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ABSTRACT

Arabic is a language that makes extensive use of the so-called cognate object construction, which is made up of two elements: a lexical verb plus an accusative-case marked NP that is represented by a verbal derived N called the masdar in Arabic; the verb and the N are morphologically and semantically related, as can be seen in (1).

1) **ibtasamat ibtisāmat-an jaḍdašaṭa**
   - **smile.PST** smile.MS-ACC attractive
   - ‘She smiled an attractive smile.’

The cognate object construction has been the focus of much interest for many authors cross-linguistically, and yet it remains an understudied linguistic phenomenon in Arabic. The majority of studies have been carried out in a very traditional framework. They provide brief descriptions concerning the construction and do not make the more precise and well-defined distinctions required for a modern analysis (see e.g. Al-Galayni 1993; Ryding 2005; Salehbeik & Ghorbani 2014). Therefore, in this thesis I provide a linguistic characterization of the construction in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) which covers morphological, syntactic, semantic aspects. I indicate that in Arabic the cognate object construction incorporates a network of types that exhibit variations at the different linguistic levels.

The thesis also attempts to answer the recurrent question in the literature regarding the semantic and syntactic status of the cognate object. In works such as Kim & Lim (2010) and Pereltsvaig (2016), cognate objects are of two types; there are cognate objects that function as direct objects of the verb, and there are cognate objects that function as predicates. In previous analyses, cognate objects have been awarded a unified treatment. They are analysed as thematic arguments, as in the works of Macfarland (1995); Höche (2009); and, more specifically as structural thematic objects in Massam (1990). In other works, cognate objects are analysed as adjuncts (Jones 1988) or as predicates (Mittwoch 1998; Mirto 2007; Horrocks & Stavrou 2010).

In this thesis, I provide extensive evidence based on objecthood, referentiality and the diagnostic properties of predicative NPs. I argue that there are at least three types of cognate objects in Arabic: (i) cognate objects that function as direct objects of the verb which are found in a transitive or a ditransitive construction; (ii) cognate objects that function as coverbs and hence create a complex predicate; and (iii) cognate objects that function as adjuncts. Therefore, I aim in this thesis to fill the gap in the literature on the study of the construction in Arabic, to revalidate the significant works by Kim & Lim (2010) and Pereltsvaig (2016) in revealing the heterogeneous nature of the construction, and the significant work by Massam (1990), which reveals the objecthood of certain types of cognate objects which superficially appear as distinct from ORDINARY OBJECTS and were hence analyzed differently in the literature.
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GLOSSING CONVENTIONS

ACC accusative
ADJ adjective
BM basic maṣdar
CAUS causative
DEF definite
DU dual
F feminine
FOC focus
GEN genitive
INF infinitive
INS instrumental
M masculine
MD made-up maṣdar
MM mīm maṣdar
MNM manner maṣdar
MS maṣdar
NOM nominative
NSDM non-stem derived maṣdar
PASS passive
PL plural
PRS present
PRT particle
PST past
TSM t-suffixed maṣdar
UM unit maṣdar
1 first person
2 second person
3 third person
## TRANSLITERATION SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transliteration Symbol</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transliteration Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ا/ا</td>
<td>?/ā</td>
<td>ض</td>
<td>ḍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>ţ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>ţ</td>
<td>ع</td>
<td>ʕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ǧ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>ḏ</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>هـ</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>w/ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>ي</td>
<td>y/ī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

The present study deals with the type of construction represented by the sentences in (1). These involve a verb and an accusative-case marked NP whose head is morphologically cognate with the verb and which occurs in a position typical of that of the ordinary object in a monotransitive construction.

1) 
   a. She smiled an attractive smile
   b. ibtasamat  ibtisāmat-an jaḍḍābatan
      smile.PST.3FSG  smile.MS-ACC  attractive

This type of construction has come to be called the ‘Cognate Object Construction’ in the linguistic literature, and it has been a centre of interest for many authors cross-linguistically. Attempts have been made to define it, identify the status of the cognate NP, solve the ambiguities associated with it and provide accounts for it within a variety of theoretical frameworks. Nevertheless, in Arabic the topic of cognate object constructions remains among the understudied linguistic

\[\text{Note the following on glossing conventions: the cognate N which is a derived N called the maṣdar in Arabic (see section 1.4.1.5) is glossed according to the meaning of the corresponding verb. The maṣdars are of different classes and the symbol MS is used for any of the different maṣdar classes. In Chapter 2, the different maṣdar classes are introduced and characterized and therefore, the specific maṣdar class is then indicated in the glossing rather than the general description as MS. Also, throughout the thesis, indication of case-marking on NPs focuses more or less on the head N in the cognate object NP but not the dependent(s) involved, such as the adjective in this example, unless it is relevant to the point being discussed. Moreover, in the introductory parts of the thesis where focus is on the cognate relation between the two elements i.e. the cognate object and the cognate verb, the cognate verb as well as the cognate object are in bold. In that later parts, however, only the cognate object, whose behavior is being considered, is in bold.}\]
phenomena, despite the extensive use of the construction. The majority of studies have been carried out in a very traditional framework. They provide brief descriptions concerning the construction and do not make the more precise and well-defined distinctions required for a modern analysis (see e.g. Al-Galayni 1993; Ryding 2005; Salehbeik & Ghorbani 2014). In such works the focus is mostly on the semantic functions of cognate objects and the formal patterns in which these cognate objects are represented. Three semantic functions are identified for three formal categories, as indicated in (2), and these are respectively exemplified in (3). Therefore, a strictly one-to-one relation is frequently assumed in such works.

2) a. Emphasizing the event, as a bare NP
b. Quantifying the event, as a quantifier + NP
c. Indicating the type of the event, as an NP + Adjective

3) a. ibtasamat ibtisām-an
   smile.PST.3FSG smile.MS-ACC
   ‘She smiled.’

b. ibtasamat ibtisāmat-an wāḥidatan
   smile.PST.3FSG smile.MS-ACC one
   ‘She smiled one smile’

c. ibtasamat ibtisāmat-an jaḏdābatan
   smile.PST.3FSG smile.MS-ACC attractive
   ‘She smiled an attractive smile’

The present work, however, reveals a complex network of distinct cognate object categories, which are classified on the basis of multidimensional criteria, and which incorporate interfaces as well as mismatches. For instance, the

2 Although I have not undertaken a quantitative study, the extensive use of the construction can be observed from the number of tokens that results when searching for instances of a cognate object whether in the corpus or when searching the web.

3 In fact, Al-Samurrayi (1985) observing the imprecisions and misconceptions associated with the characterization of cognate objects in traditional works and how this differs from the actual use of the cognate object construction, has called for a more precise treatment and characterization of the phenomenon.
classifications are related to the morpho-syntactic properties of the cognate N, the
constructional pattern of the cognate object NP, the interpretation of the cognate
object and, lastly, the properties of the verb with which the cognate object is
associated. To mention a few aspects of the classification, there are five
morphological classes that can occur as the head N in the cognate object NP. The
cognate object NPs can be found in about 13 constructional patterns, which vary
in their semantics and syntax. Besides, the cognate object can be found with
intransitive, monotransitive and ditransitive verbs.

Al-Sammak (2012) provides a linguistic account of cognate objects in Arabic.
However, the crucial morpho-syntactic and constructional distinctions among the
various categories, as indicated in the present work, are not found in Al-Sammak
(2012). Moreover, the investigation is constrained to two types of cognate objects,
and the judgements on the status of these cognate objects are based on data that
are poorly defined and constructed.\(^4\) For instance, some cognate NPs that lack the
principal properties necessary to be considered a cognate object, as found in the
literature cross-linguistically, are included in the data.\(^5\) Moreover, some of the
elements constructed by Al-Sammak (2015) do not reflect MSA data.

\(^4\) Al-Sammak (2012) mentions that the work is an analysis of cognate objects in
MSA. However, there are examples (e.g. (110) & (111):30) which seem to be
constructed on the basis of the data from classical Arabic that he provides in the
introductory overview. Moreover, ungrammatical examples where Al-Sammak
(2012) does not use the correct morphological form of the cognate N, but rather
another corresponding morphological form of the same verbal root; the
morphological form he uses in the respective examples cannot be used in the
contexts he has given. Also, some examples appear to be translations of English
examples he mentions from the literature reviewed.

\(^5\) To quote one example, \textit{irtadā ridā\?an} ‘to dress a dress’ (lit. ‘dress.PST.3SG dress’) is
merely a case where the verb and the N happen to be morphologically cognate.
Other criteria often considered in the literature in delimiting the construction such
as the semantic ones are not considered (see section 1.4.1). There is no indication
that such instances represent a different type if they are to be called cognate
objects. The scope of the construction is thus not clearly delimited in Al-Sammak’s
Given this gap in the literature on the cognate object construction in Arabic, I am conducting the present work to fulfill the following aims:

1. To provide an adequate descriptive characterization of the cognate object construction in Arabic in order to reveal the complex interfaces among the various linguistic levels;

2. To investigate and identify the similarities and differences among the various categories of cognate objects and the ways in which these categories are similar to, or distinct from, the properties of the prototypical category of objects, i.e. the ORDINARY OBJECT in a monotransitive construction;

3. To identify the status of the categories of cognate objects in terms of the questions frequently asked in the literature, namely whether cognate objects are arguments or adjuncts, and whether they represent referential NPs or predicative NPs.

1.2. Modern Standard Arabic

The present study focuses on Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). MSA is the modern variety of Arabic that stands between the other two varieties: classical Arabic and dialectal Arabic. It is the official language in the different Arabic nations, serving as a unifying language for all the dialectal groups (Freeman 1996; Ryding 2005:5) (see figure 1.1, adapted from Wikipedia). MSA is used in formal speech and writing, such as in situations related to media, literature, and education. Saudi Arabia is one country where MSA is used. For example, it is the language used throughout the years of education (instructing and in-class communication), as well as in the varied media programs, including news broadcasts, children’s programs and in different formal situations, whether speaking or writing, such as

---

sermons, interviews, lectures, public speeches and meetings. MSA is a well-documented language and many corpora are available on MSA data.

Given this position of MSA in Arabic countries, I therefore, focus on MSA in providing a comprehensive characterization of this understudied construction in the Arabic language.

Figure 1.1 Distribution of Modern Standard Arabic as an official language in the Arabic countries

1.3. The Data

The data used in the present study are either examples constructed by the author of the present work or examples that are extracted from two sources of authentic language, i.e. the Oxford Arabic corpus and the Web. Although much of the present work is based on data extracted and collected from these two sources of authentic language, exemplification throughout the thesis relies predominantly on constructed examples. This is for two reasons: either because (i) a certain example

---

7 Green=the only official language; blue=one of the official languages (it is not given in the source what the light blue colour stands for.)

8 The Oxford Arabic corpus on Modern Standard Arabic includes the Arabic Gigaword fourth edition corpus (2009), Linguistic Data Consortium, plus other smaller corpora.
is not available in the corpus or the Web; or (ii) the available corpus or Web example does not precisely serve the purpose of clarifying a particular grammatical point. To illustrate, in some cases a set of comparable sentences is needed to indicate how the different categories of cognate objects behave with respect to a particular syntactic phenomenon. In this case, either the available sentences are not as simple as is necessary for the purpose of the point being demonstrated, or the sentences are not available for the respective category of cognate object which is grammatical but is not commonly found in the given structure. Accordingly, since exemplification by constructed sentences is the default case, this information is not indicated when a constructed sentence is given. However, in the case of a corpus example, the token number is given below the sentence, as shown in (4) and in the case of Web examples, the link is provided in a footnote.

4) lan naqtula=kum faḥasb bal sa-nuqaṭṭisū=kum
   will.not.kill.PRS.1PL=2PL only but will-cut.PRS.1PL=2PL
   taqṭī-an
   cut.MS-ACC
   ‘We will not only kill you but we will cut you.’
   (#199781025)

Moreover, given that MSA is not a language used in everyday speaking, intuitive judgments on structures that are not common with cognate objects are checked with seven informants. One of these informants is an instructor of Arabic rhetoric in Umm Al-Qura university, who not only uses MSA in formal situations but also in her informal conversations. Another informant is a writer of literary pieces in MSA, who has published a book of her written articles. The other informants use the language mainly in formal situations, as is the case with other language users of MSA. The judgements of the different informants tend to be similar, except in a few cases where the informant who teaches Arabic rhetoric and uses MSA in conversing may give judgements that are based on the rules of Arabic grammar.
rather than on her own intuition.\(^9\) In this case, I tend to go with the judgements of the other informants which are also consistent with the author’s intuition.

## 1.4. Cognate Object Constructions

### 1.4.1. Delimitation of the Concept

The widespread cross-linguistic literature on cognate object constructions uses various criteria, including morphological, syntactic, and semantic, to identify cognate object constructions. In the paragraphs below, I consider the major criteria present in the literature and consequently postulate delimitation of the concept of the cognate object construction in MSA which is adopted in this work.

#### 1.4.1.1 Morphological Criterion

The first criterion that is commonly used in the literature is that of the morphological relationship that holds between the verb and the noun of the cognate object; the relationship needs to be ‘cognate’ i.e. related in form as indicated by the term in the designation of the respective construction. In other words, the verb and the noun share a morpheme. For example, in ‘smile a happy smile’, the verb and the noun are morphologically cognate but this is not the case between the verb and the noun in e.g. ‘smile a graduation grin’. Opinions vary as to the extent to which this criterion is taken into consideration in delimiting the cognate object construction. According to one view, that of Höche (2009) on English cognate objects, morphological cognateness is a sufficient condition for classifying an instance as a cognate object. Hence examples such as ‘fish some fish’ and ‘feed some food’ are considered as cognate objects by Höche (2009:89). In the majority of works, however, morphological cognateness is not deemed to be a sufficient criterion and they do not classify the above examples as cognate objects;

---

\(^9\) I refer to this informant as informant A when indicating her dissimilar judgements.
rather semantic criteria are taken into consideration when classifying an NP as a
cognate object (e.g. Mittwoch 1998; Macfarland 1995; Ogata 2008; Sailer 2010).

1.4.1.2 Semantic Criteria

There are a number of semantic aspects and constraints on delimiting the scope of
the cognate object construction which are considered in the literature. These
aspects and constraints are related to the cognate object per se as well as to its
relation with the verb in the cognate object construction. One of these semantic
constraints is related to the type of semantic relation that holds between the
cognate object and the verb. A cognate object is an NP that, unlike ordinary
objects, does not hold an affected object relation with the verb; rather the cognate
object is a resultant/effected object. This means that the cognate object comes into
existence as a consequence of the action denoted by the verb (Jesperson 1927;
Visser 1963; Baron 1971; Quirk et al 1985; Macfarland 1995; Kuno and Takami
2004). For example, the cognate objects of verbs such as ‘grin’, ‘scowl’ and ‘sigh’
do not exist independently of the actions of ‘grinning’, ‘scowling’ and ‘sighing’
(Macfarland 1995:33-34). The difference between the affected object and the
effected object relations is that in the former the relation is ‘a cause to change’
relation whereas in the latter it is a ‘cause to exist’ relation; this difference can be
illustrated by the two sentences below which involve non-cognate object NPs.¹⁰

5)
   a. Hind cut the cake
   b. Hind made a cake

While in (5a), something is done to the cake by Hind and it is thus affected, in (5b),
the cake is produced by Hind’s action. Another difference is that the former has a
pre-existence whereas the existence of the effected object results from the action

¹⁰ See e.g. Fillmore (1968) for a discussion on the difference between the two types of relations.
per se. Therefore, there are NPs such as the examples in (6) which are morphologically cognate with the verb but do not count as cognate objects because they represent instances of affected objects rather than resultant/effect objects (e.g. Macfarland 1995).

6)

a. She went on naming the names in the fictional Polish genealogy…
b. A judge to judge a judge.
c. No one can make us love love as much as Shakespeare
d. I can't tell when I'm going to feel melancholy. It used to be whenever I went by our old house. Or smelled a certain smell.

(Corpus examples taken from Macfarland 1995:36, 40,41)

One constraint on the resultant or effected object criterion can be indicated here, and that is that the cognate object NP should not denote a concrete result. In the majority of works on cognate objects, formally cognate NPs as in ‘build a building’ that denote a concrete result do not qualify as cognate objects. To my knowledge, the only author as far as I know who includes those cognate NPs that denote concrete resultant entities is Höche (2009) in her study on English cognate objects; some of the instances included in her data are ‘weave a web’, ‘produce a product’, ‘paint a painting’, ‘record a record’ (141). The reason Höche (2009) mentions for including these concrete-result denoting cognate NPs is to establish a network of different NPs which she designates cognate objects, ranging from typical instances of cognate objects to those less typical ones. She even includes in her definition the type of cognate NPs that hold an affected object relation with the verb which do not count as cognate objects in the literature as demonstrated above.

The third semantic criterion, which appears to be the principal one among the different authors, is that referred to in the literature as ‘semantic cognateness’ or relatedness between the verb and the cognate object. Kuno and Takami (2004:125) define this property of semantic cognateness, which they consider among the functional constraints that they postulate for cognate object constructions, as
follows: ‘the [cognate] object NP must represent a specific state or event that belongs to the set of the possible states or events resulting from the activity or event’. The verb and the cognate object have similar or related denotations, which are eventive. For example, the cognate nouns, ‘a sigh’, ‘a laugh’, ‘a smile’, ‘a sleep’, all involve an eventive element that is related to the meaning denoted by the corresponding verbs. It is perhaps because of a failure to satisfy this criterion of semantic cognateness that cognate nouns which denote concrete objects that result from the action are excluded from the scope of the construction by many authors. The result object ‘building’ does not imply an eventive element that relates to the action of ‘building’; rather, it merely refers to a built entity; hence, no semantic cognateness is involved here even though the entity comes into existence as a result of the action denoted by the verb with which it is morphologically cognate.

In fact, based on the criterion of semantic cognateness, some authors even consider instances of semantically, though not morphologically, cognate V-N pairs such as those given in (7), as representing instances of a cognate object construction (Jesperson 1927; Visser 1963; Quirk et al 1985; Mittwoch 1998; Kuno and Takami 2004; Sailer 2010).

7)

a. He slept a fitful slumber
   (Horita 1996:241)

b. strike a blow, fire a shot, fight a battle

c. plēgas typtein (Ancient Greek)
   blows-ACC strike-INF
   (Mittwoch 1998:312-13)

d. “Let’s wipe our brows and smile a graduation grin,” said Ms. Ator of Reisterstown.
   (from T.W. Waldron, the Baltimore Sun, cited in Macfarland 1995:90)

e. Van Aldin laughed a quiet little cackle of amusement.
   (from Agatha Christie, The Mystery of the Blue Train, p.19 cited in Omuro 1990:76)
Another semantic criterion is pointed out in Mittwoch (1998:312); this relates to the direct relatedness between the verb and the cognate object and the fact that the cognate object owes its existence to the verbal event. Mittwoch (1998:312) further points out that ‘the verb and the NP together denote one eventuality’ and, consequently, ‘the understood agent of the NP must be the same as the subject theta role of the verb’. Therefore, an example such as ‘Can you smell a funny smell?’ does not count as an instance of a cognate object as demonstrated in Mittwoch (1998:312). The ‘funny smell’ is an event that exists independently of the verbal event. Also, the subject of the verb ‘smell’ has the theta role of an EXPERIENCER whereas the noun smell ‘denotes an event of emission by an entity not mentioned in the sentence’. However, in instances of cognate objects such as ‘laugh a loud laugh’, the agent of the verb is also the agent implied by the cognate object. Even in examples where the cognate object involves a different participant from that in the verbal event as in ‘talk the talk of a boss’, the respective participant, i.e. ‘a boss’, still has the same theta-role of the subject of the verb, i.e. that of AGENT (see Mittwoch 1998:312).

A contrary case is that of cognate objects that do not mainly owe their existence to the verbal event and seem to have an independent existence, such as ‘song’ and ‘dance’ (in one of its readings). Therefore, some authors exclude this type of cognate NPs (e.g. Mittwoch 1998; Kuno & Takami 2004; Sailer 2010). According to other analyses, however, these NPs are still semantically cognate with the verb and they qualify as a type of cognate objects; the verb is seen to represent a

11 Note that though the term ‘eventuality’ in Mittwoch’s (1998) definition of cognate objects seems to be used in cases where focus is not merely on the event but also on the participants involved in the event, in the present work I will only use the term ‘event’ whether or not reference is made to the participants involved in the event.

12 The reason for excluding this instance can also be demonstrated in terms of the first semantic constraint indicated above and that it is because the cognate NP in this example is an affected object. See the example given in (6d) from Macfarland (1995:36).
realization of the type of event expressed by the cognate object (see e.g. Ogata 2008; Kim & Lim 2012). Ogata (2008) uses the descriptive terms **ASYNCHRONOUS** and **SYNCHRONOUS** to distinguish between instances of cognate objects that can have an independent existence, as in ‘dance a traditional dance’, and those that only exist by virtue of the verbal event, as in ‘smile an attractive smile’.

