inflected, as mentioned by Afif Dimashqiyya and Ramadan Abd al-Tawab in justifying the prohibition of the word "things" (أشياء) from inflection. This word has no inherent reason for being prohibited from inflection, but it is prohibited from inflection in the verse, "O ye who believe! Ask no questions about things which, if made plain to you, may cause you trouble..." (5:101) Quran.

Kufan and Basran[25] disagreed on this matter and the various assumptions, interpretations, and complexities surrounding it, they concluded that "things" (أشياء) were initially prohibited from inflection in the previous verse, without any inherent reason for the prohibition. The reason for its prohibition was the consecutive similarity of two successive units, namely the nunation of "things" (أشياء) and the conditional particle "in," which has the same effect as the diacritic *kasrah* before it. The language was influenced by the tendency to differentiate between these two units, resulting in the omission of the diacritic *kasrah* in "things" (أشياء). At the same time, the *hamzah* in "in" remained with a broken (*maksura*) vowel."[34].

Al-Shayeb[20] also focused on the word "things" (أشياء) in a study published in the Journal of the Arab Academy of Damascus. In the footnote (279) of his research in the journal, he mentioned that when he finished his Master's thesis, he thought he was the first to provide a phonetic explanation for the prohibition of "things" (أشياء) from inflection. Still, later, he became aware of Afif Dimashqiyya's book and Ramadan Abd al-Tawab's research. However, he did not find what was mentioned in the thesis or the Azhar Journal, as he preceded Abd al-Tawab and Dimashqiyya[37].

However, al-Shayeb's study[20] is of great importance, as he does not settle for explaining the prohibition of inflection for "things" (أشياء) alone. Instead, he makes it a general rule that applies to other similar words as well, such as "parts" (جزاء), "regions" (أنحاء), and "names" (أسماء). He states, "If a similar word like 'things' (أشياء) occurs in a context like this, it would be necessary to prohibit its inflection as well, due to the same reason that led to the prohibition of 'things' (أشياء), which is the succession of similar units."

Furthermore, Al-Shayeb argues that the prohibition of inflection for "things" (أشياء) is dependent on the phonetic context, as it is used in the speech of Arabs as inflected when it does not occur in such a context. This is a matter that grammarians have overlooked, and it also demonstrates that the statement of Abu Hatim, "It was heard from the Arabs that it is not inflected," is not based on proper inference.

Moreover, Al-Shayeb[20] cited four poetic verses that he believed were sufficient evidence for the inflection of "things" (أشياء). It is mentioned as inflected in the statement of the Al'aalam Habib ibn Abdullah:

بِما رامَ أَشْياءً بِنا لا نَرُومُها   جَزَى اللهُ حَبْشِيًّا بِما قالَ أَبْؤُسًا

"May Allah reward the Habshi (*Ethiopian*) for what he said, which was evil,
For what he intended of things upon us that we do not desire."[20].

It may be argued in response that the poet was compelled to inflect the permissible word. Al-Shayeb addressed this permissibility in a section of his research, saying, "Inflecting anything that cannot be inflected is permissible in poetic necessity according to the Basri scholars. It is a matter unanimously agreed upon and firmly established among them, requiring no further debate. Sibawayh[7] has already settled the ruling on this matter." (Al-Shay. However, the commentator, As-Sukkari, deemed inflection to be forbidden. He expressed this view in his interpretation of the verse, saying, "He mentions things that we do not mention from him."[31]. Bashar ibn Burd also remarked:

وَفِي المَعِيشَةِ أَشْياءٌ مَناكِير   أَمَّا الحَياة فَكُلُّ النَّاسِ يَحْفَظُها

"As for life, everyone preserves it,
And in livelihood, there are forbidden things."[38].

Al-Shayeb[20] mentioned that an objection could be raised, suggesting that the poetic verse could maintain its meter even with the prohibition of inflection. In response, he addressed this objection, stating, "However, this objection can be refuted by considering that the fundamental rule for verb forms, when compatible with the correctness of the meter, takes precedence. Prohibiting the inflection of 'things' (أشياء) would result in the presence of modulation

(*transition from one beat to another*) as a variation (Zahaf al-Tai زحاف الطيّ). In contrast, the absence of modulation is a preferable variation (First Zahaf زحاف أولى)." Nonetheless, there are two other valid objections. One relates to the stature of the poet in question, while the other pertains to the possibility of necessity. It is worth noting that these objections do not exclude the possibility of another narration ('abla' أبلاء).

