

Cognate Object Constructions in Arabic

Abdulrahman Alqurashi

Department of European Languages & literature

King Abdelaziz University, P.O. BOX 80200, Jeddah 21589

Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

E-mail: aaalqurashi@kau.edu.sa

Received: February 13, 2020

Accepted: March 2, 2020

Published: March 16, 2020

doi:10.5296/ijl.v12i2.16683

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v12i2.16683>

Abstract

This paper aims to explore Cognate Object constructions in Modern Standard Arabic and addresses the question of whether they are arguments or adjuncts. It examines in detail the properties of these constructions. The facts related to Cognate Objects suggest that they are best seen as arguments and not as some sort of adverbial adjuncts. Unlike English and many other languages, the use of cognate objects in Modern Standard Arabic is very productive. They occur with almost all types of verbs: intransitive, unergative, unaccusative, monotransitive and ditransitive verbs. Moreover, they can be passivized, pronominalized and topicalized. The paper also presents more evidence in favour of the argument analysis and against the adjunct analysis for cognate objects in Modern Standard Arabic.

Keywords: Cognate objects, Cognate accusatives, Unergative, Unaccusative, Argument, Adjunct

1. Introduction

Cognate object (henceforth, CO) constructions are attested widely in many languages (e.g. English, French, German, Japanese, Russian, and Hebrew among others) and have been the subject of a lengthy controversial debate revolving around whether COs are arguments or adjuncts (see e.g. Zubizarreta, 1987; Jones, 1988; Massam, 1990; Macfarland, 1995; Matsumoto, 1996; Pereltsvaig, 1999, 2002; Nakajima, 2006 and Real-Puigdollers, 2008). CO constructions, Jones (1988:89) defines, are those “constructions in which a normally intransitive verb occurs with what appears to be a direct object NP whose head noun is the event or state nominalization of the verb” as illustrated in (1).

-
- (1) a. The man *smiled* a wicked **smile**.
 b. James *laughed* a loud **laugh** at the funeral.
 c. Mary *sang* a beautiful **song**.
 d. The man smiled a **smile** which impressed everyone.
-

English COs are normally indefinite NPs and contain an adjectival modification (1a-c) (Jones, 1988). They can also involve modification by a relative clause as in (1d). It was generally assumed that they occur only with unergative verbs as in (1), at least until Kuno and Takami (2004) who observe that COs can actually occur with some unaccusative verbs like the following: (Note 1)

-
- (2) a. The tree *grew* a century's **growth** within only ten years. (ibid, p.116)
 b. The stock market *slid* a surprising 2% **slide** today.
 c. The apples *fell* just a short **fall** to the lower deck, and so were not too badly bruised.
-

CO constructions are also attested in Arabic. The cognate/accusative object is referred to in traditional Arabic syntax as *al-maffʿuul al-muTlaq* “the absolute object” which is defined as “an accusative noun phrase that takes the form of its *Masdar* (*nomina verbi* or infinitives) or its substitute; it is used to emphasize the action of its governor (the verb or its substitutes), its kind or number” (Ar-raajihī, 1988, p.277 cited in Moheiddin, 2008, p.455-461). See furthermore Wright (1896, 1898), Cantarino (1975), Badawi (2004) and Ryding (2005). Consider the following examples from Modern Standard Arabic (henceforth, MSA):

-
- (3) *ʔibtasama* r-rajul-u **ʔibtisamat-a-n** maakirat-a-n.
 smiled.3.M.SG DEF-man-NOM smile-ACC-INDEF wicked-ACC-INDEF
 ‘The man smiled a wicked smile.’
-
- (4) *namat* n-naxlat-u **numuuw-a-n** sariif-an.
 grew.3.M.SG DEF-palm-NOM growth-ACC-INDEF fast-ACC
 ‘The palm grew fast.’ Literary: ‘The palm grew a fast growth.’
-
- (5) *ħaTama* t-timsaaħ-u l-qaarib-a **tahTiim-a-n**.
 smashed.3.M.SGDEF-crocodile-NOM DEF-boat-ACC smashing-ACC-INDEF
 ‘The crocodile did smash the boat.’
 Literary: ‘The crocodile smashed the boat smashing.’
-

As can be observed from the above examples, COs in MSA can appear with both unergative verbs as in (3) and unaccusative verbs as in (4), bearing the accusative case. However, an interesting fact about MSA is that it always allows COs to appear after the direct object of transitive verbs as in (5). They also appear with ditransitive, ergative and passive verbs, as will be discussed later.

The CO constructions have been studied thoroughly in English, French, Hebrew and many other languages (Note 2). However, there is very limited literature on the syntax of CO constructions in Arabic. Fassi Fehri (1988) wrote an unpublished manuscript in which he discusses COs in MSA briefly and argues that they are arguments. On the other hand, Al-Sammak (2012) discusses COs with unaccusative and unergative verbs in MSA and

argues that they are adjuncts (Note 3). However, this paper will take Fassi Fehri's (1988) assumption to be true and present more evidence that COs are best treated as arguments and not as some sort of adverbial adjuncts.

The remaining of this paper will be structured as follows. In section 2, I will investigate the properties of this construction in MSA. Then in section 3, I will consider the view that COs are adverbial adjuncts and present some facts that undermine this view. In section 4, I will consider the opposing view that COs are arguments and argue that such an analysis can accommodate the facts related to COs in MSA. In section 5, I conclude the paper.

2. Properties of Arabic COs

Arabic COs are used to serve at least one of three specific semantic purposes: to intensify or emphasize the occurrence/meaning of the verb as in (6), to specify the type or the manner of the action as in (7) or to specify the number of occurrences of an act as in (8). Note that they sometimes serve a double function as in (9) in which the CO specifies both the type of action and the number of occurrences.