It can be pointed out that, given the different semantic criteria of delimiting the concept of cognate objects as found in the literature, authors differ in their interpretation and analysis of the same instance of cognate object. Some authors interpret the cognate object as the abstract and eventive result of the verbal event (e.g. Macfarland 1995), while others interpret the same instance as the cognate object that expresses the same event as that expressed by the verb (Mittwoch 1998; Mirto 2007). Yet, a third group of authors vary in their interpretation and distinguish between result-denoting cognate objects and event-denoting cognate objects (Sailer 2010; Kim & Lim 2012). Moreover, in Höche (2009), the typical type of cognate objects, i.e. the ones often identified in the literature as cognate objects, is characterized as a polysemous category with a result as well as an event reading. Regardless of what interpretation the authors give to the instances of the cognate object, and what analysis they propose on their status, as will be indicated in the subsequent section, the semantic criteria, and not the mere morphological cognateness, are principal in delimiting the concept of the cognate object construction cross-linguistically.

### 1.4.1.3 Syntactic Criteria

A third type of criterion that has often been considered in delimiting the scope of the phenomenon in a language such as English is that of the type of the cognate verb that licenses a cognate object. According to one view, the construction must be restricted to an otherwise intransitive verb, i.e. one that can have as an object only a cognate NP, e.g. ‘die’, ‘laugh’, and ‘sigh’ (Poutsma 1926; Jones 1988;
Moltmann 1989; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Macfarland 1995; Felser & Wanner 2001; Sailer 2010). Accordingly, sentences with optionally transitive verbs, such as ‘dream’, ‘dance’ and ‘sing’, which can also have non-cognate objects, as shown in (8), do not count as cognate objects for these authors.\(^{13}\)

8)

a. Sam danced a jig/ a piece from Swan Lake/ something involving lots of pirouettes.

b. Bill dreamed a most peculiar thing/ that he was a crocodile.

\[\text{(Jones 1988:89)}\]

c. Tosca sang a song/ an aria/ a ballad from Ireland

\[\text{(Massam 1990:163,164)}\]

Authors may go further in restricting the concept of the cognate object construction to only intransitive unergative verbs and assume that an unaccusative verb cannot license a cognate object as can be seen in the following ungrammatical sentences (Jones 1988; Moltmann 1989; Massam 1990; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Macfarland 1995; Felser & Wanner 2001).

9)

a. *It emerged a strange emergence

\[\text{(Keyser & Roeper 1984:404)}\]

b. *The glass broke a crooked break

\[\text{(Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995:40)}\]

c. *The snow melted a snow melt

\[\text{(Macfarland 1995:198)}\]

Such constraint is attributed to the fact that the internal argument of the unaccusative verb is occupied by the theme subject (Macfarland 1995). However, counter-examples of unaccusative verbs taking a cognate object are provided by

\(^{13}\) Authors might exclude the verbs ‘dance’ and ‘sing’ not merely because they are not true intransitive verbs but because the cognate NPs of these verbs do not represent resultant objects but rather they can have an existence that is independent from the action of the verb (Mittwoch 1998; Kuno and Takami 2004) (see semantic criteria section 1.4.1.2).
Kuno and Takami (2004) such as the examples given in (10). They argue that the unergativity constraint posited by some authors does not hold for English.

(10)

a. The tree grew a century’s growth within only ten years.
b. The stock market dropped its largest drop in three years today.
c. Stanley watched as the ball bounced a funny little bounce right into the shortstop’s glove.
d. The apples fell just a short fall to the lower deck, and so were not too badly bruised.

(Kuno and Takami 2004:116)

Although it has been shown that cognate objects with unaccusative verbs do exist and that the unergativity constraint no longer holds, it will be demonstrated in section 1.4.2. that the cognate objects of the two types of verbs are not always similar in their status (Nakajima 2006; Kim & Lim 2012). Therefore, the transitivity constraint which is considered by some authors is often associated an attempt for a unified treatment of the status of the cognate object. For example, Jones (1988) excludes cognate NPs combining with optionally transitive verbs as they exhibit similar behavior to direct objects with respect to passivization. Likewise, Kuno and Takami (2004) leave open the question of whether the cognate nouns occurring with the verbs ‘live’, ‘scream’ and ‘shriek’ should be categorized as cognate objects since these cognate nouns, although semantically different, behave like direct objects in terms of passivization and pronominalization. In more recent works, such as Matsumoto (1996), Nakajima (2006), Ogata (2008), Höche (2009), Sailer (2010), the cognate object construction is less delimited and cognate objects are analyzed as semantically and/or syntactically heterogeneous categories.

It is worth noting that this transitivity constraint is often discussed in works on English. In other languages such as Hebrew and Russian (see Pereltsvaig 1999b; Mittwoch 1998), the transitivity constraint is not considered and the cognate object
can be found with different verb types including transitive and ditransitive verbs as can be seen in the examples in (11) and in (12) respectively.

11) Hezini oto hazana melaxunit
   They fed him feeding artificial
   ‘They fed him artificially’

   (Mittwoch 1998:314, Hebrew)

12) Hu šalax lanu mixtav šlixa bilti axrait
   He sent to-us letter sending non responsible
   ‘He sent us a letter in an irresponsible way.’

   (Pereltsvaig 1999b:538)

1.4.1.4 Categories of Cognate Objects

Having outlined the various criteria and the constraints discussed in the literature on delimiting the concept of cognate object constructions in different languages, as summarized below, I provide in this section a list of the different types that might be designated cognate objects by the different authors. I also set out and the categories which I include and exclude in the present work. The main criteria include the following:

   A. Morphological cognateness between the verb and the noun.
      This is sometimes a sufficient condition for some authors; consequently, cognate NPs that do not meet the semantic criteria, such as those instances that hold an affected object relation (‘UNDERGOER’) with the verb, are included.

   B. Semantic relatedness between the verb and the noun.
      The cognate object is semantically cognate with the verb; it expresses the same event expressed by the verb or it expresses the outcome of the verbal event. The cognate object directly relates to, and owes its existence to, the verbal event, and/or it can have an independent existence.
C. Syntactic type of the verb

As can be seen in the list below, there are categories that are classified according to the type of the verb and others which are classified according to the properties of the cognate NP per se. The type of criterion or criteria involved in ruling in the respective category is also indicated.

**CATEGORIES ACCORDING TO VERB TYPE:**

**Type A: syntactic criterion**

A cognate NP with an unaccusative verb e.g.,

13) The apples fell just a short fall to the lower deck, and so were not too badly bruised

(Kuno and Takami 2004:116)\(^{14}\)

**Type B: syntactic criterion**

A cognate NP with an unergative verb e.g.,

14) Bill sighed a weary sigh

(Jones 1988:89)

**Type C: syntactic and semantic criteria**

A cognate NP with an optionally transitive verb whose cognate noun is hyponymous with the possible set of non-cognate nouns that the verb selects e.g.,

15) Tosca sang a song/an aria/a ballad from Ireland

(Massam 1990:163, 164)

---

\(^{14}\) Citing these sentences to exemplify the various categories does not necessarily mean that the authors of the respective sources, or the author of the present work, count the cited examples as an instance of a cognate object construction.
Type D: syntactic criterion

A cognate NP with a monotransitive verb e.g.,

16) Hezinu oto hazana melaxutit
    They fed him feeding artificial
    ‘They fed him artificially’

(Mittwoch 1998:314, Hebrew)

Type E: syntactic criterion

A cognate NP with a ditransitive verb e.g.,

17) Hu šalax lanu mixtav šlixa bilti axrait
    He sent to-us letter sending non responsible
    ‘He sent us a letter in an irresponsible way.’

(Pereltsvaig 1999b:538)

CATEGORIES ACCORDING TO PROPERTIES OF THE COGNATE NP

Type F: morphological and semantic criteria

An NP that is morphologically and semantically cognate with the verb; the cognate object expresses an event that owes its existence to the verb. The implied agent in the cognate object is the same as that of the verb.\(^\text{15}\)

18)  
    a. Fight a heroic fight
        (Mittwoch 1998:314)
    b. Alex lived a happy life
        (Sailer 2010:196)

\(^{15}\) Authors vary in how they refer this type of cognate objects. The same instances are described as event objects (e.g. Mittwoch 1998) or resultant object (e.g. Macfarland 1995), but this is related to a difference in the analyses that they propose. For example, Höche (2009) describes these cognate objects with regard to their interpretation as EVENT-RESULT cognate objects i.e. they can have two readings. But in her analysis of their status, she refers to them as objects of results or effected objects.
Type G: morphological and semantic criteria

An NP that is morphologically and semantically cognate with the verb but one that can have an existence independent of the verb e.g.

19) He danced a traditional dance  
   (Ogata 2008:5)

Type H: semantic criterion

An NP that is semantically but not morphologically cognate with the verb e.g.,

20) He slept a fitful slumber  
   (Horita 1996:241)

Type I: morphological and semantic criteria

A morphologically or also semantically cognate NP but one that does not directly relate to the verb; it neither expresses the same event of the verb nor the result of the event. It represents an affected object (‘UNDERGOER’) e.g.,

21)
   a. Can I borrow this cup now to fish these fish?  
      (KBW:105, cited in Höche 2009:86)
   b. Can you smell a funny smell  
      (Mittwoch 1998:312)
   c. No one can make us love love as much as Shakespeare  
      (A. Bloom, Love and Friendship, 395, cited in Macfarland 1995:41)

Type J: morphological and semantic criteria

A morphologically cognate NP that denotes a concrete product of the event denoted by the verb e.g.,

22) They built a brick building  
   (Höche 2009:165)
Other categories, which are not given in the list above but which can be considered a category of a cognate object construction in Arabic by the various criteria discussed above include the following.

Type K: semantic criteria

The cognate NP and the verb do not express the same event; the participants in the event expressed by the cognate object are different from those of the participants in the verbal event and the participants in the cognate object are expressed by referential NPs e.g.,

23) \(yuf\dd d\dd\)=hum al-q\=ida \(\dd d\dd\)-a fi\=SHA\=NA\ li-qawmi=hi\
torture.PRS=3PL the-leader torture-ACC Fir\=SHA\=NA of-nation=his

‘The leader torture them in the way of Fir\=SHA\=NA’s torturing of his nation.’

Type L:

An indefinite singular cognate N that obligatorily occurs as a bare NP e.g.,

24) \(\dd d\dd\)=al-\=fa-t-t\=hai=\=u \=i\=t\=t\=i\=h\=a\=d\=a\=n\16\
Oh.you PRT-unite.IMP=2PL uniting-ACC

‘Oh, you unite completely.’

Type M:

A cognate N that morpho--semantically denotes a manner of the verbal event e.g.,

25) qatal=\=u=hu qitlat-an wa\=SHA\=S\i\=ya\=yan\
kill.PST=3PL=3SG manner.of.killing-ACC violent

‘They killed him in a violent manner of killing’

This study will be inclusive of a wide range of cognate object categories based on the definitional criteria of the concept in Arabic as will be demonstrated in the subsequent section with the aim of exploring the properties of the different categories, identifying their syntactic and semantic status and indicating the degree to which they are similar to or distinct from the ORDINARY OBJECTS.

\(\text{http://www.muslm.org/vb/archive/index.php/t-423874.html, accessed in 27/09/13}\)
Therefore, all the categories set out in the list above are included in the investigation, with the exception of two categories namely type (I) and type (J). The cognate object in type (I) holds an affected object relation with the verb, whereas it is indicated in section 1.4.1.2 that one constraint on cognate objects, in contrast to the case with ordinary objects, is that they cannot be affected objects. This type of cognate objects is included in Höche (2009), for instance, merely because the noun is formally cognate with the verb. I exclude type (J), as do the majority of authors, because it does not fulfil the principal criterion, i.e. that of semantic relatedness between the verb and the cognate object (see section 1.4.1.2).17

1.4.1.5 Delimitation of the Concept in MSA

The cognate object construction in MSA is, in fact, of considerable variation and it does not involve the same set of restrictions that might be found in languages such as English. Firstly, compared to another Semitic language like Hebrew, an MSA cognate object is not restricted to occurring with verbs, but can occur with a number of other predicate types, including adjectivals and nominals represented by deverbal derived forms, as evident in the examples below.

26) a. ʔinna haddihi š-šāta maḍbūḥat-un ḏabḥ-an šaršiyyan
EMPH this the-sheep slaughtered-NOM slaughter.MS-ACC legal
‘This sheep is slaughtered a legal slaughtering’
(Adjectival passive participle)

17 Also, as will be demonstrated in 1.4.1.5, the reason for excluding the cognate objects that express concrete resultant entities can be related to another definitional criterion in delimiting the concept in MSA namely the constraint on the morphological classes and derivational properties of the nouns that represent the head N in the cognate object and that it must be it must be a maṣdar N. A maṣdar N is derived directly or indirectly from the verb, whereas it is debatable whether these concrete-result denoting nouns belong under the maṣdar classes.
b. **at-tā?isatu** li-rabbi=ḥā ẓāsat-an muṭṭaqaṭan

the-be.obedient to-lord=her obey.MS-ACC absolute

‘The one being obedient to her Lord an absolute obedience’

(Agent present participle)

c. **tafāja?=ū** min ṭāliqi=hi la=ḥā ṭalāq-an

get.surprised=3PL from divorcing=3SG of=3FSG divorce.MS-ACC

bā?inan irrevocable

‘They were surprised from his divorcing her an irrevocable divorce’

(a deverbal derived N)

However, I restrict the investigation to those cognate object constructions in which the main predicate is a basic verb and not a deverbal-derived form, since this type of construction is more common, and huge datasets can be found for it, in contrast to the other types of the construction. Moreover, in terms of the verb type, it is also varied; it can be a one-place predicate (whether unaccusative or unergative), a two-place predicate or a three-place predicate.

As for identifying the NPs that can be said to function as cognate objects in Arabic, two interrelated criteria need be considered, namely the morphological as well as the semantic criteria. There is one specific morphological class of nouns that are likely to occur as the head N in the cognate object. These nouns are referred to in Arabic grammar as the **MAṢDARS**.\(^{18}\) The maṣdars are of a main class and five other subclasses.\(^{19}\) They have a corresponding verb with which they are morphologically and semantically cognate. They are derived from the verb according to specific derivational processes as will be demonstrated in detail in

\(^{18}\) These maṣdar nouns can still have other grammatical functions and not mainly functioning as cognate objects. Moreover, there are constraints within the instances of some of the subclasses on their functioning as a cognate object as will be indicated in Chapter 2.

\(^{19}\) The next chapter is an overview of the properties of these nouns which is given as the preliminary section in the present study.
Chapter 2. The semantic cognateness between the verb and the various maṣdar instances can be indicated with regard to the types of denotations that are expressed by the instances of the maṣdar nouns: there are maṣdars that denote an event that is similar to the event denoted by the base verb e.g. suqūṭ ‘falling’ from saqāt ‘fall’, maṣdars that denote an event outcome, e.g. ṣalāt ‘a prayer’ from ṣallā ‘pray’, and maṣdars that denote an event manner, e.g. qitlat ‘a way of killing’ from the verb qatal ‘kill’ (see Chapter 2 for details).

It can be pointed out that there are other types of nouns which, like the maṣdars, denote an event e.g. mukālamat ‘a call’, tajrubat ‘experiment’, ṛihlat ‘trip’, tamrīn ‘exercise’. The evidence that they involve an eventive meaning is their compatibility with an aspectualizer such as istamarra ‘continue’ and intahā ‘finish’ as can be seen in (27).

27)

a. istamarrat al-mukālamatu ḳamsa daqā?iq
   last.PST the-call five minutes
   ‘The call lasted for five minutes.’

b. intaha ṭ-tamrīn
   finish.past the-exercise
   ‘The exercise finished.’

These nouns cannot function as cognate objects. There does exist, in the language, verbs with which these nouns seem to be morphologically cognate; nevertheless, they do not normally co-occur with these verbs to form the cognate object construction as can be seen in the examples in (28). Rather, they can be found with a non-cognate verb as accusative-case marked NPs or as constituents in a PP, as indicated in (29).

---

20 Some of the maṣdar subclasses are derived from the corresponding main maṣdar class instance which in turn is derived from the verb. Therefore, the derivational relation between the verb and the various maṣdar instances still holds.
28)

a. *sa-ʔatakallamu mukālamat-an qaṣīratan
   will-talk.PRS.1SG call-ACC short
   ‘I will make a short call.’

b. *tamarran=tu tamārīn-a šāqqatan
   exercise.PAST=1SG exercises-ACC hard
   ‘I did hard exercises.’

29)

a. sa-ʔujrī mukālamat-an qaṣīratan
   will-make.PRS.1SG call-ACC short
   ‘I will make a short call.’

b. qum=tu bi-tamārīn-in šāqqatin
   do.PAST=1SG PRE-exercises-GEN hard
   ‘I did hard exercises.’

These nouns are not maṣdars (see e.g. Al-Maany Dictionary); they are not derived from a corresponding verb according to specific derivational processes as is the case with the maṣdars. Therefore, that the N in the cognate object is a maṣdar N is a definitional criterion in delimiting the concept of the cognate object construction in Arabic. 21

Another point that should also be indicated here is that there are nouns that share the same morphological form of some instances of the maṣdar nouns, but while the maṣdar noun denotes an event, these nouns refer to a concrete resultant entity. Examples of these nouns include bināʔ-an ‘building’, wasiyyat ‘exhortation/testament’, tarjamat ‘translation’, šarḥ ‘explanation’ and the like. The meaning can be determined by the surrounding context as can be seen in the sentences set out in (30). In (30a) bināʔ-an ‘building’ is modified by the manner-modifying adjective whereas in (30b) bināʔ-an ‘building’ is modified by the

21Macfarland (1995), in her work on English cognate objects, indicates a comparable constraint that is related to the derivational properties of the nouns in the cognate object, and that they are deverbal derived nouns i.e. derived from the verb, e.g. ‘sigh’ but not denominal derived nouns, i.e. derived from the noun, e.g. ‘name.
property-modifying adjective ‘high’, and is therefore a concrete-entity denoting noun.

30) 

a. banaw l-masjida binā?-an mutqanan
   build.PST.3PL the-mosque build.MS-ACC perfect
   ‘They built the mosque in a perfect way.’

b. banaw binā?-an šāhiqan
   build.PST.3PL building-ACC high
   ‘They built a tall building’

In the literature, there is a debate as to whether these concrete-entity denoting nouns can still be included within the morphological class of nouns designated as the maṣdars (deverbal derived nouns) (see e.g. Ukaasha 2009). In fact, whether these concrete-entity denoting nouns can best be described as homophonous with the maṣdars, or whether the respective instance of the maṣdar is polysemous, i.e. with a concrete and abstract (eventive) denotation, is a question that is beyond the scope of the present study. Consequently, it should be indicated that despite the fact that these concrete nouns can co-occur with a verb with which they are formally cognate, as could be seen in the example in (30b), and can hold with the verb a resultant object relation, I do not include these cognate NPs in the definition specified for the cognate object construction in the present study. One reason is related to their equivocal morphological status. The other reason relates to the fact that they do not fulfil the other definitional criterion i.e. the criterion of semantic relatedness which is indicated in section 1.4.1.2. to be the principal criterion in the different studies on cognate objects in the different languages. The cognate object either expresses the same event as that expressed by the verb or the abstract outcome of the verbal event; nevertheless, these nouns denote concrete entities and are consequently excluded.

With that said, all instances of the maṣdars with a single sense are necessarily semantically related to the corresponding base verb. As stated earlier concerning
the maṣdars, they can express an event that is the same as the verbal event, an abstract outcome of the event, or an event manner. This generalization regarding the semantic relatedness between the denotation of the maṣdars and the verb and that they are the morphological classes that occur as the N in the cognate object construction supports the assumption that semantic cognateness is a principal criterion in delimiting the concept of cognate object constructions cross-linguistically.

I have outlined so far, the definitional criteria and constraints related to the verb and the noun as individual elements. The other semantic criteria which are also discussed in the literature, as indicated in section 1.4.1.2, relate to the relation between the verb and the cognate object. A cognate object cannot be an NP that holds an affected object relation with the verb. Therefore, in the example in (31), the head N in the postverbal NP is a maṣdar noun that is morphologically and semantically cognate with the verb; nevertheless, I do not count it as a cognate object because it holds an affected object viz. a [cause to change] relation with the verb (see section 1.4.1.2).

31) ?aḥbab=tu ḥubb-a=hā l=ī

love.PST=1SG love.MS-ACC=her of=me

‘I loved her love of me.’