Abu Qays ibn al-Aslat expressed:

أَرَبَّ النَّاس أَشْياءٌ أَلَمَّتْ   يلفُ الصَّعْبُ مِنْها بِالذَّلُول

"O Allah, Lord of mankind, things befallen,
The hard ones of them are enveloped in humiliation."[20]

Regarding the word "things" (أشياءُ). Al-Shayeb mentioned in his commentary (287) that "it should be written without nunation. He explained that the absence of nunation leads to a clear *kasrah* in the poetic verse. According to Al-Shayeb, it appears that scholars adjusted the writing of this word under the influence of grammarians who deemed

its inflection prohibited. As a result, they refrained from inflecting it in a place where it should have been inflected."[20]. The clear diacritic *kasrah* that Al-Shayeb referred to can be resolved through the manner of recitation, where the diacritic *kasrah* disappears when the diacritic *damah* is terminated. Qais bin Al-Khatim said:

ثأرت عديًا والحطيم فلم أضع   ولاية أشياءٍ جعلت ازاءها

"I took revenge on Adiyya, but I did not relinquish control over
the matters I was responsible for."[39].

Additionally, Al-Shayeb expressed his observation, stating, "It appears that the narrators took pride in the inflection of the word 'أشياء' (things) in this poetic verse. They substantiated their stance by affirming alternative narrations that maintain harmony with grammar rules and principles. Notably, these alternative narrations include 'ولاية أشياخ' (*Guardianship of Sheikhs*) and 'وصية أقوام' (*Commandment*

of Peoples)."[20].

Al-Shayeb concludes by stating, "Therefore, the word 'أشياء' (things) is indeed infected, but it may encounter factors that prevent its inflection. These factors can be related to phonetic considerations, as seen in the Quranic verse, or for the purpose of maintaining the meter. The following statement exemplifies this:

فما أشياءُ نشريها بمال   فإن نفقت فأكسد ما تكون

"These are not the things that we buy with money,
So that if they are spent, they become the least desirable."

The verse adheres to the *wafer* (الوافر) meter, and if the word 'أشياء' (things) were inflected with nunation, the verse would be disrupted. Hence, it appears without nunation[20].

Moreover, as the context requires in 'أشياءٍ' (things), certain things are prevented from being inflected. They are prohibited without any specific inherent reason for their inflection. Reasonably, this prohibition is driven by achieving phonetic harmony, coherence, balance, or the preservation of rhythm. Conversely, the opposite can also occur where what

was initially prohibited from inflection is now permitted for the same reasons. Just as the permitted is prevented, the prohibited is inflected, all in the interest of preserving the rhythm and musicality of speech. Dimashqiyya[37] remarked, "When we delve into the magnificent noble Quranic text, we discover a strong emphasis on musical harmony... and an aversion to anything that burdens the auditory or vocal faculties. We find that the nunation of 'أشياء' (things) with 'إن' (if) must inevitably create a form of musical dissonance that

the ear rejects. Likewise, the prohibition of inflection serves the same purpose."

Furthermore, suppose we carefully contemplate the context of "Af'al Min" (أفعل من) and analyze it in the genitive case, starting with the diacritic *kasra*, followed by the inflected form (nunation). In that case, it becomes evident that the prevention of inflection for this structure was also motivated by a dislike for consecutive similarities. This becomes even more apparent if we inflect this structure, causing it to bear the diacritic *kasra* and be affected by the nunation.

5. Study Findings

The findings of this study illuminated minute details between inflection and prevention in Arabic grammar, shedding light on the conditions under which nouns are inflected or prohibited from inflection. A significant finding is that non-inflected nouns, which exhibit diacritical marks and are accompanied by nunation, achieve this state due to their lack of resemblance to verbs. Thus, preventing the declension of the plural or proper noun form is based on the syllabic structure, which creates harmony in the phonetic syllables.

Conversely, nouns that are prohibited from inflection lack nunation and the diacritic kasra because of their perceived similarity to verbs. This distinction supports the grammatical rules governing noun behavior in classical Arabic.

Another prominent outcome is the transformative role of the definite article "al." If the "al" is prefixed to a noun it would be prohibited from being inflected, and the noun changes back to the nominal state. As a result, the noun does not resemble verbs due to its inflection. This phenomenon emphasizes the primary function of nominal markers in return to the linguistic identity of words within the grammatical framework.

