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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 idiosyncracy.
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Introduction

Cognate Object (CO) constructions in English have received much attention in the linguistic literature 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". Pereltsvaig, for example, defines COs in English as "noun phrases containing a noun which is morphologically related to the verb". Moreover, Brinton maintains that CO in English "is normally preceded by an indefinite article". A third defining characteristic of CO constructions in English is that they "require modification of some kind". The following examples reflect the three above characteristics.

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

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' and 'Cognate
Accusative\textsuperscript{13}. CO in Arabic is basically masdar 'verbal noun' that is derived from the root of the main verb of the sentence\textsuperscript{14}. This post verbal accusative is used to "intensify the action of the verb"\textsuperscript{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"\textsuperscript{16} to provide a vehicle for qualification of the action referred to by the verb\textsuperscript{17}. The following example is illustrative.

(2) rakaDarakDan sari9an\textsuperscript{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'\textsuperscript{19}, 'transposition'\textsuperscript{20}, and 'alteration'\textsuperscript{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 SL\textsuperscript{22}. 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. Nida suggests that "all types of translation involve (1) loss of information, (2) addition of information, and/or (3) skewing of information."\textsuperscript{23} That is, during the process of translation something is lost or gained\textsuperscript{24}. 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 untranslatable\textsuperscript{25}, the present study will explain "how the translator, manipulates the linguistic material in order to produce an appropriate target text"\textsuperscript{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"\textsuperscript{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 predicate. These roles are universal in the languages of the world, 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 verb.

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 Quran. 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: Pickhtal, whose translation of the Quran faithfully sticks to the original, and Ali, who has an excellent English language command.

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. Consider the following examples in which CO is paraphrased by MA.

(3) Heather smiled a pleasant smile.

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).
In Arabic, on the other hand, the expression of manner can be expressed through a CO\textsuperscript{39}.

(4) Darab-a Zayd-un l-Himmar-a Darb-anqawiyy-an\textsuperscript{40}.

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

'Zayd hit the donkey strongly.'

The literal translation \textit{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. \textit{yu-fajiruuna-haatafiiraa} (76: 6)

Subj DO CO (Grammatical functions)

\textit{l-?abraara} making it gush forth abundantly (PI)

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

Subj DO Adv

<Agent> <Patient> <Manner>

b. \textit{fa-quulaala-huqawanllayinan} (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 Phrase\textsuperscript{41}. The following example explains the linguistic phenomenon of Cognate Prepositional Phrase.

(6) Kelly buttered the bread with unsalted butter\textsuperscript{42}.

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 care44.
    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 it with dire punishment (PI)
    Subj   DO  Adv
    < Agent > < Patient > < Instrument >

b.  faʔaxað-naa-humʔaxoʔatanraabiyah (69: 10)
    Subj   DO  CO
    < Agent > < Patient > < Instrument >
    therefore did He grip them with 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 butter45.

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. Pustejovsk-y 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 tried the with (right) a heavy trial (PI)
    Subj  DO  Adv
    < Agent > < Patient > < Instrument >

b.  wa9add-a-hum9adda (19:94)
    He ... and number them with (right) numbering (PI)

c.  fadammar-naa-haadmiira (17:16)
    and We annihilate it with 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 require-
ment 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 Unac-
cusative 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 construc-
tions.

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 morphologi-
cally 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.

    Subj CO
    < Agent > < Range >

Similarly, CO in Arabic occurs with Unergative verbs as in

Subj CO

<Agent> <Range>

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

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 Expereinceverbs. The following subsections explain the lexical entries of these subclassies 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 UnaccusativeTheme 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 noisy arrival.
    Subj Adv CO
    < Theme > < Path > < Range >

    c. *The water settled on the floor 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-rukkanbumin 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. ?istaqarral?aljufawqas-sTHi?istiqraaran 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 state. 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 Adverbinstead 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 differently.\(^{53}\) 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
\(<\text{Experiencer}>\quad <\text{Theme}>\)

b. **Ghosts frightened the children.**
Subj DO
\(<\text{Theme}>\quad <\text{Experiencer}>\)