Also, with regard to the other semantic criterion on the relationship between the cognate object and the verb, namely whether it can have an independent existence or whether it only owes its existence to the verbal event, I include both types as I have indicated in section 1.4.1.4. They possess enough properties to be considered cognate objects. They are morphologically and semantically cognate with the verb, and they do not hold an affected object relation with the verb. Examples of the two
types can be given in (32).22

32)

a. raqaṣat \textit{raqṣat-a} l-bolḵā
dance.PST.3SG dance.MS-ACC the-Polka
‘She danced the Polka dance.’

b. ibtasamat \textit{ibtisāmat-an} jaḏḏābatan
smile.PST.3SG smile.MS-ACC attractive
‘She smiled an attractive smile.’

Given this variation in the cognate object construction in Arabic, either with respect to the verb types or the cognate object types, compared to some other languages, the investigation and characterization of its nature can give good insight into the cross-linguistic nature of cognate object constructions in general. In the subsequent section, I demonstrate the various approaches found in the literature on the linguistic status of cognate objects.

1.4.2. Status of Cognate Objects

A central question in the widespread literature on cognate objects investigates the theoretical semantic and/or syntactic status of the cognate object has frequently been at the centre of many of these research works. The discussions and analyses often focus on the theoretical distinction between the two semantic categories viz. arguments and adjuncts. Moreover, in some works, the cognate object NPs are also analysed in terms of their referentiality vs. their comparability to non-referential NPs such as predicative NPs. Also, the syntactic status of cognate objects is investigated in the literature and whether or not cognate objects qualify as structural objects of the respective verbs. In the subsequent sections, I provide

\[\text{22 A characterization of the different types of cognate objects in MSA is given in Chapter 3.}\]
an overview on the types of evidence and diagnostics utilized by the different authors in reaching the specific conclusion on the status of the cognate object.  

1.4.2.1 Cognate Objects as Arguments or Adjuncts

As generally defined by Needham and Toivonen (2011:1) 'arguments are the central, necessary participants in the event, whereas adjuncts provide “extra” information about where, when and how the event occurred'. Three types of proposals are found in the literature regarding whether cognate objects qualify as arguments of their verbs or as adjuncts. According to one proposal, cognate objects are arguments of their verbs i.e. they are participants in the event and are assigned a theta role by the verbs, as in the work of Massam (1990), Macfarland (1995), Matsumoto (1996), Pham (1996), Kuno and Takami (2004), Puigdollers (2008), Höche (2009), and Sailer (2010). Another view is that cognate objects are not arguments in the sense indicated above; but they are categorized as adjuncts, e.g. Jones (1988) and Moltmann (1989). However, according to one group of authors, the strict argument-adjunct distinction does not apply to all categories of cognate objects; rather, they posit that there are two types of cognate objects within a single language: argument cognate objects and adjunct cognate objects. See for instance Pereltsvaig (1999b) for Russian, Hebrew, Vietnamese, and Edo and Nakajima (2006) for English.

The argument-adjunct diagnostics are related to a diversity of syntactic and/or semantic phenomena, including optionality/obligatoriness of the expression, subcategorization, passivization, extraction, paraphrase and coordination, question formation and adjacency to the verb. The diagnostics for the different statuses are given below with exemplifications from different languages.

---

23 I primarily focus on the various diagnostics the authors utilize as evidence for the specific linguistic status without judging an author’s conclusion on the status of the cognate object in a particular language.
24 Edo is a language spoken in Nigeria.
OPTIONALITY of cognate objects, as noted by Moltmann (1989), is among the adjunct properties that cognate objects display. The sentence in (33) is grammatical without the cognate object.

33) John screamed (a terrifying scream)

(Moltmann, 1989:1)

However, though optionality is among the typical properties of adjuncts, some constituents which are classified as adjuncts, as pointed out by Massam (1990:163), can be obligatory as in (34a), whereas those constituents generally thought of as arguments can, in contrast, be optional as in (34b) and (34c). Hence, the optionality test alone cannot be determinate for the argument/adjunct status of the cognate object.

34)  
a. Grandcourt treated Gwendolyn *(badly)
b. Mirah ate (the banana) slowly
  c. Antonio pushed the car (to town)

(Massam 1990:163).

DISTRIBUTION across a wide variety of predicate types is another property of cognate objects that indicates affinity with adjuncts rather than arguments. For instance, in Hebrew, cognate objects occur with unaccusatives as in (35), psych-verbs as in (36), unergatives as in (37), transitives as in (38), ditransitives as in (39), passives as in (40), verbs of all aspectual classes including statives as in (41) and with adjectival as well as individual-level predicates as in (42) and (43) respectively (examples are from Pereltsvaig 1999b:538-39, unless indicated otherwise).

35) Hu nafal nefila kaša
   He fell falling hard
   ‘He had a heavy fall.’

(Mittwoch 1997:314)
36) Ani podedet mi-klavim (paxad mavet)
   I fear from-dogs fear death
   ‘I fear dogs (with a deadly fear)’

37) Dani xijix xijux same’ax
    Danny smiled smile happy
    ‘Danny smiled a happy smile’

38) Hezinu oto hazana melaxutit
    they-fed him feeding artificial
    ‘They fed him artificially’

39) Hu šalax lanu mixtav šlixa bilti axrait
    He sent to-us letter sending non responsible
    ‘He sent us a letter in an irresponsible way.’

40) Ha-toca’ot nivdeku bdika jesodit
    The-results were-examined examination thorough
    ‘The results were examined a thorough examination.’

41) Hu mevin ota havana muxletet
    He understands her understanding complete
    ‘He understands her completely’

42) Hu axrai axrajut eljona…
    he responsible responsibility supreme
    ‘He has supreme responsibility.’

43) Ein hu mofi’a hofa’a taxbirit ba-mišpat
    not it appears appearance syntactic in the sentence
    ‘It does not appear syntactically in the sentence’

(Mittwoch 1997:314)

As pointed out by Pereltsvaig (1999b:539), this observation that cognate objects occur with different predicate types is, in fact, ‘problematic’ because of the assumption that cognate objects should only be analysed as internal arguments of their verbs. The fact that they occur with different predicates indicates that they
are not selected by these predicates. Moreover, some of these predicates already have a thematic argument in the position of the predicate internal argument, as in the case of unaccusative and transitive verbs, whereas other predicates, such as adjectival predicates, do not have an internal argument in the first place.

Besides, Pereltsvaig (2002:111) points out that cognate objects that show argument properties occur with two types of predicates only, namely unergatives and optionally transitive verbs, as observed for English and Modern Hebrew; hence, they are not adverbial in their distribution, unlike adjunct cognate objects.\(^{25}\)

The behaviour of cognate objects with respect to passivization is another property that is taken by some authors as a diagnostic for concluding that cognate objects are adjuncts; cognate objects are claimed not to allow passivization as shown by the unacceptable sentences in (44) (e.g. Jones 1988; Pinker 1989; Moltmann 1989).

44)

   a. John died a gruesome death
   b. *A gruesome death was died by John.
   c. Harry lived an uneventful life.
   d. *An uneventful life was lived by Harry.
   e. Bill sighed a weary sigh
   f. *A weary sigh was sighed by Bill.

   (Jones 1988:92).

However, this argument is refuted by the fact that passivization of cognate objects, though infrequent and constrained to certain pragmatic and discourse factors, is, in fact, possible, as indicated in different works (see e.g. Macfarland 1995; Höche 2009; Kuno & Takami 2004).

\(^{25}\) In fact, not even all verbs that are unergatives license a cognate object construction as indicated in Levin (1993).
a. So patently, blatantly accidental had the death of Publius Claudius Pulcher been that Sulla knew it was no accident. Only how had the deed been done?


b. Life here had been lived on a scale and in a style she knew nothing about.


c. ... these thoughts would only have been thought by a Christian audience of that time.

   (HUB:980; cited in Höche 2009:175)

d. Pictures were taken, laughs were laughed, food was eaten

   (Open web, cited in Kuno and Takami 2004:128)

Nevertheless, non-passivizability, together with other properties, does distinguish some categories of cognate objects from others, as demonstrated by authors postulating two classes of cognate objects within a single language Pereltsvaig (1999a, 1999b, 2002) and Nakajima (2006).

For example, Pereltsvaig (1999a; 1999b; 2002) shows that one class of cognate objects in some languages, which she classifies as adjuncts, cannot be passivized, in contrast to cognate objects she assumes to be arguments, as can be seen in the examples in (46).

46)

   a. *Mot su kinhtrong dacbiet duoc (Hien) kinhtrong a CL respect special PASS (Hien) respect ‘A special respect was respected (by Hien).’

   (Pereltsvaig 1999a: 274)

   b. Ego dela byli sdelalny včera [his affairs].NOM were done yesterday ‘His affairs were settled yesterday.’

   (Pereltsvaig, 1999a:274)
Likewise, Nakajima (2006) demonstrates that cognate objects occurring with unaccusative verbs, such as those in (47), which he categorizes as adverbial cognate objects, cannot be passivized, contrary to those occurring with unergative verbs which allow passivization; hence, the unacceptability of the passive sentences in (48).

(47)

a. The tree grew a century’s growth within only ten years.
b. The stock market dropped its largest drop in three years today.
c. The apples fell just a short fall to the lower deck, and so were not too badly bruised.


(48)

a. *A century’s growth was grown within only ten years by the tree trunk.
b. *The largest drop in three years was dropped by the stock market today.
c. *Just a short fall was fallen to the lower deck by the apples.


Having said that, non-passivizability of some cognate objects does not necessarily have to lead to the conclusion that they are adjuncts since passivization is a diagnostic of objecthood, and arguments cannot be merely objects.

As for the (NON-)EXTRACTABILITY diagnostic, one class of cognate objects in some languages such as Hebrew are restricted in terms of extraction by A’-movement and is thus categorized by Pereltsvaig (2002) as adjuncts as can be observed in the following examples.

(49) Relativization

*Ha- kri’a še- Dani kar’a et ha- sefer hajta jesodit
The-reading that-Danny read ACC the-book was thorough
‘The reading that Danny read the book was thorough.’
50) Cleft

\[\text{*Zu hajta kri’a jesodit še- Dani kar’a et ha- sefer}\]

That was reading thorough that-Danny read ACC the-book

‘It was a thorough reading that Danny read the book.’

51) Pseudo-Cleft

\[\text{*Ma še- Dani kar’a et ha- sefer hajta kri’a jesodit}\]

What that-Danny read ACC the-book was reading thorough

‘What Danny read the book was a thorough reading.’

**PARAPHRASE** and **COORDINATION** have also been used to argue for either adjunct or argument status of two classes of cognate objects. For instance, adjunct cognate objects in Russian can be paraphrased into an adverbial as in (52) as shown by Pereltsvaig (1999a).

52) 

a. On ijubil eë strastnoj ijubovju =
   He.NOM loved her.ACC [passionate love].INSTR

b. On Ijubil eë strastno
   He loved her passionately
   both: ‘He loved her passionately.’

Jones (1988:93) also indicates that English cognate objects can be paraphrased into manner adverbials as can be seen in the cognate object constructions in (53) with their corresponding verb + adverbial construction in (54). Therefore, Jones provides this property as another justification for classifying cognate objects as adjuncts.

53) 

a. John died a gruesome death
b. Harry lived an eventful life
c. Bill sighed a weary sigh

(Jones 1988:89)

54) 

a. John died gruesomely
b. Harry lived eventfully
c. Bill sighed wearily

(Jones 1988:93)

Similarly, Mittwoch (1998) takes the semantic or functional correspondence between cognate objects and adverbs in terms of manner modification as one reason in categorizing cognate objects as a subset of adverbials.

But it is not always the case that an adjective from which an adverb can be derived is available in a particular language to sanction the adjuncthood paraphrase test, as demonstrated by the Hebrew sentences below.26

55)  

a. Hem šavtu švitat mexa’a
   they struck strike- CONSTR protest
   ‘They staged/held a protest strike/They struck *protestantly’

b. Hu naxat nexitat xerum
   he landed landing-CONSTR emergency
   ‘He made an emergency landing/ he landed *emergentially’

(Mittwoch 1998:316)

Moreover, not all cognate objects such as the ones given in (56) involve a manner component or allow paraphrase into an adverbial. Therefore, the paraphrase test cannot always be applied to all types of cognate objects. Examples (56a-c) are from Kim & Lim (2012:2, 4); examples (d) and (e) are from Massam (1990:167)).

56)  

a. He waved and smiled a toothless smile at the girls
b. He’s lived a life and traveled the world lifting people’s spirits, sights, motivation.

   c. They had danced a single dance in London, and now they spent an afternoon together.

   d. She sneezed a sneeze/ danced a dance.
   e. She sneezed her early morning sneeze/ danced her early morning dance.

26 Mittwoch (1998:316) points out that the lack of a corresponding adverbial expression perhaps lies behind the use of the cognate object construction.
He dreamed a happy dream

Because some types of cognate objects can be paraphrased into a non-cognate direct object, they are analysed as arguments according to Pereltsvaig (1999a, 1999b). Consider the following example (Pereltsvaig 1999a:271).

57) On sdelal delo = On sdelal rabotu
   He did job.\text{ACC} he did work.\text{ACC}
   both: ‘He did (his) work.’

With regard to \textit{COORDINATION}, it is often used to conjoin two or more structures that are similar in their syntactic category or semantic function (see e.g. Schachter 1977). Therefore, the type of cognate objects that can be conjoined to an adverbial as in (58a) and (59a) are analysed as adjuncts, whereas those that can be joined to a direct object such as the example in (60) are arguments according to Pereltsvaig (1999a; 1999b).

58) 
   a. Ja vas i jublju i jubovju brata i,
      I.NOM you.\text{ACC} love love.\text{INSTR} brother.\text{GEN} and
      mozhet byt’, ešče nežnej.
      maybe even more-tenderly
      ‘I love you with a brotherly love and maybe even more tenderly’
   b. *Ja i jublju i jubovju brata i Tatjanu.
      I.NOM love love.\text{INSTR} brother.\text{GEN} and Tatiana.\text{ACC}
      lit. ‘I love a brotherly love and Tatiana’
      (Pereltsvaig 1999a, Russian)

59) 
   a. Hu kar’a et ha-sefer kria yesodit ve-leat
      he read:Past ACC the-book reading thorough and-slowly
      ‘He read the book thoroughly and slowly’
   b. *Hu kar’a et ha-sefer ve-kria yesodit
      he read:Past ACC the-book and-reading thorough
      ‘He read the book and thoroughly.’
      (Pereltsvaig 1999b:542, Hebrew)
They dance folk dances and ballet fragments.

(Pereltsvaig 1999a:271, Russian).

**Question Formation** or the type of phrase that introduces a question to which the answer can be the cognate object is another property employed by some authors in comparing cognate objects to either adjuncts or arguments (see Macfarland 1995; Nakajima 2006; and Pereltsvaig 1999b). Cognate objects that are compatible with questions containing ‘how much’ or ‘how far’ but not with ‘what kind of’ are adjuncts according to Nakajima (2006:677).

61)

a. The tree grew a century’s growth within only ten years.

b. The stock market dropped its largest drop in three years today.

c. The apples fell just a short fall to the lower deck, and so were not too badly bruised.

62)

a. How much/How far/*What kind of growth_ did the tree grow in ten years?

b. How much/How far/*What kind of drop_ did the stock market drop today?

c. How much/How far/*What kind of fall_ did the apples fall to the lower deck?

Cognate objects that can form an answer to ‘what’, on the other hand, are considered arguments.

63)


(Macfarland 1995:45)

b. What kind of dream did the boy dream? The boy dreamed a terrifying dream.

(Nakajima 2006:677)
Argument status is assigned to cognate objects according to Massam (1990) because they require adjacency to the verb as is the case with direct objects in contrast to adjuncts. Therefore, splitting the verb and the cognate object by an adverbial as indicated by Massam (1990:166) results in ungrammatical structures as can be seen in (64b) and (64c) but the structure is grammatical in (64a) where the adjunct ‘that way’ is separated from the verb.

64)
   a. Ben always runs (quickly) that way.
   b. Let Ben run (*quickly) a little run.
   c. Ben sneezed (*that way) a glorious sneeze.

By the same adjacency requirement between the verb and the cognate object, Macfarland (1995) determines the argument status of cognate objects. She applies a number of traditional argumenthood constituency tests that are found in the literature. According to these tests, an argument in contrast to an adjunct is within, rather than outside, the VP, and hence, an argument is inseparable from the verbal head by movement or by the insertion of other elements. Macfarland (1995) demonstrates that cognate objects pattern with arguments rather than adjuncts in this respect. Such tests include tough-movement and VP preposing, do-so copying and long wh-movement.

Arguments of the VP, but not adjuncts, can be preposed with the verb by though-movement as shown in (65) and in (66) respectively; Macfarland (1995) indicates that cognate objects show similar behaviour to arguments in that they can also be preposed, as can be seen in (67) (examples from Macfarland 1995:103).

65)
   a. I read that book.
   b. Read that book though I did

66)
   a. I read that day

50
b. *Read that day though I did.

67)

a. Chris smiled a happy smile.
b. Smile a happy smile though Chris did.

Similarly, as VP preposing only moves the constituents in the VP, moving an argument, but not an adjunct, results in a grammatical sentence, as can be seen in (68a) and (68b). Likewise, the sentence with the cognate object in (68c) is also grammatical (examples from Macfarland 1995:103).

68)

a. I wanted Chris to read that book on vacation, and read that book she did on vacation.
b. *I wanted Chris to read that day on vacation, and read that day she did on vacation.
c. I wanted Chris to smile a happy smile that day, and smile a happy smile she did that day.

Arguments of a verb must be included in *do-so* substitution as shown in (69), whereas with adjuncts, they may or may not be included as in (70). As with arguments, cognate objects must be included with their verbs when they are substituted by *do so* as can be observed in (71).

69)

a. I gave Chris a book, and John did so, too.
b. *I gave Chris a book, and John did so a magazine.

70)

a. I saw Chris that day.
b. I saw Chris that day, and John did so, too.
c. I saw Chris that day, and John did so another day.

71)

a. Chris smiled a happy smile, and Mary did so, too.
b. *Chris smiled a happy smile, and Mary did so a sarcastic smile.
Also, in the case of long *wh*-movement, cognate objects, like arguments, result in questionable sentences, but adjuncts result in completely ungrammatical sentences as is demonstrated in the sentences below (examples from Macfarland 1995:103).

72)  
   a. Chris wondered [whether Lee read that book].
   b. ?What book did Chris wonder [whether Lee read t]?  

73)  
   a. Chris wondered [whether Lee read that day]
   b. *What day did Chris wonder [whether Lee read t]?  

74)  
   a. Chris wondered [whether Lee smiled a happy smile].
   c. ?[What kind of smile] did Chris wonder [whether Lee smiled t]?

1.4.2.2 Cognate Objects as Referential NPs or Predicative NPs

The other distinction that is often made in the literature as mentioned earlier is in terms of the referentiality or not of the cognate NP. Referentiality of a NP or saying that the NP has a referent means, as defined by Huddelston & Pullum (2002:399), that ‘by using it on a given occasion, a speaker intends it to pick out some independently distinguishable entity, or set of entities, in the real world (or in some fictional world)’. Conversely, a non-referential NP is one that does not have a referent i.e. it does not refer to an independent distinguishable entity. Authors such as Massam (1990), Macfarland (1994), and Sailer (2010) classify cognate objects as referential NPs. In contrast, some authors argue that cognate objects are predicative NPs e.g. Moltmann (1989), Mittwoch (1998), Mirto (2007), Horrocks & Stavrou (2010). In such works, the predicative status of the cognate object is posited on the basis of the properties which cognate objects share with another type of non-referential NPs namely predicative NPs such as the postcopular NP in ‘Sarah and her sister were both headteacher of the school’ and
the postverbal NP in light verb constructions e.g. ‘They had a fight’. There is also a third view on the referentiality or not of cognate objects which states that cognate objects are of two types: those that represent referential NPs and those that exhibit aspects of predicative NPs (see Pereltsviag (1999b, 2002), Puigdollers (2008), Kim & Lim (2012). In the subsequent paragraphs, I indicate the properties of cognate objects that classify them with either referential NPs or predicative NPs, as demonstrated by the various authors.

Moltmann (1989:2) claims that, in parallel with adverbial event predicates and obligatory controlled clauses, cognate objects cannot be topicalized, as illustrated by the ungrammatical sentences below.

(75)

a. *A painful death, John died t.
b. *A shrill scream, John screamed t.
c. This man, John saw t today.
d. *Slowly, John ate the cake.

e. *Beautifully, Mary sang the song
f. *PRO to go to school, John intends.
g. *PRO to study Linguistics, John persuaded Mary.