(6)	kalama	Allah-u	Muusa	takliima-a.
	spoke.3.M.SG	Allah-NOM	Moses.ACC	speech-ACC
	'Allah did speak to Moses.'			
	Literary: 'Allah spoke to Moses with a [direct] speech.'			
	(The Holy Qurʔaan, 3:164) (Note 4)			
(7)	saqaTa	l-walad-u	suquuT-a-n	mufaaji?-a-n
	fell.3.SG.M	DEF-boy-NOM	fall-ACC-INDEF	sudden-ACC-INDEF
	'The boy fell suddenly.' Literary: 'The boy fell a sudden fall.'			
(8)	qara?tu	l-maqaal-a	qira?t-ayn	
	read.1.SG	DEF-article-ACC	read-DUAL.ACC	
	'I read the article twice (literary: two readings).'			
(9)	qara?tu	l-maqaal-a	qira?t-ayn	mukaθafat-ayn
	read.1.SG	DEF-article-ACC	read-DUAL.ACC	intensive-DUAL.ACC
	'I gave the article two intensive readings (literary: read...two intensive readings)'			

Accordingly, Arabic CO constructions can be classified into three main types: emphatic/intensifying, modifying and quantifying. The COs must be modified in the second and the third type as shown in (7) and (9), but not in the first as shown in (6). It is worth noting that, in fact, using COs will make the sentence emphatic by default (Hassan, 1976). This entails that the second and the third type are also emphatic besides their main semantic roles, namely specifying type and number.

Although both Arabic and English have CO constructions, the above constructions cannot be seen equivalents to the English ones as their translations demonstrate. It is rarely possible to have a literal translation that can convey the meaning accurately. It seems that English frowns upon the use of COs with verbs that are not classed as intransitive. However, note that sometimes COs in English appear with certain verbs that are classed as optional transitive.

Observe the following examples provided by Jones (1988:89) in which the verb *dance* can take a direct object:

- | |
|------------------------------|
| (10) a. Mary dances a dance. |
| b. Mary danced a jig. |

This is not the case in MSA since it is possible for COs to occur with all sorts of verbs. As seen above, they can occur with intransitive verbs, whether they are unergative (3) or unaccusative (4), and with monotransitive verbs (5). They can also occur with ditransitive verbs, ergative verbs and in passive constructions as illustrated in (11-13), respectively.

(11)	<i>salaba</i>	r-rajul-u	zayd-an	maal-a-hu	
	deprived.3.M.SG	DEF-man-NOM	Zayd-ACC	money-ACC-3.M.SG	
	salb-a-n	kaamil-a-n.			
	deprivation-ACC-INDEF	complete-ACC-INDEF			
	‘The man deprived Zayed of his money completely (literary: a complete deprivation).’				
(12) a.	<i>ġala</i>	l-maaʔ-u	ġalay-a-n	sariiʕ-a-n.	
	boiled.3.M.SG	DEF-water-NOM	boiling-ACC-INDEF	fast-ACC-INDEF	
	‘The water boiled fast.’				
	Literary: ‘The water boiled a fast boiling.’				
b.	<i>ġala</i>	r-rajul-u	l-maaʔ-a	ġalay-a-n	sariiʕ-a-n.
	boiled.3.M.SG	DEF-man-NOM	DEF-water-ACC	boiling-ACC-INDEF	fast-ACC-INDEF
	‘The man boiled the water fast (literary: a fast boiling).’				
(13)	<i>ʕuumilaa</i>	muʕaamalāt-a-n	mumtaazt-a-n		
	treated.PASS.3.M.DUAL	treating-ACC-INDEF	splendid-ACC-INDEF		
	‘They were both treated splendidly (Literary: a splendid treatment).’				

(Badawi, 2004:552)

There seems to be no restriction on the type of verbs that can be used in CO constructions in MSA. Furthermore, COs can appear in non-verbal sentences. As stated in the definition of COs above, the governor is not always a verb; it can be substituted by another element. This element can be, e.g., an adjective as in (14) or a noun in (15) below.

(14)	ha ʕa	r-rajul-u	ħaziin-u	huznn-a-n	mufriiʕ-a-n	
	this	DEF-man-NOM	sad-NOM	sadness-ACC-INDEF	excessive-ACC-INDEF	
	‘This man is excessively/overly sad (Literary: sad an excessive sadness).’					
(15)	ʔina	<i>t-tawakul-a</i>	ʕala	Allah-i	tawakull-a-n	ħaqiiqiy-a-n
	that	DEF-trust-ACC	on	Allah-GEN	trust-ACC-INDEF	real-ACC-INDEF
	daliil-u-n	ʕala	quuwat-i	l-ʔimaan-i		
	evidence-NOM-INDEF	on	strength-GEN	DEF-faith-GEN		
	The real trust in Allah is evidence of the strength of faith (Literary: the trust a real trust).					

On the other hand, the CO can be replaced by another word that is not related to the governor (the verb or its substitutes) morphologically. This word can be a synonym as in (16) or an explanatory term as in (17).

(16)	<i>yuhibu-haa</i>	<i>zayd-un</i>	hub-a-n./šišq-a-n.
	love.3.M.SG-3.F.SG	Zayd-NOM	love-ACC-INDEF
	‘Zayd loves her very much /passionately (literary: a love).’		
(17)	<i>Daraba</i>	<i>zayd-un</i>	šamr-an Darb-a-n/sawT-a-n
	beat up.PAST.3.M.SG	Zayd-NOM	Amr-ACC beating-ACC-INDEF/whip-ACC-INDEF
	‘Zayd gave Amr a beating / a lash of a whip.’		
	Literary: ‘Zayd beat up Amr a beating/ a whip.’		

COs are normally indefinite, but they might be sometimes definite. Thus, they may take a definite article (18a), a weak determiner (18b) as well as a strong determiner (18c) or may be a part of definite construct state phrase (18d). However, definite COs are not quite as common as the indefinite ones.