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
\(<\text{Experiencer}>\quad <\text{Theme}>\quad <\text{Range}>\)

b. *Ghosts frightened John a big fright.*
Subj DO CO
\(<\text{Theme}>\quad <\text{Experiencer}>\quad <\text{Range}>\)

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

(21) *Arthur feared his kingly fear.\(^{54}\)

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. **watulibb-uu-nal-maalubbanjammal** (89: 20)
Subj DO CO
\(<\text{Experiencer}>\quad <\text{Theme}>\quad <\text{Range}>\)
'Lit. And love wealth abounding love.'
And **loewealth with abounding love**(PI)
And ye **love wealth** with inordinate love! (AL)
Subj DO Adv
\(<\text{Experiencer}>\quad <\text{Theme}>\quad <\text{Manner}>\)
b. ?axaafal-kalbul-walad-axawfانŠadiidaan
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)
Second, there is Agentivity distinction between the two categories of verbs; the subject is the Agent in the Unergative verbs, whereas the subject of the Unaccusative verbs is non-Agentive. This leads us to the say that in English the subject of the one-place predicate should have enough self-generation to induce the event denoted by this verb, hence this verb accepts CO. These two semantic constraints are not found in Arabic, hence its Unergative and Unaccusative verbs behave equally towards accepting COs.

7. Cognate object and the degree of predicate

Semantically, the degree of a predicate means the "number of arguments that is normally understood to have in simple sentences". This section will discuss the relation between CO constructions and two-and three-place predicates.

7.1 Cognate object as the first inner argument

In English, CO can occur with one-place predicates (intransitive verbs), as shown in subsection (4.1). These verbs have one external argument (Arg1) which is the subject. However, CO in English cannot occur as the first inner argument (Arg2) or a Direct Object of a two-place predicate (monotransitive verb). Compare the following pair.

(25) a. Thomas killed the mosquitoes.
     Subj          DO
     < Agent > < Patient >

b. *Thomas killed a kill.
     Subj        CO
     < Agent > < Range >

Ogata justifies the impossibility of CO occurrence with two-place predicates as Arg2 (Direct Object) in English as "cognate objects are not targets of activities but additional elements to characterize the activities described by the verb." Hence the thematic hierarchy Agent > Range is blocked in English.

However, in Arabic, two-place predicates allow for CO to occur as their second argument.

(26) a. waZanan-tumZannas-ssaw?i(48: 12)
     Subj        CO
     < Patient > < Range >
     andye did think an evil thought(PI)
     Subj        CO
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. Newsonet.al divide these arguments into two types; an Agent subject and Patient object, and an Experiencer subject and Theme object as shown below.

(27) a. \textit{Same sawed the wood}.
    Subj \hspace{1cm} DO
    \hspace{1cm} < Agent > \hspace{1cm} < Patient >

b. \textit{Samsaw the wood}
    Subj \hspace{1cm} DO
    < Experiencer > \hspace{1cm} < Theme >

In English CO cannot co-occur after Direct Object (Arg2) as additional Direct Object (Arg3). This is illustrated in (28).

(28) *Max is telling a joke a tale.

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

(29) *\textit{Same sawed the wooda good saw.}
    Subj \hspace{1cm} DO \hspace{1cm} CO
    < Agent > \hspace{1cm} < Patient > \hspace{1cm} < Range >

*\textit{Samsawthe wooda close seeing.}
    Subj \hspace{1cm} DO \hspace{1cm} CO
    < Experiencer > \hspace{1cm} < Theme > \hspace{1cm} < 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: \textit{NP}_{\text{Arg1}} [VP \textit{V} NP_{\text{Arg2}}](\textit{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." 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?aanatartiila (74: 4)  
Subj DO CO  
< Agent > < Theme > < Range >  
and chant the Qur’ainin measure (PI)  
and recite the Qur’ainin 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 number them with (right) numbering (PI)  
Subj DO Adv  
< Agent > < Theme > < Instrument >  
And (He) hath numbered them (all) exactly (AL)  
Subj DO Adv  
< Agent > < Theme > < Manner >

