
The Syntax and Cognitive Semantics of Comitative Constructions in English and Arabic

Mohamed Abdelmageed Mansour

Assistant Professor, Dept. of English, College of
Science and Arts, King Khalid University, Kingdom
of Saudi Arabia

This study presents a contrastive analysis of the comitativization process in both English and Arabic. The syntactic features of Comitative such as form, function and type are explored. Moreover, A-bar movement as well as control of Equi in complements and reflexives are discussed using the constituent analysis test and the semantic constraint of anomaly. The exploration of plurality feature and premodification of comitative constructions reveals a main difference between the two languages. Moreover, a cognitive-semantic typology of Comitative through introducing a three-layer analysis of comitative constructions is proposed. Ambiguity of case due to polysemy and anaphora in comitative constructions is investigated and the degree of principality of DPs is highlighted. The results of the study indicate that though there are some differences between English and Arabic comitative constructions, they exhibit a similar behaviour, hence the two languages should receive a unified analysis.

Introduction

The main objective of this paper is to initiate a cross-linguistic typology of the syntax and cognitive semantics of comitative constructions in English and Arabic in order to bring forth some similarities through differences that are intuitively felt between the two languages. Moreover, the study attempts an internal language analysis of Arabic Comitative in terms of modern linguistic theory - an attempt that has not been given a unified treatment in the Arabic linguistic literature of Comitative. These two objectives might help in finding common grounds between English and Arabic comitative constructions to be included within other generalizations in the linguistic literature of Comitative. This double objective is well-stated by Seiler as "the process of generalizing must be carried out both within one particular language and in the comparison between different languages"⁽¹⁾.

The starting point of this study will be Fillmore's semantic roles proposed in his Case paper in which he identified a number of semantic roles played in a predication. In this seminal paper, he observed that "the sentence in its basic structure consists of a verb and one or more noun phrases, each associated with the verb in a particular case relationship"⁽²⁾.

This study investigates how both languages map the comitative semantic role into morphological and grammatical relations through introducing a constituent analysis of the complex DP showing how the host phrase clusters with the comitative phrase.

Moreover, this study is a treatment of the Comitative in relation to cognitive semantics. It can be claimed that there are three levels of structures in dealing with the real world; the syntactic surface structure, the semantic deep structure and the cognitive-semantic structure. This study will prove that True Comitative exists but on a long spectrum of other comitatives.

In English syntactic and semantic literature, the comitative constructions have been discussed by many linguists (e.g. Walmsley⁽³⁾; Buckingham⁽⁴⁾; Kayne⁽⁵⁾; Stolz⁽⁶⁾; Lehmann and Shin⁽⁷⁾; Stolz, Stroh, and Urdeze⁽⁸⁾; Haspelmath⁽⁹⁾; Stassen⁽¹⁰⁾, to mention but a few). On the other hand, Comitative in Arabic has been treated by Arab grammarians from a purely syntactic point of view without an analysis of the semantic and cognitive-semantic roles associated with this linguistic form. It is described as a noun in the accusative case preceded by the particle of accompaniment *wa* (i.e. *mafuulun maahu man-Suubun bilfatHah*) (e.g. Al-Hamadi, Al-Shinawi, and Ata⁽¹¹⁾; Ibn Aqil⁽¹²⁾; Ibn Hisham⁽¹³⁾; Ibn Hisham⁽¹⁴⁾; Hasan⁽¹⁵⁾; Hassan⁽¹⁶⁾, for instance).

The study consists of seven sections. Section (1) discusses the syntactic form of Comitative. Section (2) explains the syntactic function of comitative constructions. The syntactic types of comitative constructions are compared in section (3). The formal features of Comitative are presented in section (4). A cognitive-semantic typology of Comitative is proposed in section (5). Comitative and ambiguity are tackled in section (6). Finally, the notion of principality of DPs is presented in section (7).

1. Syntactic form

According to Trask, Comitative case is defined as "indicating an individual in whose company something is done"⁽¹⁷⁾. That is, X is in the company of Y. Each language has its unique way to encode such grammaticalized semantic relation. For the purpose of coding such relation, different morphological and syntactic relators are used. The comitative construction in English is composed of "two Determiner Phrases (DPs) and the word *with* to form a complex nominal [DP₁ *with* DP₂] in their base-positions"⁽¹⁸⁾. Thus, English

might be classified as an isolating language in expressing this semantic role, according to the linguistic typology of language. (For more discussion of the typology of language, see Katamba)⁽¹⁹⁾.

The Arabic comitative construction *al-maf'uul ma'ah* "the object of accompaniment", on the other hand, is composed of [DP₁ *wa* DP_{2-a}]. DP₁ is the host noun phrase and DP₂ is the comitative phrase that is followed by the accusative morphological case marker *-a*⁽²⁰⁾. It is a morphosyntactic category because it is morphosyntactically encoded by the particle *wa* that is prefixed to DP₂ which inflects for the accusative case. Thus, Arabic might be classified as a fusional language in expressing this semantic role since Arabic Comitative is encoded by the morphological process of circumfixation; the circumfix *wa -a* is employed to express this semantic role. This is how English and Arabic comitative constructions appear.

- (1) a. English: [DP₁ *with* DP₂]
 b. Arabic: [DP₁ *wa* DP_{2-a}]

It is clear from (1) that English and Arabic use the same way to encode the semantic case of Comitative. There are complex nominal DPs in which DP₂ is preceded by a particle of accompaniment. Hence both structures suggest the same analysis.

2. Syntactic function

In English, as a SVO language, comitative phrase has two functions. First, it functions as a clausal adpositional-phrase adjunct that comes postverbal [DP₁ + V + *with* DP₂], such as *those people passed with their cattle*. This adjunct comitative phrase may also occur adnominally that comes preverbal [DP₁ *with* DP₂ + V], such as *a woman with her baby is sitting outside*⁽²¹⁾. In both subclasses, the nominal adjunction comitative phrase [*with* DP₂] is optional. The second function is the VP-complement, in which the meaning is not complete without it, as in *he conferred with his friend*. In this sentence the comitative phrase has non-adverbial feature and it is an obligatory constituent.

In Arabic, as a VSO language, comitative phrase occurs as an adpositional-phrase postverbal adjunct [DP₁ + V + *with* DP₂].

- (2) ?*anaa jaalis-un wa baasim-an*
 I.1MS sit-IND with Basim-ACC
 "I sit down with Basim."

However, DP₂ can occur in a postverbal adnominal position [V + DP₁ with DP₂].

- (3) *jalas-a kaarim-un wa baasim-an*
 sit.PERF-3MS Karim-NOM with Basim-ACC
 "Karim sat with Basim."

The comitative phrase in Arabic, unlike English, can never be in a preverbal adnominal position. If it occurs in an adnominal preverbal position, it becomes a conjunctive construction and its semantic role is changed from being Comitative to Agentive. Witness (4).

- (4) *?al-?ab-u wa l-?abnaa?-u taħaddaθ* [coordinate reading]
 the-father-NOM and the-sons-NOM talk.PERF-3MP
 "The father and the sons talked."

As for the complement position, the postverbal comitative phrase in Arabic is considered *faDlah* "an optional structure"⁽²²⁾.

- (5) *taè-a l-?ab-u wa l-?abnaa?-a* [comitative reading]
 talk.PERF-3MS the-father-NOM with the-sons-ACC
 "The father talked with the sons."

In example (5), the comitative phrase *wa l-?abnaa?-a* "with the sons" can be deleted without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence, as shown in (6).

- (6) *taħaddaθ-a-1?ab-u*
 talk.PERF-3MS the-father-NOM
 "The father talked."

3. Syntactic types

3.1 Symmetrical comitatives

If DP_1 and DP_2 are equally important in satisfying the collective verb requirement, the comitative construction is considered symmetrical. However, if the verb is non-collective and it is an adjunct, but DP_2 plays an important part in the eventuality, the comitative construction is also symmetrical⁽²³⁾, as shown in (7a-b), respectively.

- (7) a. John mixed the rice with the powder. [symmetrical: collective]
 b. Tom ate dinner with his friend. [symmetrical: non-collective]

In (7b) DP_1 and DP_2 are equally important, regardless of DP_2 being syntactically adjunct. Thus, there is no one-to-one correspondence between syntactic structure and semantic structure of the Comitative.

