

Lexical Semantic Constraints on the Use of Cognate Object and their Syntactic Implications in Arabic-English Translation

Mohamed Abdelmageed Mansour

Assistant Professor, Dept. of English, Faculty of Science and Arts, Assiut University, Egypt

Abstract

This study presents a cross-linguistic analysis of the lexical semantic constraints which govern the occurrence of Cognate Object (CO) in English and Arabic and how they affect Arabic-English translation. Based on real language examples drawn from Arabic and two English translations, the study provides a typology of the possible and impossible Grammatical Function Patterns and Thematic Role Hierarchies of CO constructions. Moreover, the study offers a classification of the compensational syntactic devices that the English language manipulates when it fails to find CO constructions at its disposal. Showing the lack of intimacy between the surface grammatical functions and their deep thematic roles, it is assumed that licensing of CO constructions in English are constrained semantically, but not syntactically, as the case in Arabic, because licensing CO in English depends on the lexical semantic entry of the governing verb. Unaccusative-unergative distinction shows that in English one-place predicate licenses CO, provided that the agentive subject should be self-generated enough to induce the event denoted by the verb. English two-and three-place predicates as well as Patient passive constructions do not accept COs, contrary to Arabic. It is claimed that the lexical semantic restrictions on the use of CO in English do not necessarily carry over to Arabic and the occurrence of CO is a matter of language-specific lexical-semantic idiosyncrasy.

Key words: lexical semantics, cognate object, thematic roles, unaccusative and unergative verbs, degree of predicate.

Introduction

Cognate Object (CO) constructions in English have received much attention in the linguistic literature^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5}, among others. However, to our knowledge, there has been hardly any study on contrasting CO constructions in English and Arabic based on lexical semantics. Moreover, there is no complete and uniform linguistic study devoted to such area, showing how lexical semantic differences of CO constructions between Arabic, as a source language (SL) and English, as a target language (TL) can affect translation.

The aim of this paper is twofold. First, it provides a linguistic analysis of the lexical semantic constraints of the use of CO constructions in English through explaining the relationship between the surface Grammatical Function Patterns and deep Thematic Role Hierarchies of CO constructions in English and Arabic. Second, based on these lexical semantic constraints, the study will examine the syntactic devices that English manipulates to compensate the loss of CO constructions. With these two aims in perspective, the present study is considered a continuation of decades of research on Cognate Object constructions in linguistic literature.

The study is organized as follows. Section (1) introduces the concept of CO in English and Arabic. The notion of equivalence in translation is presented in section (2). The theoretical framework of the study is given in section (3). Section (4) is concerned with the use of CO as a manner adverb in English and section (5) is devoted to the use of CO as a Prepositional Phrase. Section (6) explains the relation between CO and Agentivity. The relationship between CO constructions and Degree of predicates is provided in section (7). The last section discusses CO and Patient role in passivization. The Conclusion summarizes of the main findings of the study.

1. The concept of cognate object

Though CO constructions are found in many languages, it "does not have identical properties in each language"⁶. Pereltsvaig, for example, defines COs in English as "noun phrases containing a noun which is morphologically related to the verb"⁷. Moreover, Brinton maintains that CO in English "is normally preceded by an indefinite article"⁸. A third defining characteristic of CO constructions in English is that they "require modification of some kind"⁹. The following examples reflect the three above characteristics.

- (1) a. *She laughed a *laugh*¹⁰.
- b. John died a *gruesome death*¹¹.

In Arabic, on the other hand, what is called al maf'ul l-mutlaq 'Absolute Accusative' is the CO, sometimes referred to as 'inner object'¹² and 'Cognate

Accusative¹³. CO in Arabic is basically *masdar* 'verbal noun' that is derived from the root of the main verb of the sentence¹⁴. This post verbal accusative is used to "intensify the action of the verb"¹⁵. The other uses, which are not our concern here, are to express number and type. Moreover, this verbal noun is "indefinite" and it can be "followed by an accusative adjective"¹⁶ to provide a vehicle for qualification of the action referred to by the verb¹⁷. The following example is illustrative.

(2) *rakaDarakDan sarii9an*¹⁸.

'Lit. He ran a swift running.'

"He ran swiftly."

2. Equivalence and cognate object

The notion of equivalence between one structure in the SL and another in the TL is considered a central issue in translation theory. This equivalence leads translators to what is known as structural adjustments. This structural adjustment is called 'shift'¹⁹, 'transposition'²⁰, and 'alteration'²¹. Structural adjustment is used when a grammatical structure in the SL does not exist in the TL or the TL has some restrictions on the use of a particular grammatical structure found in the SL²². It should be noted that English has few CO constructions due to some lexical semantic constraints. Thus, this study investigates as well as it proposes a typology of the structural adjustments that English language adopts to achieve equivalences to Arabic CO constructions.

Seeking equivalence inevitably risks some data. Nidasuggests that "all types of translation involve (1) loss of information, (2) addition of information, and/or (3) skewing of information."²³ That is, during the process of translation something is lost or gained²⁴. In fact, there is no translation without losing or sacrificing some of the harmony inherent in the source language. The loss of CO in Arabic-English translation is inevitable and when the translator ventures to render this Arabic structure into English, he finds that it is hardly compensational. Thus the present study examines the lexical semantic causes behind this loss and explains the possible compensations.

Since CO is practically untranslatable²⁵, the present study will explain "how the translator, manipulates the linguistic material in order to produce an appropriate target text"²⁶. This examination is linguistically based because this study adopts the principle that translation draws on "the findings of contrastive linguistics: many translation problems can be described on the basis of differences across linguistic systems"²⁷.

3. Theoretical background

The research methodology lies at the heart of what has come to be known as lexical semantics, specifically the thematic role theories. In these theories the participants assume different thematic roles as arguments of the predicate²⁸. These roles are universal in the languages of the world²⁹, such as Agent, Patient, Goal, Source, Location, Experiencer, Instrument, Beneficiary, and Percept. Furthermore, in this study the term 'Range' will be used as the thematic role of the CO. This term was first mentioned by Halliday to refer to the thematic role of a noun phrase that further qualifies the action specified by the verb³⁰.

According to the semantic role hierarchy theories, the grammatical functions of the predicate argument structure, and the thematic roles associated with them are loosely correlated. That is there is no intimate or one-to-one correspondence between the surface grammatical functions and the underlying thematic roles. By studying such associations, the study will propose a typology of thematic role hierarchies, that permits the occurrence of CO in Arabic.

To make the study based on real data, our CO constructions examples have been drawn from the book of parsing the Holy Quran³¹. However, we refer to examples from Modern Standard Arabic examples when necessary. The English translations of CO constructions have been taken from two English translations: Pickthall³², whose translation of the Quran faithfully sticks to the original, and Ali³³, who has an excellent English language command³⁴.

The following two sections (4) and (5) will explain two important concepts of CO in English that will be of great importance in understanding the subsequent arguments.

4. Cognate object as a manner adverb

Some researchers observed the similarity between COs and Manner Adverbs (MA). For example, it was claimed that CO is an adverbial that modifies the verb phrase, hence they are structurally and semantically similar to adverbs^{35, 36}. Consider the following examples in which CO is paraphrased by MA.

- (3) Heather smiled *a pleasant smile*.³⁷

Heather smiled *pleasantly*.

The alternation between CO and MA in (3) shows that the CO phrase *a pleasant smile* is semantically equivalent to the adverbial modification *pleasantly* (Massam 1990)³⁸.