Poetic and phonetic considerations were another valuable outcome where it did not abide by the standard grammatical rules. The Noble Quran and classical Arabic poetry examples illustrate the cases where inflecting is permissible inherently; non-inflected nouns to achieve phonetic harmony or rhythmic values. However, it is also permissible to prohibit the inflection of a noun, even without any specific grammatical hindrance, to maintain the musicality and aesthetic appeal of speech. These findings demonstrate the remarkable resilience of Arabic grammar in accommodating

stylistic and contextual nuances, which are compatible with what Al-Shayeb[20] and Al-Dimashqiyya[37] went for.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

In light of the preceding discussion on the interplay between inflection and prevention, the following conclusions have been derived: The inflected noun is the transformed noun that exhibits diacritical marks and is accompanied by nunation. This is because it does not share similarities with verbs. Conversely, the non-inflected noun lacks nunation, with no indication of the diacritic *kasra*, as it resembles verbs. If the definite article "al" is added to or introduced before the noun prohibited from inflection, it becomes inflected. It reverts to purely nominal, reducing its resemblance to verbs. It is permissible to inflect what is inherently non-inflected in cases of poetic necessity and situations that demand phonetic harmony, as explicitly mentioned in the Noble Quran. Similarly, it is permissible to prohibit the inflection of a noun without any specific impediment to inflection in cases of poetic necessity. This is done to uphold rhythmic values and ensure the harmonious musicality of speech.

Arabic morphology, phonology, and syntax are intertwined and connected, each of them plays a significant role in language processing and its application across various linguistic domains. Morphologically, the Arabic root-and-pattern system presents important challenges for both language instruction and translation, as learners and translators must accurately identify word structures and their derived meanings. Phonologically, features such as emphatic consonants and distinctions in vowel length directly influence pronunciation training, and speech recognition technologies in computational linguistics. Syntactically, Arabic's flexible word order and rich case-marking system cause difficulties in machine translation and natural language processing (NLP), requiring sophisticated algorithms to maintain syntactic and semantic integrity.

These linguistic characteristics highlight the necessity for specialized pedagogical approaches, innovative translation strategies, and advanced computational models that can effectively adapt the unique structural properties of Arabic. Addressing these challenges is essential for improving Arabic language acquisition, enhancing translation accuracy, and advancing NLP applications in Arabic linguistic research.

Moreover, other research could be conducted for other languages as comparative studies.

Author Contributions

Funding

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

All translator participants of the study were informed about the research purpose and reserve their right to withdraw at any time as their participation is voluntary. Verbal consent was granted as the contexts of translation evaluation was conducted through informal academic discussion and post-machine editing notes were taken from them manually

Data Availability Statement

We agree to share research data.

Acknowledgments

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Ahammad, S.S., 2017. The noun: A comparative analysis between the Arabic and the English languages. IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). 22(5), 64–73. DOI: https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2205016473

[2] Ibn Manzur, M., 1993. bab al-sarf [The Chapter on Morphology] (n.d.). Lisan al-Arab [The Tongue of Arabs]. Dar Sader: Beirut, Lebanon. pp. 189–191.

[3] Salih, H., Devi, M., Ali, D., et al., 2023. A computational analysis of Arabic noun morphology. International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation, 6, 52–62. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.3.6

[4] Qarabesh, M., 2018. Case endings in Standard Arabic: A linguistic analysis. Majallat Al-Adab. (6)1, 306–316. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35696/.v1i6.503

[5] Al-Tahnawi, M., 1963. harf al-mi:m kashshaf ilstilahat al-funuun [The Chapter on the Letter mi:m]. In: Abdel, Badie, L. (ed.). A Glossary of Technical Terms in the Arts. Egyptian Foundation: Cairo, Egypt. p. 242.

[6] Saif, A., 2024. Comparison between the characteristics of inflectional systems in Arabic and English languages. International Journal of English Linguistics. 7, 94–94. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n1p94

[7] Sibawayh, A., 2009. bab ma yansarif wa ma la yansarif [Chapter of What Declines and What Does Not Decline]. In: Haroun, A.M. (ed.). Al-Kitab [The Book]. Al-Khanji Library: Cairo, Egypt. Volume 5(3), pp. 190–205.

[8] Ahmed, A.T., 2023. Grammatical convergence between inflection and non-inflection of nouns in Arabic language. Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities. 30(7, 1), 124–147. DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.30.7.1.2023.08

[9] Ibn Asfour, A., 1980. fasl aziyada [Chapter of Argumentation]. In: Mohammed, A.I. (ed.). darair al-shi'r [Poetic Necessities]. Dar Al-Andalus: Beirut, Lebanon. pp. 22–30.

[10] Elgobshawi, A.E., 2024. Conceptualization of morphological roots in Arabic and English: A contrastive analysis. World Journal of English Language. 14(5), 436–442.