The first type that might be called collective symmetrical Comitative is not found in Arabic because there is no syntactic obligatoriness that necessitates the presence of DP_1 and DP_2 . That is, Comitative never comes as an

argument of a transitive verb⁽²⁴⁾. If the verb needs an argument DP₂ to satisfy its requirement, DP₂ becomes in the Agentive case. Arab grammarians called this class of collective verbs *af'al al-musharakah* "multi-agent verbs" or "two-place predicates". This category of verbs (e.g. *taqaatala* "fought with", *?ittafaqa* "agreed with") resists comitativization because these verbs need more than one argument to be complete⁽²⁵⁾. In this category of verbs, the two DPs are conjoined and *wa* is considered a conjunction and not a particle of accompaniment. However, contrary to the English language, DP₂ of the collective verbs in Arabic is never a Comitative.

- (8) a. **?ittafaqa-a S-Saani9-u wa t-taajir-a* [comitative reading]
agree.PERF-3MS the-manufacturer-NOM with the-merchant-ACC
"The manufacturer agreed with the merchant."
b. **?ittafaqa-a S-Saani9-u*
agree.PERF-3MS the-manufacturer-NOM
"The manufacturer agreed."
c. *?ittafaqa-a S-Saani9-u wa t-taajir-u* [coordinate reading]
agree.PERF-3MS the-manufacturer-NOM with the-merchant-NOM
"The manufacturer agreed with the merchant."

The second type of symmetrical comitative constructions that might be called non-collective symmetrical Comitative in English has a similar meaning in Arabic. The meaning of participation is inherent in the verb itself, though [*wa DP₂-a*] is syntactically optional. In (9), both *l-waalid-u* "the father" and *l-?abnaa?-a* "the boys" are equal participants in the action. Comitative is symmetrical due to real participation as an inherent feature of the verb *?akal-a* "ate"⁽²⁶⁾.

- (9) *?akal-a l-waalid-u wa l-?abnaa?-a*⁽²⁷⁾ [symmetrical]
eat.PERF-3MS the-father-NOM with the-sons-ACC
"The father ate with the sons."

It is clear that English symmetrical comitative constructions might be divided into two subcategories; a category that is related to collective verbs and can be called collective symmetrical comitatives and a category associated with non-collective verbs and can be called non-collective symmetrical comitatives. In the first subtype, DP₂ is obligatory and DP₁ is equally important to DP₂ in the eventuality. In the second subtype, though DP₂ is syntactically optional, DP₁ and DP₂ have also the same importance in the eventuality. Arabic exhibits a similar behaviour to English only with respect to the second type.

3.2 Asymmetrical comitatives

In asymmetrical comitatives the verb is non-collective and “DP₂ functions as an appurtenance of DP⁽²⁸⁾”.

(10) A man with his friends came through the gate.

The example in (10) shows that DP₂ is syntactically optional and it is not situationally as important as DP₁.

The concept of symmetrical-asymmetrical dichotomy is semantically based in Arabic whether DP₂ is a co-participant with DP₁ in the event or not. When there is participation, the Comitative is symmetrical, otherwise it is asymmetrical. This leads to another semantic concept in Arabic which determines this selection. It is the semantic feature [animacy].

(11) *sir-tu wa š-šaaTi?-a*⁽²⁹⁾ [asymmetrical]
 walk.PERF-1MS with the-seafront-ACC
 "I walked along the seafront."

The comitative construction presented in (11) is an asymmetrical comitative construction because DP₂ cannot be a participant with DP₁ due to anomaly between the verb *sir-tu* "walked" and the argument *š-šaaTi?-a* "seafront". This verb requires an argument that has the semantic feature [+animate] that is not present in the comitative argument. Thus, Comitative in Arabic is always symmetrical unless there is an anomaly between the predicate and its argument. The above discussion of the types of comitative constructions reveals the following categories in both languages with the corresponding examples mentioned above.

English:

- 1 - Syntactically obligatory and semantically important [symmetrical: collective, complement] (7a)
- 2 - Syntactically optional and semantically less important (asymmetrical: Non-collective, adjunct) (10)
- 3 - Syntactically optional, but semantically important [symmetrical: non-collective, adjunct] (7b)

Arabic:

- 1 - Syntactically optional, but semantically important [symmetrical: non-collective, adjunct] (9)
- 2 - Syntactically optional and semantically less important [asymmetrical: non-collective, adjunct] (11)

4. Formal features

4.1 Syntactic distribution

Comitatives may appear in a variety of argument positions. Zhang identified three positions of the nominal complex [DP₁ *with* DP₂]. They are subject, direct object and complement of *of*, as seen in (12a-c), respectively⁽³⁰⁾.

- (12) a. *A mother with her two small children* came through the door.
 b. John combined *butter with sugar*.
 c. a picture of *John with his fans*.

In Arabic, the nominal complex [DP₁ *wa* DP_{2-a}] never comes preverbally. When the structure [DP₁ *wa* DP_{2-a}] is preverbal, DP₂ turns to be an Agentive indicated by the nominative case marker *-u*, the particle of accompaniment *wa* becomes a coordinator and DP₁ and DP₂ are two coordinants. The comitative reading changes to coordinate reading. Compare the following two types of reading.

- (13) a. taḥarrak-a l-junuud-u wa l-qaa?id-a [comitative reading]
 move-3MS the-soldiers-NOM with the-leader-ACC
 "The soldiers moved with the leader."
 b. *?al-junuud-u wa l-qaa?id-a taḥarrak-uu [comitative reading]
 the-soldiers-NOM with the-leader-ACC move.PERF-3MP
 "The soldiers moved with the leader."
 c. ?al-junuud-u wa l-qaa?id-u taḥarrak-uu [coordinate reading]
 the-soldiers-NOM and the-leader-NOM move.PERF-3MP
 "The soldiers and the leader moved."

Second, the cluster [DP₁ *wa* DP_{2-a}] cannot occur in an "object complement" position in Arabic. The following example can be considered as comitative reading or coordinate reading. In the former, [DP_{2-a}] is considered a part of a coordinate object of the verb, whereas in the latter [DP_{2-a}] is considered an "object of accompaniment". For more discussion of the distinction between these two kinds of object, see Abu Al-Makarim⁽³¹⁾.

- (14) a. ra?ay-tu l-?umm-a wa T-Tifl-a
 see-PERF-1MS the-mother-ACC with the-child-ACC
 "I saw the mother with/and the child."

Third, the complex [DP₁ *wa* DP_{2-a}] never comes as a complement of a preposition in Arabic. When DP₂ comes as an object of a preposition, the comitative reading is blocked, and it turns to be coordinate reading in which DP₂ receives the deep semantic participant role Agentive⁽³²⁾. Consider.

- (15) a. naZar-tu li-Suurat-i-ka wa l-baħr-a[comitative reading]
 look.PERF-1MS to-photo-GEN-your with the-sea-ACC
 "Lit: *I looked at your picture with the sea."
 "I looked at your picture with the sea (beside you)."
 b. naZar-tu li-Suurat-i-ka wa li-l-baħ-i[coordinate reading]
 look.PERF-1MS to-photo-GEN-your and to-the-sea-GEN
 "I looked at your picture and the sea."

4.2 Extraction

Extraction means that the host phrase and comitative phrase can be separated and moved around without losing the grammaticality of the sentence. This part will introduce a constituent analysis to the host phrase and comitative phrase through contrasting three types of A-bar movement in English and Arabic. Movement test will be used to test the discontinuity of these forms. The movement test for phrase structure is stated by Fabb as "if a sequence of words can be moved as a single group, they may form a phrase"⁽³³⁾.

4.2.1 A-bar movement of the host phrase

In English collective symmetrical comitative constructions, DP₁ movement is permitted.

- (16) a. I mixed rice with milk. [symmetrical]
 b. Rice was mixed with milk.

This supports the notion that the construction [DP₁ with DP₂] in English does not form a constituent in collective symmetrical Comitative because DP₁ can undergo movement. Thus, the extraction of [DP₁] is permitted in symmetrical Comitative. That is, the host and comitative phrase [DP₁ with DP₂] do not form a coherent DP.

In Arabic, similarly, the comitative phrase [*wa* DP₂-a] does not form a constituent with the host phrase [DP₁]. Consequently, extraction is permitted. The contrast between (17a) and (17b) supports this view. Both (17a) and (17b) are in the Comitative⁽³⁴⁾.

- (17) a. tarak-tu s-sayyaarat-a wa s-saaʔiq-a [symmetrical: comitative reading]
 leave.PERF-1MS the-car-ACC with the-driver-ACC
 "I left the car with the driver."
 b. ʔas-sayyaarat-u turikat wa s-saaʔiq-a [comitative reading]
 the-car-NOM was left with the-driver-ACC
 "The car was left with the driver."