Cognate objects are analysed as predicative NPs because they exhibit DEFINITENESS RESTRICTION (e.g. Moltmann 1989; Mittwoch 1998; Pereltsvaig 1999b, 2002 (for the cognate objects she analyses as adjuncts); Mirto 2007).

Definiteness restriction means that there are positions/constructions in which the

---

27 In light verb constructions, as demonstrated in Mittwoch (1998:311) ‘a verb occurs with an event nominalisation as object; the understood agent (or, sometimes, patient) role of the nominalisation is identical with that of the verb; verb and object appear to be one lexical unit at lexical cognitive structure, with the verb acting as a kind of skeleton and most of the lexical information being carried by the nominalization.’ (311).

28 The constraint on topicalizing obligatory controlled clauses is noted by Safir (1986) as pointed out by Moltmann (1989).

29 For some native speakers the sentences in (63d) and (63e) are grammatical.
NP cannot occur as definite. The example below from Ross (1995:4) indicates this restriction on the definiteness of predicative NPs.

76) *My cousins are not yet [the / these / some / Ann’s] drunkards.

Besides, Mirto (2007:123) indicates the similarity between cognate objects and the postverbal NP in light verb constructions and provides references that point out to the restrictions on definiteness in the two types of constructions. H&P (2002:291; cited in Mirto 2007:123) states that ‘the most usual determiner with light verbs is the indefinite article’. Also, Mirto (2007:123) mentions the results of an investigation of cognate object constructions in the Cobuild corpus by Rymen (1999) and Davidse and Rymen (2006) and that ‘the zero article and the indefinite article are used in almost three-quarters of the occurrences (7.7% + 65.4% respectively)’ (Mirto 2007:123).

Mittwoch (1998:319) indicates that cognate objects can be found as definite NPs but only in a very restricted way. She demonstrates that in cases where cognate objects occur as definite NPs such as the examples in (77) where the cognate objects are associated with the definite determiners namely the definite article and the possessive pronoun, they still cannot have a presuppositional interpretation.

77)  

a. hu paraš ‘et priša-to ha-‘axrona ve-ha-goralit  
he resigned ōm resignation his the last and the fateful  
be-xay-av.  
in life his.  
‘He handed in his resignation, the last and most fateful of his life./’He resigned for the last and most fateful time in his life.’  

b. ha-kesem šel ha-mizrax pa’al al-av et pe’ula-to  
the charm of the East worked on him ōm work its  
‘The charm of the East did its work/had its effect on him.’  

c. ha-kesem šel ha-mizrax pa’al al-av et pe’ula ha-cefuya

---

The charm of the East worked on him. *The charm of the East had the expected effect on him.*

The information regarding priša-to ‘resignation-his’, pe’ula-to ‘effect-its’ and pe’ula ha-cefuya ‘effect the-expected’ i.e. ‘the effect of the charm of the East’ is not shared, but, as Mittwoch (1998:319) points out the use of the definite cognate objects asserts the occurrence of the event rather than indicates that the event is being presupposed.\(^{31}\) Mittwoch (1998:319) demonstrates that

What makes [the cognate objects] … definite is unique reference established by the ordinal/superlative or by the possessive. The possessive seems redundant since it can only be anaphoric to the subject; its functions seems to be to convey that the event denoted by the predicate is characteristic of the denotee of the subject. This is conveyed directly by the adjective [ha-cefuya ‘the-expected’ in (77c)].

Hence, Mittwoch (1998:319) indicates that the use of the definite article with the cognate object in a situation where the information that some workers had staged a hunger strike is shared, results in the sentence being contextually ill-formed.

78) *Elu ovdim šavtu et švitat ha-ra’av?\(^{32}\)

which workers struck OM strike-CONSTR the hunger

‘Which workers staged the hunger strike?’

(Mittwoch 1998:319)

Mittwoch (1998:320) shows the resemblance in the restriction on definiteness between cognate objects and other predicative NPs, namely postcopular NPs in existential sentences such as the ones given in (79). The sentences are analogous with the cognate object constructions in (77) as they involve the same definite determiners; nevertheless, the usual case with these NPs is to occur as indefinite NPs.

---

\(^{31}\) Some authors provide an explanation of why cognate objects may appear definite if they are events that result from the action of the verb (see Macfarland 1994; Höche 2009).

\(^{32}\) The infelicity in the use of the definite cognate object is indicated by an asterisk in Mittwoch (1998:319).
a. There was the last of a series of concerts in the town hall last night.

b. Last May there occurred the most decisive victory of all.

c. There was the expected reaction from the opposition.

(Mittwoch 1998:320)

Another related property that indicates similarity between cognate objects and predicative NPs as pointed out by e.g. Mittwoch (1998) and Pereltsvaig (1999b, 2002) is there incompatibility with strong quantifiers as can be seen in the examples in (80).

80)

a. *Hem šavtu et kol/rov ha-švitot biglal ha-menahel
   they struck OM all/most the strikes because-of-the manager

b. *Tali bikra ‘et Dani ‘et kol ha-bikurim/
   Tali visited ACC Danny ACC all the-visits/most of the visits/
   ‘et ha-bikur ha-ze.
   the-visit the-this
   intended: ‘Tali visited Danny all the visits/most of the visits/this visit’

(Pereltsvaig 2002:112)

Doron (1988; cited in Massam 1990:169) points out a similar constraint with predicative NPs and that some quantifiers are not possible with predicative NPs in contrast to referential NPs as can be seen in the two examples respectively.

81)

a. *Chrisanne is/They are/ every member of the club.

b. Libby is/They are/ many women that I met that day.

c. Fred ate every pudding in the house.

(Massam 1990:169)

Another aspect in which cognate objects are shown to be similar to predicative NPs is related to their behaviour with respect to PRONOMINALIZATION. Mittwoch (1998) and Pereltsvaig (2002) indicate that cognate objects, unlike referential NPs,
cannot be antecedents of a resumptive pronoun as in (82a), nor can they be referred to by a pronoun in a later sentence as can be seen in the examples in (82b).

82)  
a. ha-švita še-šavtu (*ota)  
the strike that they struck it  
(Mittwoch 1998:320)  
b. *ha- mora bikša ’et ha-talmidim likro’ ’et ha-sfarim  
the teacher asked ACC the-pupils to-read ACC the-books  
šelahem kri’a yesodit, ve-ya’akov kara ’et ha-sefer  
their reading thorough and-Jacob read ACC the-book  
šelo ’ota/ hi/zi  
his her/she/it  
intended: ‘The teacher asked the pupils to read their books thoroughly and Jacob read his book it [= a thorough reading].’

Similarly, the predicative NPs in (83a) and (83b), as shown by (see Doron 1988; Rizzi 1990) disallow this type of pronominalization whereas it is possible with referential NPs such as the ordinary object in (83c) as shown in Massam (1990:168).

83)  
a. *John, Daniel, and Morris have all three been president of the club. He is always a distinguished member of the community  
(Doron 1988:284).  
b. *Being computer freaks in the Sahara is a drag. They have to travel so far to be able to buy memory chips  
(Ross 1995:4)  
c. Rose hit the ball. The dog caught it and chewed it up.  
(Massam 1990:168)

A third non-referentiality property indicated for predicative nominals is that they do not create scope ambiguities (see Williams 1994); they are required, to be interpreted in situ. Mittwoch (1998) and Pereltsvaig (1999b, 2002) (following Mittwoch but restricting the property to adverbial cognate objects) show that,
likewise, cognate objects cannot give rise to scope ambiguities, as is illustrated by the pairs of sentences in (84).

84)

a. ha-rofe biker xole yapani 6 pe’amim.
   the-doctor visited patient Japanese 6 times
   ‘The doctor visited a Japanese patient 6 times.’

b. ha-rofe biker xole yapani 6 bikurim.
   the-doctor visited patient Japanese 6 visits
   ‘The doctor visited a Japanese patient 6 visits.’

(Mittwoch 1998:324)

Sentence (84a) is ambiguous. The quantifying adverbial either has a narrow scope reading in which the doctor made six visits to the same Japanese patient or, in the wide-scope reading, the adverbial distributes over the direct object and hence there can be more than one patient.\(^{33}\) In contrast, the sentence with the cognate object in (84b) can only have the narrow-scope reading; the cognate object cannot be scoped out of its position. The same applies to the English sentences below.

85)

a. A student giggled 3 times in my lecture today

b. A student giggled/gave 3 giggles in my lecture today.

(Mittwoch 1998:324)

In (85a), where the quantifying adverbial is used, the sentence is ambiguous and it is either that the same student giggled in the three times (narrow scope reading) or there is more than one student who giggled in the lecture (wide scope reading). In (85b), where the cognate object ‘3 giggles’ is used, only the narrow scope reading is possible and there is only one student involved.

Pereltsvaig (1999b, 2002) indicates that some cognate objects exhibit similarity to non-referential NPs in that they cannot affect the \textit{aspectuality} of the event. For

\(^{33}\) Such a reading is more conspicuous when the adverbial is fronted as illustrated by the corresponding English sentence below (Mittwoch 1998:324).

1. Six times the doctor visited a Japanese patient.
example, the sentence in (86) is ungrammatical because the use of the cognate object does not delimit the event and, therefore, using the frame adverbial ‘in five minutes’ is not feasible.

86) *Dani kara sfarim (kri’a yesodit) be-xames dakot
   'Danny read books thoroughly for/in five minutes.'

(Pereltsvaig 2002:114)

Cognate objects are also analysed as predicative NPs on the basis of the relation they hold with the CLAUSAL SUBJECT (see Mittwoch 1998; Mirto 2007; Horrocks & Stavrou 2010). Mirto (2007) indicates this property of cognate objects by demonstrating its similarity to the predicative NP in the light verb construction, as can be seen in the examples in (87).

87)
   a. The two boxers had a fight
   b. The two boxers fought
   c. She gave him a kiss
   d. She lived a good life
   e. He breathed his last breath

(Mirto 2007:122-23)

Mirto (2007) demonstrates that the postverbal NP in (87a), the postverbal noun, assigns a syntactic relation and thematic role to the subject in the same way as the predicate, i.e. the verb, in (87b) does to its argument, which is the subject. Therefore, he states that the interpretation in (87c) can only be that the subject is the one who kisses. He proposes the same case applies to the cognate objects in (87d) and (87e). The sentences are interpreted as ‘she’ and ‘he’ are the ones who ‘had that good life’ or ‘gave the last breath’ respectively.

It should be noted that the non-referentiality properties of cognate objects, represented so far, are not necessarily characteristic of all cognate objects. This can
be seen in works of authors contending for an argument status of cognate objects in general (Massam 1999; Macfarland 1995; Kuno and Takami 2004; Höche 2009; among others) or of one class of cognate objects (Pereltsvaig 1999a, 1999b, 2002). For instance, cognate objects are found which can be topicalized, occur with strong determiners, be pronominalized, have wide scope and have an effect on the aspectuality of the event. These are a cluster of properties that do not conform with a predicative status of the NP under consideration. The different cases are exemplified below.

Massam (1999) and Macfarland (1995) indicate that topicalization of a cognate object is possible, as can be observed in (88), and they attribute the rarity of topicalized cognate objects to pragmatic and discourse factors, rather than to syntactic conditions.

88)  
   a. Such a crazy whooping laugh, Norma would never laugh; so there must have been someone else in the room.  
      (Massam 1990:181)  
   b. For he who lives more lives than one/More deaths than one must die.  
   c. No greater deed had Minturnae done than to decline to kill Gaius Marius …  

Also, examples of cognate objects with strong determiners are given by these authors as can be seen in (89).

89)  
   a. All intelligent thoughts have already been thought; what is necessary is only to think them again.  

---

b. Tom sneezed every sneeze that we heard that day.  
(Massam 1990:169)

c. rakadnu ‘et kol ha-rikudim/
(we) danced ACC all the-dances/most of the dances
‘et ha-rikud ha-ze.
ACC the-dance the-this
‘We danced all the dances/most of the dances/this dance.’
(Hebrew, Pereltsvaig 2002:112)

Pronominalization of cognate objects with a pronoun in a later sentence is indicated to be possible as exemplified in (90).

90)

a. Tomorrow he would be merciful and let the man die an easy death before he was forced to die a difficult one.
   (B. Thoene, Danzig Passage, 137, cited in Macfarland 1995:77)

b. Though no one dared to sing its song aloud, for the moment, they felt satisfied to be able to hum it to themselves

a. He lived a happy trouble-free life. He could live it because his wife took care of all the difficulties.
   (Kuno and Takami 2004:132)

b. Upon hearing the news, Sue shrieked a banshee-like shriek at the top of her lungs, and I couldn’t help feeling that she shrieked it mostly for my benefit.
   (Kuno and Takami 2004:132)

c. ha-rikud ha-’axaron, Dani rakad ‘oto be-‘ayefut.
the-dance the-last Danny danced it in-tiredness
‘The last dance, Danny danced it tired.’
(Pereltsvaig 2002:113)

Pereltsvaig (2002:113) demonstrates that one type of cognate object such as the example in (91) can have wide scope and can give rise to scope ambiguities, in
contrast to the case with the cognate object given in (84b) (repeated in (91) below) which must be interpreted in situ and cannot give rise to scope ambiguities.\(^{36}\)

91) kol zug yirkod xamiša rikudim
every couple will-dance five dances
‘Every couple will dance five dances.’

(Pereltsvaig 2002:113)

92) ha- rofe biker xole yapani 6 bikurim.
the-doctor visited patient Japanese 6 visits
‘The doctor visited a Japanese patient 6 visits.’

(Mittwoch 1998:324)

Therefore, one of two interpretations is plausible for the sentence in (91): in the narrow-scope interpretation, every couple will dance five dances of their choice; and in the wide-scope interpretation, there will be five dances that every couple has to dance (Pereltsviag 2002).

Likewise, Massam (1990:169) demonstrates that, in contrast to predicate nominals which cannot have a wide scope, as noted by McCawley (1988), cognate objects can have wide scope as illustrated by the examples in (93).

93)

a. Champagne is a wine.
   (*There is a wine such that Champagne is this wine.)

b. People are/Charlotte is smiling a dumb smile these days.
   (OK: There is a dumb smile such that people are/Charlotte is smiling this smile.)

(Massam, 1990:169)

Unlike the type of cognate objects given in (86) (repeated in (94) below), which has no effect on the aspectuality of the event, the cognate object in the sentence in (95) has a delimiting effect on the aspectuality of the event. The use of the cognate object sanctions the use of the adverbial be-xameš dakot ‘in- five minutes’; otherwise, the sentence is ungrammatical (Pereltsvaig 1999b; 2002).

\(^{36}\) The sentence in (92) from Mittwoch (1998:324) is cited in (Pereltsvaig 2002:113).
Massam (1990:168) also refers to another distinction between cognate objects and predicative NPs. According to Doron (1988), predicative NPs, in contrast to referential NPs, are compatible with non-restrictive relative clauses introduced by ‘which’ only if they have a gap in a predicate position such as the gap after ‘to be’ in the example given in (96a); a gap in a non-predicate position as in (96b) results in ungrammaticality. Cognate objects, however, can be associated with a relative clause with a gap in a non-predicate position such as the positions of ordinary objects that are indicated in the examples in (97).

96)  
a. John is a considerate man, which is a rare thing to be _.  
b. *The Jollyboat is a row boat, which _ is not very expensive.  

(Massam 1990:168)

97)  
a. Mona smiled a sarcastic smile, which John photographed _.  
b. Elsie prayed a prayer, which my father wrote _.  
c. Kate sneezed a 20 decibel sneeze, which is a rare thing to hear _.  

(Massam 1990:168)

In short, an overall picture that can be drawn here is that cognate objects as investigated in the literature are of a heterogeneous nature; some categories have properties of referential NPs, whilst others exhibit properties of predicative NPs. Also, there are cognate objects that behave like arguments; yet others are similar to
adjuncts. Therefore, the dispute among the authors who assign a single status for
cognate objects can more or less be attributed to a distinction in the limits they
posit on what qualifies as a cognate object. Authors might exclude some
categories, which show properties of the counter status. For instance, some
authors who determine an argument status do not include cognate objects of
unaccusative verbs; those determining an adjunct status exclude cognate objects of
optionally transitive verbs. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the properties and
behaviour of cognate objects differ cross-linguistically, and, therefore, the specific
status of cognate objects and the accurate accounts might also vary.37

In this study, as mentioned earlier, I take an inclusive approach and include a
wide range of cognate objects types with the aim of studying the variations among
the different types. After careful investigations and after applying a number of
diagnostics related to argumenthood and properties of referential and predicative
NPs, I argue that there are three types of cognate objects in Arabic: argument
cognate objects and non-argument cognate objects which include adjunct cognate
objects (cognate adverbials) and predicate cognate objects that construct with the
verb a complex predicate.

1.4.2.3 Cognate Objects as Structural Objects

Massam (1990) is among those authors who analyse cognate objects as referential
NPs representing internal arguments of the verb that are assigned the THEME
theta-role. Syntactically, Massam (1990) analyses cognate objects in English as
structural objects. She points to two types of cognate objects which, based on their
distinct syntactic behaviour, are treated differently in the literature. The first type
are cognate objects occurring with unergative verbs, such as the examples in (98).
The latter type, such as those in (99), are the cognate objects of optionally

37 According to Pereltsvaig (2002) in some languages, the cognate object is an
argument such as in English and French but there are two classes in other
languages such as Hebrew, Russian, Vietnamese and Edo.
transitive verbs which can take other non-cognate objects that hold a hyponymous relation with the cognate object.\textsuperscript{38}

98)

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. *A silly smile was smiled. \hspace{3cm} \text{[Passivization]}
\item b. *A silly smile, nobody smiled. \hspace{3cm} \text{[Topicalization]}
\item c. *Maggie smiled a silly smile and then her brother smiled it. \hspace{3cm} \text{[Pronominalization]}
\item d. *He smiled the smile for which he was famous. \hspace{3cm} \text{[Definiteness Restriction]}
\item e. *What did he die? \hspace{3cm} \text{[Questioning]}
\item f. ?He died a death. \hspace{3cm} \text{[Modifier obligatory]}
\item g. *He died a suicide/ a murder. \hspace{3cm} \text{[Object necessarily cognate]}
\end{enumerate}

99)

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. The Irish jig was danced by Bernadette Dooley \hspace{3cm} \text{[Passivization]}
\item b. The Irish jig, nobody danced. \hspace{3cm} \text{[Topicalization]}
\item c. Fred danced the slow number. \hspace{3cm} \text{[No Definiteness Restriction]}
\item d. What did he sing? \hspace{3cm} \text{[Questioning]}
\item e. She sang a song. \hspace{3cm} \text{[Modifier non-obligatory]}
\item f. He sang an aria / a song. \hspace{3cm} \text{[Object not necessarily cognate]}
\end{enumerate}

(Massam 1990:164-165).

For example, in Jones (1988), the cognate objects in (98) are considered real cognate objects which he analyses as adjuncts, whereas the cognate objects in (99) are ordinary objects that happen to be morphologically cognate. Massam (1990) argues that the cognate objects in English, including those in (98), must also be

\textsuperscript{38} Puigdollers (2008) refers to this type of construction as the Hyponymic Object Construction.
analysed in the same way as the cognate objects in (99), and that they are ordinary objects that receive structural case. Massam (1990) uses two types of evidence for concluding that they are ordinary objects namely that these cognate objects cannot occur with another ordinary object and they require adjacency to the verb in parallel to the ordinary object as can be seen in the following examples.

100)

a. *Mordred killed the knight a gruesome kill
b. *Ethel moved her lips a slight move(ment)
c. Mordred killed the knight gruesomely
d. Ethel moved her lips slowly

(Massam 1990:166)

101)

a. Ben always runs (quickly) that way
b. Let Ben run (*quickly) a little run
c. Ben sneezed (*that way) a glorious sneeze

(Massam 1990:166)

In (100a) and (100b), the cognate objects ‘a gruesome kill’ and ‘a slight movement’ occur in sentences where there is already another ordinary object i.e. ‘the night’ and ‘her lips’; hence, the ungrammaticality of the sentences. In contrast, the sentences in (100c) and (100d), which involve adverbs that are equivalent to the cognate objects in the previous sentences, are grammatical.

Moreover, the sentences in (101) indicate whether or not the adverbial ‘that way’ in (101a) or the cognate objects in (101b) and (101c) require adjacency to the verb. As can be seen, separation by an adverbial is possible with the adverbial ‘that way’ but the separation results in ungrammaticality with the cognate objects.

Massam (1990) reduces the different syntactic behaviour of the two types of objects to their distinct semantic properties. While the type of cognate objects in (98) denote events that owe their existence to the verbal event, the type of cognate
objects in (99) are interpreted as entities that have a separate existence independent of the action of the verb.