In Arabic, on the other hand, the expression of manner can be expressed through a CO³⁹.

- (4) Darab-a Zayd-un l-Himmar-a Darb-anqawiyy-an⁴⁰.

'Lit: Zayd hit the donkey a strong hit.'

'Zayd hit the donkey strongly.'

The literal translation *Zayd hit the donkey a strong hit* in (4) does not only sound odd but also confusing. The reason behind this perplexity is that English does not welcome such repetition; a postverbal noun derived from the verb to describe the action denoted by this verb. In contrast, repeating the verbal noun after the verb is common in Arabic.

Since English is too reserved in expressing CO constructions, it uses MA to fill the gap as shown in (5).

- (5) a. yu-fajjiruuna-haatafjiiraa (76: 6)

Subj DO CO (Grammatical functions)

< Agent > < Patient > < Range > (Thematic roles)

I-?abraara making it gush forth abundantly (PI)

Subj DO Adv

< Agent > < Patient > < Manner >

- b. fa-quulaala-huqawlanllayyinana(20:44)

< Source > < Goal > < Range >

Subj IO CO

But speakto himmildly (AL)

Subj IO Adv

< Source > < Goal > < Manner >

5. Cognate object as a prepositional phrase

English does not always allow CO to co-occur after Direct Object. However, CO can come with direct object if it occurs within a prepositional phrase as its head. Hence this phrase, which is mainly with-phrase and denotes the thematic role Instrument, is called Cognate Prepositional Phrase⁴¹. The following example explains the linguistic phenomenon of Cognate Prepositional Phrase.

- (6) Kelly buttered the breadwith unsalted butter⁴².

Subj DO Adv (Grammatical functions)

< Agent > < Patient > < Instrument > (Thematic roles)

Moreover, words that express the thematic role Instrument can be

abstract words such as *care* and *intelligence* if they accept the expression use to as a test of their Instrumentality⁴³.

(7) He did it *with care*⁴⁴.

He did it *with intelligence*.

In (4) *with care* and *with intelligence* are Instrumental. We can say 'He used his intelligence to do it.'

It has been found that English uses the linguistic device Cognate Prepositional Phrase to fill the lost CO after Direct Object. Take (8ab) as examples.

(8) a. ?awmu9aðib-uu-haa9aðaabanŠadiidaa (17:58)

Subj DO CO

< Agent > < Patient > < Range >

We ... or punish itwith dire punishment (PI)

Subj DO Adv

< Agent > < Patient > < Instrument >

b. fa?axað-naa-hum?axðatanraabiyah (69: 10)

Subj DO CO

< Agent > < Patient > < Instrument >

therefore did He grip themwith a tightening grip (PI)

Subj DO Adv

< Agent > < Patient > < Instrument >

Another important feature of Cognate Prepositional Phrase in English is that the instrumental CO within the Prepositional Phrase should be modified.

(9) a. Kelly buttered the bread *with unsalted butter*⁴⁵.

b. *Kelly buttered the bread *with butter*.

Example (9b) shows that when the instrumental CO within the Prepositional Phrase is not modified, the sentence will be ungrammatical. Pustejovsky explains the basis of this semantic constraint that the act of buttering is performed with the verb *butter*. Therefore, the instrumental *with butter* is shadowed by the semantics of this verb and the use of CO is blocked unless it is modified by an adjective. After modification with the adjective *unsalted*, the shadow is lifted and the syntactic expression is possible⁴⁶. This semantic phenomenon obliges the translator to add a modifier to the instrumental CO of the TL in the Cognate Prepositional Phrase even if this modifier is not present in the SL as shown in the following examples. (The grammatical functions and thematic role hierarchies presented in (10a) are also applicable to (10bc)).

- (10) a. wafatan-aa-kafutuunaa (20:40)
 Subj DO CO
 < Agent > < Patient > < Range >
 We ... and triedtheewith (*right*) a heavytrial(PI)
 Subj DO Adv
 < Agent > < Patient > < Instrument >
- b. wa9add-a-hum9addaa (19:94)
 He ... and numbereththemwith (*right*) numbering(PI)
- c. fadammar-naa-haatadmiiraa (17:16)
 andWe annihilateitwith *complete*annihilation(PI)

In the above examples the italicized adjectives *heavy*, *right* and *complete* are added, though not present in the SL, to satisfy the semantic TL requirement that the instrumental CO within the Cognate Prepositional Phrase should be

6. Cognate object and agentivity

In lexical semantics, verbs are classified according to their agentives into Unergative verbs (Agentive verbs) that have an Agentive subject, and Unaccusative verbs (non-Agentive verbs) whose subjects do not actively initiate the action of the verb⁴⁷. The following subsections explain the lexical entries of these two types of Agentive verbs and their relations with the CO constructions.

6.1 Cognate object and unergative verbs

Though Unergative verbs, similar to intransitive verbs, do not need objects or second arguments, they "may appear with a limited set of objects"⁴⁸. These objects are called Cognate Objects which are morphologically related to the verb. CO in English occurs only with Unergative verbs⁴⁹. In this construction the subject and the CO receive the thematic roles Agent and Range, respectively. The following example explains the relationship between the grammatical functions and the thematic roles expressed by Unergative verbs.

- (11) John smiled a pleasant smile. (Oxford: 2008: 25)⁵⁰
 SubjCO
 < Agent > < Range >

Similarly, CO in Arabic occurs with Unergative verbs as in

- (12) ?inna-kakaadihun?ilaarabbikakadhan. ...(84: 25)

Subj CO

< Agent > < Range >

... O man, art working toward thy Lord a work. (PI)

SubjCO

< Agent > < Range >

It is obvious from (11) and (12) that Unergative verbs in English and Arabic allow for CO to occur and both languages have a similar Grammatical Function Patterns and Thematic Role Hierarchy.

6.2 Cognate object and unaccusative verbs

Contrary to the Unergative verbs, the subjects of the Unaccusative verbs do not actively initiate the action the verb. That is the syntactic subjects of these verbs are not their semantic agentives. Unaccusative verbs can be classified into three categories; Theme verbs, Patient verbs and Experience-verbs. The following subsections explain the lexical entries of these subclasses in detail showing their relationship with COs in both English and Arabic.

6.2.1 Theme verbs

This category of Unaccusative verbs has one DP argument (the grammatical subject) that is assigned the thematic role Theme by the verb, which is optionally followed by either the thematic role Location or Path. Consider the following examples.

- (13) a. The train departed.

Subj

< Theme >

- b. The team arrived from our city to London.

Subj

Adv

< Theme >

< Path >

- c. The water settled on the floor.

Subj

Adv

< Theme >

< Location >

Taken the patterns in (13), COs do not occur with Unaccusative verbs in English⁵¹. That is the thematic hierarchy *Theme* < (*Path*) > (*Location*) of the Unaccusative Theme verbs does not license the thematic role Range. If we

add the CO to the examples presented in (13), the resulting sentences will be both ungrammatical and semantically odd.

- (14) a. *The train departed a quick departure.
 Subj CO
 < Theme >
- b. *The team arrived from the station to Georgia a noisy arrival.
 Subj Adv CO
 < Theme > < Path > < Range >
- c. *The water settled on the floor a quick settling.
 Subj Adv CO
 < Theme > < Location > < Range >

The data presented in (14) show three impossible Grammatical Function Patterns and that the Thematic Role Hierarchy *Theme* < (*Path*) > (*Location*) > *Range* is also impossible in English.