4.2.2 A-bar movement of the comitative phrase

In English collective and non-collective symmetrical comitative constructions, the cluster [*with DP₂*] can undergo mobility. The following sentences are illustrative:

- (18) a. John compared the tea with the milk. [symmetrical: collective]
 b. It was with the milk that John compared the tea.
 c. John baked the cake with Mary. [symmetrical: non-collective]
 d. It was with Mary that John baked the cake.

Similarly, in asymmetrical comitative constructions, the comitative phrase [*with DP₂*] does not form a constituent with the host phrase [*DP₁*]. Consequently, extraction is licensed and [*with DP₂*] can be moved⁽³⁵⁾. Consider the following sentence in which the comitative phrase is asymmetrical.

- (19) a. Tom came with his children. [asymmetrical]
 b. With his children, Tom came.

The comitative construction *with his children* can be moved due to being an optional structure. That is, it can be left out without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence.

In Arabic the mobility of the cluster [*wa DP_{2-a}*] is not allowed in both symmetrical and asymmetrical comitative constructions because this construction cannot occur in a preverbal position. It cannot be moved to the front and topicalized. Arabic, unlike English, does not allow for A-bar movement of [*wa DP_{2-a}*]. (For more discussion of this phenomenon in Arabic, see Hasan)⁽³⁶⁾. The examples presented in (20a-b) show the impossibility of fronting the cluster [*wa DP_{2-a}*] in both symmetrical and asymmetrical Comitative in Arabic. (Section (3) gives full characterization of both types of Comitative).

- (20) a. **wa l-?umm-a jalas-at l-bint-u* [symmetrical]
 with the-mother-ACC sit.PERF-3FS the-girl-NOM
 "With the mother, the girl sat."
 b. **wa ?iiqaa9-a l-musiqa9 ganna-a l-mu9anniy-u* [asymmetrical]
 with rhythm-ACC the-music sing.PERF.1MS the-singer.NOM
 "With the rhythm of the music, the singer sang."

4.2.3 A-bar movement of the host and comitative phrase

Zhang stated that "the cluster [*DP₁ with DP₂*] cannot undergo A-bar movement in symmetrical comitatives, unlike in asymmetrical comitatives"⁽³⁷⁾.

- (21) a. * The apple with the orange, Mary compared. [symmetrical: collective]
 b. * John with Bill, Mary saw. [symmetrical: non-collective]

c. A mother (together) with her kids, Mary saw. [asymmetrical]

Thus, it is clear that in both collective and non-collective symmetrical comitative constructions presented in (21a-b), respectively, the cluster [DP₁ with DP₂] can not undergo A-bar movement, whereas this movement is allowed in (21c).

In Arabic symmetrical and asymmetrical Comitative, A-bar movement of [DP₁ wa DP₂-a] is not permitted for the same syntactic constraint that the comitative phrase must be preceded by a verb form. Compare the following pairs.

- (22) a. raʔay-ta basim-an wa Taaʔr-an [symmetrical]
 see.PERF-1MS Basim-ACC with bird-ACC
 "I saw Basim with a bird."
 b. *basim-an wa Taaʔr-an raʔay-ta [symmetrical]
 Basim-ACC with bird-ACC see.PERF-1MS
 "**Basim with a bird, I saw."
- (23) a. ʔistayqaZ-a karim-un wa tağriid-a T-Tuur-i [asymmetrical]
 wake up.PERF-1MS Karim-NOM with chant-ACC the-birds-GEN
 "Lit: *Karim woke up with the chant of the birds."
 "Karim woke up as the birds chant."
 b. *karim-un wa tağriid-a T-Tuur-i ʔistayqZ-a [asymmetrical]
 Karim-NOM with chant-ACC the-birds-GEN woke up.PERF-1MS
 "Lit: *Karim with the chant of the birds woke up."

4.3 Control

4.3.1 Control of *Equi* in infinitival complements

The [DP₁ with DP₂] cluster in English behaves like a constituent with respect to control of *Equi* in infinitival complements. Finegan characterizes this transformational process as "this operation deletes the subject NP of an embedded clause when the NP is the same as the subject NP of the matrix clause and has the same index"⁽³⁸⁾. The deep structure of the sentence *Fred wanted to win* can be represented as.

- (24) *Fred_j wanted Fred_j to win.

In the above ill-formed sentence, the subscript _j index indicates that *Fred* refers to the same person in both the matrix clause and the embedded clause.

In English symmetrical comitatives, the preverbal subject cluster [DP₁ with DP₂] is able to control PRO, as shown in (25a-b)⁽³⁹⁾.

- (25) a. A father (together) with his two children traveled ten miles *PRO* to attend the class.
 b. A mother with her two kids tried *PRO* to move the piano themselves.

In Arabic, *to*-infinitive can be expressed by the imperfective verb. Consider the following example.

- (26) *jalas-at l-?umm-u wa l-?ab-a yu-naaqiš-aa l-qaDiyat-a* [comitative reading]

sit.PERF-3FS the-mother-NOM with the-father-ACC 3-IMP.discuss-MD the-issue-ACC

"The mother sat with the father to discuss the issue."

In the sentence (26), the cluster [DP₁ *wa* DP₂-*a*] is able to control *PRO*, similar to the English language, because both [DP₁] and [DP₂] participated of the action according to the inherent nature of the verb *naaqas* "discussed".

Moreover, in Arabic, [DP₂] alone is able to control *PRO*. This feature is absent in the English language.

- (27) *jalas-at l-?umm-u wa l-?ustaað-a li-tu-naaqiš-a ġiyaab-a ?ibn-i-haa 9an l-madrasat-i* [comitative reading]

sit.PERF-3FS the-mother-NOM with the-teacher-ACC for-3F-IMP.discuss-S the-absence-ACC son-GEN-her from the-school-GEN

"The mother sat with the teacher to discuss (the mother) the absence of her son from the school."

4.3.2 Control of reflexives

This section deals with the control of reflexive pronouns within the comitative phrase in symmetrical and asymmetrical comitative constructions in both English and Arabic.

In English collective and non-collective symmetrical constructions the cluster [DP₁ *with* DP₂], unlike the asymmetrical comitative, are unable to control reflexive pronouns, as shown by the ungrammaticality of the examples (28a-b). On the contrary, in (28c) the reflexive pronoun is coreferring with both the head noun and the prepositional phrase, as shown below.

- (28) a. *[John]_j conferred with [Tom]_j [themselves]_j. [symmetrical: collective]
 b. *[John]_j drank with [Tom]_j [themselves]_j. [symmetrical: non-collective]
 c. [The boss with his colleague]_j inspected the place [themselves]_j. [asymmetrical]

In Arabic symmetrical Comitative, [DP₁ *wa* DP₂-*a*] is unable to control reflexive pronouns, similar to the English language. DP₁ only is capable of controlling reflexive pronouns in Comitative. If the reflexive pronoun corefers

with both DPs, the complex nominal [DP₁ *wa* DP_{2-a}] becomes a case of coordination and the *-an* marker for accusative is changed into the *-un* marker for nominative because adnominals that come after the comitative phrase should show agreement only with [DP⁽⁴⁰⁾]. In this case, the comitative phrase [*wa* DP_{2-a}] is considered an "appositive"⁽⁴¹⁾. Compare the following two readings.

- (29) a. *saar-a* [basim-un]_j *wa* *kaarim-an* [nafushu]_j [comitative reading]
 walk.PERF-3MS Basim-NOM with Karim-ACC himself
 "Lit: *Basim walked with Karim himself."
 "Basim himself walked with Karim."
 c. *saar-a* [basim-un *wa* *kaarim-un*]_j ?*nafusuhum-aa*_j [coordinate reading]
 walk.PERF-3MS Basim-NOM and Karim-NOM themselves-D
 "Lit: *Basim and Karim walked themselves."
 "Basim and Karim walked."

In asymmetrical Comitative, unlike English, the nominal [DP₁ *wa* DP_{2-a}] is also unable to control reflexive pronouns for the same reason mentioned above. [DP₁] only does so, as shown in (30).

- (30) a. *sahir-a* [basim-un]_j *wa* *l-mizyaa?-a* [nfusuhu]_j [comitative reading]
 stay late.PERF-3MS Basim-NOM with the-radio-ACC himself
 "Lit: *Basim himself stayed late with the radio."
 "Basim himself stayed late listening to the radio himself."
 b. *sahir-a* [basim-un *wa* *l-mizyaa?-u*]_j ?*anfusuhum-aa*_j [coordinate reading]
 stay late.PERF-3MS Basim-NOM and the-radio-NOM themselves-D
 "Lit: *Basim and the radio stayed late themselves."
 "Basim stayed late listening to the radio."