I employ a number of syntactic operations that are characteristic of structural objects in Arabic to show to what extent cognate objects are similar to or distinct from the ordinary object. I show that argument cognate objects qualify as structural objects and that the variations in the extent to which they are more or less-ordinary object like can be attributed to the variations in their semantics.

1.5. Layout of the Study

The thesis is divided into seven chapters in which the first (present chapter) displays the aims of the work, the gap in the literature on Arabic cognate object constructions, a definition of MSA and the data of the study. This chapter also provides an overview of the various criteria that are considered in the literature as delimiting the scope of the construction. This is followed by an overview of the various proposals that are suggested in indicating the status of the cognate object cross-linguistically.

Chapter 2 presents preliminaries for the thesis. It focuses on the various morphological classes that can be found as the head N in the cognate object, namely the masdars. It provides a characterization of the derivational, morphosyntactic and lexico-semantic characteristics of the masdars.

Chapter 3 outlines the constructional properties of the two elements that make up the construction: the cognate object NP and the cognate verb. In this chapter, a classification of the categories of cognate objects in Arabic is proposed on the basis of the quantificational properties of the masdar N as well as the constructional patterns in which the categories occur. The possible interpretations that are correlated with these categories are identified. In addition, the chapter presents a characterization of the properties of the verbs that occur in the construction. It also
points to the distribution of the cognate object types, and the constraints involved, with respect to the various verb types. Lastly, the chapter provides a demonstration of the various semantic functions that might be carried out by the cognate object categories, such as intensification, focusing, qualification, quantification, aspectual delimitation, specification of the scope of the event.

Chapter 4 is an investigation of the syntax of the cognate object subtypes. The aim of the chapter is two-fold: (1) it indicates the variation among the cognate object subtypes in terms of their syntax and (2) it investigates the similarities and distinctions between the cognate object subtypes and the ORDINARY OBJECT. The characterization focuses on a number of phenomena including passivization, adverb insertion, fronting, relativization, pronominalization, and question formation.

Chapter 5 investigates the status of the cognate object categories. They are first analysed in terms of the standard diagnostics that distinguish arguments from adjuncts. Second, the referentiality or non-referentiality of the cognate object NPs is investigated in light of the syntactic tests found in the literature. Third, the type of relationship that holds between the verb and the different types of cognate objects is analysed and a tripartite classification of the cognate object types in Arabic is proposed. The chapter is concluded by presenting a comparison between the cognate object construction and other corresponding constructions, namely V + manner/quantifying adverbial and light verb constructions.

Chapter 6 summarizes the results of the thesis and points to other future research.
CHAPTER 2: MAṢDARS IN MSA: A PRELIMINARY

2.1. Introduction

In Chapter 1, it is pointed out that the morphological classes of nouns that are likely to occur as a cognate object are those labelled MAṢDARS in Arabic grammar. As these nouns represent the head N in the cognate object, highlighting their properties is a fundamental preliminary to the general characterization of cognate objects. Therefore, the present chapter provides an overview of the different maṣdar classes, covering their meaning, derivational and morpho-syntactic properties. Also, the chapter covers aspects of the maṣdars that are understudied in the literature viz. it provides a characterization and classification of maṣdar nouns in Arabic in terms of their quantificational/aspectual properties. In fact, the present research work on cognate object constructions in Arabic reveals that these quantificational/aspectual properties of the maṣdars significantly relate to the variations in behaviour and theoretical status among the types of cognate objects and to the aspects of the cognate object construction in general.

Nouns in Arabic are classified into two main types depending on whether or not they are derived: jawāmid ‘primitives’ and muštaqqāt ‘derivatives’. Primitive nouns are those that are composed of ‘solid stems’, i.e. they cannot be analysed as consonantal roots.¹ Examples are šajarah ‘tree’ and rajul ‘man’. Derivatives are derived from fully vocalised stems. They can be derived from verbs or nouns. Masdars are among the deverbal derivatives (Wright 1967:106; Holes 2004; Ryding 2005:74-75).

¹ As demonstrated in Holes (2004:99), ‘the principle of Arabic derivational morphology … is that of “root and pattern”.’ The root is defined as ‘a semantic abstraction consisting of three consonants …from which actual words are derived by the superimposition of templatic patterns. Lexical sets are thereby formed that are both structurally and semantically related to the root.’
Maṣdars, also referred to as ‘the nomina verbi, nomina actionis, or infinitives’ by Wright (1967:110), are defined as ‘abstract substantives [opposite to adjectives], which express the action, passion, or state indicated by the corresponding verbs, without any reference to object, subject, or time.’

They are called maṣdars ‘(lit. the place whence anything goes forth, where it originates)’ (Wright 1967:110; italics and brackets in original), because most Arab grammarians derive the compound idea of the finite verb from the simple idea of this substantive. Wright (1967:110) suggests that the Greek infinitive that is used with the article as a substantive can be compared to the maṣdars in Arabic.

Maṣdars are made up of one main class (to which the designation is often confined) and five other subclasses. The six classes are referred to in the traditional and modern literature as follows: (i) al-maṣdar; (ii) al-maṣdar al-mīmī ‘the mīm maṣdar’; (iii) ism al-maṣdar ‘the noun of the maṣdar’; (iv) ism/maṣdar al-marrat ‘the noun/the maṣdar of the one-time’; (v) ism/maṣdar al-hay?at ‘the noun/the maṣdar of the manner’; and (vi) al-maṣdar aṣ-šīnāfī ‘the made-up maṣdar’. Note that in the present work, I designate the categories in (i), (iii) and (iv) as the BASIC MAṢDAR, the NON-STEM DERIVED MAṢDAR and the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDAR respectively (justification is given in the respective sections).

As can be seen in the subsequent sections, despite the morphological, syntactic and semantic distinctions among the various maṣdar classes, they have one semantic property in common, viz. that of semantic cognateness with the verb.

It should also be pointed out that, although the head N in the cognate object NP is

---

2 Among the divisions of nouns in the grammarians’ description of Arabic are substantives ‘the nomen substantivum’ and adjectives ‘the nomen adjectivum’ (see Wright 1967:104), which can perhaps be equivalents to the descriptions in current linguistics as entity-denoting nouns and nouns involving a quality component.

3 In the present study, when the term maṣdar is used, it covers the main class as well as the other subclasses.

4 Note that in the thesis, I use small caps not only for technical terms but also for distinct types of maṣdars as well as of the distinct types of cognate objects as will be seen in Chapter 3.
always a maṣdar, not all instances that belong in the maṣdar classes can occur as a
cognate N. In fact, for certain morphological and semantic reasons, it is not
possible for the MADE-UP MAṢDAR to occur in the construction, and in the case of
the MĪM MAṢDAR, its occurrence as a cognate N is largely constrained. Nevertheless, I give an overview on the six classes for completeness and since
pointing out the constraints gives insight into the nature of the cognate object and
the construction in general.

2.2. Derivation and Meaning

2.2.1. The Basic Maṣdar

Generally speaking, the BASIC MAṢDAR is defined in the grammatical literature as a
verb-like noun that denotes the same event expressed by the corresponding verb
stem without reference to time (see Sibawayhi 1970; Al-Galayni 1993). Moreover,
in other recent works such as Fassi Fehri (1993:232, 236); Holes (2004:146); and
Ryding (2005:79), it is indicated that some instances of the BASIC MAṢDAR can also
denote another type of reading in other contexts namely the result of the event
reading. The two readings are compared to the English gerund in ‘writing is fun’
and ‘I do not like his writing’ (Holes 2004:146). In fact, polysemy of meaning can
be found with many instances that belong under the maṣdar classes. I will return
to this point on the polysemy of the maṣdars in section 2.4.
This class of maṣdars is the most productive of all the maṣdar classes; for almost
every verb in the language there is at least one BASIC MAṢDAR hence the suggested

---

5 See below section 2.2.2 and section 2.2.6.
6 These authors include in the delimitation of the semantic readings of the
instances of the BASIC MAṢDARS the abstract as well as the concrete result reading.
Nevertheless, as pointed out in Chapter 1, regardless of whether the nouns that
denote the concrete result can still be called maṣdars or they are mere homophonous with the maṣdars, as cognate NPs they do not fulfil the semantic
criterion in delimiting the concept of the cognate object construction as specified
in the present work i.e. that the cognate N is semantically cognate with the verb.
In terms of the morphological form, a BASIC MAŠDAR involves all the consonants and long vowels involved in the verb stem and where there is a missing vowel or consonant, a substitute is used. As illustrated in Al-Galayni (1993:160) *film* and *qitāl*, for instance, are the BASIC MAŠDARS for the verbs *salim* ‘to know’ and *qātal* ‘to fight’; they involve all the sounds of their corresponding verbs which occur in the patterns (C, C, C) and (C, V, C, C) respectively. The long vowel in the second verb is merely converted into an *i* in the BASIC MAŠDAR and is not dropped. In examples of BASIC MAŠDARS such as *ṣidat* and *taslim* for the verbs *waṣad* ‘promise’ and *sallam* ‘greet’, a different consonant is used for the dropped consonant: the final *t* for the dropped *w* and the initial *t* for the dropped second *l* (see Al-Galayni, 1993:160). BASIC MAŠDARS are principally derived according to specific patterns based on the form of the verb such as the instances given in Table 2.1 for the different forms of the triliteral verb. Nevertheless, in the case of the BASIC MAŠDARS of the first form of triliteral verbs viz. the *CaCaC* form (considered the simple or base form); there is no one specific pattern for which the BASIC MAŠDAR of the verb can be derived; rather, around forty four patterns are identified in the literature which grammarians more or less relate to the semantic field of the respective verbs (see Wright 1967; Al-Galayni 1993; Ryding 2005). In the two tables below, examples of the BASIC MAŠDARS that are of predictable

---

7 For some verbs, there is more than one BASIC MAŠDAR. According to one view such as Fassi Fehri (2005), the difference between the various forms of the derived noun is a quantificational (aspectual) one. For example, one form may be the internal plural of the other corresponding BASIC MAŠDAR form. A traditional view describes the distinct forms of the same BASIC MAŠDAR as phonic variants which are associated with the different language communities.

8 In this respect, it is an opposite to the other class of mašdars namely the NON-STEM DERIVED MAŠDAR (see section 2.2.3 below).

9 The C and V stand for the consonants and vowels in the form of the lexical item.

10 Fassi Fehri (2005) relates the formation of the basic pattern of the various forty-four patterns BASIC MAŠDAR which is the *CaC.C* pattern to the aspectual class of the verb. That is, only certain aspectual types of the triliteral verb tend to have a BASIC MAŠDAR in the pattern *CaC.C*. Therefore, he assumes that the pattern is not always non-predictable contra how it has often been indicated in the grammatical literature.
patterns (Table 2.1) and those with non-predicatable patterns i.e. of the triliteral verb in the base form (Table 2.2) are given respectively.  

Table 2.1 Instances of Basic Maṣdars with Established Patterns Based on the Form of the Corresponding Verb  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Verbs</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Corresponding BASIC MAṢDAR</th>
<th>Pattern of the BASIC MAṢDAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. qabbala ‘kiss’</td>
<td>Form II CaCCaC</td>
<td>taqbil ‘kissing’</td>
<td>taCCTaC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ḥāwala ‘attempt’</td>
<td>Form III CaCaC</td>
<td>muḥāwalat ‘attempting / attempt’</td>
<td>muCaCaCa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. taṣarruf ‘behave’</td>
<td>Form V taCaCCaC</td>
<td>taṣarruf ‘behaving / behaviour’</td>
<td>taCaCCuC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. tanāfas ‘compete’</td>
<td>Form VI taCaCaC</td>
<td>tanāfus ‘competing’</td>
<td>taCaCuC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. intaṣara ‘spread’</td>
<td>Form VII inCaCaC</td>
<td>intiṣar ‘spreading’</td>
<td>inCiCaC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ijtana? ‘meet’</td>
<td>Form VIII iCtaCaC</td>
<td>ijt imaṣ ‘meeting’</td>
<td>iCtiCaC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. iswadda ‘blacken’</td>
<td>Form IX iCCaCCa</td>
<td>iṣwīdād ‘blackening’</td>
<td>iCsiCaC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. istaqbala ‘receive’</td>
<td>Form X istaCCaC</td>
<td>istiqbal ‘receiving’</td>
<td>istiCCaC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 For a list of all the patterns of the BASIC MAṢDAR, the predictable patterns as well as the patterns of the base verb form, see, for instance, Wright (1967) and Al-Galayni (1993).  
12 Note that in the tables where instances of maṣdars are given out of context, I provide the equivalent in English for the denotation that is considered primary according to its dictionary meaning. This is different from the glossing convention of the maṣdars, as mentioned earlier (see Chapter 1 ft.1 and ft.13 in the present chapter), which is by giving the verb plus the type of maṣdar and only in the idiomatic translation, the respective interpretation is provided.
Table 2. 2 Instances of Basic Maṣdars of Triliteral Verbs in the Base Form (CaCVC) with Varied Morphological Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Verb</th>
<th>The BASIC MAṢDAR</th>
<th>The Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. raqaṣa ‘dance’, ḡasala ‘wash’,</td>
<td>raqṣ ‘dancing’ ḡasl ‘washing’</td>
<td>CaCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ṭalaba ‘request’ nazara ‘look’</td>
<td>ṭalab ‘requesting/request’ nazar ‘looking’</td>
<td>CaCaC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. saqat</td>
<td>suqāṭ ‘falling’ dukāl ‘entering’</td>
<td>CuCāC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ḫūṭasa ‘sneeze’ saʔala ‘ask’</td>
<td>ḫūṭās ‘sneezing’ suʔāl ‘asking/question’</td>
<td>CuCaC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of BASIC MAṢDARS occurring as a cognate object include the following.⁴³

1) 

a. ḍaḥikat hind ḍaḥik-an mutawāšilan
   laugh.PST Hind laugh.BM-ACC constant
   ‘Hind laughed constantly.’

b. istaqqbal=ū=hum istiqbāl-an rasmiyyan
   receive.PST=3PL=3PL receive.BM-ACC formal
   ‘They received them in a formal way.’

---

⁴³ Due to variations in the interpretation of the maṣdar N in the different contexts, the technique followed throughout the thesis in the glossing of the various maṣdars as indicated early in the thesis (see Chapter 1, ft. 1) is that the corresponding verb is given followed by the class of the maṣdar. For instance, for this BASIC MAṢDAR, the glossing would be ‘kiss.BM’. Only in the idiomatic translation is the meaning provided.
2.2.2. The Mīm Maṣdar

The MĪM MAṢDAR is defined in the literature as expressing the same event of the corresponding verb parallel to the BASIC MAṢDAR (see Sibawayhi 1970:246-74; Al-Galayni 1993:174). It is designated after its derivational process which principally involves the prefixation of a mīm consonant to the verb stem as can be seen in the examples given in Table 2.3 below.¹⁴ Moreover, for the MĪM MAṢDAR, as in the general case of the BASIC MAṢDAR, there are established patterns that vary depending on the form of the verb. Therefore, a verb BASIC MAṢDAR is predictable and generally for any verb a MĪM MAṢDAR can be derived according to the established patterns; nonetheless, not all the derived forms are in effect used in the language; hence, this class is not as productive as the class of BASIC MAṢDARS. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, the occurrence of a MĪM MAṢDAR as a cognate N is, for semantic reasons, largely constrained. The MĪM MAṢDAR can be distinguished from the corresponding BASIC MAṢDARS in that the majority of the instances can be said to denote ‘a state’ rather than ‘an event’, other instances can have ‘a result’ reading as well.¹⁵ For example, qatl and maqtil are respectively the BASIC MAṢDAR and the MĪM MAṢDAR of the verb qatala ‘kill’. While in the former the meaning implied is ‘the process of killing’, in the latter it means ‘the state of one’s having been killed’.¹⁶ In this meaning, the MĪM MAṢDAR does not occur as a cognate object as it contradicts the dynamic nature of the construction as often indicated in the literature (see e.g. Macfarland 1995).¹⁷

---

¹⁴ One distinction between instances of MĪM MAṢDARS and their corresponding BASIC MAṢDARS is an aspectual one (see section 2.5).
¹⁵ See section 2.4 on the polysemy of the maṣdars.
¹⁶ The meaning can more clearly be explained in aspectual terms, perfectivity vs. imperfectivity or a propositional meaning in contrast to expressing a happening.
¹⁷ It should be pointed out that the aspectual characteristics of the cognate object construction as a whole is beyond the scope of the present work.
In the table below I provide a list of some MIM MASDARS that are used in the language and the corresponding verbs from which they are derived; the instances are grouped according to the various patterns (instances that can be found as a cognate N are in bold).

Table 2. 3 MIM MASDAR of a Set of Verbs, Patterns and the Corresponding BASIC MASDARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Verb</th>
<th>The Corresponding MIM MASDARS</th>
<th>The Pattern</th>
<th>The Corresponding BASIC MASDARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. māta ‘die’, nāma ‘sleep’ qatal ‘kill’ ḏahaba ‘go’</td>
<td>mamāt ‘death’ manām ‘sleep’ maqatal ‘kill’ maḏḥab ‘going’</td>
<td>maCCaC</td>
<td>mawt ‘dying’ naawm ‘sleeping’ qatl ‘killing’ ḏahab ‘going’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. wašada ‘promise’, rajiṣa ‘return’, bāta ‘stay overnight’</td>
<td>maḏsid ‘promise’ marjiṣ ‘return’ mabīt ‘staying overnight’</td>
<td>maCCiC</td>
<td>waḏd ‘promising’ ruṣaṣ ‘returning’ bayāt ‘staying overnight’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ḥabba ‘love’ wadda ‘like’ ḏāba ‘reward’</td>
<td>maḥabbat ‘love/loving’ mawaddat ‘love/loving’ maṭwābat ‘reward’</td>
<td>maCCaCat</td>
<td>ḥubb ‘loving’ widd ‘loving’ iṯābat ‘rewarding’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ʕarafa ‘know’ faṣaṣ ‘sin’</td>
<td>maṣrifat ‘knowledge’ maṣṣiyat ‘sin’</td>
<td>maCCiCat</td>
<td>ʕirfān ‘knowing’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of MIM MASDARS occurring as a cognate object include the following.

2)

a. ʔahhabbat=tu=ha ma-ḥabbat-an šādiqatan
love.PST=1SG=3FSG MM-love-ACC true
‘I loved her with true love.’

b. ʔasrifu=hā maṣrifat-an šakṣiyyatan
know.PST.1SG=3FSG MM-know-ACC personal
‘I know her personally.’
2.2.3. The Non-Stem-Derived Maṣdar

In the literature, this class of masdars is often generally and non-distinguishably defined, like the first two classes, as the noun that expresses the same event expressed by the corresponding verb. Still, in others works (see e.g. Al-Ramīṭī 1435), it is differentiated and is defined as the noun that represents the result or outcome of the event in contrast to the corresponding basic masdar which is seen to represent the action that leads to the result. In fact, it is generally the case that with the instances of this class of maṣdars both readings are possible, i.e. both the event reading and the result readings are plausible as will be demonstrated in section 2.4. Perhaps it is this result reading, which is deemed as the primary denotation, that is perhaps the reason for labelling it ism al-maṣdar ‘the noun of the maṣdar’ which can be seen an equivalent or can be interpreted as ‘the result of the process’; results, unlike, processes, are typically expressed by nouns. Moreover, the designation might also be related to another semantic distinction indicated in the literature between this class of maṣdars and the corresponding instances of the BASIC MAṢDAR namely that in the latter an actor and/or undergoer (parallel to verbs) is implied while in the case of the noun of the maṣdar no such participants are implied. In any case, given this variation in the reading of this class of maṣdars, I suggest a designation on the basis of the derivational process of this maṣdar class and refer to it as the NON-STEM-DERIVED MAṢDARS. In their morphological form, the instances of the NON-STEM-DERIVED MAṢDARS do not

---

18 Another distinction that can be observed between the action denoting NON-STEM-DERIVED MAṢDAR and their corresponding action denoting BASIC MASDARS is an aspectual one (see section 2.5).