In Arabic, contrary to English, COs are possible with Unaccusative Theme verbs and the thematic hierarchy *Theme* > (*Path*) allows for the co-occurrence of the thematic role *Range*.

- (15) a. waSalar-rukkabumin l-qaryati?ila l-madiinatiwuSuulansarii9an
 SubjAdv CO
 < Theme > < Path > < Range >
 'Lit. The passengers arrived from the village to the city a quick arrival.'
 'The passengers arrived from the village to the city quickly.'
 SubjAdvAdv
 < Theme > < Path > < Manner >
- b. ?istaqarraθ-θalju fawqas-sTHi?istiqaaran sarii9an
 Subj Adv CO
 < Theme > < Location > < Range >
 'Lit. The snow settled on the roof a quick settling.'
 'The snow settled on the roof easily.'
 Subj Adv Adv
 □ Theme □ Location □ < Manner >

The examples presented in (15) show that the acceptance of Theme verbs of CO results in one Grammatical Function Pattern, but two Thematic Role Hierarchies that can be represented as *Theme* □ (*Path*) □ (*Location*) □ *Range*. On the other hand, English uses Manner Adverbs to compensate the

absence of CO. The result is one Grammatical Function, but two Thematic Role Hierarchies that can be reduced as *Theme* □ (*Path*) □ (*Location*) □ *Manner*.

6.2.2 Patient verbs

The second semantic category of Unaccusative verbs is called Patient verbs. These verbs indicate a change of state⁵². In the Patient verbs construction the syntactic subject receives the thematic role Patient in the D-structure.

- (16) The glass broke.

Subj

< Patient >

Patient verbs in English do not occur with CO and adding CO to Patient verb constructions results in one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy, which both are unacceptable.

- (17) *The glass broke a big break.

Subj

CO

< Patient >

< Range >

Contrary to English, Unaccusative Patient verbs allow for CO.

- (18) ?infajarats-sayaatu?infijaaraa

Subj

CO

< Patient >

< Range >

'Lit. The car exploded an explosion.'

'The car exploded noisily.'

Subj

Adv

< Patient >

< Manner >

From (18) we find that Arabic Patient verbs accept CO and the result is one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy, which both are acceptable. Again English uses Manner Adverb instead of the CO, and the result is one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy, which are completely different from those in Arabic.

6.2.3 Experiencer verbs

The third category of Unaccusative verbs is the Experiencer verbs. The grammatical subject of these verbs expresses the thematic role Experiencer. These verbs are also known as perceptive verbs and psych verbs because they express cognition and emotion.

Though these verbs are close in meaning, they distribute their thematic roles differently⁵³. They exhibit variation in subject-object assignment; some verbs assign the thematic role Experiencer to the subject position, whereas others assign this role to the object position. The following examples map this arbitrary relationship between grammatical functions and thematic roles in English.

- (19) a. The children fear ghosts.
 Subj DO
 < Experiencer > < Theme >
- b. Ghosts frightened the children.
 Subj DO
 < Theme > < Experiencer >

In English Experiencer verbs do not permit CO to occur after their argument or Direct Object.

- (20) a. *John fears ghosts a big fear.
 Subj DO CO
 < Experiencer > < Theme > < Range >
- b. *Ghosts frightened John a big fright.
 Subj DO CO
 < Theme > < Experiencer > < Range >

Also Experiencer verbs in English do not allow CO to be used as their inner arguments.

- (21) *Arthur feared his kingly fear⁵⁴.

Arabic, on the other hand, allows for CO to occur with Experiencer verbs after their argument whether the thematic role Experiencer is applicable to the subject or the object, as shown in (22a) and (22b), respectively.

- (22) a. watuhibb-uu-nal-maalaubbanjammaa (89: 20)
 Subj DO CO
 < Experiencer > < Theme > < Range >
 'Lit. And love wealth abounding love.'
 And lovewealthwith abounding love(PI)
 And ye love wealthwith inordinate love! (AL)
 Subj DO Adv
 < Experiencer > < Theme > < Manner >

b. ?axaafal-kalbul-walad-axawfanŠadiidaan

Subj DO CO

< Theme > < Experiencer > < Range >

'Lit. The boy feared the dog a great fear.'

'The boy feared the dog greatly.'

Subj DO Adv

< Experiencer > < Theme > < Manner >

In addition, Experiencer verbs in Arabic allow for CO to occur as their inner arguments, contrary to the English example presented in (21).

(23) kallaalaw ta9lam-uu-na9ilma l-yaqiini(102: 5)

Subj CO

< Experiencer > < Range >

'Lit: Nay, would that you know a sure knowledge.'

Nay, would that ye knew (now) with a sure knowledge(PI)

Nay, were ye to know with certainty of mind(AL)

Subj Adv

< Experiencer > < Instrument >

The data in (22ab) and (23) show that adding CO to Experiencer verbs in Arabic results in one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy. This is contrasted to the data presented in (20) and (21) that the CO in English does not occur with Experiencer verbs.

It is clear that when the English is unable to provide CO with Experiencer verbs due to the semantic constraints imposed by the Predicate, it resorts either to Manner Adverb in (22b) or Cognate Prepositional Phrase in (22a) and (23). Typologically, it is noteworthy that English uses two types of Cognate Prepositional Phrase: Manner Cognate Object Prepositional Phrase in (22a-AL) and Instrumental Cognate Prepositional Phrase in (23PI and AL).

After discussing Unergative and Unaccusative verbs and their relations with CO constructions, one can reach the following lexical semantic generalizations. First, the asymmetry between the Unergative and Unaccusative verbs in accepting CO in English is often related to the D-structure of the two types; the complement position is empty in (24a), whereas it is filled in (24b) because the train is driven by someone, hence it does not accept CO.

(24) a. Unergative: NP [_{VP} V] (Mary laughed)

b. Unaccusative: [_{VP} V NP] (The train arrived)

- < Patient > < Range >
 and ye conceived an evil thought(AL)
 Subj DO
 < Patient > < Theme >
- b. waqul-naqawlan ma9ruufaa (44: 36)
 Subj CO
 < Agent > < Range >
 but tuttercustomary speech(PI)
 Subj DO
 < Agent > < Theme >
 but speakyea speech (that is) just(AL)
 Subj CO
 < Agent > < Theme >
- c. faquulaalahugawlanlayyinaan (20: 44)
 Subj CO
 < Agent > < Range >
 And speak unto him a gentle word(PI)
 Subj DO
 < Agent > < Theme >
 But speak to him mildly(AL)
 SubjAdv
 < Agent > < Manner >

A typological analysis of the examples presented in (26) shows that Arabic has one Grammatical Function Pattern, but two Thematic Role Hierarchies when CO is used as Arg2 of a two-place predicate. TL language uses different typology to indemnify these grammatical and semantic structures in the SL. Three linguistic devices are used. First, CO is used, however, this use is constrained; the translator turns the transitive Arabic verbs 'Zana' and 'qaala' into optionally transitive English verbs 'think' and 'speak', to allow CO constructions 'an evil thought' and 'a speech (that is) just' to occur, as shown in (26a-PI) and (26b-AL), respectively.

Second, when a two-place predicate is used in English, a Direct Object instead of the CO is used in Arabic, as in (26a-AL, 26bc-PI). The third linguistic device is Manner Adverb with the thematic role Manner as exempli-

fied in (26c-AL). The use of these devices by the TL results in three different Grammatical Function Patterns, but four Thematic Role Hierarchies.