(18)	a. <i>ihazzat</i>	<i>l-mazhariya-t-u</i>	l-ihizzaat-a	<i>l-ʔaxiirat-a</i>
	shook.3.F.SG	DEF-vase-F-NOM	DEF-shake-ACC	DEF-last-ACC
	‘The vase shook with one last shake (literary: the last shake).’			
	b. <i>ihazzat</i>	<i>l-mazhariya-t-u</i>	[baʕD-a	l-ihizzaat-i]
	shook.3.F.SG	DEF-vase-F-NOM	some-ACC	DEF-shake-GEN
	‘The vase shook a little (literary: some shake).’			
	c. <i>yuhibu-haa</i>		[kul-a	l-hub-i]
	love.3.M.SG-3.F.SG		all-ACC	DEF-love-GEN
	‘He gives her all the love.’ Literary: ‘He loves her all the love.’			
	d. <i>mašat</i>	<i>l-fatat-u</i>	[mašyat-a	<i>l-ğazaal-i]</i>
	walked.3.F.SG	DEF-girl-NOM	walk-ACC	DEF-deer-GEN
	‘The girl walked like a deer’ Literary: ‘The girl walked the deer’s walk.’			

A final point that should be mentioned in this section is that COs in MSA can occupy a direct object position of a monotransitive verb or a ditransitive verb. Thus, the direct object *l-maqaalatii* ‘the articles’ in (19a) can be replaced by the phrase [*kitaabt-a-n mutqant-an* ‘a perfect writing’] in (19b), which functions as a direct object; and also the direct object *maala-hu* ‘his money’ in (20a) can be replaced by the phrase [*salban kaamilan* ‘a complete deprivation’] in (20b) and (20b).

(19)	a. <i>yaktubu</i>	<i>zayd-un</i>	<i>l-maqaalat-i</i>	kitaabt-a-n	<i>mutqant-a-n</i>
	write.3.M.SG	Zayd-NOM	DEF-articles-ACC	writing-ACC-INDEF	perfect-ACC-INDEF
	‘Zayd writes the articles perfectly (literary: perfect writing).’				
	b. <i>yaktubu</i>	<i>zayd-un</i>		kitaabt-an	<i>mutqant-an</i>
	write.3.M.SG	Zayd-NOM		writing-ACC	perfect-ACC
	‘Zayd produces a perfect piece of writing.’				
	Literary: ‘Zayd writes perfect writing.’				
(20)	a. <i>salaba</i>	<i>r-rajul-u</i>	<i>zayd-an</i>	<i>maal-a-hu</i>	

deprived.3.M.SG	DEF-man-NOM	Zayd-ACC	money-ACC-3.M.SG
salb-a-n	kaamil-a-n.		
deprivation-ACC-INDEF complete-ACC-INDEF			
‘The man deprived Zayd of his money completely.’			
Literary: ‘The man deprived Zayd of his money a complete deprivation.’			
b. <i>salaba</i>	r-rajul-u	Zayd-an	salb-an kaamil-an.
deprived.3.M.SG	DEF-man-NOM	zayd-ACC	deprivation-ACC complete-ACC
‘The man deprived Zayed of everything completely.’			
Literary: ‘The man deprived Zayed a complete deprivation.’			

However, one might argue that the direct objects, the prototypical arguments, in (19b) and (20b) are assumed to be syntactically null and that what appear to occupy the direct object positions are in fact COs. With both direct objects and COs being assigned an accusative case, it seems difficult to tell straightforward whether [*kitaabtan ...*] and [*salb-an ...*] function as direct objects or as COs in these examples. However, I will return to this later in section 4. In the meantime, let us consider the following examples in which no room for uncertainty exists:

(21) <i>qaala</i>	l-qaadi-u	qawl-a-n	faSSI-a-n
said.3.M.SG	DEF-judge-NOM	saying-ACC-INDEF	final-ACC-INDEF
‘The judge said a final saying.’			
(22) <i>saʔala</i>	l-muʕalm-u	T-Taalib-a	suʔaal-a-n
asked.3.M.SG	DEF-teacher-NOM	DEF-student-ACC	question-ACC-INDEF
waaʕid-a-n			
one-ACC-INDEF			
‘The teacher asked the student one question.’			

In (21), the phrase [_{QP} *qawlan faSSI-a-n*], which happens to contain a cognate element, functions as a true direct object of the monotransitive verb *qaala* ‘said’, and also in (22), the phrase [_{QP} *suʔaalan waaʕidan*] functions as a direct object of the ditransitive verb *saʔala* ‘asked’.

To sum up, the most notable properties of COs in MSA are as follow. First, they do not impose any selectional restriction on the type of predicate with which they appear. Second, they can be replaced by an element that is not morphologically related to the verb and can be definite sometimes. Finally, they may occur in an argument position, namely the direct object position. There are other properties which will be mentioned in the following two sections where I will consider the two opposing views regarding the syntactic status of COs.

3. Against an Adjunct Analysis

As mentioned earlier, there is an ongoing controversial debate over the status of COs; should they be treated as arguments of the verb on a bar with other objects or as modifying adjuncts-NPs on a bar with manner adverbs since they are usually taken to be modifiers of the verb. Advocate of the adjunct analysis (see e.g. Jones, 1988; Pereltsvaig, 2002; Nakajima, 2006) base their arguments on some empirical characteristics that distinguish COs from true

(argument) objects and hence the former should be analyzed differently. These properties have been summarized by Massam, (1990) and Real-Puigdollers (2008) as follow: (i) impossibility of passivization, (ii) impossibility of pronominalization, (iii) incompatibility with definite articles or strong determiners, (iv) impossibility of topicalization, (v), obligatory modification, (vi) necessity for being cognate, (vii) impossibility to be questioned with what. Al-Sammak (2012) uses some of these arguments to support his claim that COs that occur with unergative and unaccusative verbs in MSA are different from argument-like objects, and thus they are best treated as adjuncts. However, although the above alleged distinguishing properties have been challenged for English by Massam (1990), I will show in this section that COs in MSA do not exhibit any of them and that Al-Sammak's (2012) claims are far from the truth, which in turn refutes the adjunct analysis of COs in MSA.

The claim that COs cannot occur as the subject of passive sentences is one of the main arguments used in favour of the adjunct analysis of COs. Therefore, Al-Sammak's (2012) argues that COs that appears with unergative and unaccusative verbs are adjunct because they fail to passivize, unlike argument-like objects. However, this claim can be easily undermined by the fact that there are plenty of examples in the traditional grammatical literature of MSA that demonstrate the possibility of passivization of COs. Thus, the examples in (3-5) are repeated below with their passive counterparts given in (23b), (24b) and (25b), respectively.