[11] Al-Mubarrad, A., 1994. hatha bab na yajri wa ma la yajri [This is the Chapter on What Applied and What Does not Apply]. In Azimah, M.A. (ed.). Al-Muqtadib [The Concise]. Committee for the Revival of Islamic Heritage: Cairo, Egypt. pp. 309–320.

[12] Alfara', A., 1983. surat al-baqara [Chatper of the Cow]. m'aani al-kuraan [Meanings of the Qur'an]. Alam al-

Kutub: Beirut, Lebanon. pp. 40–61.

[13] Ibn al-Sarraj, A., 1996. thikir ma yansarif min al-asma' wa ma la yansarif [Mentioning the Nouns that Decline and those that Do Not Decline]. In: Al-Fatli, A. (ed.). al-usuul fi-nahu [Principles of Grammar]. Al-Resala Foundation: Beirut, Lebanon. pp. 150–165.

[14] Ibn Jinni, A., 1988. bab fi maqayees al-arab [Arab Metrics]. In: Al-Najjar, M.A., (.e.d) al-khsa'is [Characteristics]. Scientific Library: Cairo, Egypt, pp. 210–230.

[15] Al-Zajjaji, A., 1984. bab yansarif wa ma la yansarif [Chapter of What Declines and What Does Not Decline]. In: Al-Hamad, A. (ed.). Al-Jamal fi nahu [Sentences in Syntax]. Al-Resala Foundation: Beirut, Lebanon & Dar Al-Amal: Irbid, Jordan. pp. 98–115.

[16] Jalabneh, A., 2009. Multiple functions of the nunations in Arabic syntax: A minimalist perspective. Dirasat, Human and Social Sciences, 36(3), 687–707.

[17] Wilder, C., Gärtner, H.M., Bierwisch, M. (Eds.), 2018. The role of economy principles in linguistic theory. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG: Berlin, Germany. p. 40.

[18] Rfa'i, A.I., 2017. The declension of diptotes and the prevention of the declined. Journal of Educator. 11(1), 5–29.

[19] Al-Suyuti, I., 2001. al-bab athani ma la yansarif [Chapter Two: What Does Not Decline]. In: Haroun, A., Makram, A. (Exp. & Ver.). ham'a al-hawam'i fi sharh al-jawa'I [The Swarming of Tears in the Commentary on the Comprehensive Collections]. Alam al-Kutub: Cairo, Egypt. pp. 245–265.

[20] Al-Shayeb, F., 1996. Man' al-sarf bayn al-isti'ma; wa ataqyeed an-nahawi [Preventing Conjugation between Usage and Grammatical Restriction]. Journal of the Arabic Language Academy in Damascus. 71(4), 695–767.

[21] Al-Samin A.A., 1987. Surat Al-Insan [The Chapter of The Man]. In: Al-Kharraat, A.M. (ed.). Al-Durr Al-Masun fi Ulum Al-Kitab Al-Maknoun [The Preserved Pearls in the Sciences of the Hidden Book]. Dar Al-Qalam: Damascus, Syria. pp. 590–615.

[22] Ibn Aqeel, B., 2005. ma la yansarif [Nouns Exempt from Declension]. In: Abdul Hamid, M.M. (ed.). Ibn Aqeel's Commentary on Ibn Malik's Alfiyyah [Ibn Aqil's Commentary on Alfiya]. Dar al Turath Library: Cairo, Egypt. pp. 245–265.

[23] Medjedoub, R., 2022. Noun inflectional morphology in English and Arabic. Journal of Linguistic Studies, 33, 9–22.

[24] Ryding, K.C., 2021. Case in Arabic. In: K. Ryding & D. Wilmsen (Eds.), The Cambridge Handbook of Arabic Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 353–370.

[25] Al-Qaisi, A., 1974. surat al-insan [The Chapter of The Man]. In: Ramadan, M. (ed.). al-kashif 'an wjuuh al-qira'at al-sabi' wa 'ililha wa hajimha [Revealing the

Faces of the Seven Readings, Their Reasons, and Their Proofs]. Publications of the Arabic Language Academy: Damascus, Syria. pp. 300–320.

[26] Ibn Zanjleh, A., 1982. surat al-insan (The Chapter of The Man). In: Al-Afghani, S. (ed.). hujjat al qira'at [Argument of Reading]. Al-Resala Foundation: Beirut, Lebanon. pp. 735–750.