7.2 Inner argument and cognate object co-occurrence

Two-place predicates have two arguments; an external argument (Arg1) as their subject and an internal argument (Arg2) as their object. Newson et al. divide these arguments into two types; an Agent subject and Patient object, and an Experiencer subject and Theme object as shown below⁵⁸.

- (27) a. Same sawed the wood⁵⁹.
 Subj DO
 < Agent > < Patient >
- b. Samsaw the wood
 Subj DO
 < Experiencer > < Theme >

In English CO cannot co-occur after Direct Object (Arg2) as additional Direct Object (Arg3)^{60, 61}. This is illustrated in (28).

- (28) *Max is telling a joke a tale⁶².

If we add CO after Arg2, the examples presented in (27), the resulting structures will be both syntactically and semantically unacceptable.

- (29) *Same sawed the wood a good saw.
 Subj DO CO
 < Agent > < Patient > < Range >
- *Samsaw the wood a close seeing.
 Subj DO CO
 < Experiencer > < Theme > < Range >

English two-place predicates do not permit Arg2-CO co-occurrence. In (29) CO does not occur because the object position is already occupied by a noun phrase as Arg2. This is expressed by the underlying argument structure in (30).

- (30) Two-place predicate: NP_{Arg1} [VP V NP_{Arg2}](Same sawed the wood)

However, Arabic allows for CO to come after Arg2 of two-place predicates. According to de Swart, COs in Arabic can be "found with verbs that normally take only one direct complement, i.e. transitive verbs"⁶³. Such licensing inspires us to start a typology of the permitted CO thematic role

hierarchies of the two-place predicates in Arabic and their corresponding ones in English translation.

Agent > Theme > Range

- (31) a. warattill-qur?aanatartiilaa (74: 4)
 Subj DO CO
 < Agent > < Theme > < Range >
 and chantthe Qur'anin measure(PI)
 and recitethe Qur'anin slow, measured rhythmic tones(AL)
 Subj DO Adv
 < Agent > < Theme > < Manner >
- b. wa9add-a-hum9addaa (19: 94)
 Subj DO CO
 < Agent > < Theme > < Range >
 (He) and numberethemwith (right) numbering(PI)
 Subj DO Adv
 < Agent > < Theme > < Instrument >
 And(He) hath numberedthem (all) exactly(AL)
 Subj DO Adv
 < Agent > < Theme > < Manner >

Agent > Patient > Range

- (32) a. fadammar-naa-haatadmiiraa (25: 36)
 Subj DO CO
 < Agent > < Patient > < Range >
 Then We destroyed them, a complete destruction (PI)
 Subj DO CO
 < Agent > < Theme > < Range >
We destroyed with utter destruction(AL)
 Subj Adv
 < Agent > < Instrument >
- b. fa-yu-9äðibu-hum9aäaaban ?aliimaan (4:173)
 Subj DO CO
 < Agent > < Patient > < Range >
them will He punish with a painful doom(PI)

DO Subj Adv
 < Patient > < Agent > < Manner >
He will punish with a grievous penalty(AL)
 Subj Adv
 < Agent > < Manner >

Source > Goal > Range

(33) kallamal-llaahumuusaatakliimaa (5: 146)

Subj DO CO
 < Source > < Goal > < Range >
 andAllahspakedirectlyunto Moses (PI)
 Subj Adv Adv
 < Source > < Manner > < Goal >
 andto MosesAllahspokedirect(AL)
 Adv Subj Adv
 < Goal > < Source > < Manner >

From (31), (32) and (33) one can say that Arabic has the typology: one Grammatical Function Pattern, but three Thematic Role Hierarchies. All the examples show that CO is incompatible with Direct Object in English⁶⁴. To fill this gap, English resorts to three syntactic devices. First, it uses the Prepositional Phrase, which is classified into two types, Instrumental Cognate Prepositional Phrase in (31b-PI), (32a-AL), and Manner Prepositional Phrase in (32b-PI and AL). Second, CO is used, however it is separated by a comma to be grammatically correct since it is used with the two-place predicate 'destroy', as in (32a-PI). This might be called Separated Cognate Object. Ogata argues that since COs are not targeted by the verb, they can be separated by inserting punctuation marks, such as commas, colons, or dashes⁶⁵. Third, Manner Adverb is used in (31ab-AL) and (33PI and AL). Such structural adjustments used by the TL lead to the appearance of five Grammatical Function Patterns, but eight Thematic Role Hierarchies in English translation.

7.3 Cognate object and multiple inner arguments

Multiple complement verbs are three-place predicates that have two inner arguments and an external one as their subject. Following Newsonet.al, multiple complement verbs are divided into three types according to their thematic role structure: Verbs of placement, Prepositional argument verbs and Verbs of two DP complements⁶⁶.

7.3.1 Verbs of placement

In English, Verbs of placement can have three arguments; one external as a subject, and two internal as complements⁶⁷. These verbs exhibit the syntactic and semantic structures presented in (34).

- (34) Steve stored the books in the closet.

Subj DO Adv
< Agent > < Theme > < Location >

Verbs of placement cannot take a CO.

- (35) *Steve stored the books in the closet a good storing.

Subj DO Adv CO
< Agent > < Theme > < Location > < Range >

It is evident that the Verb of placement 'stored' has up to two inner arguments only. As a result, the thematic role hierarchy *Agent > Theme > Location > Range* is not permitted. Thus the degree of the predicate determines the occurrence of the CO in English.

In Arabic, on the other hand, CO is permitted with Verbs of placement as three-place predicates.

- (36) xazzan-azayd inl-kutub afi S-Sanduuq itaxziinan mutqanan

Subj DO Adv CO
< Agent > < Theme > < Location > < Range >

'Lit. Zayd stored the books in the box a perfect storing.'

'Zayd stored the books in the box perfectly.'

Subj DO Adv Adv
< Theme > < Location > < Manner >

'Zayd stored the books in the box a perfect way.'

Subj DO Adv Adv
< Agent > < Theme > < Location > < Manner >

In (36) Arabic exhibits one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy when Verbs of placement accept CO. English makes up for CO constructions with Verbs of placement in Arabic using two syntactic devices: Manner Adverb and Manner Prepositional Phrase. This allows for one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy, which are different from Arabic ones.

7.3.2 Verbs of prepositional arguments

The second semantic type of multiple complement verbs is the Verbs of prepositional arguments. Inspecting our data, it has been found that these verbs can be further divided into Verbs of one prepositional argument (found in English and Arabic) and Verbs of two prepositional arguments (found only in Arabic).

7.3.2.1 Verbs of one prepositional argument

Verbs of one prepositional argument have two inner arguments one of them is a prepositional phrase. They exhibit one Grammatical Function Pattern, but two Thematic Role Hierarchies.

- (37) a. John sent a gift to Suzy
 Subj DO IO
 < Source > < Theme > < Goal >
- b. Kent knitted a glove for Tom.
 Subj DO IO
 < Agent > < Theme > < Beneficiary >

In English, Verbs of one prepositional argument cannot occur with CO constructions as exemplified in (35)

- (38) a. *John sent a gift to Suzy good sending.
 Subj DO IO CO
 < Source > < Theme > < Goal > < Range >
- b. *Kent knitted a glove for Tom perfect knitting.
 Subj DO IO CO
 < Agent > < Theme > < Beneficiary > < Range >

On the contrary, Verbs of one prepositional argument co-occur with CO constructions in Arabic.