(23) a.	<i>ʔibtasama</i>	r-rajul-u	ʔibtisamat-a-n	maakirat-a-n.
	smiled.3.M.SG	DEF-man-NOM	smile-ACC-INDEF	wicked-ACC-INDEF
	'The man smiled a wicked smile.'			
b.	<i>ibtusimat</i>		ʔibtisamat-u-n	maakirat-u-n. (Note 5)
	smiled.PASS 3.F.SG		smile-NOM-INDEF	wicked-NOM-INDEF
	Literary: 'a wicked smile was smiled.'			
(24) a.	<i>namat</i>	n-naxlat-u	numuuw-a-n	sariiʕ-a-n.
	grew.3.M.SG	DEF-palm-NOM	growth-ACC-INDEF	fast-ACC-INDEF
	'The palm grew very fast (literary: a fast growth).'			
b.	<i>numiya</i>		numuuw-u-n	sariiʕ-u-n
	grew.PASS.3.M.SG		growth-NOM-INDEF	fast-NOM-INDEF
	Literary: 'A fast growth was grown.'			
(25) a.	<i>ħaTama</i>	t-timsaaħ-u	l-qaarib-a	tahTiim-a-n.
	smashed.3.M.SG	DEF-crocodile-NOM	DEF-boat-ACC	smash-ACC-INDEF
	kaamil-u-n.			
	complete-NOM-INDEF			
	'The crocodile smashed the boat completely (literary: a complete smashing).'			
b.	<i>ħuTima</i>		tahTiim-u-n	kaamil-u-n. (Note 6)
	smashed.PASS. 3.M.SG		smash-NOM-INDEF	complete-NOM-INDEF
	Literary: 'a complete smashing was smashed.'			

It is evident from the above examples that COs can be passivized regardless of whether they appear with an unergative (23b), an unaccusative (24b) or a transitive verb (25b). What is more interesting about examples like (23b) and (24b) is that it is, in fact, the CO which

licenses their grammaticality. Passives of intransitives are not permitted in MSA unless the subject position (of the passive sentence) is filled by maSdar (i.e. CO) or other elements such as a prepositional phrase (see e.g. Abdulhamid, 1963). This means that in order for passivization to apply, there must be an element like a CO or a PP following the intransitive verb in the active sentence. In other words, COs do not occur with impersonal passives in MSA. Thus, (26b) and (27b) would be rendered ungrammatical (i.e. non-passivizable) without the COs acting as the subject as the following examples illustrate:

(26) a.	<i>ibtusimat</i>	*(?ibtisamat-u-n	<i>maakirat-u-n</i>)
	smiled.PASS 3.F.SG	smile-NOM-INDEF	wicked-NOM-INDEF
	Intended: 'It was smiled.'		
b.	* <i>ibtusima</i>	?ibtisamat-a-n	<i>maakirat-a-n</i> .
	smiled.PASS 3.M.SG	smile-ACC-INDEF	wicked-ACC-INDEF
	Intended: 'It was smiled a wicked smile.'		
(27) a.	<i>numiya</i>	*(numuuw-u-n	<i>sariiṣ-u-n</i>)
	grew.PASS.3.M.SG	growth-NOM-INDEF	fast-NOM-INDEF
	Intended: 'It was grown.'		
b.	* <i>numiya</i>	numuuw-a-n	<i>sariiṣ-a-n</i> .
	grew.PASS.3.M.SG	growth-ACC-INDEF	fast-ACC-INDEF
	Intended: 'it was grown a fast growth.'		

Another claim made by Al-Sammak (2012) is that COs appearing with unergative and unaccusative verbs in MSA cannot be pronominalized. This claim can be challenged by the following examples:

(28)	<i>Saraxa</i>	<i>l-mariiD-u</i>	Sarxa-t-a	<i>l-mutʔalim-i</i>	<i>wa qad</i>
	screamed.3.M.SG	DEF-patient-NOM	scream-F-ACC	DEF-sufferer-GEN	and FM
	<i>Saraxa-haa</i>	<i>mubaaṣart-an</i>	<i>fii i ḏn-i</i>	<i>T-Tabiib.</i> (Note 7)	
	screamed.3.M.SG-3.F.SG	directly-ACC-INDEF	in	ear-GEN	DEF-doctor
	'The patient screamed a sufferer scream and (I assert that) he screamed it directly in the doctor's ear.'				
(29) a.	<i>namat</i>	<i>l-aṣjaar-u</i>	numuuw-a-n	<i>sariiṣ-a-n</i> .	<i>lakin</i>
	grew.3.M.SG	DEF-trees-NOM	growth-ACC-INDEF	fast-ACC-INDEF	but
	<i>lam yulaḥiḏ'a-hu</i>	<i>l-muzaariṣ-u</i>			
	NEG	noticed3.M.SG-3.F.SG	DEF-farmer-NOM		
	'The trees grew very fast, but the farmer did not notice.'				
	Literary: 'The trees grew a fast growth, but the farmer did not notice it.'				
(30)	<i>Daraba</i>	<i>Zayd-un</i>	<i>l-ʔawalad-a</i>	Darb-a-n	<i>lam</i>
	beat up. PAST.3.M.SG	Zayd-NOM	DEF-boys-ACC	beating-ACC-INDEF	NEG
	<i>yuDrabuu-hu</i>	<i>min qabl.</i>			
	beat. PASS.3.M.PL-3.M.SG	from	before		
	'Zayd gave the boys a beating that they had not been given before.'				
	Literary: 'Zayd beat up the boys beating that they had not been beaten up before.'				
(31)	<i>aʔhaba</i>	<i>Zayd-un</i>	<i>l-fatat-a</i>	hub-a-n .	<i>Saadiq-a-n</i>
					<i>lam</i>

loved.3.M.SG	Zayd-NOM	DEF-girl-ACC	love-ACC-INDEF	true-ACC-INDEF	NEG
yuhiba-hu	aʔhad-a-n	min	qabl.		
loved.3.M.SG-3.M.SG	one-ACC-INDEF	from	before		
‘Zayd gave the girl a true love which he had never given anyone before.’					
Literary: ‘Zayd loved the girl a true love which he had not loved anyone before.’					