4.4 The host and comitative phrase as a preverbal subject

Zhang stated that "in symmetrical comitative the cluster [DP₁ *with* DP₂] cannot surface as preverbal subject, unlike in asymmetrical comitatives"⁽⁴²⁾.

- (31) a. *John with his wife collided. [symmetrical: collective]
 b. *John with Bill baked a cake. [symmetrical: non-collective]
 c. A mother with her two kids were killed in the accident. [asymmetrical]

In Arabic symmetrical comitative structure, similar to the English language, the whole complex [DP₁ *wa* DP_{2-a}] cannot be fronted. If it is fronted, it will be changed into a coordinate structure, and the accusative morphological

marker *-a* that accompanies the Comitative is changed into the nominative marker *-u* that indicates Agentivity, as shown below.

- (32) a. ?akal-a ?aħmad-u wa l-?aSdiqaa?-a [comitative reading]
eat.PERF-3MS Ahmad-NOM and the-friends-ACC
"Ahmad ate with the friends."
b. ?awa l-?aSdiqaa-u ?akal-uu [coordinate reading]
Ahmad-NOM and the-friends-NOM eat.PERF-3MP
"Ahmad and his friends ate."

In asymmetrical Comitative, the complex [DP₁ wa DP₂-a] cannot occur preverbally, contrary to the English language. The sentence in (33b) becomes ungrammatical for syntactic and semantic constraints. Syntactically, the cluster [wa DP₂-a] is always postverbal. Semantically, DP₁ and DP₂ cannot occur in a coordinate structure because DP₂ has the semantic feature [-animate] and the verb *daras-a* "studied" requires an [+animate] argument.

- (33) a. ?istaðkar-a l-muhandis-u wa l-ħaasuub-a [comitative reading]
study-3MS the-engineer-NOM with the-computer-ACC
"Lit: *The engineer studied with the computer."
"The engineer studied with the computer (in front of him)."
b. *?al-muhandis-u wa l-ħaasuub-u?istaðkar-aa [coordinate reading]
the-engineer-NOM with the-computer-ACC study-3MD
"Lit: *The engineer studied with the computer."

4.5 Plurality feature

In English symmetrical comitative constructions, collective verbs exhibit a plural feature. In contrast, asymmetrical comitative constructions do not have this property, because the comitative phrase [*with* DP₂] is optional and thus the number feature is determined by DP₁ alone, as shown in the following examples⁽⁴³⁾.

- (34) a. John conferred with Bill.
b. * John conferred.
c. Jack (together) with several of his noisy friends was drinking till after 2 in the morning.

In Arabic, this plurality feature is not found in symmetrical and asymmetrical Comitative constructions because of two syntactic constraints. First, the comitative phrase [wa DP₂-a] is always a postverbal structure. Second, the verb, in Arabic, agrees only with the first DP in a conjoined postverbal DPs. That is, in the Arabic verbal sentence, "the verb does not carry a plural

morpheme"⁽⁴⁴⁾. Compare the following pairs of Arabic verbal sentences in which number is not Spelled-Out morphologically:

- (35) a. TabaX-at l-bint-u wa l-?umm-a [symmetrical]
 cook.PERF-3FS the-daughter-NOM with the-mother-ACC
 "The daughter cooked with the mother."
 b. TabaX-at l-bint-u
 cook.PERF-3FS the-daughter-NOM
 "The daughter cooked."
 (36) a. ?istayqaZ-a karim-un wa Tuluu9-a š-šams-i [asymmetrical]
 wake up.PERF-1MS Karim-NOM with rise-ACC the-sun-GEN
 "Lit: *Karim woke up with the sunrise."
 "Karim woke up at sunrise."
 b. ?istayqaZ-a karim-un
 wake up.PERF-1MS Karim-NOM
 "Karim woke up."

4.6 Premodification and case shift

English allows for the premodification of DP₂ in the comitative phrase [*with* DP₂] without shifting the participant role to the premodifier in both symmetrical and asymmetrical comitatives. In (37), the premodifiers (demonstratives, numerals and quantifiers) can intervene between the preposition *with* and DP₂, respectively.

- (37) a. He compared his father with this man.
 b. He drank tea with three friends.
 c. He came with some strangers.

In Arabic, unlike English, when DP₂ is premodified, the premodifier takes the role of the Comitative case, whereas DP₂ is changed into an appositive *badal* "substitute" in the case of demonstrative, as shown in (38a). In this example, -∅ indicates that the accusative case has a zero marker because *haǰa* is an uninflected form in Arabic. Numerals and quantifiers take the role of Comitative case and the noun that follows them takes the genitive case "muDaaf ?ilayyi". This changeability of semantic roles is due to the fact Arabic comitative structure does not permit any syntactic element to intervene between the particle of accompaniment *wa* and DP₂ in the comitative phrase [*wa*⁽⁴⁵⁾. The examples presented in (38a-c) show this linguistic phenomenon for demonstratives, numerals and quantifiers, respectively.

- (38) a. maša-a karim-un wa haða-ø S-Sadiiq-a
walk.PERF-1MS Karim-NOM with this-ACC friend-ACC
"Karim walked with this friend."
b. maša-a Karim-un wa ?arba9at-a ?a-Sdiqaa?-in
walk.PERF-1MS Karim-NOM with four-ACC friends-GEN
"Karim walked with four friends."
c. jaa?-at l-?umm-un wa ba9D-a l-?awlaad-i
come.PERF-3FS the-mother-NOM with some-ACC the-boys-GEN
"The mother came with some boys."

5. Cognitive-semantic typology of comitatives

There is an interface between semantic participant roles due to our perception of the structure of the real world that is outside the language boundary. This cognitive structure reflects how we perceive the world⁽⁴⁶⁾. Moreover, Langacker puts this cognitive-semantic phenomenon as "there is no unique or exclusive set of role conceptions. Those cited as archetypical are analogous to the highest peaks in a mountain range: they coexist with others that may be significant despite their lesser salience."⁽⁴⁷⁾

As for Comitative, Buckingham explains that "any comitative DP is always considered as belonging to some other deep case category. This rather significant feature is often neglected by linguists analyzing these structures"⁽⁴⁸⁾. Thus, though we have such seeming unrelated semantic categories such as Comitative and Instrumental, "this does not mean that we view the world in terms of such discrete categories"⁽⁴⁹⁾, and on this continuum there is "a range and spectrum of meaning"⁽⁵⁰⁾.

This study attempts a cognitive-semantic classification of the comitative constructions in English and Arabic and it shows how they are compared in both languages. I assume that in both English and Arabic there are three levels of structure in our dealing with the semantic role of Comitative: the syntactic surface structure, the semantic deep structure and the cognitive-semantic structure. For example, the sentence *He ate the cake with his wife* receives the following comitative three-layer analysis.

- (39) a. Syntactic structure: [DP₁ *with* DP₂]
b. Semantic structure: Comitative
c. Cognitive-semantic structure: Agentive-Comitative

5.1 Instrumental Comitative

Stolz, Stroh, and Urdze state that "comitatives are not isolated from other categories. There is an intriguing interaction between Comitatives and

various other categories - especially the Instrumental”⁽⁵¹⁾. Moreover, Lakoff and Johnson consider Comitative-Instrumental syncretism as a universal phenomenon: and “with few exceptions, the following principle holds in all languages of the world: The word or grammatical device that indicates ACCOMPANIMENT also indicates INSTRUMENTALITY”⁽⁵²⁾.

The above principle holds true only for English because in English *with* marks both instrumental and comitative roles through a conceptual continuum⁽⁵³⁾.

- (40) a. The prisoner won the appeal with a highly paid lawyer.
 b. The engineer built the machine with an assistant.

The above two examples lie in the middle range of this continuum, (40a) is closer to Instrument and (40b) is closer to Comitative.

Arabic, on the other hand, is an exception. The accompaniment particle *wa* marks the semantic role Comitative. Arabic uses another instrument marker *bi-* “with the use of” which is prefixed to the instrument itself⁽⁵⁴⁾. However, a case is found in Arabic asymmetrical Comitative in which though there is no overt morphological marker of instrumentality, it is cognitively understood that it comes closer to be Instrumental because the *l-mabaaniy-a* “buildings” are used as an instrument to help *Basim* to reach his destination⁽⁵⁵⁾.

- (41) maša-a baasim-un wa l-mabaaniy-a
 walk.PERF-3MS Basim-NOM with the-buildings-ACC
 “Lit: *Basim walked with the buildings.”
 “Basim walked along the buildings.”