- (39) a. ?inna anah nunazzalnaa 9aly-kal-qur?aanatanziilaa (76: 23)
 Subj IO DO CO
 < Source > < Goal > < Theme > < Range >
-We, have revealed unto thee the Qur'an, a revelation (PI)
 Subj IO DO CO
 < Source > < Goal > < Theme > < Range >

It is We Who have sent down the Qur'anto theeby stages(AL)

Subj IO DO Adv

< Source > < Goal > < Theme > < Manner >

b. wa9araD-naajahannamayawma?iðinlil-kaafiriina9arDaa (18: 100)

Subj DO IO CO

< Theme > < Beneficiary > < Range >

On that day we shall present hellto the disbelievers, plain to view (PI)

Subj DO IO Disj

< Agent > < Theme > < Beneficiary > < Attribute >

... We shall present Hell ...for Unbelievers to see, all spread out(AL)

Subj DO IO Disj

< Agent > < Theme > < Beneficiary > < Attribute >

Examining the pattern in (36) shows that CO occur Verbs of one prepositional argument in Arabic, resulting in two Thematic Role Hierarchies represented by two Grammatical Function Patterns. However, English behaves differently as a TL. In (39a-PI) CO is used, however separated by a comma, because English does not allow for CO construction to modify two-place predicates of one prepositional argument. In (39a-AL) the translator uses Manner Prepositional Phrase to express this adverbial function. In (39b) the grammatical function Disjunct is used. Disjunct "refers to the expression of the speaker's stance or attribute to what is saying"⁶⁸. The thematic role expressed by the Disjunct is Attribute⁶⁹. Compared to Arabic, English uses two Grammatical Function Patterns, but three Thematic Role Hierarchies.

7.3.2.2 Verbs of two prepositional arguments

Verbs of two prepositional arguments are a special type of Verbs of prepositional arguments that is found in Arabic but not in English. These verbs have two prepositional complements as inner arguments and accept CO constructions as exemplified in (40).

(30) wa-na-muddula-humin l-9aðaabimaddaa (19: 79)

Subj IO DO CO

< Patient > < Theme > < Range >

And prolong for him a span of torment (PI)

Subj IO DO

< Agent > < Patient > < Theme >

and We shall add and add to his punishment (AL)

Subj	Predicator	Adv
< Theme >	< ϕ >	< Theme >

Adding CO to the Arabic verb results in one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy. In the translation presented in (40PI) CO is not mentioned in the TL. This shows that sometimes CO can be left out in English as *in he smiled a happy smile and he smiled*⁷⁰. In the second translation presented in (40AL) CO is rendered as an additional coordinated VP that has the grammatical function Predicator⁷¹ and the thematic role?. This can be called Cognate Verb Phrase since the verb add is morphologically related to the preceding verb. Thus English uses two Grammatical Function Patterns and two Thematic Role Hierarchies, as opposed to Arabic.

7.3.3 Verbs of two DP complements

The third type of multiple complement verbs is Verbs of two DP complements. These three-place predicates include two nominal inner arguments.

- (41) a. Thomas sent Linda the present.

Subj	IO	DO
< Agent >	< Goal >	< Theme >

- b. Tony knitted Gray a jacket.

Subj	IO	DO
< Agent >	< Beneficiary >	< Theme >

Verbs of two DP complements in English cannot take CO.

- (42) a. *Thomas sent Linda the present an early sending.

Subj	IO	DO	CO
< Agent >	< Goal >	< Theme >	< Range >

- b. *Tony knitted Gray trouser sa perfect knitting.

Subj	IO	DO	CO
< Agent >	< eneficiary >	< Theme >	< Range >

In Arabic, CO is permitted with Verbs of two DP complements.

- (43) a. ?arsalabasimun Sadiiqahuxi Taaban? irsaalan sarii9an

Subj	IO	DO	CO
< Goal >	< Theme >	< Range >	

'Salim sent his friend a letter quickly.'

'Salim sent his friend a letter in a quick way.'

Subj IO DO Adv

< Goal > < Theme > < Manner >

- b. xaaTasalimunSadiiqa-huqamiiSanxiyaaTatanjayyidatan

Subj IO DO CO

< Agent > < Beneficiary > < Theme > < Range >

'Salim sewed his frienda shirtperfectly.'

'Salim sewed his frienda shirtin a perfect way.'

Subj IO DO Adv

< Agent > < Goal > < Theme > < Manner >

Adding CO to Arabic DP complement verbs results in one Grammatical Function Patterns, but two Thematic Role Hierarchies. It is clear from the renderings in (43) that the TL uses two adverbials: Manner Adverb and Manner Prepositional Phraseto express CO in Arabic. This adjustment results in one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy.

7.4 Cognate object as a second argument

CO does not occur with multiple complement verbs in English as a second complement. That is CO cannot replace Arg2 in three-place predicate constructions.

- (44) a. *Ann sent Krisa sending

Subj IO CO

< Agent > < Goal > < Range >

- b. *Susan stored the potatoesa good storing

Subj DO CO

< Agent > < Theme > < Range >

- c. *Tom gave Johna precious giving.

Subj IO CO

< Agent > < Beneficiary > < Range >

Arabic, on the other hand, allows CO to occur with multiple complement verbs as an inner Arg2 of a three-place predicate. As a result, two Grammatical Function Patterns, but three Thematic Role Hierarchies are created. Examples (45), (46) and (47) are illustrative of this typology.

Agent > Goal > Range

- (45) fa?axað-naa-hu?xðanwabiilaa (73: 16)

Subj DO CO

< Agent > < Goal > < Range >

Whereupon We seized him with no gentle grip (PI)

So We seize dhimwith a heavy Punishment (AL)

Subj DO Adv

< Agent > < Goal > < Instrument >

In (45) the translators do not use the CO in the TL because the predicate seize does not allow for the use of CO, instead Instrumental Prepositional Phrases *with no gentle grip* and *with a heavy punishment* are used. The result is one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy.

Experiencer > Theme > Range

(46) Z-ZZaan-ii-nabi-IlaahiZannaS-SSaw?i(48: 12)

Subj Adv CO

< Experiencer > < Theme > < Range >

who think an evil thought concerning Allah (PI)

Subj CO Adv

< Experiencer > < Range > < Theme >

who imagine an evil opinion of Allah (AL)

Subj DO Adv

< Experiencer > < Theme > < Theme >

To achieve similarity to Arabic CO, TL uses one-place predicate (an optionally transitive verb) *think* (used intransitively) instead of the Arabic transitive verb Zana 'think' to allow the use of the CO to occur in (46PI). Moreover, in (46YA) TL manipulates Direct Object an evil *opinion* instead of CO since there is a shift from Arabic transitive verb Zana 'think' to the English transitive verb imagine.

Agent > Beneficiary > Range

(47) li-yu-dxilanna-hummudxalanyarDawnahu (23: 59)

Subj DO CO

< Agent > < Beneficiary > < Range >

...He will cause them to enterby an entry that they will love (PI)

Subj DO Adv

< Agent > < Beneficiary > < Location >

... He will admit them to a placewith which they shall be well pleased (AL)

Subj DO Adv

< Agent > < Beneficiary > < Location >

TL replaces CO with two types of Prepositional Phrases" Locative

translations, as a target language (TL), this study has offered two typological classifications: a typology of the Grammatical Function Patterns and Thematic Role Hierarchies that result when CO is added to different structures in Arabic, and a typology of the linguistic devices that English uses to replace CO, and the resulting Grammatical Function Patterns and Thematic Role Hierarchies.