The above examples show clearly that pronominalization is possible in CO constructions in MSA. The pronominal clitics do not refer to the events, but to the COs, which is further evidence that refutes the adjunct analysis of COs.

Furthermore, Al-Sammak (2012) claims that strong determiners are incompatible with some COs (adverbial COs), building on Pereltsvaig’s (2002) analysis for Hebrew. However, this does not hold true for COs in MSA. As seen in the previous section, COs in MSA can be definite, and they are compatible with weak determiners as well as strong determiners. Besides, the example he provides, which he marks as ungrammatical, is in fact perfectly grammatical.

(32)	zaara	firaas-un	ʔamiir-an	kol-a	z-ziyaaraa-t-i	/ha ʔhi
	visited.3.M.SG	Firas-NOM	Ameer-ACC	all-ACC	DEF-visits-F-GEN	this.F
	z-ziyaara-t-a.					
	DEF-visit.F-ACC					
	‘Firas visited Ameer all the visits/ this visit.’					

A further claim made by proponents of the adjunct analysis is that COs, unlike prototypical objects, cannot be topicalized. Yet again, this is not the case in MSA as the following examples indicate that topicalization is possible with COs:

(33)	ʔibtisamat-a-n	maakirat-a-n,	ʔibtasama	r-rajul-u.	
	smile-ACC-INDEF	wicked-ACC-INDEF	smiled.3.M.SG	DEF-man-NOM	
	Literary: ‘A wicked smile, the man. smiled’				
(34)	numuw-a-n	sariiʕ-a-n,	namat	n-naxlat-u.	
	growth-ACC-INDEF	fast-ACC-INDEF	grew.3.M.SG	DEF-palm-NOM	
	Literary: ‘A fast growth, the palm grew.’				
(35)	Darb-an	ʕadiid-an,	Daraba	r-rajul-u	zayed-an
	beating-ACC	violent-ACC	beat up. PAST.3.M.SG	DEF-man -NOM	Zayd-ACC
	Literary: ‘A violent beating, the man beat up Zayd.’				

As for the obligatoriness of modification, it was made clear in the previous section that COs in MSA are not always modified. Furthermore, COs in MSA can sometimes be replaced by ordinary NPs. As mentioned in section 2, they can sometimes be replaced by another word that is not related to the verb morphologically as (16) and (17) above illustrate.

The last property supposed to distinguish COs from prototypical objects is that the former, but not the latter, cannot be questioned with *what*. However, note that the CO is derived from the verb and construed as the event itself created by the action. Thus, to question the CO, we

need to question the action using questions like *what happened?* as in (36) or *what did/does someone/something do?* as in (37).

(36) a.	maa ċa ħadaθa	li r-rajul-i ?	
	what happened.3.M.SG.to	DEF-man-GEN	
	‘What happened to the man?’		
b.	saqaTa suquuT-a-n	min l-ʔaʕlaa.	
	fell.3.M.SG.fall-ACC-INDEF	from DEF-top	
	‘He fell from the top.’ Literary: ‘He fell a fall from the top.’		
(37) a.	maa ċa faʕala	t-timsaaħ-u	bi l-qaarib-i ?
	what did.3.M.SG	DEF-crocodile-NOM	to DEF-boat-GEN
	‘What did the crocodile do to the boat?’		
b.	haTama-hu	tahTiim-a-n.	
	smashed.3.M.SG-3.M.SG	smash-ACC-INDEF	
	‘It did smash it (literary: smashed it smashing).’		

When the CO is modified by an element that specifies the type of an action, then it can be questioned with *what* or *what sort of?* as in (38) below. Note that it is the modifier that is being questioned here and not the CO. And when the CO is modified by an element that specifies the manner of an action, it can be questioned with *how?* as in (39). On the other hand, when the CO specifies the number of occurrences of an action, it can be questioned using *how many CO?* as shown in (40) below.

(38) a.	maa / maa nawʕ-u	l-qiraʔat-i	llati qaraʔta?	
	what what sort-NOM	DEF-reading-GEN	that read.2.M.SG	
	‘What sort of reading did you read?’			
b.	(qiraʔat-a-n)	ʕaamilat-a-n		
	reading-ACC-INDEF	thorough-ACC-INDEF		
	‘a thorough (reading)’			
(39) a.	kayfa saqaTa	l-walad-u?		
	how fell.3.SG.M	DEF-boy-NOM		
	‘How did the boy fall?’			
b.	suquuT-a-n	mufaajiʔ-a-n		
	fall-ACC-INDEF	sudden-ACC-INDEF		
	‘a sudden fall.’			
(40) a.	kam	qiraʔat-a-n	qaraʔta?	l-kitab-a
	how.many	reading-ACC-INDEF	read.2.M.SG	DEF-book- ACC
	‘How many readings did you read the book?’			
b.	qiraʔat-ayn			
	read-DUAL.ACC			
	‘two readings’			

A final point we should note here is that scholars often tend to paraphrase CO constructions into corresponding constructions containing an adverb or an adverbial PP when translating

into English. This is due to the fact that the use of COs is much more productive in Arabic than in English as discussed above. However, this practice does not entail that the corresponding constructions convey precisely the same meaning that is conveyed by the CO constructions. To elaborate further, let us consider the following examples:

(41) a.	saqaTa	l-walad-u	suquuT-a-n	mufaaji?-a-n.
	fell.3.SG.M	DEF-boy-ACC	fall-ACC-INDEF	sudden-ACC-INDEF
	‘The boy fell suddenly (literary: fell a sudden fall).’			
b.	saqaTa	l-walad-u	faj?at-an.	
	fell.3.SG.M	DEF-boy-ACC	suddenly-ACC	
	‘The boy fell suddenly.’			
(42) a.	katabtu	kitaabt-a-n	mutqant-a-n.	
	wrote.1.SG	writing-ACC-INDEF	perfect ACC-INDEF	
	‘I produced perfect writing.’ Literary: ‘I wrote perfect writing.’			
b.	katabtu	[bi-?itqaan]		
	wrote.1.SG	with-perfection		
	‘I wrote with perfection.’			