In sentence (41), the surface syntactic structure is indicated by the grammatical morpheme marker *wa* of the morphological accusative case marker *-a*, the deep semantic structure is the semantic role Comitative, and the cognitive-semantic structure is the Instrumental-Comitative.

5.2 Agentive Comitative

In the comitativization process, there is an actor and a sharing companion. This companion is “participating in varying degrees: from mere ‘accompanying’ to ‘helping’ to full-fledged ‘partnership’”⁽⁵⁶⁾. For more clarification, Buckingham analyses DP₂ in the sentence *He ate the pie with Mary* as Agentive Comitative.

We must somewhere show that Mary functions both as Agent and as Comitative, because it is most certainly the case that she also ate. I do not feel that we have a true Comitative... if Mary does not

actually eat some of the pie. There is a problem here, though, if she does not eat any of the pie, (i.e. He ate the pie with Mary (at his side, on his lap, across from him, etc....))⁽⁵⁷⁾

The same intermingling between Agentive and Comitative is found in Arabic.

- (42) ?akal-tu wa z-zawjat-a
eat.PERF-1MS with the-wife-ACC
"I ate with the wife."

In (42), semantically, DP₂ is Comitative. On the cognitive-semantic level, DP₂ is Agentive Comitative because DP₂ is a co-participant with DP₁.

5.3 Causative Comitative

Larson stated that "the accompaniment is the THING which participates in close association with the agent, causer, or affected in an EVENT. It is like a secondary agent, causer, or affected"⁽⁵⁸⁾. Consider the example in (43).

- (43) The ice cream melted along with *the butter*

In (43), both the *ice cream* and *the butter* melted. The *ice cream* is the main causer, but also *the butter* is considered a secondary causer. In the Arabic example presented in (44) DP₂, *l-miḥ-a* "the salt" is considered Causative Comitative since it is a secondary Causer.

- (44) ḏaab-a θ-θalj-u wa l-miḥ-a
melt.PERF-3MS the-ice-NOM with the-salt-ACC
"The ice melted along with the salt."

5.4 Beneficiary Comitative

Saad defines the Beneficiary as "the case of the entity for the sake of which the action, process, or experience identified by the verb is carried out"⁽⁵⁹⁾.

- (45) Tom went with the injured man to the hospital.

This means that *Tom* accompanied *the injured man* to the hospital. *The injured man* benefited from this accompaniment. This leads us to consider *the injured man* as Beneficiary Comitative.

The example presented in (46) confirms the same cognitive-semantic point in Arabic.

- (46) ḏahab-tu wa l-mariid-a ?ila l-mustašfaa
go.PERF-1MS with the-patient-ACC to the-hospital
"I went with the patient to the hospital."

In (46), DP₂ *l-mariiD-a* "the patient" might be treated as Beneficiary Comitative.

5.5 Affected Comitative

Hurford and Heasley define the participant role of the affected as "the thing (not usually a person, although it may be) upon which the action is carried out..."⁽⁶⁰⁾ The following example mentioned by Larson is illustrative.

(47) The fork was on the table with *the knife and spoon*.⁽⁶¹⁾

It seems that Arabic behaves the same way with respect to the Affected Comitative, as shown in (48).

(48) waDa9-tu T-Tifl-a wa l-li9abat-a
put.PERF-1MS the-child-ACC with the-toy-ACC
"I put the child with the toy."

5.6 Percept Comitative

Percept thematic role is an entity that is perceived, as in Suzie saw *the monster*.⁽⁶²⁾ Here is a relevant example.

(49) I saw Tom with John.

In (49), DP₂ *John* is the perceived entity, so it might be considered Percept Comitative. The following example, taken from Hasan⁽⁶³⁾, explains the same cognitive-semantic concept in Arabic.

(50) naZar-tu la-ka wa Taa?ir-an
look.PERF-1MS to-you.2MS with bird-ACC
"Lit: *I looked at you with a bird."
"I looked at you with a bird (beside you)."

In (50), the DP₂ *Taa?ir-an* "bird" receives the Comitative semantic participant role in the deep semantic structure, but on the cognitive-semantic level, it is Percept Comitative.

5.7 Goal Comitative

Goal as semantic participant role is found in English. However, Goal Comitative does not exist. Goal is considered as "the place to which something moves"⁽⁶⁴⁾. Arabic, on the other hand, exhibits this cognitive-semantic feature. In (51), *Basim*'s goal is to reach *Makkah*.

(51) nazal-a basim-u wa makkat-a
get down-PERF-3MS Basim-NOM with Makkat-ACC
"Lit: *Basim got down with Makkah."

"Basim reached Makkah."

5.8 Experiencer Comitative

According to Yule, "if we see, know or enjoy something, we're not really performing an action (hence we are not agents). We are in the role of Experiencer"⁽⁶⁵⁾. Consider the following example in which *his friend* is Experiencer Comitative.

(52) He looked at me along with his friend.

In Arabic, the example presented in (53) illustrates the interaction between the Experiencer case and the Comitative case.

(53) naZar-a ?ilayya wa Sadiiq-a-hu
look.PERF-3MS to me with friend-ACC-his
"He looked at me along with his friend."

5.9 Locative Comitative

To Todd, the semantic role Locative "specifies the special orientation of the action or a state identified by the verb"⁽⁶⁶⁾. The study has found that Locative Comitative can be divided into two subtypes; physical Locative Comitative and mental Locative Comitative. The first subtype is found in Arabic but not in English, whereas the second type is found in both languages. Consider the following ungrammatical sentence.

(54) *[Tom]_{+animate} woke up with [the city]_{-animate}

The sentence in (54) is ungrammatical due to animacy constraint because in English comitative constructions DP₁ has same animacy value as DP₂⁽⁶⁷⁾. The ungrammatical sentence in (54) becomes grammatical in (55) by replacing the preposition of accompaniment *with* by the preposition of place *in*.

(55) Tom woke up in the city.

In Arabic, there is no such animacy constraint, hence physical Locative Comitative is permitted, as can be seen from the well-formedness of the example below.

(56) ?istayqaZ-a [basim-u]_{+animate} wa [l-madiinat-a]_{-animate}
wake up.PERF-3MS Basim-NOM with the-city-ACC
"Lit: *Basim woke up with the city."
"Basim woke up as he reached the city."

The second subtype, mental Locative Comitative, employs a "conceptual metaphor"⁽⁶⁸⁾ in which togetherness happens mentally, as the example below indicates.

(57) Is the child still with his mother, or has he been taken to his father's custody?

The following example in Arabic is an exact translation of the English sentence presented in (57). In this example, the location of the DP₂ is our mind.

(58) hal-t-tifla maazaala wa ?ummahu ?am nuqila ?ila ?abihi?

5.10 Temporal Comitative

Temporal semantic role is "the case of the time in which or at which an action or a process identified by the verb takes place"⁽⁶⁹⁾. Consider the following example in English in which Temporal Comitative is blocked due to animacy constraint.

(69) *[The hunter]_{+animate} returned with [the sunset]_{-animate}

The sentence becomes grammatical by replacing the preposition of accompaniment *with* by the preposition of time *at*.

(60) The hunter returned at sunset.

The anomaly between DP₁ and DP₂ in the comitative construction is permitted in Arabic.

(61) 9aad-a S-Sayaad-u wa duruub-a š-šams-i
return-3MS the-hunter-NOM with down-ACC the-sun-GEN
"Lit: *The hunter returned with the sundown."
"The hunter returned at the sundown."

5.11 Ingredient Comitative

Another type of Comitative is Ingredient Comitative. In (62), DP₂ plays the Ingredient participant role in the Comitative.

(62) I cooked the meat with tomatoes.

Arabic has the same Ingredient-Comitative concept.

(63) Tabax-tu l-laħim-a wa T-TamaaTim-a
cook.PERF-1MS the-meat-ACC with the-tomatoes-ACC
"I cooked meat with tomatoes."

5.12 Theme Comitative

Cowper describes the participant role of Theme as "a theme occurs only with a verb of motion or location...With a verb of motion, the theme is what moves. With a verb of location, the theme is the entity whose location is being described"⁽⁷⁰⁾. Moreover, sometimes the participant in a comitative construction can be conceived as having something.⁽⁷¹⁾ Accordingly, one can divide

Theme Comitative into two types; intrinsic-Theme Comitative, and extrinsic-Theme Comitative, as shown in (64a-b), respectively.

- (64) a. Tom came down with a dangerous disease.
b. The soldiers came down with a lot of money.

The same proposed classification holds true for Arabic.