The relation between CO and Agentivity is fully explained. Unergative verbs, similar to Arabic ones, accept CO and in both languages, the resulting Grammatical Function Pattern and Thematic Role Hierarchy are the same. Unaccusative verbs are classified, according to their relation with the CO, into Theme verbs, Experiencer verbs, and Patient verbs. Theme verbs do not accept CO. When Arabic Theme verbs accept CO, one Grammatical Function Pattern, but two Thematic Role Hierarchies result. TL, on the other hand, uses Manner Adverb instead of the CO, resulting in one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy. The second category of Agentive verbs is Patient verbs. These verbs do not take CO in English. On the contrary, Arabic Patient verbs accept CO, and the result is one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy. English uses Manner Adverb to express this adverbial function instead of the CO. Again one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy result. The third category is the Experiencer verbs. In English these verbs do not accept CO. On the other hand, adding CO to Arabic Experiencer verbs results in one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy. TL uses three different linguistic devices: Manner Adverb, Instrumental Cognate Prepositional Phrase, and Manner Cognate Object Prepositional Phrase. This modification results in one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy.

The relationship between CO and the Degree of predicate has been explained. First, CO cannot occur in English as Arg1 with two-place predicates. On the other hand, Arabic two-place predicates accept CO as their Arg1. This leads to the appearance of one Grammatical Function Pattern, but two Thematic Role Hierarchies. It has been found that English manipulates three linguistic devices: CO is used, similar to Arabic, but the TL turns the Arabic intransitive verb into optionally intransitive verb to accept the CO. The second device is the Direct Object instead of CO. English uses the grammatical device Manner Adverb in place of Arabic CO. Such modifications result in two Grammatical Function Patterns, but four Thematic Role Hierarchies.

Secondly, the possibility of CO occurrence after Arg2 with two-place predicates has been examined. When we add CO after Arg2 in English, the result is ill-formed syntactic and odd semantic structures. This shows that the occurrence of Arg1 in English blocks the occurrence of CO with two-place

predicates. This might be called Arg2-CO co-occurrence constraint. Arabic, on the other hand, uses CO with Arg2. This results in the typology: one Grammatical Function Pattern, but three Thematic Role Hierarchies. TL uses different compensational devices: Instrumental Prepositional Phrase, Cognate Prepositional Phrase, Manner Prepositional Phrase, Separated Cognate Object, and Manner Adverb instead of CO. This results in four Grammatical Function Patterns and four Thematic Role Hierarchies. Thirdly, the relation between CO and multiple inner argument verbs (three-place predicates) has been analyzed. This category of verbs areclassified into three subcategories. First, Verbs of placement do not accept CO in English. Arabic Verbs of placement, on the other hand, accept CO and the result is one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy. CO is expressed in the TL by both Manner Adverb and Manner Prepositional Phrase. Using these two linguistic devices results in one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy.

The second subcategory is verbs of prepositional arguments, which are further divided into two sub-subcategories: Verbs of one prepositional argument and Verbs of two prepositional arguments. The first sub-subcategory is found in English and does not allow for CO to occur. When Arabic Verbs of one prepositional argument accept CO, three Grammatical Function Patterns and three Thematic Role Hierarchies result. The compensational devices used by the TL are Separated Cognate Object, Manner Prepositional Phrase, and Disjunct. The second sub-subcategory, Verbs of two prepositional arguments, is found only in Arabic. This category accepts CO and the result is two Grammatical Function Patterns and two Thematic Role Hierarchies. TL uses two different linguistic devices instead of the CO: Omission of CO, and Cognate Verb Phrase, leading to the appearance of two Grammatical Function Patterns and two Thematic Role Hierarchies. The third main category of the multiple complement verbs is Verbs of two DP complements. These verbs do not allow for CO to occur in English. Arabic Verbs of two DP complements, on the other hand, accept CO. This results in one Grammatical Function Pattern, but two Thematic Role Hierarchies. In English, CO is expressed either through Manner Adverb or Manner Prepositional Phrase. As a result, one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy appear.

Also, this study has discussed the occurrence of CO as Arg2 with multiple complement verbs. Adding CO as Arg2 of multiple complement verbs in English results in unacceptable syntactic and semantic structures. Three-place predicates in Arabic accept CO as Arg2 and the result is two Grammatical Function Patterns, but three Thematic Role Hierarchies. TL replicates this by using CO, Instrumental Prepositional Phrase, Locative Cognate

Prepositional Phrase, and Locative Prepositional Phrase. Accordingly, two Grammatical Function Patterns, but four Thematic Role Hierarchies are manipulated.

The last section in the study has dealt with the relation between CO and the Patient role in passive constructions in both languages. CO is not possible with passive verbs in English. Arabic, on the other hand, allows for CO to come with passive verbs. This results in one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy. It has been found that six linguistic devices are used by TL: Omission (or zero realization), Separated Cognate Object, Manner Adverb, Result Prepositional Phrase, Manner Prepositional Phrase, and Instrumental Cognate Prepositional Phrase. Such structural changes resulted in three Grammatical Function Patterns, but five Thematic Role Hierarchies.

Finally, one can reach the following conclusions: First, the only case in which English and Arabic are similar in using CO with verbs is the Unergative verbs because these verbs are one-place predicates, and the agentive subject is self-generated enough to carry the action represented by the verb. Secondly, Arabic makes extensive use of COs to express manner adverbial modification compared to English conservative nature to COs. When English does not find CO constructions at its disposal, it resorts to several compensational linguistic devices. Above all, when English ventures to use CO, similar to Arabic, it either turns the Arabic transitive verb into an optionally transitive verb, or separates the CO by a comma from the transitive construction. Most importantly, when there is an impossibility of using CO, English does not hesitate to drop it. Thus, Arabic can be classified as a CO language, whereas English cannot. The lexical-semantic restrictions imposed on the English make this construction exotic both to the English language and its speakers. While English frowns at the CO and considers it redundant, Arabic welcomes it wholeheartedly and regards it as an integral part of its style.

Finally, the lexical entry of the verb determines the occurrence of CO in English. Hence, the occurrence of CO is restricted semantically but not syntactically as in Arabic. These findings might lead one to claim that the restrictions on English CO do not necessarily carry over to Arabic and the occurrence of Cognate Object is a matter of language-specific lexical-semantic idiosyncrasy.

Endnotes

- 1 - Mria-Luisa Zubizarreta, *Levels of Representation in Lexicon and in Syntax* (Dordrecht: Foris, 1987).
- 2 - Michael Jones, *Cognate Objects and the Case Filter*, *Journal of Linguistics* 24 (1988).