Although both (41a) and (42a) can have a quasi-paraphrase as shown in (41b) and (42b), the two sentences cannot be seen semantically equivalent. As mentioned earlier, all COs have an additive meaning besides their primary semantic functions in that they make the sentence emphatic. However, this emphatic meaning is not captured by (41b) and (42b) as they merely express the manner of the action. Furthermore, when an unmodified CO construction, which is merely intended to intensify or emphasize the occurrence/meaning of the verb, is paraphrased into a construction containing an adverb phrase, a new meaning that was not initially expressed by the CO emerges. Thus, the two constructions in (43) below cannot be seen semantically parallel since the adverbial phrases in (43b) specify the type or the manner of the action, whereas the CO in (43a) does not.

(43) a.	haTama	t-timsaaħ-u	l-qaarib-a	taħTiim-a-n.
	smashed.3.M.SG	DEF-crocodile-NOM	DEF-boat-ACC	smashing-ACC-INDEF
	‘The crocodile did smash the boat (literary: smashed the boat smashing).’			
b.	haTama	t-timsaaħ-u	l-qaarib-a	tamam-an /
	smashed.3.M.SG	DEF-crocodile-NOM	DEF-boat-ACC	totally. ACC
	[bi-quwah] / [bi-šidah].			
	with-strength with-violence			
	‘The crocodile smashed the boat totally/strongly/violently.’			

In addition to the above, not all CO constructions in MSA are paraphrasable with adverbial constructions, as demonstrated by the following examples:

(44) a.	ihtazzat	l-mazhariya-t-u	l-ihitzaazt-a	l-?axiirat-a / ihitzaazt-a-n
	shook.3.F.SG	DEF-vase-F-NOM	DEF-shake-ACC	DEF-last-ACC shake-ACC-INDEF
	?axiirat-a-n			
	last-ACC-INDEF			

‘The vase shook with one last shake.’

Literary: ‘The vase shook the/a last shake).’

b. **ihtazzat* l-mazhariya-t-u [bi-šakl-in ʔaxiir]

shook.3.F.SG DEF-vase-F-NOM in-manner-GEN last

Intended: ‘The vase shook lastly.’

To sum up, it seems that the test procedures that have been applied throughout the literature on cognate objects for the purpose of distinguishing them from prototypical objects fail to show any differences between the two types of objects in MSA. This leaves us with no solid ground for assuming the adjunct analysis for COs. In the following section, I will consider the opposing view which argues that COs are arguments.

4. COs as Arguments

Most of the discussion of the previous section supports the view that CO in MSA are best analysed as arguments and not as some sort of adverbial adjuncts. Such an assumption was first proposed by Fassi Fehri (1988) based on some essential differences he observed between COs and adverbs. First, although both COs and adverbs can occur as the subjects of passives, the latter, but not the former, lose their semantic status when they are passivized. He provides the following examples:

(45) a. Daraba l-rajul-un zayd-an Darb-an šadiid-an
 beat. PAST.3.M.SG DEF-man -NOM Zayd-ACC beating-ACC violent-ACC
 ‘The man beat up Zayd a violent beating.’

b. Duriba Darb-un šadiid-un
 beat . PASS.3.M.SG beating-NOM violent-NOM
 ‘A violent beating was beaten.’

(46) a. sahirtu laylat-a l-ʔahad -i
 was awake.1.SG night-ACC DEF-sunday-GEN
 ‘I passed Sunday’s night awake’
 ‘I stayed awake Sunday night’

b. suhirat laylat-u l-ʔahad -i
 passed.awake. PASS.3.F.SG night-NOM DEF-sunday-GEN
 ‘Sunday’s night was passed awake.’

Fassi Fehri (1988) notes that the semantic status of the CO does not change when it is passivized as in (45b), in that it cannot be considered as a participant (i.e. an actor, an undergoer or an instrument of the event). For him, the CO is understood as the EVENT itself in both (45a) and (45b). In contrast, the adverb in (46a) is an adjunct expressing the time of the event, but when it is passivized in (46b), it becomes understood as a participant (i.e. an undergoer of the event). Accordingly, Fassi Fehri assumes, adopting Higginbotham’s (1985) thematic theory, that COs, but not adverbs, are part of the thematic grid of the verb in that they realize the EVENT position (E).

It should be noted here that the direct object appears in (45a), but not in the passive counterpart in (45b) because there are certain restrictions imposed by some traditional Arabic grammarians on the passivization of COs that occur with transitive verbs. For them, COs can move to the subject positions in passive constructions only if there is no other internal argument can move. Thus, they rule out examples like (46a) below because the CO moves to the subject position leaving the THEME behind, whereas (46b) is fine.

(46) a.	? <i>Duriba</i>	Darb-u-n	šadiid-u-n	zayd-an
	beat.PASS.3.M.SG	beating-NOM-INDEF	violent-NOM-INDEF	Zayd-ACC
	Intended ‘A violent beating was beaten to Zayd.’			
b.	<i>Duriba</i>	zayd-un	Darb-a-n	šadiid-a-n
	beat.PASS.3.M.SG	Zayd-NOM	beating-NOM-INDEF	violent-NOM-INDEF
	‘Zayd was beaten a violent beating.’			

This restriction on passivization also extends to the double object constructions. Some traditional Arabic grammarians do not permit examples like (47c) where the direct object *maal-an* is moved to the subject of the passive verb leaving the indirect object *Zayd* behind.

(47) a.	?ašTa	r-rajul-u	zayd-an	maal-an
	gave.3.M.SG	DEF-man-NOM	Zayd-ACC	money-ACC
	‘The man gave Zayd money.’			
b.	?ušTiya	zayd-un	maal-an	
	gave.PASS.3.M.SG	Zayd-NOM	money-ACC	
	‘Zayd was given money.’			
c.	? ?ušTiya	maal-un	zayd-an	
	gave.PASS.3.M.SG	money-NOM	Zayd-ACC	
	‘Money was given to Zayd.’			