[27] Ibn Hisham, J., 2009. fi khruuj itha 'an al-shartiya [On the Departure of 'if' from Conditionality]. In: Abdl al Hamid, M.M. (ed.). Mughni al-Labib on the Books of Arabs [The Sufficient Guide for the Eluciation of Grammar]. Dar al Tala'i: Cairo, Egypt. pp. 205–215.

[28] Abu Hayyan A.M., 1999. surat nouh [The Chapter of Noah]. In: Jamil, S.M. (ed.). Tafsir Al-Bahr, Al-Muhit [The Interpretation of the Vast Ocean]. Dar Al-Fikr: Beirut, Lebanon. pp. 280–290.

[29] Al-Anbari, A., 2002. hal yaguuz sarf af'al atl-tafdil fi dharorat al-sh'ir [Is it Permissible to Decline the Comparative From af'al at-atafdil in Poetic Necessity?]. In: al-insaf fi msa'il al-khilaf bayn al-nahaween wa al-basriyeen [Fairness in Issues of Disagreement between Grammarians and Basraists]. Mabrout, J.M.M. (ed.) & Abd Tawab, R. (rev.). Al-Khanji Library: Cairo, Egypt. pp. 390–400.

[30] Al-Qais, I., 2008. bab al-ba' [The Chapter of the Letter ba']. In: Ibrahim, M.A. (ed.). Diwan of Imru' al-Qais [Collection of Imru' Al-Qais Poems]. Dar al-Ma'arif: Cairo, Egypt. pp. 45–55.

[31] Al-Sukari, A., 1965. sharh ash'ar al-hudhaliyyin [Explanation of the Poetry of Al Hudhaliyyin]. Farraj, A.A. (ed.) & Shaker, M. (Rev). Al-Madani Press and Dar Al-Urouba Library: Cairo, Egypt. p. 1268.

[32] Ibn Haddad, H., 1984. mu'jam shawahid al-nahw al-shi'riyyah [Dictionary of Evidence of Poetic Grammar]. 1st ed. Dar Al-Ulum for Printing and Publishing: Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. p 877.

[33] Ibn Qais Al-Ruqayat, U., 1985. diwan ubaid allah bin qais al-ruqayat [The Collected Poems of Ubaid Allah bin Qais Al-Ruqayat]. Najm, M.Y. (ed.). Dar Sader: Beirut, Lebanon. p. 3.

[34] Ibn Mardas Al-Sulaimi, A., 1991. qafiyat al-'ayn [The Rhyme of the Letter 'Ayn]. In: Al-Jubouri, Y. (ed.). diwan al-'abbas bin mardas al-sulaimi [The Diwan of Al-Abbas bin Mardas Al-Sulaimi]. Al-Resala Foundation: Beirut, Lebanon. p. 112.

[35] Ibn Yaish, M., 1900. Asbab man' al-fasil [Reasons for Prohibiting Inflection]. In: Jacob, A.B. (ed.). Sharh al Mufassal [Explanation of al-Mufassal]. Al-Muniriyah Printing Department: Cairo, Egypt. pp. 65–80.

[36] Abd Tawab, R., 1995. karahit tawali al-amthali fi abniyat al-arabiya [The Aversion to the Repetition of Examples in the Structures of Arabic]. In: Buhuuth wa maqalaat fil al-lugha [Research and Articles in Language]. Al-Khanji Library: Cairo, Egypt, pp. 25–40.

[37] Dimashqiyya, A., 1987. Al-qira'at al-qur'aniyya wa

al-mamnu' min al-sarf [Quranic Readings and the Prohibited from Declension]. In: athar al-qira'at al-qur'aniyya fi tatawwur al-dars al-naḥawi [The Impact of Qur'anic Readings on the Development of Grammatical Lessons]. Institute for Arab Development: Beirut, Lebanon, pp. 150–175.

[38] Ibn Burd, B., 1957. Qafiyat arra' [The Rhyme of the Letter raa']. In: Ibn Ashour, M.A. (ed.) & Amin, M.S. (Rev.). diwan Bashar Ibn Burd [The Collection of Bashar Ibn Burd Poems]. Authorship and Translation Committee: Cairo, Egypt. pp. 95–110.

[39] Ibn al-Khatim, Q., 1962. kasi:da: tathakkar Layla hus-naha wa safa'aha [Poem: Remembering Layla, Her Beauty, and Her Purity]. In: Al-Assad, N. (ed.). diwaan qais bin al-khatim 'an ibn Sukait wa gharuhu [Diwan of Qais bin al-Khatim on the authority of Ibn Sukait and among others]. Dar al-Urouba Library: Cairo, Egypt, pp. 25–35.