- 3 - TalkeMacfarland, *Cognate Objects and the Argument/Adjunct Distinction in English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1995.
- 4 - Hoa Pham, "Cognate Objects in Vietnamese Transitive Verbs," *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 17 (1998).
- 5 - Anita Mittwoch, "Cognate Objects as Reflections of Davisonian Event Arguments," ed. Susan Rothstein, *Events and Grammar* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998).
- 6 - Will Oxford, "A Classifier Analysis of Direct Object Doubling," eds. Carla Dunphy, and Will Oxford. *MUN Occasional Student Papers in Linguistics* 1, (St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland, 2008) 22.
- 7 - Asya Pereltsvaig, "Cognate Objects in Modern and Biblical Hebrew," eds. Jamal Ouhalla, and Ur Shlonsky. *Themes in Arabic and Hebrew Syntax* (Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002) 107.
- 8 - Laurel Brinton, "Attitudes Towards Increasing Segmentalization: Complex and Phrasal Verbs in English," *Journal of English Linguistics* 24.3 (1996): 187.
- 9 - Takafumi Ogata, "Cognate Objects as Categorical Expressions," *Journal of ChikushiJogakuen University and Junior College* 3 (2008) 2.
- 10 - Ibid., 2.
- 11 - Michael Jones, op. cit., 89.
- 12 - Wolfdieterich Fischer, *A Grammar of Classical Arabic* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2002) 376.
- 13 - Barbara Johnstone, *Repetition in Arabic Discourse: Paradigms, Syntagms and the Ecology of Language* (John Benjamins: Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1991) 63.
- 14 - Abbas Hasan, Al-NaHw Al-Waafii, [The Comprehensive Grammar], 4vols., 4th ed. (Cairo: Daar Al-Ma'aarif, 1973) Vol. 2. 206-7.
- 15 - Baha-EddinIbn Aqil, SharhIbn Aqil, [Explaining Ibn Aqil], 4 Vols., 20th ed., Verified by M. Abdul-Hamid (Cairo: Daar Turaath, 1980) 169.
- 16 - Faruk Abu-Chacra. *Arabic: An Essential Grammar* (London: Routledge, 2007) 302.
- 17 - Barbara Johnstone, op. cit.
- 18 - Faruk Abu-Chacra, op. cit., 302.
- 19 - John Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).
- 20 - Jean-Paul Vinay, and Jean Darbelnet, *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for translation*, trans. Juan Sagar, and Michael Hamel (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995).
- 21 - Peter Newmark, *A textbook of Translation* (London: Longman, 1988).
- 22 - Ibid.
- 23 - Eugene Nida, *Language structure and translation* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1975).
- 24 - Roger Bell, *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice* (London: Longman, 1991).
- 25 - Aladdin Al-Khrabsheh and Bakri Al-Azzam, "Translating the Invisible in the Qur'an," *Babel* 54.1(2008).
- 26 - Andrew Chesterman, *Memes of Translation* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1997) 2.

- 27 - Juliane House, Translation (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) 15.
- 28 - Kirsten Malmkjar, ed. The Linguistic Encyclopedia (Routledge, 2004).
- 29 - Charles Fillmore, "The Case for Case," eds. Emmon Bach, and Robert Harms. Universals in Linguistic Theory (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968).
- 30 - Michael Halliday, "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English," Journal of Linguistics 3.1 (1967).
- 31 - Muhyi-Eddin Darwish, 'i9raab Al-Quran Al-Karimwa Bayanuh, [Parsing of the Holy Quran and its Rhetoric], 4 Vols., 7th ed. (Beirut: Al-Yamamah Publishing Co, 1999).
- 32 - Marmaduke, Pickthall, The Meaning of the Glorious Quran, (London: A. A. Knoph, 1930).
- 33 - Yusuf Ali, The Holy Quran: Translation and Commentary (Lahore, Pakistan: Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, 1934).
- 34 - Abdur Rahim Kidwai, A Survey of English Translations of the Quran. The Muslim World Book Review 7.4 (1987).
- 35 - Mria-Luisa Zubizarreta, Levels of Representation in Lexicon and in Syntax (Dordrecht: Foris, 1987).
- 36 - Friederike Moltmann, "Nominal clausal event predicates," Papers from the 25th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, ed. Caroline Wiltshire, Randolph Graczyk, and Bradley Music (Chicago Linguistic Society, 1989).
- 37 - Mria-Luisa Zubizarreta, op. cit.
- 38 - Diane Massam, "Cognate Objects as Thematic Objects," Canadian Journal of Linguistics 35.2 (1990).
- 39 - Samir Khalaily, One syntax for all categories: Merging nominal atoms in multiple adjunction structures. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Leiden University, 1997.
- 40 - Ibid.
- 41 - Bet Levin, English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1993).
- 42 - Bet Levin, op. cit.
- 43 - Izchak Schlesinger, "Cognitive Structure and Semantic Deep Structure: The Case of the Instrumental," Journal of Linguistics 15.2 (2007): 31.
- 44 - Ibid., 316.
- 45 - Bet Levin, op. cit.
- 46 - James Pustejovsky, Lexical Shadowing and Argument Closure," eds. Yael Ravin and Claudia Leacock. Polysemy: Theoretical and Computational Approaches (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000).
- 47 - Mark Newson, Dàniel Pap, Gabriella T?th, KrisztinaSzécsényi, Marianna Hord?s, and Veronika Vincze. Basic English Syntax with Exercises. (B?lcsész Konzorcium: Minden jogfenntartva, 2006).
- 48 - Ibid., 158.
- 49 - Bet Levin, op. cit.
- 50 - Will Oxford, op. cit., 22.
- 51 - Ibid.

- 52 - Mark Newson, Dániel Pap, Gabriella Tóth, KrisztinaSzécsényi, Marianna Hordós, and VeronikaVincze, op.cit.
- 53 - Ian Roberts, *Diachronic Syntax* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007).
- 54 - Anita Mittwoch, op. cit., 243.
- 55 - James Hurford, and Brendan Heasley, *Semantics: A Coursebook*. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983) 47.
- 56 - Takafumi Ogata, op. cit.
- 57 - Ibid., 1-2.
- 58 - Mark Newson, Dániel Pap, Gabriella Tóth, KrisztinaSzécsényi, Marianna Hordós, and VeronikaVincze, op. cit.
- 59 - Ibid., 172.
- 60 - Diane Massam, op. cit.
- 61 - Petrusde Swart, *Cross-Linguistic Variation in Object Marking*, (The Netherlands: LOT, 2007).
- 62 - Ibid., 37.
- 63 - Ibid., 16.
- 64 - Diane Massam, op. cit.
- 65 - Takafumi Ogata, op. cit., 1-2.
- 66 - Mark Newson, Dániel Pap, Gabriella Tóth, KrisztinaSzécsényi, Marianna Hordós, and VeronikaVincze, op. cit.
- 67 - Ibid.
- 68 - Howard Jackson, *Analyzing English: An Introduction to Sentence Description*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982) 80.
- 69 - Mark Newson, Dániel Pap, Gabriella Tóth, KrisztinaSzécsényi, Marianna Hordós, and VeronikaVincze, op. cit.
- 70 - Takafumi Ogata, op. cit.
- 71 - Thomas Linda, *Beginning Syntax* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1993).
- 72 - Bet Levin, op. cit.
- 73 - AsyaPereltsvaig, op. cit.
- 74 - Wolfdieterich Fischer, op. cit., 376.
- 75 - Eugene Nida, *Towards a Science of Translating* (Leidn: E. J. Brill, 1964) 228.