19 I refer to the two readings as the EVENT and the PRODUCT readings in the present work (see section 2.4 on the polysemy of the maṣdar N). Note that the descriptive term PRODUCT does not cover the concrete products that result from the action of the verb but only abstract products or outcomes (see section 1.4.1.5 on the delimitation of the concept in MSA as specified in the present work). It is indicated that formally cognate NPs that denote concrete products or results are not included in the definition of cognate objects.
involve all the sounds of the corresponding verb (or a substitute) contrary to the case with BASIC MASDARS as shown in section 2.2.1. For example, the verb ?aṣṭā ‘give’ has the morphological pattern ?aCCSC.\(^\text{20}\) The NON-STEM-DERIVED MAŠDAR is ʕaṣṭā CaCāC whereas the BASIC MASDAR is ?iṣṭāʔ ?iCCaC; the initial sound ? is not retained in the NON-STEM-DERIVED MAŠDAR (see Al-Galayni (1993:160)). Accordingly, I refer to it by the suggested designation as it does not involve all the sounds of the verb stem. This class of masdars is a closed class; only a limited set of verbs have a NON-STEM DERIVED MAŠDAR and their derivation is according to no specific pattern. Below is a list of some NON-STEM-DERIVED MAŠDARS together with the corresponding verbs and BASIC MAŠDAR.

Table 2. 4 NON-STEM DERIVED MAŠDAR of a Set of Verbs and the Corresponding BASIC MAŠDARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Verb</th>
<th>Number and of Form Pattern</th>
<th>The Corresponding BASIC MAŠDAR</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>The Corresponding NON-STEM DERIVED MAŠDAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ?aṣṭā ‘give’</td>
<td>Form IV  ?aCCaC</td>
<td>?iṣṭāʔ ‘giving’</td>
<td>?iCCaC</td>
<td>ʕaṣṭā ‘offering’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ?atāba ‘reward’</td>
<td>Form IV  ?aCaCCa</td>
<td>?iṭābat ‘rewarding’</td>
<td>?iCaCaC</td>
<td>ʕawāb ‘reward’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. qarrara ‘decide’</td>
<td>Form II  CaCCaC</td>
<td>taqrīr ‘deciding’</td>
<td>taCCīC</td>
<td>qarār ‘decision’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ʂalla ‘pray’</td>
<td>Form II  CaCCaSC</td>
<td>taṣliyat(^\text{21})</td>
<td>taCCīCat</td>
<td>ʂalāt ‘prayer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ʕaddaba ‘torture’</td>
<td>Form II  CaCCaC</td>
<td>taṣḏīb ‘torturing’</td>
<td>taCCīC</td>
<td>ʕadāb ‘torture’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{20}\) I use the symbol SC to refer to the semi-consonants in Arabic: wāw and yāʔ which appear as ã or ì in pattern 4 of the verbs (see Ryding 2005:517).

\(^{21}\) The corresponding BASIC MAŠDAR of this verb is not used in MSA.
Examples of NON-STEM-DERIVED MAṢḌARS occurring as a cognate object include the following.

3)
   a. ṣallay=nā ṣalāt-a l-fajri
       pray.PST=1PL pray.NSDM-ACC the-Dawn
       ‘We prayed the Dawn prayer’
   b. ?aṭāba=hum ṭawāb-an Šazīman
       reward.PST.3SG=3PL reward.NSDM-ACC great
       ‘He rewarded them a great reward.’

2.2.4. The T-Suffixed Maṣdar

The traditional designation of this class of the maṣdars as ism/maṣdar al-marra (lit. ‘the noun/maṣdar of one.time’) is based on the definition of its meaning as the noun that expresses a one-time occurrence of the event (Wright 1967; Al-Galayni 1993; Ryding 2005).\(^\text{22}\) Nevertheless, the designation does not precisely capture the quantificational variation and the polysemous nature of the instances that fall under this maṣdar class as demonstrated in section 2.4.\(^\text{23}\) Therefore, a designation based on their morphological formation is suggested and hence they are referred to as the T-SUFFIXED MAṢḌARS. The derivational process, as the designation indicates, involves the attachment of a -t suffix to the corresponding BASIC MAṢḌAR, e.g. raqs-ṣat ‘a dance’ and ibtisām-ṣat ‘a smile’ are derived from the BASIC MAṢḌARS raqs ‘dancing’ and ibtisām ‘smiling’ of the verbs raqṣa ‘dance’ and ibtasama ‘smile’ respectively. The class of T-SUFFIXED MAṢḌARS is a closed class; not all BASIC MAṢḌARS and consequently not all verbs have a derived T-SUFFIXED

\(^\text{22}\) Other less common designations include maṣdar al-wiḥdat ‘the maṣdar of oneness’ or as in Wright (1967) ‘a maṣdar of instance’, and in Fassi Fehri (2005) it is referred to, based on its quantificational properties, as a ‘unit maṣdar’.

\(^\text{23}\) Not all the instances that belong under this class denote the meaning of a one-time occurrence of the event as the traditional designation implies. There are different instances that have different interpretations when pluralized and some instances can have a manner interpretation in some contexts (see section 2.4 below).
MAŠDAR. Below is a list of some T-SUFFIXED MAŠDARS together with the corresponding verbs and the basic BASIC MAŠDARS from which they are derived.

Table 2. 5 T-SUFFIXED MAŠDARS of a Set of Verbs and the Corresponding BASIC MAŠDARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Verb</th>
<th>The T-SUFFIXED MAŠDAR</th>
<th>The Corresponding BASIC MAŠDAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ibtasama ‘smile’</td>
<td>ibtisāmat ‘a smile’</td>
<td>tabassum ‘smiling’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. daraba ‘hit’</td>
<td>darbat ‘a hit’</td>
<td>ḍarb ‘hitting’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. rakala ‘kick’</td>
<td>raklat ‘a kick’</td>
<td>rakl ‘kicking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. nāma ‘sleep’</td>
<td>nawmat ‘a sleep’</td>
<td>nawm ‘sleeping’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. raqaṣa ‘dance’</td>
<td>raqṣat ‘a dance’</td>
<td>raqṣ ‘dancing’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of T-SUFFIXED-DERIVED MAŠDARS occurring as a cognate object include the following.

4)

a. ibtasamat ibtisām-at-an jaḍḍābatan
   smile.PST.3FSG smile-TSM-ACC attractive
   ‘She smiled an attractive smile.’

b. ḍaraba hindun ḍarb-at-an qawiyyatan
   hit.PST.3SG Hind hit-TSM-ACC hard
   ‘He hit Hind a hard hit.’
2.2.5. The Manner Maṣdar

MANNER MAṢDARS (or ism al-hay?at ‘the noun of the manner’ according to the traditional designation) are nouns that express the manner of the event of the corresponding verb. MANNER MAṢDARS are derived for triliteral base form verbs i.e. in the pattern CaCaC. However, not all verbs of this pattern have a derived MANNER MAṢDar. MANNER MAṢDARS have the same derivational device as in T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS i.e that a –t suffix is attached; they only differ in that the first short vowel is an <i> rather than an <a>; so the derivational pattern for the MANNER MAṢDar is CiCCat. For example, for the verb ḏakala ‘enter’, the MANNER MAṢDar is diḫlat and the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDar is daḫlat (see Al-Galayni 1993; Ukaasha 2009).

With respect to meaning, the denotation of an instance of a MANNER MAṢDar literally means ‘a manner or a way of’. For example, there is the MANNER MAṢDar mītat for the verb māta ‘die’. The meaning of the MANNER MAṢDar is ‘a manner of dying’. It is different from the corresponding BASIC MAṢDar mawt ‘dying’ and T-SUFFIXED MAṢDar which both denote an event.²⁴ (see section other instances in Table 6.2). Note that a difference can be observed among the three maṣdar instances with regard to the type of dependents that occur with them which can further clarify the meaning of the morphological class of the MANNER MAṢDARS in Arabic. For example, while the MANNER MAṢDar mītat can be found with manner-modifying adjectives such as ḥasanatan ‘good’ and sayyi?at ‘bad’, the same adjectives are not possible with the other two types i.e. the BASIC MAṢDar mawt ‘dying’ and the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDar which are event-denoting maṣdars. Conversely, an event-modifying adjective such as muṭāji? ‘sudden’ cannot occur

²⁴ The event expressed by the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDar is aspectually different from the event expressed by the corresponding BASIC MAṢDar (section 2.5 on the quantificational and aspectual properties of the maṣdars).
with the MANNER MAŠDAR but it is likely with the other two MAŠDARS. The feasible and non-feasible sequences are indicated in (5).

5)

a. mītātun ḥasanatun/*mufāji?atun
die.MNM good/sudden
‘a good manner of dying/a sudden manner of dying’
b. mawtun mufāji?un/*ḥasanun
die.BM sudden/good
‘a sudden dying/a good dying’
c. mawt-atun mufāji?atun/*ḥasanatun
die-TSM sudden/good
‘a sudden death/a good death’

Examples of MANNER MAŠDARS in MSA are given in Table 2.6. below with the corresponding verbs and BASIC MAŠDARS.25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Verb</th>
<th>The MANNER MAŠDAR</th>
<th>The Corresponding BASIC MAŠDAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. māla ‘die’</td>
<td>mītāt ‘manner of death’</td>
<td>mawt ‘dying’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ḥaša ‘live’</td>
<td>ḥišat ‘manner of living’</td>
<td>ḡayš ‘living’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. qatala ‘kill’</td>
<td>qitlat ‘manner of killing’</td>
<td>qatl ‘killing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ḏabāha ‘slaughter’</td>
<td>ḏīḥat ‘manner of slaughtering’</td>
<td>ḏabh ‘slaughtering’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 It can be pointed out that some instances of MANNER MAŠDARS that are often given as exemplifications in grammar books are not used in MSA; they can be described as instances from Classical Arabic.
Examples of MANNER MAṣDARS occurring as a cognate object include the following.

6)  

a. **māta** mītat-an ḥasanatan  
   die.PST.3SG die.MNM-ACC good  
   ‘He died a good death’

b. **ʕāšat** ģīšat-a l-mulūki  
   live.PST.3FSG live.MNM-ACC the-kings  
   ‘She lived the life of kings.’

2.2.6. The Made-Up Maṣdar

The morphological class that is often discussed in grammar books as the last subclass of maṣdars is that which can be referred to as **al-maṣdar aṣ-ṣināṭī** ‘the MADE-UP MAṢDAR’. Ukaasha (2009) demonstrates the properties of this class of maṣdars which trigger the respective designation, and that it is because **al-maṣdar as-sināṭī** ‘the MADE-UP MAṢDAR’ is made up or constructed by the addition of two affixes: a geminate -y and a -t; hence, the resulting noun ends in -iyya(t). The MADE-UP MAṢDAR, in contrast to the other maṣdar classes, is solely derived from nouns. The nouns from which a MADE-UP MAṢDAR is derived can either be a primitive noun such as ?insān ‘human’ for ?insāniyyat ‘humanism’ or a derived noun such as rafāhat ‘luxury’ for rafāhiyyat ‘luxuriousness’.

26 The designation as used in the present work is a literal translation of the traditional term viz. **al-maṣdar aṣ-ṣināṭī**.

27 The attachment of the feminine suffix -t results in the gemination of the -y consonant.

28 Haytham describes the compounded affixes as aṣ-ṣīḡat aṣ-ṣināṭīyyat ‘the-formula the-made’ (http://www.mltaka.net/forums/multka66089/, accessed in 21/08/2016.)

29 Among the different types of nouns from which MADE-UP MAṢDARS can be derived is the BASIC MAṢDAR (see the example given in 7).

30 The derivation source of the other maṣdar classes are the verb stem, a deverbal root or can be the BASIC MAṢDAR per se in the case of the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDAR and the MANNER MAṢDAR.
In terms of meaning, the **MADE-UP MAṢDAR** is often generally described in the literature as the noun that expresses the event meaning of the maṣdar. Moreover, it is also described as in Al-Galayni (1993:178) that in essence it is the attribute that is ascribed to the noun stem. In another definition by Ukaasha (2009) the **MADE-UP MAṢDAR** is a noun that expresses the true nature of the noun stem and the manners and actions that are associated with it. Ukaasha (2009) illustrates that for instance from the noun *rajul* ‘man’ the **MADE-UP MAṢDAR** *rujūliyyat* ‘masculinity’ is derived to indicate ‘the essence of manliness’ and what qualities it presupposes by which a man is known. Given these definitions in the literature, it could perhaps be said that the made-up maṣdar expresses an eventive concept with inherited (or individual-level) properties; it means something like *being + the noun stem*. Therefore, it is noted that a **MADE-UP MAṢDAR** is paraphrasable into a non-finite clause e.g. *al-*?insāniyyat* ‘the-humanism’ can be paraphrased into *kawnu=ka ?insānan* ‘being=your a human’.

Though I have included the **MADE-UP MAṢDAR** here for completeness, it should be pointed out that the **MADE-UP MAṢDAR** cannot function as a cognate object. This can firstly be related to the fact that one source of their derivation is primitive nouns and thus there is no corresponding verb for these nouns with which they can be associated. Moreover, as for the instances of the **MADE-UP MAṢDAR** that are derived from the **BASIC MAṢDAR** or from derived nouns with a deverbal root, they still cannot be attracted by the corresponding verb to form a cognate object construction as can be seen in the sentence below.

7) *jahila=hu jahl-an kāmilan/*jāhiliyyat-an

   be.ignorant.PST.3SG=3SG be.ignorant.BM-ACC complete ignorism.MD-ACC

   ‘He was completely ignorant of it.’

This can probably be attributed to the incompatibility between the aspectual nature of the event expressed by the cognate object construction and its transitivity level and the meaning of the **MADE-UP MAṢDAR** which is parallel to an
individual level predicate. The \textit{MADE-UP MAŞDAR} seems to denote a property and does not express a happening or a change of state which is characteristic of the cognate object construction.\footnote{See e.g. Macfarland (1995) and Höche (2009) on the aspectuality of the construction and Höche (2009) on the transitivity of the construction.}

2.3. \textbf{Morpho-Syntactic Properties}

Maşdars are nominals derived from a verbal source (Fassi Fehri 1993:232); accordingly, it is not unexpected that maşdars exhibit verbal properties beside their nominal properties. Among their nominal properties are those of bearing case, taking determiners, heading a genitive-case marked NP phrase or genitive phrase with \textit{li-} ‘of’, being modified by an adjective and that they can pluralize. On the other hand, the verbal properties that might, varyingly, be associated with maşdars include their having obligatory arguments, assigning accusative case, taking a cognate object, and taking manner and temporal adverbials.

In the general characterization and distinction of the categories of cognate objects, it is relevant to indicate some of the verbal properties that the maşdars might varyingly exhibit, viz. those related to the argument structure of the maşdar N; in particular, the types of patterns that the maşdar Ns construct with its arguments (referred to as participants hereafter). In representing the various patterns, two aspects need be pointed out: the number of the participants that can be expressed and the propensity or not for the maşdar N to assign accusative case.

Verbs can have one, two or three expressed participants, and they can assign accusative case to one or two internal core arguments. Nevertheless, not all maşdars equally exhibit these verbal properties but some can be more verb-like than others. In the following paragraphs the five maşdars can be differentiated on the basis of these two aspects.

The \textit{BASIC MAŞDAR}, \textit{MİM MAŞDAR}, and \textit{NON-STEM DERIVED MAŞDAR} have the
propensity to be associated with the same number of participant(s) as the corresponding verb, be it a one, two or three-place predicate. Moreover, they can assign accusative case to the second and/or third expressed participants. Note that the noun immediately following the maṣdar is always genitive-case marked forming what is known in Arabic, and in related languages such as Hebrew, as the ‘construct state’. The phrases in (8) illustrate these properties of the maṣdars.

8)

a. ʔiʕṭā?-u ʕaliyy-in al-fuqarā?-a l-ʔamwāl-a
   giving.BM-NOM Ali-GEN the-poor.PL-ACC the-money-ACC
   ‘Ali giving the poor the money’

b. maʕṣiyat-u ʕaliyy-in wālid-ayy=hi
   disobey.MM-NOM Ali-GEN parents-ACC=his
   ‘Ali disobeying his parents’

c. ʃalāt-u ʕaliyy-in l-fajr-a
   pray.NSDM-NOM Ali-GEN the-Dawn.prayer-ACC
   ‘Ali praying the Dawn prayer’

Having this verbal property i.e., that the maṣdar N takes an accusative-case marked N, the pattern of the construct state involving the maṣdar can be described as a verbal pattern. Alternatively, the same second accusative-cased marked noun can be headed by the genitive li- ‘of’ as in (9); hence, setting the maṣdar nouns as distinct from verbs in the options of how the participants can be structurally represented. This pattern of the maṣdar N, where the internal argument of the corresponding verb occurs as a genitive phrase with li- ‘of’, can be described as a quasi-verbal pattern; it involves two participants bearing the same semantic roles of the verb arguments i.e actor and undergoer but the second participant is headed by a preposition that does not normally head an argument of the verb. The similarity and the difference between the maṣdars and the verb can be illustrated by the example in (9); (9a) involves a BASIC MAṢDAR and (9b) the corresponding verb.
9)

a. taṭlīq-u=hu zawjat-a=hu/li-zawjat-i=hi
divore.BM-NOM=his wife-ACC=his of-wife-GEN=his
‘His divorcing his wife/of his wife’

b. ṭallāqa zawjat-a=hu/*li-zawjat-i=hi
divore.PST.3SG wife-ACC=his of-wife-GEN=his
‘He divorced his wife/of his wife’

The other two maṣdars i.e. the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS and MANNER MAṢDARS are less verb-like than the three maṣdars described above.\(^{32}\) The two maṣdars cannot assign accusative case in contrast to the other three maṣdars. As for the number of the participants that can be expressed, the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDAR can occur with two participants as the corresponding verb but the second participant is expressed as a PP. The difference between the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDAR and the corresponding verb can be illustrated by the following examples.

10)

a. rakal-at-u=ka li-ʕaliyy-in/*ʕaliyy-an
kick-TSM-NOM=your.GEN to-Ali-GEN/Ali-ACC
‘Your kick to Ali.’

b. rakal=ta ʕaliyy-an/*li-ʕaliyy-in
kick.PST=2SG Ali-ACC/*to-Ali-GEN
‘You kicked Ali.’

The T-SUFFIXED MAṢDAR is that of the transitive verb rakala ‘kick’; the two participants i.e. the actor ka ‘2SG’ and the undergoer ʕaliyyin ‘Ali’ can be expressed but the second participant is genitive-case marked and cannot be accusative-case marked.

The MANNER MAṢDAR is the least-verb like of the four maṣdar classes. It is constrained in the number of participants that can be expressed; it cannot occur

\(^{32}\) Comparable to simple event nominals in Grimshaw’s (1990) classification of derived nouns.
with the same number of participants as the corresponding verb but only with one participant which has the same semantic role as that occurring with the corresponding verb. As for the propensity to assign accusative case, it is irrelevant here because it only applies to the second or third expressed theta-marked participant whereas in the case of the \textit{MANNER MAṢDAR}, it merely allows the occurrence of a single participant. Hence, the construct state pattern in which only one participant is involved which is genitive-case marked can be described as the nominal pattern. The difference between the \textit{MANNER MAṢDAR} and the corresponding verb can be illustrated by the following examples.

11)  

a. \textit{qitlat} u ʕa\textit{liyy-in/*qitlat} u l-ʔaʃdā?-i \textit{ʕa\textit{liyy-an}}  
\text{kill.MM-NOM Ali-GEN kill.MM-NOM the-enemies-GEN Ali-ACC}  
\text{‘Ali’s manner of death.’}  

b. \textit{qatala} l-ʔaʃdā?-u \textit{ʕa\textit{liyy-an}}  
\text{kill.PST the-enemies-NOM Ali-ACC}  
\text{‘The enemies killed Ali.’}  

In (11a) the \textit{MANNER MAṢDAR} of the transitive verb \textit{qatala} ‘kill’ can only take one participant which is the genitive-case marked internal argument i.e. \textit{ʕa\textit{liyy-in ‘Ali-GEN’} and the structure is ungrammatical when the other participant which is the external argument viz. al-ʔaʃdā?-u ‘the enemies-NOM’ is expressed.