- (65) a. 9aad-a basim-un wa l-maraD-a
return.PERF-3MS Basim-NOM with the-disease-ACC
"Basim returned with a disease."
b. 9aad-a saalim-un wa l-maal-a
return.PERF-3MS Salim-NOM with the-money-ACC
"Salim returned with the money."

5.13 True Comitative

In True Comitative DP₂ does not assume any other semantic role. It might be called passive participant, as (66) illustrates.

- (66) The mother drank tea with the baby on her lap.

Arabic has the same type. In (67), *Zayd* can be passive participant because he "can be an unconscious person accompanied by *Hind* in an ambulance on the way to a hospital"⁽⁷²⁾. This pure accompaniment is presented as follows.

- (67) ðahab-at hind-un wa zayd-an
leave.PERF-3FS Hind-NOM with Zayd-ACC
"Hind left with Zayd."

6. Comitative and case ambiguity

6.1 Ambiguity of polysemy

The indistinctness between Comitative and Instrumental in English results in semantic case ambiguity, due to the polysemous nature of *with*, as presented in the English sentence (68).

- (68) I saw_i john_j [with a telescope]_{i,j}.

The phrase *with a telescope* can be either an Instrumental or a Comitative. The _i coindexation is Instrumental, whereas _j coindexation is Comitative. In Arabic, this ambiguity is resolved:

- (69) raʔay-tu basim-a wa l-minZaar-a [Comitative]
see.PERF-1MS Basim-ACC with the-telescope-ACC
"I saw Basim with the telescope."

In (70), DP₂ can never be Instrumental since Arabic uses a different particle to indicate instrumentality, namely *bi-*. Thus, the ambiguity is resolved.

- (70) raʔay-tu rajul-an bi-l-minzaar-i [Instrumental]
 see.PERF-1MS man-ACC through-the-telescope-GEN
 "I saw a man through the telescope."

6.2 Ambiguity of polysemy and anaphora

When DP₁ or DP₂ is able to bind morphological anaphors, a different kind of ambiguity results; namely between Instrumental and Agentive. In (71), _i coindexation is Agentive, whereas _j coindexation is Instrumental.

- (71) [The police officer]_i pursued [the mafia boss]_j [with his colleague]_{i,j}.

In Arabic, there is an ambiguity but in a different way, namely between Affected and Comitative.

- (72) Taarad-a D-Dabt-u [l-lliS-a]_{i,j} [wa [rafiiq-a-hu]_i]
 pursue.PERF-1MS the-officer-NOM the-thief-ACC with/and colleague-ACC-his
 "The police officer pursued both the mafia boss and his colleague."
 "The police officer pursued the mafia boss who was accompanied by his colleague."

The sentence in (72) can have either a coordinate reading in which DP₂ receives the Affected case or a comitative reading in which DP₂ assumes the participant role of Comitative case. That is, the above sentence is ambiguous, but in a different way from English; _i coindexation is Affected, whereas _j coindexation is Comitative. It should be noted that DP₂ in Arabic cannot be in the Agentive case because it is separated from DP₁, which together form a conjoined Agentive DP, by the object of accompaniment *l-lliS-a* "the thief". Moreover, DP₂ cannot become Instrumental because, as mentioned above, Arabic language has its own way of marking instrumentality by the particle of instrument *bi-*.

7. The notion of principality

In symmetrical comitatives, DP₁ has the same importance as DP₂ in the eventuality. However, DP₂ in asymmetrical comitatives is considered an appurtenance to DP⁽⁷³⁾. In Arabic, on the other hand, Saad argues that "the Comitative is the more important of the two participants whether there is agency on its part or not"⁽⁷⁴⁾.

From the present researcher point of view, the importance of the participants in asymmetrical comitatives depends on our realization of the situation. Thus, I argue against the position of both Zhang and Saad, and I consider it generalization. The degree of principality is left for the speaker to decide. That is, the speaker's meaning is more important than the sentence meaning (For more discussion of the difference between sentence meaning and speaker meaning, see Hurford and Heasley)⁽⁷⁵⁾. Thus, one participant should be more important contextually than the other. In the comitative construction, DP₁ could be in full control, with DP₂ as a co-actor, or vice versa⁽⁷⁶⁾. Consider the following examples.

- (73) a. The mother came to the hospital with her sick child. [asymmetrical]
 b. The sick mother came to the hospital with her child. [asymmetrical]

Though (73a-b) are asymmetrical comitatives, DP₁ in (73a) is an appurtenance to DP₂, whereas DP₂ in (73b) is an appurtenance to DP₁. The degree of the importance of the DP depends on our recognition of the situation. The following example in Arabic supports our point of view.

- (74) maš-a basim-un wa l-mataajir-a [asymmetrical]
 walk.PERF-1MS Basim-NOM with the-shops-ACC
 "Basim walked along the shops."

Basim does not know his way, so he follows *the shops* to reach his destination. The DP₂ *l-mataajir-a* "the shops" is more important situationally. However, consider the following example.

- (75) maša-a basim-un wa š-šaaTi?-a [asymmetrical]
 walk.PERF-3MS Basim-NOM with the-seafront-ACC
 "Basim walked along the seafront."

Basim here is exercising and he is walking along the seafront. In this case, DP₁ *Basim* is more important situationally. Thus, the degree of importance depends on the situation itself.

So, this study proves by evidence that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the comitative type and the degree of principality of DPs. This is left for the cognition to decide. Consequently, three types of principality are identified in this study, as shown in (76a-c).

- (76) a. Principal-to-principal relationship [symmetrical]
 b. Principal-to-non-principal relationship [asymmetrical]
 c. non-Principal-to-principal relationship [asymmetrical]

Conclusion

In this two-division study, it has been shown that both English and Arabic exhibit comitative constructions. The syntax and the cognitive semantics of Comitative have been discussed. The discussion of the syntax of Comitative reveals the following. First, English and Arabic present a similar syntactic comitative structure. Second, both English and Arabic have the functions adpositional-phrase adjunct and adnominal-phrase adjunct. However, the VP-complement position is confined only to English. Third, English and Arabic show two types of Comitative; symmetrical and asymmetrical. Fourth, English and Arabic differ in the syntactic positions of the complex nominal of Comitative in the subject, object of a verb and object of a preposition positions. A-bar movement of the host phrase is permitted in both English and Arabic, which shows that the host phrase and the comitative phrase do not form a constituent in both languages. English allows for the A-bar movement of the comitative phrase in both symmetrical and asymmetrical constructions. Arabic, on the other hand, does not allow for this movement. English and Arabic assume a similar position in disallowing A-movement of the host phrase and the comitative phrase, though English does in asymmetrical Comitative.

English and Arabic complex nominal of Comitative is able to control Equi in infinitival complements in symmetrical comitatives. English complex nominal of symmetrical Comitative, contrary to asymmetrical Comitative, is able to control reflexive pronouns. On the contrary, both symmetrical and asymmetrical Comitative in Arabic are unable to control reflexive pronouns. The complex nominal does not occur as a preverbal subject in both languages, though English asymmetrical Comitative, unlike Arabic, does so. Polarity feature is not found in English and Arabic symmetrical Comitative. However, English asymmetrical Comitative, unlike in Arabic, exhibits this feature. Premodification does not change semantic case placement, whereas this shift is permitted in Arabic.

The exploration of the semantic-cognitive structure of Comitative in both languages has yielded the following results. First, a cognitive-semantic typology of Comitative in both languages has been proposed. Accordingly, thirteen classes have been identified. Second, the discussion of Comitative and case ambiguity reveals that ambiguity of case is found in English due to the polysemy, and in both English and Arabic due to polysemy and anaphora. Finally, the principality of the host phrase and comitative phrase depends on our cognition of the situation.

On providing a unified cross-linguistic account of comitative constructions in both languages, one would be able to find some common ground and

shed some light on the differences. It can therefore be concluded that the consideration of all these phenomena show that there are no finer grained distinctions between the two languages, and that English and Arabic comitative constructions act very much the same way.