In fact, this is a controvertible issue among traditional Arabic grammarians. This is due to the fact that there are two old schools of Arabic grammar named after the two famous cities in Iraq: Kufah and Basra. According to Yaacob (2014:1) “the school of Basra was generally more philosophically inclined when formulating the system of Arabic grammar while the school of Kufah based its rules on evidence found in classical texts” (Note 8). Thus, the examples in (46a) and (47c) are permitted by Kufan grammarians, but not by Basran grammarians although some of them permit it (see Hindaawi, 2005, p.242-48; Al-šamsaan, 1987, p.150-52). Note that the example in (47c) sounds better if we change the word order as shown below.

(47) c.	?ušTiya	zayd-an	maal-un	
	gave.PASS.3.M.SG	Zayd-ACC	money-NOM	
	‘Money was given to Zayd.’			

Despite the fact that the examples in (46a) and (47c) are considered grammatical by the majority of Arabic grammarians (Al-šamsaan, 1987, p.150-52), Fassi Fehri (1988) rules them out following some Basran grammarians. He assimilates the ungrammaticality of (46a) to the

one of (47c) and accounts for both by postulating that grammatical argument-linking obeys a thematic hierarchy like the one in (49) in which the EVENT role is located at the lowest end.

(49) AGENT (CAUSE) > SOURCE > GOAL (BENEFACTOR, EXPERIENCER) > INSTRUMENT
> THEME > LOCATIVE > EVENT.

According to this hierarchy, the THEME is ranked above the EVENT role, and the GOAL is ranked above the THEME, and hence they are entitled to move to the subject position first. Therefore, (46a) and (47c) are ruled out for him because the EVENT *Darbun šadiidun* moves to the subject position leaving the THEME *zaydun* behind in (46a), and in (47c), the THEME *maal-un* is moved to the subject of the passive verb leaving the GOAL *Zaydan* behind. However, such an account is not needed if we take (46a) and (47c) to be grammatical following Kufan grammarians.

The second difference Fassi Fehri (1988) observes between COs and adjuncts is that the latter, but not the former, occur with impersonal passives that take a pleonastic subject (it appears as an inflection on the verb) as the following examples illustrate:

(50) *suqiTa suquuT-a-n mufaaji?-a-n.
fell.PASS fall-ACC-INDEF sudden-ACC-INDEF
Intended: ‘it was fallen a sudden fall.’

(51) suhira laylat-a l-?aħad -i
was.awake.PASS night-ACC DEF-sunday-GEN
‘It was awake on Sunday's night.’

Fassi Fehri (1988) accounts for the ungrammaticality of (50) by assuming that pleonastics are pronouns for EVENT. Therefore, whenever they appear in a construction, COs cannot appear since they also express the EVENT, in accordance with the Theta Criterion (i.e. each theta role is assigned to only one argument) (Chomsky, 1981).

I will adopt Fassi Fehri's (1988) view that COs in MSA are arguments. However, I depart from his proposal in that they are not always realized as EVENT, but they may be realized as THEME sometimes. In MSA, COs can function as direct objects as illustrated by the examples given in (21) and (22) above and repeated below.

(52) *qaala* l-qaaDi-u **qawl-a-n** faSSl-a-n
said.3.M.SG DEF-judge-NOM saying-ACC-INDEF final-ACC-INDEF
‘The judge said a final saying.’

(53) *sa?ala* l-muʕalm-u T-Taalib-a **su?aal-a-n**
asked.3.M.SG DEF-teacher-NOM DEF-student-ACC question-ACC-INDEF
waħhid-a-n
one-ACC-INDEF
‘The teacher asked the student one question.’

In these examples, the CO is not understood as the EVENT, but as an undergoer of the event. This appeal to semantics removes the doubts that exist in examples such as (19b) and (20b)

above and repeated below as (54) and (55). When the direct object disappears, the CO replaces it and gets interpreted as the undergoer of the event.

(54)	<i>yaktubu</i>	<i>zayd-un</i>	<i>kitaabt-an</i>	<i>mutqant-an</i>	
	write.3.M.SG	Zayd-NOM	writing-ACC	perfect-ACC	
	‘Zayd produces a perfect piece of writing.’				
	Literary: ‘Zayd writes perfect writing.’				
(55)	<i>salaba</i>	<i>r-rajul-u</i>	<i>zayd-an</i>	<i>salb-an</i>	<i>kaamil-an.</i>
	deprived.3.M.SG	DEF-man-NOM	smile-ACC	deprivation-ACC	complete-ACC
	‘The man deprived Zayed of everything completely.’				
	Literary: ‘The man deprived Zayed a complete deprivation.’				

It can be said, then, that when COs occur with intransitive verbs, they are realized as the EVENT, but when they occur with monotransitive or ditransitive verbs, they may be realized as either EVENT or THEME depending on the appearance and disappearance of the direct objects.

5. Final Remarks

I have argued in this paper that COs in MSA are best treated as arguments and not as some sort of adverbial adjuncts. However, they are not always realized as EVENT as they are sometimes realized as THEME. This proposal is similar to that of Massam (1990) for English COs. There is a resemblance between CO constructions with transitive verbs and double object constructions. There is also a resemblance between CO constructions with intransitive verbs and single object constructions. Therefore, the analysis that suggests itself here is to assimilate the structure of CO constructions that occur with intransitive verbs to that of monotransitive constructions, and to assimilate the structure of CO constructions that occur with monotransitive verbs to double object constructions. As for CO constructions that appear with ditransitive verbs, they can be assimilated to be complex transitive constructions in which the verb selects three arguments as its complements (Note 9).

References

- Abdulhamid, M. M. (1963). *šaraḥ qatar n-nadaa wa bal s-sda (Ibn Hisham)*. Egypt: Al-maktabah At-tijariah Al-kubraa.
- Akkuş, F., & Öztürk, B. (2017). On COs in Sason Arabic. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 23(1), 2.
- Al-Sammak, M. (2012). Cognate objects with unaccusative and unergative verbs in Arabic. Unpublished Master’s Thesis, California State University, Fresno.
- Al-šamsaan, I. (1987). *QaDayaa t-taḥadi wa l-uzuuum (Issues of Transitivity and Intransitivity)*. Jeddah: Daarul-madani.
- Aoun, J., Choueiri, L., & Benmamoun, E. (2010). *The syntax of Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ar-raajihī, A. (1988). *At-Tabiiq n-naḥawii*. Beirut: Daar An-nahDah Al-Šarabiyya.