Accordingly, the three types of the construct state patterns that the maṣdar Ns form with the associating participants can be summarized as follows:\textsuperscript{33}

A. The Verbal Pattern: a maṣdar N – $N_{rev}$ – $N_{rej}$ – ($N_{rev}$)  
B. The Quasi-Verbal Pattern: a maṣdar N – $N_{rev}$ – li- ‘of’ – $N_{rej}$  
C. The Nominal Pattern: a maṣdar N – $N_{rev}$

\textsuperscript{33} Other types of patterns in which the maṣdars can be found when they occur as a cognate object are given in the next chapter.
2.4. Polysemy of the Maṣdar N

In section 2.2, the general meaning of the various maṣdar classes as indicated in the literature is given. It has been mentioned that some instances of maṣdars can denote two different meanings in different contexts. Accordingly, maṣdars can be described as polysemyous in nature. For example, the BASIC MASDAR ṭalab of the verb ṭalaba ‘request’ can denote ‘the action of requesting’ in one context but it can refer to ‘what is being requested’ in another context as can be seen in the sentences in (12a) and (12b) respectively. I refer to the first reading as the EVENT reading and the latter as the PRODUCT reading.34

12)  

a. kāna ṭalabu=ka li-sayyārati=hi ?amran muḥrijan la=hu  
   be.PST request.BM=2SG of-car=his matter embarrassing to=him  
   ‘Your request of his car was embarrassing to him.’

b. mā huwa ṭalabu=ka  
   what it request.BM=2SG  
   ‘What is your request’

In fact, polysemy in the interpretation of derived nouns and the ambiguity that might arise is well-known in the literature cross-linguistically. Ample studies are undertaken to investigate the properties that characterize the derived nouns in the different readings so as to disambiguate the derived N in the different contexts (see e.g. Grimshaw 1990; Alexiadou 2001; Peris et al 2012). It is thus useful to indicate some of the properties that can be utilized in indicating the reading of the

34 Different terms are used in the literature in the different approaches investigating derived nouns. The most frequently used terms are the EVENT vs. RESULT reading of the derived noun. Moreover, as I indicated in ft. 18 of the present chapter, the descriptive term PRODUCT does not cover the concrete products that result from the action of the verb but only abstract products or outcomes (see section 1.4.1.5 on the delimitation of the concept in MSA as specified in the present work). It is indicated that formally cognate NPs that denote concrete products or results are not included in the definition of cognate objects.
maṣdar N when occurring as the cognate object as it relates to the interpretation of the cognate object and to its function with respect to the verbal event as will be indicated in the next chapter.

One definite test which indicates that the maṣdar has an EVENT reading but not a PRODUCT reading is when it heads an accusative-case marked argument (hence, constructing a verbal construct state as shown in section 2.3). This distinction can be seen in the following pairs of phrases, one being in a verbal construct state pattern while the other is in a nominal pattern.35

13)

a. ṭalabu=hum al-māl-a min an-nāsi
   request.BM=3SG the-money-ACC from the-people
   ‘Their requesting the money from people.’

b. tas?alu ġan ṭalab=ī
   ask.PRS.2SG about request.BM=my
   ‘Do you ask about my request?’

Related to this property is what is indicated in the literature regarding the interpretation of the participants associating the derived N. In a derived noun with an EVENT reading, the participant is analysed as an argument that can be theta-marked by the derived noun. In contrast, in derived nouns with a PRODUCT reading, the noun is interpreted as a possessor (see e.g. Grimshaw 1990; Fassi Fehri 1993). Therefore, the pronoun -hum in (13a) can be interpreted as an argument that bears the semantic role of actor. In (13b), on the other hand, the pronoun -ī can be interpreted as a possessor. In both cases, the pronoun is formally similar to the possessive pronouns occurring with object-denoting nouns.

Another distinction between the two interpretations is the fact that that the derived noun in the EVENT reading can be found with event-modifying adjectives

35 This test does not apply to T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS which have an event reading as these do not assign an accusative case to the participant (see 2.3).
such as those denoting ‘processual characteristics’ whereas the adjectives occurring with the derived noun in the PRODUCT reading are property adjectives (see Höche 2009; Iwasaka 2007:10, ftn 20, for derived nouns occurring as cognate objects in English). The two examples in (11a) and in (11b) illustrates the distinction.

14)

a. ŏalabu=hu l-mufāji? li-l-māl-i
   request.BM=3SG the-sudden of-the-money-GEN
   ‘His sudden request of the money.’

b. ʕind=tx ŏalabun şağırun
   have=1SG request.BM small
   ‘I have a small request.’

Also, one distinct property that holds for some instances of PRODUCT-denoting maṣdars in Arabic is that they are compatible, similarly to inanimate entities, with the interrogative mā huwa ‘what is it’ and can be used in place of the noun šay? ‘thing’ as can be seen in the sentences below.

15)

a. mā huwa ŏalabu=ka
   what 3SG request.BM=your
   ‘what is your request?’

b. ŏalab=tu=hu šay?=an lakinna=hu lam yunaffiḏ
   request.PST=1SG=3SG thing=ACC but=3SG not perform
   ḏalika at-ţalab
   that the-request.BM
   ‘I requested something from him but he did not do that request’

The last distinction that is indicated here between PRODUCT-denoting maṣdars and EVENT-denoting maṣdars can also be observed when the two are pluralized. When maṣdars in the PRODUCT reading are pluralized, the counting is of individual instances of products and it cannot be a counting of the times of the event occurrences as with EVENT-denoting maṣdars. In (16) the PRODUCT-denoting
maṣdar ṭalabān ‘two requests’ express two request instances but not the times of the occurrence of a request. In (17a), on the other hand, the EVENT-denoting maṣdar saqṭatayn ‘two falls’ count the times of ‘the falling event’ and hence it is paraphrasable into the quantifying adverbial marratayn ‘twice’ in (17b). Note that EVENT-denoting maṣdars can also have other interpretations of the plural which vary depending on the quantificational and aspectual type of the maṣdar as demonstrated in the next section.

16) ṭalab-ān
have=1SG request.BM-DUL
‘I have two requests.’

17)

a. ṭaʾarraḍat fi ḥayāṭī=ha li-saqṭ-at-ayn =
expose.PST.3FSG in life=her to-fall-TSM-DUL
‘She had two falls in her life.’
b. saqṭatat marratayn fi ḥayāṭī=ha
fall.PST.3FSG twice in life=her
‘She fell twice in her life.’

As a cognate object, it will be seen in the next chapter that the interpretation of the cognate object is largely based on the reading of the maṣdar N and that the constructional patterns in which the types of cognate objects occur include clues that disambiguate the respective reading of the maṣdar N.

2.5. Quantificational Properties of the Maṣdar

The other aspect of the maṣdars which also has a significant role in the study of cognate objects as revealed by the present research work is related to the quantificational and/or aspectual properties of the maṣdars.\textsuperscript{36} In this section, I

\textsuperscript{36} It can be pointed out that one main criterion, as manifested by the investigation undertaken in the present work, in the classification of the cognate objects in MSA into two major classes as proposed in the present work is related to the quantificational/aspectual type of the maṣdar N (see Chapter 3).
propose a classification of the maṣdar nouns in Arabic based on their quantificational/aspectual properties, an aspect of maṣdars that is understudied in the literature.

Given that maṣdars are nouns that denote events, both the quantificational and the aspectual properties are interrelated in the domain of the maṣdar derived nouns. Quantificational properties relate to how the maṣdar N behaves with respect to counting and pluralization whereas aspectual properties relate to whether or not the event that the maṣdar denotes involves boundaries in time. Therefore, in characterizing the maṣdars from the two angles I use the overarching concept of (un-)boundness, which can be defined as the involvement or not of limitation in quantity and/or time; hence, the description of a noun as bound refers to limitations in quantity and/or time and unbound refers to lack of limitations in quantity and/or time.

The descriptive terms of bound/unbound have often been used in the literature in characterizing the aspectual properties of verbs and the quantificational properties of entity-denoting nouns. For example, mass nouns and atelic verbs such as states and activities are generally described as unbound. On the other hand, count nouns and telic verbs such as accomplishments and achievements are characterized as bound in nature (e.g. Krifka 1987; Jackendoff 1991). This recurrent analogy between count/mass nouns and telic/ataelic verbs as being bound/unbound is extended to derived nouns in, for instance, Brinton (1995) on English and Fassi Fehri (2005) on Arabic.³⁷ Brinton (1995) describes the quantificational properties of three types of derived nouns in English and in Fassi Fehri (2005), the description covers a few categories of the maṣdars in Arabic. In the quantificational

---

³⁷The quantificational classification provided by Fassi Fehri is based on a quadripartite system proposed in classifying object-denoting nouns as well as verbs (Fassi Fehri 2004). It is an alternation to the widespread binary system which involves the single value of a [+count] feature (see Fassi Fehri 2004 for details on the quadripartite quantificational system).
description and classification, which I provide of the maṣdars in this section, I utilize the types of evidence that are found in the two works. An overview of the various diagnostics can be provided below.

In Brinton (1995), the three types of derived nouns that are characterized include (i) derived nouns with the Latinate suffixes i.e. those ending in e.g. -age, -al, -ance/-ence, -tion, etc.; (ii) the gerund i.e. ending in -ing; and (iii) the zero-affix which involves no change in morphological form between the verb and the derived N. Brinton (1995) characterizes the quantificational properties of the Latinate suffixes by indicating their similarity or distinction from count and mass nouns; hence indicate their behaviour with respect to counting, pluralization and the type of determiners they take. The gerund and the zero-affix are characterized in terms of the aspectual properties of the types of contexts in which they can be found.

Brinton (1995) indicates that for the Latinate-suffixed derived nouns, there are categories that are similar to count (bound) nouns and other categories that are similar to mass (unbound) nouns. Those that are derived from states and activities behave like mass nouns, ‘capable of modification with the definite article, and with mass-quantifiers such as much, but not with the indefinite article, numerals, or count quantifiers such as many’. Exemplifications are given in (18).

18) 
   a. The survival, the guidance, some leakage, some resemblance, some drift, much astonishment

(Brinton 1995:31)

On the other hand, Brinton (1995) shows that the Latinate-suffixed derived nouns that are derived from achievements or accomplishments are similar to count nouns: to singular count nouns when they refer to a single instance of a situation
and to plural count nouns when the refer to more than one instance of a situation. Examples that illustrate their behaviour are given in (19).

19)

a. a refusal, an arrangement, a marriage, an entrance, an appearance, a decision
b. two refusals, two arrangement, many marriage, several entrances, a few appearances, another decision

(Brinton 1995:31)

As for the gerund and the zero-affix, Brinton (1995) represents their aspectual properties by indicating their effect on the event denoted by the corresponding verb stem and by indicating the types of contexts in which they are likely to found. She suggests two effects of the two derived nouns: a bounding effect by the zero-affix and an unbounding effect by the gerund.\(^{38}\) She demonstrates the bounding and unbounding effects by highlighting their resemblance to a common process in the noun domain that has also turned to be used in the verbal domain namely ‘packaging’ and ‘grinding’. Brinton (1995:32) illustrates the packaging and grinding processes are where ‘mass nouns being used in a count sense and count nouns being used in a mass sense’ as can be seen in (20a) and (20b) respectively (examples in (20b) and (21) are from Allen (1966:205-06); cited in Brinton (1995:32-33)).

20)

a. I drank two coffess
b. I would like some cake

\(^{38}\) Note that Brinton in her quantificational characterization principally aims to indicate what effects the different derivational processes have on the \textit{aktsionsart} of the corresponding verb stem. It can be noted that in this study I do not aim to indicate the relation between the aspecool features of the corresponding verb and those of the derived noun. Rather, I am mainly concerned with the general aspectual and quantificational properties of the maṣdar N.
In (20a), the noun ‘coffee’ is a mass/unbound noun but it is being used in ‘a count sense’ in the sentence because it occurs with the quantifier ‘two’ and hence this quantifier has a packaging or bounding effect on the quantificational aspect of this noun. In contrast, the noun ‘cake’ is a count noun but it is being used in a ‘mass sense’ because it occurs with the quantifier ‘some’; hence, the quantifier is described to have a grinding/unbounding effect on the count noun ‘cake’.

In the verb domain, the grinding effect can be observed for example when an inherently bound event such as ‘drown’ is used in a sentence in the imperfective aspect as can be seen in (21a). Conversely, the use of the inherently unbound event ‘walk’ in the perfective aspect in (21b) results in a packaging effect.

21)

   a. The man is drowning
   b. I walked

Brinton (1995) indicates that the -ing suffix, like the progressive in the verbal domain, has an unbounding effect on the event regardless of the aktionsart of the corresponding verb. She illustrates this unbounding effect by the following sentences.

22)

   a. My writing is progressing slowly [Continuous Activity]
   b. The rubbing of the strap is causing irritation [Iterative Activity]
   c. The coughing of the sick child went on all night. [Punctual Event]
   d. Finishing the paper is taking a long time. [Achievement]
   e. His growing up is proceeding quickly [Accomplishment]
   f. John’s liking of rock music is well-known. [State]

(Brinton 1995:33)

Brinton demonstrates that with continuous or iterative activities, the situation is represented as ‘ongoing’. The effect of the -ing on punctual events is an iterating one; hence, the situation becomes ‘durative’. In the gerunds of accomplishment and achievement verbs, focus is on the process that leads to the endpoint while
'with states, the effect of the -ing nominalization is to give it an activity or ‘temporary’ sense’ (1995:34). Therefore, it can be suggested that the unbounding effect, which Brinton specifies for the gerund in the different aktionsart cases can more or less be compared to the aktionsart feature of durativity in which some time interval is involved.

As for the zero affix e.g. ‘a move’, ‘a push’, ‘a smile’, ‘a sleep’, etc., Brinton demonstrates that it has a bounding effect, which she compares to the ‘simple past’ in the verbal domain. There are limits on the amount of the event denoted.
Brinton (1995:34-35) suggests this bounding effect of the zero affix on grounds of the frequent, though not exclusive, occurrence of this class of derived nouns in a periphrastic construction with a general verb including ‘have’, ‘take’, ‘give’, ‘make’, ‘do’ and ‘pay’. In such a construction, Brinton (1995) points out, citing Talmy (1988:176), that a single unit of the event is picked out and is foregrounded e.g. ‘breathe’ > ‘take a breath’, a process which Talmy (1988) calls ‘unit-excerpting’ and which he illustrates with ‘furniture’ > ‘a piece of furniture’ in the nominal domain.

Therefore, the construction, as indicated by Wierzbicka (1982:757), presents the action ‘as limited in time’. The following are instances of zero-affixed nouns in a have a V construction; the corresponding verbs are of different aspeclual properties but they all express situations with an endpoint.

23)

a. have a walk, give a smile, make a visit [continuous activity]

b. give a laugh, make a move, take a breath [incremental activity]

c. give a whistle, take a stumble [iterative activity]

d. give a kick, take a bite, make a call [punctual events]

(Brinton 1995:35)

Moreover, the limitation involved in situations expressed by have a V construction

39 The labelling of this type of construction as ‘have a V construction’ rather than have a N construction in Brinton (1995) and other references (e.g. Wierzbicka 1982) can perhaps be attributed to the different views on the status of the postverbal zero-affix derived noun which is identical in form with the verb.
is not merely identified with the involvement of endpoints but can also be a limitation in the duration of the event. Wierzbicka (1982:757) suggests that an ‘antidurative’ process is involved in such a construction and hence the time of the event is rather short. Brinton (1995) indicates that this process is obvious in the case of zero-affixed nouns of activity verbs; accordingly, she demonstrates that while a long period can be involved in a situation bounded by the perfective aspect as in (24a), it is questionable in a have a V construction as in (24b). However, when the period of time indicated is short, the two constructions are equally acceptable as shown in (20c).

24)

a. We walked for ten hours
b. ?We had a walk for ten hours
c. I [slept/had a sleep] for an hour

In Fassi Fehri (2005) the quantificational description covers a few categories of the maṣdars which include: (i) the class of T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS, referred to by Fassi Fehri as ‘event unit-maṣdars’; and (ii) two of the morphological patterns of BASIC MAṢDARS namely the CVCC and the CuCuCu patterns. These are among the numerous patterns of the triliteral verbs in the simple form CaCaC (see section 2.2.1). Fassi Fehri (2005) characterises these types on the basis of a quadripartite system firstly proposed in describing the quantificational properties of object-denoting nouns. According to the system-specific terms, T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS are classified as INDIVIDUALS; BASIC MAṢDARS in the two patterns are classified as KINDS (Fassi Fehri 2005). The two types exhibit different behaviour with respect to pluralization and counting.

---

40 Fassi Fehri refers to BASIC MAṢDARS as maṣdars as is generally the case in the literature on Arabic. I will be using the terms suggested in the present work.
41 The proposed system is an alternation to the widespread binary system which involves the single value of a [±count] feature.
42 For an overview on the system see (Fassi Fehri 2004).
Fassi Fehri (2005) demonstrates that T-SUFFIXED MAŞDARS, e.g. raqsat ‘a dance’, are comparable to normal particular unit-denoting nouns such as tamr-at ‘a date’. Both are derived by adding a -t suffix which signifies a unit to a corresponding more generic noun that represents a kind: an ‘object kind’ as in tamr ‘dates’ or an ‘event kind’ as in the case of the BASIC MAŞDAR in the pattern CVCC raqs ‘dancing’. The other pattern of the BASIC MAŞDAR i.e. the CuCuuC pattern e.g. julas ‘sitting’ is described by Fassi Fehri (2005:12) as an internally plural form of the CVCC pattern, that is in its morphological pattern, it involves a lengthened vowel on parallel to broken plurals in ordinary nouns such as the plural noun wurud ‘flowers’ of the singular noun wardat ‘a flower’.

With respect to the behaviour of these maşdars, Fassi Fehri (2005) shows that T-SUFFIXED MAŞDARS, like an object-unit noun, can occur with numbers, be pluralized and get a bounded interpretation of their plural, i.e. it is a pluralization of integral units, whereas the corresponding BASIC MAŞDARS cannot be pluralized or counted as can be seen in (25).

25)  
   a. raqaṣa raqs-at-ayn  
      danced dance-unit-DUL  
   b. *raqaṣa raqs-ayn  
      danced dance.-dual  
      ‘He danced two dancings.’  

   (Fassi Fehri 2005:9).

Also, CuCuuC BASIC MAŞDARS which involve an internal plural cannot have a bounded interpretation; the meaning of the plural marker (the lengthened vowel) is often that of ‘extension, progression, and continuousness (Fassi Fehri & Vinet 2008:66). Fassi Fehri & Vinet (2008:66) relate the unbounded interpretation of event kind nouns to the other observation that they are basically derived from activities, accomplishments and extended achievements (the types of verbs that
involve a kind of duration); hence, ‘their denotation must involve a form of inherent plurality, so to speak’ (Fassi Fehri 2005:66).

Fassi Fehri’s (2005) observation and description, though not comprehensive of all the maṣdar classes and their subcategories, do give insight into the quantificational properties of the other categories of the maṣdars. Also, for the purposes of the present work, a more general quantificational concept is required namely that of boundedness in parallel to the work by Brinton (1995) on the aspectual properties of the derived nouns in English.

The types of evidence that are used in classifying the maṣdars relate to the morphological form, the behaviour with respect to pluralization and counting, the types of context in which they occur and whether or not they can have a delimiting effect. By applying these tests and by using the overarching descriptive labels of bound or unbound, I classify a maṣdar N that exhibits a quantificational and/or aspectual delimitation as [+bound] ([+b]), whether or not it is morphologically marked, and the maṣdar that does not involve delimitation as [-bound] ([-b]). The cases of the maṣdars that can be described as [+bound] include: (i) the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS; (ii) the MANNER MAṢDARS; and (iii) the instances that belong to the other three classes, namely BASIC MAṢDARS, MĪM MAṢDARS and NON-STEM DERIVED MAṢDARS, when these instances have a PRODUCT reading. On the other hand, the EVENT-denoting instances of these three maṣdar classes represent a [-bound] maṣdar. Examples of [+bound] maṣdars and [-bound] maṣdars are given in (26a) and in (26b) respectively.

26)  

a. ḏ arb-at ‘a hit’ (‘a hit-TSM’), mītat ‘a death’ ‘die.MNM’, ḥ ulm ‘a dream’ (‘dream.BM’)

b. istiqbāl ‘receiving’ (‘receive.BM’), ṭ aqīb ‘kissing’ (‘kiss.BM’), nawm ‘sleeping’ (‘sleep.BM’).
T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS and MANNER MAṢDARS involve in their derivational pattern the suffix that denotes a single instance. As pointed out earlier, T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS are designated event unit-maṣdars by Fassi Fehri (2004) and as *ism al-marrat* ‘the noun of one~time/once’ in the traditional work (see 2.2.4); both designations indicate their bounded property. As the designation of PRODUCT-denoting maṣdars indicate, PRODUCTS in contrast to EVENTS are expected to involve a level of boundedness (parallel to the general division between nouns and verbs).

In terms of their pluralization, the three types can be pluralized; and like count nouns the pluralization has a bounded interpretation. It is a counting of eventive products e.g. ḥulmān ‘two dreams’, event units e.g. darbatān ‘two hits’, or instances of event manners e.g. mitatān ‘two instances of a manner of death’. With T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS the counting can also be of event times e.g. nawmatān ‘two sleeps’. But the different cases, it cannot be a counting of event sorts or groups as is the case with [-bound] maṣdars e.g. taṣqībāt ‘sorts of tortures’.