**Agent > Patient > Range**

(32) a.  
fadammar-naa-haatadmiira (25: 36)  
Subj DO CO  
< Agent > < Patient > < Range >  
Then W 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-9d dibu-hum9a  aaban ?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)  kallam–ilhaumuusaatakiima (5: 146)

Subj   DO   CO
< Source > < Goal > < Range>

and Allahspakedirectlyunto Moses (PL)

Subj   Adv   Adv
< Source > < Manner > < Goal >

and to Moses Allahspokedirect(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 English. 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 dashes. 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 Newsone.net.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 complements.
7.3.1 Verbs of placement

In English, Verbs of placement can have three arguments; one external as a subject, and two internal as complements. 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-azaydunl-kutubafi S-Sanduqitaxziinanmutqanan

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 in 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 a good sending.
Subj DO IO CO
< Source > < Theme > < Goal > < Range >

b. *Kent knitted a glove for Tom a 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. ?innaanatinunazzalnaa9aly-kal-qur?aanatanzila(76: 23)
Subj IO DO CO
< Source > < Goal > < Theme > < Range >

...We, have revealed unto the 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-naajahannayawma?iðinill-kaafiriina9arDaal (18: 100)
Subj DO IO CO
< Theme > < Beneficiary > < Range >
On that day we shall present Hellto the disbelievers, plain to view (Pl)
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-Pl) 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 Phraseto 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 prolongfor hima spanof torment(PI)
Subj IO DO
< Agent > < Patient > < Theme >
and We shall add and add to his punishment (AL)

Subj   Predicate   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 smiled70. In the second translation presented in (40AL) CO is rendered as an additional coordinated VP that has the grammatical function Predictor71 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 Graya 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 a perfect knitting.
   Subj   IO   DO   CO
   <Agent> <Beneficiary> <Theme> <Range>

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

(43) a. ?arsalabasimin Sadiqahu x Taaban? irsaalan sari9an
   Subj   IO   DO   CO
   <Goal> <Theme> <Range>
‘Salim sent his frienda letter quickly.’

‘Salim sent his frienda letterin a quick way.’
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?xðanwabila (73: 16)
Subj DO CO
<Agent> <Goal> <Range>
Whereupon We seized him with no gentle grip (PI)
So We seize [him with 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 oneGrammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy.

Experiencer > Theme > Range

(46)  Z-ZZaan-ii-nabi-IlaahiZannaS-SSaw?!(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-yyu-dxilanna-hummudxalanyarDawnahu (23: 59)
Subj DO CO
<Agent> <Beneficiary> <Range>
... He will cause them to enter by an entry that they will love (PI)
Subj DO Adv
<Agent> <Beneficiary> <Location>
... He will admit them to a place with which they shall be well pleased (AL)
Subj DO Adv
<Agent> <Beneficiary> <Location>

TL replaces CO with two types of Prepositional Phrases" Locative
Cognate Prepositional Phrase in in (47PI)\textsuperscript{72} and Locative Prepositional Phrase in (47AL). This structural shift ends with one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchy.

8. Cognate object and the passivized patient role

In English COs are not possible with passive verbs where the subject has the semantic role Patient\textsuperscript{73}. Consider.

(48) a. He has been killed.
    Subj < Patient >

b. *He has been killed a tragic killing.
    Subj CO < Patient > < Range >

In Arabic, contrary to English, COs occur with passive verbs. Passive verbs "may occur in conjunction with the accusative of the inner object, with the effect of confirming or strengthening the action"\textsuperscript{74}. Arabic syntactic and semantic structures are presented in (49).

(49) Pro-Subj CO
    < Patient > < Range >

To deal with the two patterns presented in (49), English exhibits different syntactic and semantic structures, as shown in the translated examples presented in (50).