Works Cited

- Abu Al-Makarim, Ali. *Al-Jumlah Al-Fi'liyyah*. [The Verbal Sentence]. 1st ed. Cairo: Mu'assasat Al-Mukhtaar, 2007.
- Al-Hamadi, Yusif, Muhammad Al-Shinawi, and Muhammad Ata. *Al-Qawaa'id Al-Asaasiyyah fi Al-NaHw wa Al-Sarf*. [The Basic Rules in Syntax and Morphology]. Cairo: Al-Hay'at Al-'aamat lil-MaTaba'ah Al-Amiiriyah, 1981.
- Al-Rajhi, Abdu. *Al-taTbiiq Al-NaHwii*. [Syntactic Application]. 2nd ed. Cairo: Daar Al-ma'rifah Al-Jaami'iyyah, 1981.
- Al-Shamsan, Abu Aws I. *Huruuf Al-Jarr: Dalaalatihaa wa 'ilaaqaatihaa*. [Prepositions: Their Semantics and their Syntax]. Jeddah: Daar Al-Madani, 1987.
- Aoun, Joseph, Elabbas Benmamoun, and Dominique Sportiche. "Further Remarks of First Conjunct Agreement." *Linguistic Inquiry* 30.4 (1999): 669-81.
- Buckingham, Hugh W. Jr. "The Comitative and Case Grammar." *Foundations of Language* 10 (1973): 111-21.
- Cowper, Elizabeth A. *A Concise Introduction to Syntactic Theory*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1992.
- Fabb, Nigel. *Sentence Structure*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Fillmore, Charles J. "The Case for Case." In E. Bach and R. T., 1968.
- Finegan, Edward. *Language: Its Structure and Use*. 3rd ed. Orlando: Harcourt Bruce, 1999.
- Hasan, Abbas. *Al-NaHw Al-Waafii*. [The Comprehensive Grammar]. 4vols. 4th ed. Cairo: Daar Al-Ma'aarif, 1973. Vol. 2.
- Haspelmath, Martin, ed. "Coordinating Constructions." *Typological Studies in Language* 58 (1984): 3-39.
- Hassan, Tammam. *Al-Lughah Al-Arabiyyah: Ma'naahaa wa Mabnaahaa*. [The Arabic Language: Its Semantics and Structure]. Cairo: Al-Hay'ah Al-Misriyyah Al-'aamah lil-Kitaab, 1979.

- Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Hurford, R. James, and Brendan Heasley. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Ibn Aqil, Baha' Al-Din. *SharH Ibn Aqil*. [Explaining Ibn Aqil]. 4vols. Verified by Muhammad Abdul-Hamid. Cairo: Daar Talaai', 2004. Vol. 2.
- Ibn Hisham, Jamal Al-Din. *SharH Shuzur Al-Thahab fi Ma'rifat Kalaam Al-Arab*. [Explaining the Gold Particles in the Language of the Arabs]. 4vols. 1st ed. Verified by Muhammad Abdul-Hamid. Beirut: Al-Maktabah Al-Asriyyah, 1995. Vol. 2.
- . *AwDaH Al-Masaalik*. [The Clearest Paths]. 4vols. Verified by Muhammad Abdul-Hamid. Cairo: Daar Al-Talaai', 2009. Vol. 2.
- Ibn Ya'ish, Ya'ish Ibn Ali. *SharH Al-MufaSSal li Al-Zamakhsharii*. [Explaining the Detailed of Al-Zamakhshari]. 10vols. Ed. Amil Badi' Ya'qub. Beirut: Daar Al-Kutub Al-'Imiyyah, 2001. Vol. 1.
- Katamba, Francis. *Morphology*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1993.
- Kayne, Richard S. The Antisymmetry of Syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph* 25. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Langacker, Ronald W. "Concept, Image, and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar." *Cognitive Linguistic Research*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991.
- Larson, Mildred L. *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. London: U of America P, 1984.
- Lehmann, Christian, and Young-Min Shin. "The Functional Domain of Concomitance: A Typological study of Instrumental and Comitative Relations." Ed. Christian Lehmann. *Typological Studies in Participation*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2005. 9-104.
- Palmer, Frank R. *Semantics*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and Svartvik, J. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: London, 1972.
- Saad, George. *Transitivity, Causation and Passivization: A Semantic-Syntactic Study of the Verb in Classical Arabic*. London: Kegan Paul International, 1982.

- Schlesinger, Izchak M. *Production and Comprehension of Utterances*. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, 1977.
- . "Cognitive Structures and Semantic Deep Structures: The Case of the Instrumental." *Journal of Linguistics* 15.2 (1979): 307-24.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. "The Principle of Concomitance: Instrumental, Comitative, and Collective." *Foundations of Language* 12.2 (1947): 215-47.
- Stassen, Leon. "AND-languages and WITH-languages." *Linguistic Typology* 4.1 (2000): 1-55.
- Stolz, Thomas. "To be with X is to have X: Comitatives, Instrumentals, Locatives, and Predicative Possession." *Linguistics* 39 (2001): 321-50.
- Stolz, Thomas, Cornelia Stroh, and Aina Urdze. *On Comitative and Related Categories: A Typological Study with Special Focus on the Language of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Grayter, 2006.
- Todd, Loreto. *An Introduction to Linguistics*. Longman: York Press, 1987.
- Trask, Robert L. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr., and Randy J. La Polla. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Wali, Fadil F. *Al-NaHw Al-WaZiifii*. [The Functional Grammar]. Haa'il: Daar Al-Andalus, 1997.
- Walmsley, John B. "The English Comitative Case and the Concept of Deep Structure." *Foundations of Language* 7 (1971): 493-507.
- Yule, George. *The Study of Language*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Zhang, Niina N. "The Syntax of English Comitative Constructions." *Folia Linguistica* 41.1/2 (2007): 135-69.

Appendices

Appendix (1)
List of Phonemic Symbols Used to Represent the Arabic Data
A. CONSONANTS

Manner	Place Voicing	Bilabial	Labiodental	Interdental	Dental Non – Emphatic	Dento – alveolar Em – phatic	Palatal	Velar	Uvular	Pharyngeal	Glottal
Stop	Voiceless Voiced	b		θ	t d	T D		k q			ʔ
Fricative	Voiceless Voiced		f	ð	s z	S Z	š	x g		ħ ʕ	h
Affricate	Voiced						j				
Flap	Voiced				r						
Lateral	Voiced				l						
Nasal	Voiced	m			n						
Glide	Voiced	w					y				

B. VOWELS

	Short			Long		
	Front	Central	Back	Front	Central	Back
High	i		u	ii		uu
Mid						
Low		a			aa	

Appendix (2)

List of Abbreviations

ACC	Accusative	M	Masculine
GEN	Genitive	NOM	Nominative
AF	Affected	P	Plural
BEN	Beneficiary	PERF	Perfective
D	Dual	PP	Prepositional Phrase
DP	Determiner Phrase	S	Singular
F	Feminine	V	Verb
IMP	Imperfective	VP	Verb Phrase
IND	Indicative	1	First Person
Lit	Literal	3	Third Person

Endnotes

- 1 - Hansjakob Seiler, "The Principle of Concomitance: Instrumental, Comitative, and Collective," *Foundations of Language* 12.2 (1947): 215.
- 2 - Charles Fillmore J., "The Case for Case," in E. Bach and R. T., (1968) 21.
- 3 - John B. Walmsley, "The English Comitative Case and the Concept of Deep Structure," *Foundations of Language* 7 (1971).
- 4 - Hugh W. Buckingham Jr., "The Comitative and Case Grammar," *Foundations of Language* 10 (1973).
- 5 - Richard S. Kayne, *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 25 (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994).
- 6 - Thomas Stolz, "To be with X is to have X: Comitatives, Instrumentals, Locatives, and Predicative Possession," *Linguistics* 39 (2001).
- 7 - Christian Lehmann and Young-Min Shin, "The Functional Domain of Concomitance: A Typological study of Instrumental and Comitative Relations," ed. Christian Lehmann, *Typological Studies in Participation* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2005).
- 8 - Thomas Stolz, Cornelia Stroh, and Aina Urdze, *On Comitative and Related Categories: A Typological Study with Special Focus on the Language of Europe* (Berlin: Mouton de Grayter, 2006).
- 9 - Martin Haspelmath, ed., "Coordinating Constructions," *Typological Studies in Language* 58 (1984).
- 10 - Leon Stassen, "AND-languages and WITH-languages," *Linguistic Typology* 4.1 (2000).
- 11 - Yusif Al-Hamadi, Muhammad Al-Shinawi, and Muhammad Ata, *Al-Qawaa'id Al-Asaasiyyah fi Al-NaHw wa Al-Sarf*, [The Basic Rules in Syntax and Morphology] (Cairo: Al-Hay'at Al-'aamat lil-MaTaba'ah Al-Amiiriyyah, 1981).
- 12 - Baha' Al-Din Ibn Aqil, *Sharh Ibn Aqil*, [Explaining Ibn Aqil] 4vols. Verified by Muhammad Abdul-Hamid (Cairo: Daar Talaai', 2004) Vol. 2.
- 13 - Jamal Al-Din Ibn Hisham, *SharH Shuzur Al-Thahab fi Ma'rifat Kalaam Al-Arab*, [Explaining the Gold Pieces in the Language of the Arabs] 4vols. 1st ed. Verified by Muhammad Abdul-Hamid (Beirut: Al-Maktabah Al-Asriyyah, 1995) Vol. 2.