Works Cited

- Abu-Chacra, Faruk. *Arabic: An Essential Grammar*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Ahmed, Zahoor. *Essentials of Arabic Grammar for Learning Quranic Language*. Islamabad: Darusslam Publishers and Distributors, 2008.
- Al-Khrabsheh, Aladdin and Bakri Al-Azzam. "Translating the Invisible in the Qur'an." *Babel* 54.1(2008): 1-18.
- Ali, Yusuf. *The Holy Quran: Translation and Commentary*. Lahore, Pakistan: Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, 1934.
- Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Bary, Corien, and Peter de Swart. "Additional Accusatives in Latin and Ancient Greek: Arguments Against Arguments." Ed. Judith Gervain. *Proceedings of the Tenth ESSLI Student Session* 8-19 Aug. UK: Edinburgh, 2005. 12-24.
- Bell, Roger. *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman, 1991.
- Brinton, Laurel. "Attitudes Towards Increasing Segmentalization: Complex and Phrasal Verbs in English." *Journal of English Linguistics* 24.3 (1996): 186-205.
- Catford, John. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Chesterman, Andrew. *Memes of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1997.
- Darwish, Muhyi-Eddin. *'Iraab Al-Quran Al-Karim wa Bayanuh. [Parsing of the Holy Quran and its Rhetoric]*. 4 Vols. 7th ed. Beirut: Al-Yamamah Publishing Co, 1999.
- Filmore, Charles. "The Case for Case." Eds. Emmon Bach, and Robert Harms. *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968. 1-88.
- Fischer, Wolf Dieterich. *A Grammar of Classical Arabic*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Halliday, Michael. "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English." *Journal of Linguistics* 3.1 (1967): 37-81.
- Hasan, Abbas. *Al-Nahw Al-Waafii. [The Comprehensive Grammar]*. 4 vols. 4th ed. Cairo: Daar Al-Ma'aarif. 1973. Vol. 2.
- House, Juliane. *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

- Hurford, James, and Brendan Heasley. *Semantics: A Coursebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- IbnAqil, Baha-Eddin. *SharhIbnAqil. [Explaining IbnAqil]*. 4vols. 20th ed. Verified by M. Abdul-Hamid. Cairo: DaarTuraath, 1980.
- Jackson, Howard. *Analyzing English: An Introduction to Sentence Description*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982.
- Johnstone, Barbara. *Repetition in Arabic Discourse: Paradigms, Syntagms and the Ecology of Language*. John Benjamines: Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1991.
- Jones, Michael. "Cognate Objects and the Case Filter". *Journal of Linguistics* 24 (1988): 89-111.
- Kidwai, Abdur Rahim. "A Survey of English Translations of the Quran". *The Muslim World Book Review*, 7.4 (1987): 66-71.
- Khalaily, Samir. "One syntax for all categories: Merging nominal atoms in multiple adjunction structures". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Leiden University, 1997.
- Levin, Bet. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Macfarland, Talke. "Cognate Objects and the Argument/Adjunct Distinction in English". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1995.
- Malmkjar, Kirsten, ed. *The Linguistic Encyclopedia*. Routledge, 2004.
- Massam, Diane. "Cognate Objects as Thematic Objects." *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 35.2 (1990): 161-190.
- Mittwoch, Anita. "Cognate Objects as Reflections of Davisonian Event Arguments." Ed. Susan Rothstein. *Events and Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998. 309-332.
- Moltmann, Friederike. "Nominal clausal event predicates." Papers from the 25th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Ed. Caroline Wiltshire, Randolph Graczyk, and Bradley Music. Chicago Linguistic Society, (1989): 300-314.
- Newmark, Peter. *A textbook of Translation*. London: Longman, 1988.
- Newson, Mark, Dániel Pap, Gabriella Tóth, Krisztina Szécsényi, Marianna Hordós, and Veronika Vincze. *Basic English Syntax with Exercises*. BÖlcsész Konzorcium: Minden jogfenntartva, 2006.
- Nida, Eugene. *Language Structure and Translation*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1975.

- . *Towards a Science of Translating* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.
- Ogata, Takafumi. "Cognate Objects as Categorical Expressions." *Journal of ChikushiJogakuen University and Junior College*3 (2008): 1-14.
- Oxford, Will. "A Classifier Analysis of Direct Object Doubling." Eds. Carla Dunphy, and Will Oxford. *MUN Occasional Student Papers in Linguistics* 1. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland, 2008. 19-35.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya. "Cognate Objects in Modern and Biblical Hebrew." Eds. Jamal Ouhalla, and Ur Shlonsky. *Themes in Arabic and Hebrew Syntax*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002. 107-136.
- . "Cognate Objects in Russian: Is the Notion 'Cognate' Relevant for Syntax." *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 44.3 (1999): 267-291.
- Pham, Hoa. "Cognate Objects in Vietnamese Transitive Verbs." *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 17 (1998): 227-246.
- Pickthall, Marmaduke. *The Meaning of the Glorious Quran*. London: A. A. Knoph, 1930.
- Pustejovsky, James. "Lexical Shadowing and Argument Closure." Eds. Yael Ravin and Claudia Leacock. *Polysemy: Theoretical and Computational Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 68-90.
- Roberts, Ian. *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Schlesinger, Izchak. "Cognitive Structure and Semantic Deep Structure: The Case of the Instrumental." *Journal of Linguistics* 15.2 (2007): 307-24.
- Simpson, Jane. *Warlpiri Morpho-Syntax. A Lexical Approach*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991.
- de Swart, Petrus. *Cross-Linguistic Variation in Object Marking. The Netherlands: LOT*, 2007.
- Thomas, Linda. *Beginning Syntax*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1993.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for translation*. Trans. Juan Sagar, and Michael Hamel. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.
- Zubizarreta, Mria-Luisa. *Levels of Representation in Lexicon and in Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1987.

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 Emphatic	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

Adv: Adverbial
AL: Ali
Arg: Argument
D: Deep
Disj: Disjunct
DO: Direct Object
DP: Determiner Phrase
IO: Indirect Object
MA: Manner Adverb
NP: Noun Phrase
PI: Pickthall
PP: Prepositional Phrase
V: Verb
VP: Verb Phrase
Subj: Subject

مجلة العلوم الاجتماعية

فصلية - أكاديمية - محكمة

تصدر عن مجلس النشر العلمي - جامعة الكويت

تعنى بنشر الأبحاث والدراسات في تخصصات السياسة والاقتصاد والاجتماع والخدمة الاجتماعية وعلم النفس والأنثروبولوجيا الاجتماعية والجغرافيا وعلوم المكتبات والمعلومات



رئيس التحرير: هادي مختار أشكناني

توجه جميع المراسلات إلى:

رئيس تحرير مجلة العلوم الاجتماعية

جامعة الكويت

ص.ب 27780 الصفاة، 13055 - الكويت

تليفون: 00965-4810436

فاكس 4836026

E-mail: JSS@kuc01.kuniv.edu.kw

تفتح أبوابها أمام

أوسع مشاركة للباحثين العرب في مجال

العلوم الاجتماعية لنشر البحوث الأصلية

والإسهام في معالجة قضايا مجتمعاتهم

التفاعل الحي مع القارئ المثقف والمهتم

بالقضايا المطروحة.

المقابلات والمناقشات الجادة

ومراجعات الكتب والتقارير.

تؤكد المجلة إلتزامها بالوفاء والانتظام بوصولها في

مواعيدها المحددة إلى جميع قرائها ومشتريها.

الاشتراكات

الدول الأجنبية

الكويت والدول العربية

15 دولاراً

أفراد

3 دنانير سنوياً ويضاف إليها
دينار واحد في الدول العربية

أفراد

60 دولاراً في السنة
110 دولارات لسنتين

مؤسسات

15 ديناراً في السنة
25 ديناراً لمدة سنتين

مؤسسات

تدفع اشتراكات الأفراد مقدماً نقداً أو بشيك باسم المجلة مسجوباً على أحد المصارف الكويتية ويرسل على عنوان المجلة، أو بتحويل مصرفي لحساب مجلة العلوم الاجتماعية رقم 07101685 لدى بنك الخليج في الكويت (فرع العدلية).

Visit our web site: <http://pubcouncil.kuniv.edu.kw/jss>