(50) a. wa\textsuperscript{w}ull\textsuperscript{i}lat\textsuperscript{q}u\textsuperscript{u}u\textsuperscript{f}u\textsuperscript{h}a\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{a}t\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{\ddot{i}}la\textsuperscript{a}(76: 14)
    Pro-Subj CO
    < Patient > < Range >
    and the clustered fruits thereof bow down (PI)
    Subj < Patient >

b. wanuzzil\textsuperscript{a}-malaa?ikatutanzi\textsuperscript{a}la\textsuperscript{a}(25: 25)
    and the angels will be sent down, a grand descent(PI)
    Subj CO < Range >

c. yuda99awna ?ilaajihannamada99aa (52: 13)
    ...be thrust down to the Fire of Hell, irresistibly(AL)
    Subj Adv
< Patient >  < Manner >

d. kallaʔiʔaadukktatl-ʔarDudakkaandakkaa (89: 21)
Nay! When the earth is pounded to powder (AL)
Subj Adv
< Patient >  < Result >

e. waquttluuataqtiilaa(33: 61)
they ... slain (without mercy) (AL)
Subj Adv
< Patient >  < Manner >

f. ḥaarujiatl-ʔarDurajja(56: 4)
... the earth is shaken with a shock (PI)
Subj Adv
< Patient >  < Instrument >

Examples (50a-f) show the impossibility of using CO in English passive constructions. English uses other devices to bridge the gap. In (50a) Omission or zero realization is used because CO is left out. Nida states that there are some cases where omission is required to avoid redundancy or awkwardness75. However, Arabic considers the presence of CO as part and parcel of its style. In (50b) Separated Cognate Object is used. Manner Adverb is used in place of the CO in (50c). Moreover, English uses three types of Prepositional Phrase to express Arabic CO in passive constructions; Result Prepositional Phrase in (50d), Manner Prepositional Phrase in (50e), and Instrumental Cognate Prepositional Phrase in (50f). It should be noted that Arabic allows for CO to occur in passive constructions and has only one Grammatical Function Pattern and one Thematic Role Hierarchies in (50). English, one the other hand, uses three Grammatical Function Patterns and five Thematic Role Hierarchies to bridge this gap.

Conclusion

This study has given an analysis of the lexical semantic principles that govern the occurrence of Cognate Object (CO) constructions in English and Arabic, showing how these principles might affect Arabic-English translation. It has presented the permitted and non-permitted Grammatical Function Patterns and Thematic Role Hierarchies of CO constructions. It has also shown that there is a mismatch between the surface grammatical functions and deep thematic roles and how the lexical entry of the governing verb licenses or blocks the occurrence of CO in English. Based on real language examples drawn from Arabic, as a source language (SL) and their English
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 Expereinver verbs. In English these verbs do not accept CO. On the other hand, adding CO to Arabic Expereinver 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 are reclassified 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 agentic 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.
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Appendices

Appendix (1)
List of phonemic symbols used to represent the Arabic data

A. CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>Place Voicing</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labiodental</th>
<th>Interdental</th>
<th>Dental Non-emphatic</th>
<th>Dento-alveolar Emphatic</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Uvular</th>
<th>Pharyngeal</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flap</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glide</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 - محاكمة

تصدر عن مجلس النشر العلمي - جامعة الكويت

تعنى بنشر الأبحاث والدراسات في مجالات السياسة والاقتصاد والاجتماع والخدمة الاجتماعية

وعلم النفس والاتخاذولوجيا الاجتماعية والاجتماعية وعلوم الكتب والعلوم.

رئيسي التحرير: هادي مختار أشكناني

توفّي أبوابها أمام

أسع مشاركة للباحثين العرب في مجال

العلوم الاجتماعية لنشر البحوث الأساسية

والإسهام في مواجهة قضايا مجتمعاتهم

التفاعل الحي مع القارئ المثقف والهتم

بالقضايا المطروحة.

المقابلات والمناقشات الجادة

ومراجعات الكتب والتقارير.

تؤكد المجلة إلتزامها بالقضاء على النظام بوصولها في

مواعيدها المحددة إلى جميع قرانها ومشاركتها.

الاشتراكات:

الدولة الأجنبية

الكويت والدول العربية

15 دولاراً

3 دنانير سنوياً وضافة إليها

60 دولاراً في السنة

15 دولاراً في السنة

110 دولاراً لستنين

دinars واحد في الدولة العربية

دinars ستثنين
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