- 14 - Jamal Al-Din Ibn Hisham, AwDaH Al-Masaalik, [The Clearest Paths] 4vols. Verified by Muhammad Abdul-Hamid (Cairo: Daar Al-Talaai', 2009) Vol. 2.
- 15 - Abbas Hasan, Al-NaHw Al-Wafii, [The Comprehensive Grammar] 4vols. 4th ed. (Cairo: Daar Al-Ma'aarif, 1973) Vol. 2.
- 16 - Tammam Hassan, Al-Lughah Al-Arabiyyah: Ma'naahaa wa Mabnaahaa, [The Arabic Language: Its Semantics and Structure] (Cairo: Al-Hay'ah Al-Misriyyah Al-'aamat lil-Kitab, 1979).
- 17 - Robert L. Trask, A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics (London: Routledge, 1993) 49.
- 18 - Niina N. Zhang, "The Syntax of English Comitative Constructions," *Folia Linguistica* 41.1/2 (2007): 135.
- 19 - Francis Katamba, Morphology (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1993).
- 20 - Baha' Al-Din Ibn Aqil, SharH Ibn Aqil, *op. cit.* 117.
- 21 - Martin Haspelmath, ed., *op. cit.*
- 22 - Abbas Hasan, *op. cit.*, 305.
- 23 - Niina N. Zhang, *op. cit.*, 145.
- 24 - Ya'ish Ibn Ali Ibn Ya'ish, SharH Al-MufaSSal li Al-Zamakhshari, [Explaining the Detailed of Al-Zamakhshari] 10vols. ed. Amil Badi' Ya'qub (Beirut: Daar Al-Kutub Al-'ilmiyyah, 2001) 1: 439.
- 25 - Fadil F. Wali, Al-NaHw Al-WaZiifi, [The Functional Grammar] (Haa'il: Daar Al-Andalus, 1997) 324.
- 26 - Abbas Hasan, *op. cit.*, 304.
- 27 - Ibid.
- 28 - Niina N. Zhang, *op. cit.*, 145.
- 29 - Abdu Al-Rajhi, Al-taTbiiq Al-NaHwii, [Syntactic Application] 2nd ed. (Cairo: Daar Al-ma'rifah Al-Jaami'iyyah, 1981) 243.
- 30 - Niina N. Zhang, *op. cit.*, 158.
- 31 - Ali Abu Al-Makarim, Al-Jumlah Al-Fi'liyyah, [The Verbal Sentence] 1st ed. (Cairo: Mu'assasat Al-Mukhtaar, 2007) 239.
- 32 - Abbas Hasan, *op. cit.*, 312.
- 33 - Nigel Fabb, Sentence Structure (London: Routledge, 1993) 4.
- 34 - Abbas Hasan, *op. cit.*, 308.
- 35 - Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum, The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002).
- 36 - Abbas Hasan, *op. cit.*, 310.
- 37 - Niina N. Zhang, *op. cit.*, 148.
- 38 - Edward Finegan, Language: Its Structure and Use, 3rd ed. (Orlando: Harcourt Bruce, 1999) 16-63.
- 39 - Niina N. Zhang, *op. cit.*
- 40 - Abbas Hasan, *op. cit.*, 310.
- 41 - Ali Abu Al-Makarim, *op. cit.*, 245.

- 42 - Niina N. Zhang, *op. cit.*, 147.
- 43 - Ibid., 148 -150.
- 44 - Joseph Aoun, Elabbas Benmamou, and Dominique Sportiche, "Further Remarks on First Conjunct Agreement," *Linguistic Inquiry* 30.4 (1999): 678.
- 45 - Ali Abu Al-Makarim, *op. cit.*, 235.
- 46 - Izchak M. Schlesinger, *Production and Comprehension of Utterances* (Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, 1977).
- 47 - Ronald W. Langacker, "Concept, Image, and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar," *Cognitive Linguistic Research* (Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991) 237.
- 48 - Hugh W. Buckingham Jr., *op. cit.*, p. 115.
- 49 - Izchak M. Schlesinger, "Cognitive Structures and Semantic Deep Structures: The Case of the Instrumental," *Journal of Linguistics* 15.2 (1979): 309-10.
- 50 - R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik, *A Grammar of Contemporary English* (London: London, 1972) 203.
- 51 - Thomas Stolz, Cornelia Stroh, and Aina Urdze, *op. cit.*, 14.
- 52 - George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980) 135.
- 53 - Izchak M. Schlesinger, *op. cit.*, 310.
- 54 - Abu Aws I. Al-Shamsan, Huruuf Al-Jarr: Dalaalaatihaa wa 'ilaaqaatihaa, [Prepositions: Their Semantics and their Syntax] (Jeddah: Dar Al-Madani, 1987) 16.
- 55 - Abbas Hasan, *op. cit.*, 304.
- 56 - Hansjakob Seiler, *op.cit.*, 235.
- 57 - Hugh W. Buckingham Jr., *op. cit.*
- 58 - Mildred L. Larson, *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence* (London: U of America P, 1984) 201.
- 59 - George Saad, *Transitivity, Causation and Passivization: A Semantic-Syntactic Study of the Verb in Classical Arabic* (London: Kegan Paul International, 1982) 25.
- 60 - James R. Hurford and Brendan Heasley, *Semantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983) 221.
- 61 - Mildred L. Larson, *op. cit.*
- 62 - Elizabeth A. Cowper, *A Concise Introduction to Syntactic Theory* (Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1992) 50.
- 63 - Abbas Hasan, *op. cit.*, 312.
- 64 - Frank R. Palmer, *Semantics*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981) 146-7.
- 65 - George Yule, *The Study of Language*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006) 103.
- 66 - Loreto Todd, *An Introduction to Linguistics* (Longman: York Press, 1987) 103.
- 67 - Niina N. Zhang, *op. cit.*, 136.
- 68 - George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *op. cit.*
- 69 - George Saad, *op. cit.*, 24.
- 70 - Elizabeth A. Cowper, *op. cit.*, 50.

- 71 - Robert D., Van Valin Jr., and Randy J. La Polla, *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997).
- 72 - George Saad, *op. cit.*, 26.
- 73 - Niina N. Zhang, *op. cit.*
- 74 - George Saad, *op. cit.*
- 75 - James R. Hurford and Brendan Heasley, *op. cit.*
- 76 - Martin Haspelmath, ed., *op. cit.*

* * *

الخصائص النحوية والإدراكية الدلالية لحالة المعية في العربية والإنجليزية

محمد عبدالمجيد منصور

تتناول هذه الدراسة الخصائص النحوية والإدراكية الدلالية لحالة المعية في العربية والإنجليزية. بدأت الدراسة بالجزء الخاص بالخصائص النحوية؛ حيث شرحت تركيب المعية ووظائفها داخل الجملة، وكذلك أوضحت نوعين منها في اللغتين تبعاً للمشاركة أو اللامشاركة في الحدث. وناقشت قدرة الاسم الذي قبل الواو والاسم المفعول معه بعد الواو على اتخاذ مواقع مختلفة داخل الجملة، مثل: الاستبداء، و المفعولية، وأن يكونا مفعولاً لحرف الجر. كما ألفت الدراسة الضوء على مدى الترابط بين الاسم الأول والاسم الثاني باستخدام اختبار تحليل تجانس المركب. وأوضحت الدراسة قدرة تراكيب المعية على التحكم في ضمائر الإحالة التالية عليها، وذلك باستخدام القيد الدلالي الحي مقابل غير الحي. وتناول الجزء الثاني من الدراسة حالة المعية من الناحية الإدراكية الدلالية؛ حيث قامت الدراسة بتصنيف إدراكي دلالي لحالة المعية، وكشفت عن وجود ثلاث عشرة فئة إدراكية دلالية دلت على مدى تداخل الحالات الدلالية في البنية العميقة مع حالة المعية، مثل: تداخل حالة العامل والحالة النحوية للآلة مع حالة المعية. وتناولت الدراسة الغموض في التعبير الناتج من الضمير العائد، وأخيراً، أوضحت الدراسة أن درجة أهمية الاسمين في مركب المعية تعتمد على مدى إدراكنا للموقف. وتوصلت الدراسة إلى أنه مع وجود بعض الاختلافات بين اللغتين في الخصائص النحوية والإدراكية الدلالية لحالة المعية فإنهما تسلكان السلوك نفسه في التعبير النحوي والدلالي الإدراكي عن حالة المعية.