- Badawi, E., Carter, M., & Gully, A. (2004). *Modern written Arabic: a comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Cantarino, V. (1974). *Syntax of modern Arabic prose: The expanded sentence* (Vol. 2). Indiana University Press for the International Affairs Center.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris: Dordrecht.
- Darwish, Muhi Al-Diin. (2002). *Ifraab Alqur'an wa bayaanih*. Beirut: Dar Ibn Kathiir.
- Fassi-Fehri, A. (1988). *Cognate objects as arguments*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Goldziher, I. (1994). *On the History of Grammar among the Arabs* (Vol. 73). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hassan, A. (1976). *An-Nahwu l-Waafi (The comprehensive Syntax)*. Cairo: Daaru l-maʿaarif.
- Higginbotham, J. (1985). On semantics. *Linguistic inquiry*, 16(4), 547-593.
- Hindaawi, H. (2005). *At-ta ʿayil wa t-takmiil fii šaraḥ kitaabi t-tasshiil*. Riyadh: Daaru qunuuz ʿišbiilya
- Homeidi, M. A. (2008). Object, Absolute. In V. Kees (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* (Vol. 3, pp. 455-461). Leiden: Brill.
- Jones, M. A. (1988). COs and the case-filter. *Journal of Linguistics*, 24(1), 89-110.
- Kuno, S., & Takami, K. I. (2004). *Functional constraints in grammar: On the unergative-unaccusative distinction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Macfarland, T. (1995). Cognate objects and the argument/adjunct distinction in English. *Ph.D. Dissertation*, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
- Massam, D. (1990). Cognate objects as thematic objects. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 35(2), 161-190.
- Matsumoto, M. (1996). The syntax and semantics of the CO construction. *English Linguistics*, 13, 199-220.
- Nakajima, H. (2006). Adverbial COs. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 37(4), 674-684.
- Ouhalla, J. (1993). Negation, focus and tense: The Arabic maa and laa. *Rivista di linguistica*, 5(2), 275-300.
- Pereltsvaig, A. (1999). COs in Russian: is the notion “cognate” relevant for Syntax?. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 44(3), 267-291.
- Pereltsvaig, A. (2002). COs in modern and biblical Hebrew. In J. Ouhalla, & U. Shlonsky (Eds.), *Themes in Arabic and Hebrew Syntax* (pp. 107–320). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Perlmutter, D. M. (1978). Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (Vol. 4, pp. 157-190). Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley Linguistics Society.

- Real Puigdollers, C. (2008). The nature of cognate objects. A syntactic approach. In S. Blaho, C. Camelia, & L. B. Bert (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the Student Organization of Linguistics in Europe* (pp. 157-178).
- Ryding, K. (2005). *A reference grammar of modern standard Arabic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, W. (1998). *A grammar of the Arabic language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yaacob, S. H. (2014). The conflict of theory in Arabic grammar. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 4(1), 1-4.
- Zubizarreta, M. L. (1987). *Levels of Representation in the Lexicon and in the Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Notes

Note 1. Both unergative and unaccusative verbs are classified as intransitive verbs, but they are semantically distinguished from each other in that the formers have subjects whose thematic roles are agents whereas the latter have subjects whose thematic roles are themes. In addition, they are distinguished syntactically as it is widely assumed within transformational grammar that the subjects of unaccusative verbs originate initially in the object position and then later raised to the subject position. This is referred to in the literature as the Unaccusative Hypothesis (see Perlmutter, 1978 and Kuno & Takami, 2004).

Note 2. See works cited above.

Note 3. There is another work by Moheiddin, (2008) that has been carried out on the syntax of COs in MSA, but it does not address the question of whether they are arguments or adjuncts. It is more of a descriptive nature as it is a part of an encyclopaedic work on the Arabic language. There is also a work by Akkuş & Öztürk (2017) which discusses COs in a variety/dialect known as Sason Arabic which is entirely different from MSA and other varieties spoken in the Arab world.

Note 4. The number (3) refers to the chapter (the *suura*) and (164) refers to the verse.

Note 5. MSA frowns on the use of actor phrases (e.g. *min qibali X*) in passive constructions. Thus, an example like (i) is ruled out.

(i)	* <i>numiya</i>	numuw-u-n	sariiḥ-un	min	qibali	n-naxlat-i
	grew.PASS.3.M.SG	growth-NOM-INDEF	fast-NOM	by	side	DEF-palm-GEN
Intended: ‘A fast growth was grown by the palm.’						

Badawi (2004:383) points out that the Arabic passive construction “exists primarily to express an act whose agent is unknown or suppressed, hence cannot in theory be mentioned even periphrastically elsewhere in the sentence, though MSA is starting to do so under the influence of European languages”.

Note 6. The direct object does not appear in the passive construction due to some restrictions imposed on the passivization of COs of transitive verbs in MSA. I will deal with this in section 4.

Note 7. FM stands for focus marker (See Ouhalla, 1993; Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueri 2010).

Note 8. For more information about the differences between these two grammatical schools: Kufah and Basra, see Goldziher (1994) and Yaacob (2014).

Note 9. Similar constructions are attested in MSA as exemplified in (ii) below.

(ii)	ʔaxbara	r-rajul-u	zayd-an	l-jidd-a	sabiil-a
	told.3.M.SG	DEF-man-NOM	Zayd-ACC	DEF-hard.work-ACC	way-ACC
	l-najaḥ-i				
	DEF-success-GEN				
	‘The man told Zayed that hard work is the way to success.’				
	Literary: ‘The man told Zayed hard work as the way to success.’				

Although (ii) is analysed, from generative grammar perspective, as a sentence containing three-place arguments (i.e. the verb takes as its arguments a subject, an indirect object and a clause functioning as a direct object), Arabic traditional grammarians analyse it as a sentence containing four-place arguments (i.e. the verb takes a subject and three objects as its arguments). They argue that the third object *sabiil-a* is assigned a structural case by the verb *ʔaxbara* which the governor.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)