One last distinction that can be indicated here between maṣdars that are classified as [+bound] and those that are classified as [-bound] maṣdars is related to the types of contexts in which these maṣdar types occur. The PRODUCT-denoting maṣdars and T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS, which are classified as [+bound] maṣdars, are comparable to zero-affixed derived nouns in English as characterized by Brinton (1995). They are likely to occur in constructions similar to the type of constructions mentioned above which are referred to as the *have a V* construction in English e.g. ‘have a walk’, take a bite, make a call (see Brinton 1995:35). These constructions as mentioned earlier express situations with an endpoint. In (27) and (28), examples of T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS and PRODUCT-denoting maṣdars occurring in constructions expressing situations with an endpoint. Note that the corresponding [-bound] maṣdar cannot be used in this type of constructions as can be seen in (28a), (28b), (28c), and (28f).

T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS
27)  

a. ?aʔaʔa ɡafw-at-an/ šarb-at-an/ jawl-at-an  
    take.PST.3SG nap-TSM-ACC  drink-TSM-ACC  take.a.round-TSM-ACC  
    ‘He took a nap/ a drink of/ a round’

b. talaqqā  tahzī?-at-an  
    receive.PST.3SG scold-TSM-ACC  
    ‘He received a scold’

c. ?aʔaʔaʔ=hu  daff-at-an  
    give.PST.3SG=3SG push-TSM-ACC  
    ‘He gave him a push’

PRODUCT-denoting maṣdars

28)  

a. talaqqā  balāg-an/ *tablīg-an  
    get.PST.3SG notify.NSDM-ACC notify.BM-ACC  
    ‘He received a notification/ a notifying.’

b. talaqqā  tanā?-an/ *ʔiṯnā?-an  
    get.PST.3SG praise.NSDM-ACC notify.BM-ACC  
    ‘He received a praise.’

c.ittaʔaʔa  qarār-an/ *taqrīr-an  
    take.PST.3SG decide.NSDM-ACC decide.BM-ACC  
    ‘He took a decision/a deciding.’

d. qaddama  kidmat-an  
    offer.PST.3SG serve.BM-ACC  
    ‘He offered a service.’

e. qaddama  ṭalab-an  
    make.PST.3SG request.BM-ACC  
    ‘He made a request.’

f. ?ajrā  ḥiwār-an/ *taḥāwur-an  
    make.PST.3SG converse.BM-ACC converse.BM-ACC  
    ‘He made a conversation/a conversing.’

Conversely, the cases of [-bound] maṣdars are comparable to the gerund in English. They are likely to occur in sentences expressing durative situations as can
be seen in the sentences below.

29)

a. wa faj?atan tawaqqafa ʕan al-ma?y-i/ *al-ma?y-at-i and suddenly stopped the-walk.BM-GEN/the-walk-TSM-GEN
   ‘And suddenly he stopped walking/the walk’

b. istamarra wam?-u/ *istamarrat wam?-at-u continue.PST flash.BM-NOM continue.PST.FSG flash-TSM.F-NOM
   l-mi?b?hi ?īlā ?akh?ri l-layli the-lamp to last the-night
   ‘The flashing/’the flash of the lamp continued till late at night.’

c. ?ista?graqa inj?-u r-risālati waqtan ʕawl?lan take.PST achieve.BM-NOM the dissertation time long
   ‘Finishing the dissertation took a long time.’

d. wa ?k?da t-?ar?-u/ *?k?dat a?-?ar?-atu and take.PST the-knock.BM-NOM/ take.PST.FSG the-knock-TSM.F
   ʕala l-bābi yazīdu/ ta-zīdu bi-ʃaklin muʃif on the-door increase.PRS.3SG/ FSG-increase.PRS in-way scary
   ‘And the knocking/*the knock kept on increasing in a scary way.’

e. jaʕala yatafānā fi t-)])anā?-i ʕalay=hā went.on dedicate.oneself.3SG in the-praise.NSDM-GEN on=her
   ‘He kept on doing his best in praising her.’

f. hal tujzi?u aʃ-ʃalāt-u sarīʃan PRT count the-pray.NSDM-NOM quickly
   ‘Does the praying quickly count?’

Moreover, numbering and pluralization with these maṣdars are not likely as can be seen in (30) and in the few instances that can be pluralized such as the instances in (31), the pluralization has an unbounded interpretation i.e. it is a counting of event times as in (31a) or a counting of sorts of events as in (31b) but cannot be a counting of individual instances (bounded interpretation) which is possible with [+bound] maṣdars as indicated above.

30)

   a. *yamūtu l-mar?u mawt-an wāḥidan wa laysa mawt-ayn
die.PRS the-person die.BM-ACC one and not die.BM-ACC.DUL
b. yamūtu l-mar?u mawt-at-an wāḥidatan wa laysa mawt-at-ayn
die.PRS the-person die.TSM-ACC one and not die.TSM-ACC.DUL
‘A person dies once but not twice.’

31)

a. zārat=nī ṣīdata ziyār-āt-in fi ŋahrin wāḥidin
visit.PST.3FSG=1SG several visit.BM-PL-GEN in month one
‘She visited me several times in one month.’

b. yuṣaḏḏib=hum (ṣunūfu) taḏḏib-āt-in qad tuwdī
torture.PST.3SG=3PL (sorts) torture.BM-PL-GEN PRT lead.PRS
bi-ḥayāt=him
PRE-life=their
‘He tortures them with sorts of tortures that would lead to their death.’

2.6. Summary

In this chapter I have provided a characterization of the five morphological classes of nouns that can occur as the head N in the cognate object in Arabic. These classes include: (i) the BASIC MAṢDARS; (ii) the MĪM MAṢDARS; (iii) the NON-STEM DERIVED MAṢDARS; (iv) the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS; and (v) the MANNER MAṢDARS. The characterization has touched upon their derivation, meaning, morpho-syntactic properties and, lastly, their quantificational and/or aspectual properties. I have pointed out the polysemous nature of the maṣdars and mentioned some of the clues found in the literature to disambiguate the respective reading. I have also indicated that there are three readings that a maṣdar noun can denote when it occurs as the head N in the cognate object construction. The three readings include: the EVENT reading, the PRODUCT reading and the MANNER reading. An EVENT-denoting maṣdar is one that expresses the same event as that expressed by the corresponding verb stem. A PRODUCT-denoting maṣdar is one that denotes the product of the corresponding verb stem, while the MANNER-denoting maṣdar is the one that denotes the manner of the event expressed by the corresponding verb
stem. I have shown that a maṣdar with a STATE reading does not occur in the construction. STATE-denoting maṣdars represent the majority of the instances that belong in the class of MĪM MAṢDARS. I have attributed this constraint to the incompatibility between that stative meaning implied by the MĪM MAṢDAR and the dynamic nature of the cognate object construction, as often indicated in the literature (see e.g. Macfarland 1995; Höche 2009, among others).

I also provide a characterization and classification of the maṣdars in terms of their quantificational and aspectual properties; another angle of description that is crucial in the characterization of cognate objects but one which is understudied in the literature. The maṣdars are described in terms of the overarching concept of (un-)boundness which covers quantificational as well as aspectual properties, and therefore can generally be described as the involvement or not of limitations in quantity and/or time. Two general types are posited: a [+ bound] maṣdar and a [− bound] maṣdar. A [+ bound] maṣdar is a maṣdar that involves limitations in quantity or time and a [− bound] maṣdar is one that does not involve boundaries in time. The evidence used in classifying the instance of a maṣdar as either type includes the morphological form, pluralisation and its interpretation, their aspectual properties and the types of contexts in which they occur. A mapping of the quantificational/aspectual type of the maṣdars is to the reading of the maṣdar N and to the morphological classes of the maṣdars that denote the respective reading can be made here. All instances of a T-SUFFIXED MAṢDAR and a MANNER MAṢDAR are [+bound] maṣdars, as they involve the –t suffix that denotes a single unit. The other maṣdars, namely the BASIC MAṢDAR, MĪM MAṢDAR, and the NON-STEM DERIVED MAṢDAR, represent a [+bound] maṣdar when the instance of the maṣdar denotes a PRODUCT; although they do not involve a morphological marker, they behave like other morphologically-marked [+bound] maṣdars. On the other hand, the instances of these maṣdar classes that have an EVENT reading are classified as [−bound] maṣdars.
In fact, the characterization in the way it is provided for the maṣdars in this study, which indicates their different denotations and their polysemous nature at one level and their quantificational and aspectual properties at another level, has shed light on a number of distinctions and relations among the classes of the maṣdars which have, nonetheless, been frequently described without being distinguished in the literature. Moreover, the quantificational/aspectual characterization and classification of maṣdars as posited in the present work cover aspects that are understudied in the literature and hence make a modest contribution to the literature on the maṣdars in Arabic.

In fact, it is on the basis of this quantificational classification of the maṣdars which occur as the ‘cognate’ head N in the cognate object construction that the classification of cognate objects into two major classes in this study is proposed. As will be outlined in the next chapter, there are BOUNDED and UNBOUNDED cognate objects.
CHAPTER 3: CONSTRUCTIONAL PROPERTIES OF THE COMPOSITE V + CO

3.1. Introduction

The previous chapter outlined the five morphological classes of the nouns that occur as the head noun in the cognate object construction and presented their morpho-syntactic and lexico-semantic properties. The present chapter focuses on the constructional properties of the two elements that make up the cognate object construction, i.e. the cognate object and the V, a crucial stage in a comprehensive characterization of the cognate object construction in MSA. In the first section of the chapter, I focus on the properties of cognate object. I establish that there is a rather diverse set of cognate object categories which will be shown in the present and the subsequent chapters to exhibit syntactic and semantic variations. I propose two major classes for the cognate object categories in Arabic, which are based on inherent quantificational/aspectual properties of the maṣdar N i.e. whether it is a [+bound] or a [-bound] maṣdar (see section 2.5). The subcategories of the two classes are characterized with respect to various criteria and distinctions between the two classes are highlighted.

In the second section, I provide a description of the verbs that enter the cognate object construction and indicate the types of cognate objects that the different verbs take. I also, highlight aspects related to the distribution of the cognate object categories. In the third section of the chapter, I provide a demonstration of the different types of semantic functions that the categories of cognate object carry with respect to the verbal event.

43 In fact, the investigation in the present research work leads to such classification and reveals its significant role in the distinctions among the cognate object types in MSA.
3.2. The Cognate Object

3.2.1. Internal-NP Constructional Properties

In this section I provide a description of the constructional properties of the elements that construct the cognate NP. The constructional properties relate to two aspects: (i) the morpho-syntactic properties of the NP; and (ii) the semantic properties of the elements constructing the NP.

The cognate object is an accusative-case marked NP headed by a cognate N which is a maṣdar N. The cognate object NP occurs in diverse structural patterns which are not different from the patterns of ordinary NPs, although some types of cognate objects are structurally constrained. Moreover, the specific patterns of the cognate objects are more or less related to the semantic functions that the cognate object types perform as will be seen in section (3.4). In terms of the structural patterns and the constraints involved, two major types can be identified: (i) cognate objects that strictly occur as bare NPs; and (ii) cognate objects that allow or require the use of a dependent. The two types can be referred to, respectively, as the bare cognate object NPs and the optionally or obligatorily expanded cognate object NPs.

As for the dependent in the expanded cognate object NPs, it can be an adjective phrase or clause, a quantifier, a determiner, or an NP forming what is called the construct state. The construct state may allow only one genitive NP dependent. Yet, in other types the construct state can be expanded by the addition of a second accusative NP or a li- ‘of’ marked PP. Hence, the resulting patterns in which the cognate object can be found are as follows: 44

---

44 See section 2.3 for morpho-syntactic (noun and verb) properties of the maṣdars and types of the construct state patterns involving a maṣdar.
A. Bare Cognate NPs

B. Expanded Cognate NPs
   a. Cognate N + AdjP/clause
   b. Determiner + Cognate N
   c. Quantifier + Cognate N
   d. Construct State with NP or with NP1 +NP2/ NP1+PP

One observation can be made here regarding definiteness and number of the categories of cognate objects in the structural patterns indicated. There is a general tendency for cognate objects with a determiner or quantifier to occur without an adjective and for cognate objects containing an adjective to be indefinite and singular. Cognate Ns in the construct states occur as singular Ns and their grammatical definiteness is determined by the definiteness of the dependent noun. The cognate N with a clause may occur as definite and plural.\(^{45}\)

The internal-NP semantic properties of the cognate object relate to two aspects: (i) the semantic type of the dependents involved; (ii) the reading of the maṣdar N in the cognate object NP. As for the type of the dependent in the cognate object NP, it can be indicated that the adjective can be of two types: event-modifying adjectives or property-modifying adjectives. Also, the NP in the construct state can be a qualifier or a specifier, or it can be an NP denoting a participant that can either be a possessor, or it can be an argument that performs an actor or undergoer semantic role. In the case where the NP is an argument, it can be a referential or a non-referential NP.

As for the reading of the maṣdar N, it is in principle no different from the set of readings identified for the maṣdar noun, which include EVENT, PRODUCT and MANNER (see Chapter 2). An EVENT-denoting maṣdar is one that expresses the same event expressed by the corresponding verb, a PRODUCT-denoting maṣdar is

\(^{45}\) A comparable observation is made by Sailer (2010) for the quantitative results of the corpus data of English cognate objects as provided in Höche (2009).
one that expresses the outcome of the corresponding verb, and a MANNER-denoting is one that denotes the manner in which the event denoted by the corresponding verb is performed. A fourth more abstract reading that is observed by Sailer (2010) for derived nouns (the maṣdars in Arabic) and which holds for these nouns when they occur as a cognate object is that of denoting an event kind. Referring to the works of Carlson (1980) and Wilkinson (1995) on kinds, Sailer (2010:199) demonstrates that in the domain of nouns, kinds, in contrast to concrete objects, are characterized as abstract entities. They can be arguments of kind-level predicates such as ‘widespread’, ‘extinct’, ‘common’, ‘rare’, etc., or be associated with words such as ‘species’, ‘types’, ‘sorts’, etc., as shown in the sentences in (1).

1)  
   a. The dodo is extinct  
   b. The species of the dodo is extinct

As for NPs that can occur as cognate objects and which also behave as kinds, Sailer (2010:200) illustrates by the following example.

2)  
   a. For two years I lived the life of a slave.  
      (BNC; qtd. in Sailer 2010:200).  
   b. = For two long years I lived the kind/type of life of a slave.  
      (Sailer 2010:200).

Likewise, the NPs which can be found as cognate objects in Arabic such as raqṣ-atu l-bolkā ‘dance-TSM the-Polka’, nawm-atu l-qaylūlati ‘sleep-TSM the-nap’, mašy-atu d-dî?bi ‘walk-TSM the-wolf’, jals-atu l-qurfusā? ‘sit-TSM the-squat’ are kind-referring expressions; it is feasible for these NPs to occur as arguments of a kind-level predicate e.g šā?iḥatun ‘widespread’ in (3a) and they are compatible with phrases including the noun nawṣ ‘kind’ as can be seen in (3b).
3)  

a. \textit{jals-at-u l-qurfuṣạ̄?i šaʔiKatun} bayna ?ahli qaryati=nā sit-TSM-NOM the-squat widespread among people village=our

‘Squat sitting is widespread among the people of our village’

b. \textit{raqṣ-at-u l-bolkā hiya nawṣu raqṣ-atin maʕrubātin}
dance-TSM-NOM the-Polka 3FSG kind dance-TSM known

fi haḍa l-balad in this the-country

‘The Polka dance is a kind of dance that is well-known in this country.’

3.2.2. Two Classes of Cognate Objects in Arabic

In the above section the NP-internal constructional properties of cognate objects are given and the presentation indicates that there are different categories of cognate objects in Arabic. Therefore, I propose two major classes of cognate objects under which a number of subtypes belong. In fact, the investigation in the present research work leads to the proposed classification and reveals that significant variations exist between them as will be seen in characterization and the analysis undertaken in the subsequent chapters. The classification is based on the quantificational/aspeclual class of the maṣdar N in the cognate object and whether it is a [-bound] or a [+bound] maṣdar. As indicated in Chapter 2, the (un-)boundness of the maṣdar N relates to whether or not the maṣdar N inherently involves quantificational and/or temporal limitations. A [+bound] maṣdar is one that is number-specific and/or temporally bound. A [-bound] maṣdar is inherently number-neutral and is aspectually unbound.\footnote{46} The two classes, which encompass other types, are referred to as (i) \textsc{unbounded} cognate objects and (ii) \textsc{bounded} cognate objects. The first class incorporates all the cognate object types whose cognate N is a [-bound] maṣdar. \textsc{bounded} cognate objects, on the other hand, are the cognate objects whose cognate N is a [+bound] maṣdar. Given that

\footnote{46}{See section 2.5 for the different types of maṣdars that are inherently [+bound] and those that are inherently [-bound].}
the cognate N in the UNBOUNDED cognate objects is a [-bound] maṣdar and that [-bound] maṣdars always have an EVENT reading (see section 2.5), the subcategories of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects are classified according to the other constructional property for which they exhibit differences namely their structural patterns. There are the cognate objects that strictly occur as a bare NP and those that obligatorily occur as extended NPs. The extended NPs either strictly occur as a ‘construct state’ cognate object or as an ‘indefinite N + Adj/ quantifier’. Therefore, I refer to the three types of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects as: (i) the BARE cognate object; (ii) the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object; (iii) the MODIFIED cognate object. Conversely, the [+bound] maṣdar is not restricted to one reading and hence the BOUNDED cognate objects can be classified according to the reading of the maṣdar N into EVENT cognate objects, PRODUCT cognate objects, MANNER cognate objects and lastly the abstract reading as KIND cognate objects. These categories of the BOUNDED cognate objects as will be demonstrated below do not exhibit the same constraints on the structural patterns in which they can occur as is the case with the UNBOUNDED cognate objects.\textsuperscript{47} The proposed classification of cognate objects is presented in diagram 3.1.

\textsuperscript{47} Note that the types of BOUNDED cognate objects are further classified into subtypes on the basis of other properties of the cognate object as will be demonstrated in the next section as well as on the basis of the type of the verb as will be seen in section 3.3.
In the following sections, I provide a description of the properties of the categories of cognate objects that belong under the two classes. Note that the description relates to the variation among the various categories in terms of their constructional properties and the constraints involved, the relation between the cognate object and the verbal event and lastly the interpretation of the cognate object. It should be pointed out that the parameters that distinguish the subcategories of the two classes of cognate objects are not the same in all the cases.

### 3.2.2.1 UNBOUNDED Cognate Objects

Given that the cognate N in the UNBOUNDED cognate objects is a [-bound] maṣdar and that [-bound] maṣdars always have an EVENT reading, the types of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects always express an event. Nevertheless, they differ in their other constructional properties and the constraints involved, in their interpretation and in their relation to the verbal event.

The first category of UNBOUNDED cognate objects those cognate objects that strictly occur as a ‘construct state’ and hence are referred to as CONSTRUCT STATE cognate objects. The construct state NP involves the maṣdar N plus one or two dependents: an NP or an NP+PP. The dependents denote participants that stand
as the arguments of the maṣdar N: external and/or internal argument(s) of the cognate N. The participants in this type of cognate objects are different from those involved in the verbal event. Nevertheless, they hold the same semantic roles as those of the verb arguments. Examples of the construct state cognate objects are given in (4) and (5). The participants in this type of cognate objects can be expressed by non-referential NPs as in the cognate objects given in (4) or by referential NPs as in the cognate objects given in (5). In (4), the NPs al-ʔanʕāmi ‘the-creatures’, al-ʔazhār ‘the flowers’, al-ʔum ‘the-mother’, ibnati=hā ‘her daughter, do not refer to a specific individual(s). Conversely, the referents of the NPs in (5) namely ar-rasūl ‘the-prophet’, qāʔidi=him ‘their leader’, Bashshaar and Feroen are specific individuals.

4) 
   a. yamʂ=ʊna  mašy-a  l-ʔanʕami 
      walk.PRS=3PL  walk.MF-ACC  the creatures
      ‘lit. They walk the walking of creatures.’
   b. ẓabol=t  ḍubūl-a  l-ʔazhāri 
      wilt.PST=3FSG  wilt.MF-ACC  the flowers
      ‘lit. She wilted the wilting of flowers.’
   c. ʔalḥab=tu=hā  maḥbbat-a  l-ʔummi  li-bnati=hā 
      love.PST=1SG=3FSG  love.MM-ACC  the-mother  of-daughter=hēr
      ‘lit. I loved her a mother’s loving of her daughter.’
   d. inqāḍa  ʕalā  l-liṣṣi  inqīḍāt-a  l-ʔasadi 
      pounce.PST.3SG  on  the-thief  pounce.MF-ACC  the-lion
      ʕalā  farīsat=hi
      on  prey=its
      ‘lit. He pounced on the thief the pouncing of a lion on its prey.’

5) 
   a. yuṣall=ʊna  šalāt-a  rasūli=him 
      pray.PRS=3PL  pray.NSDM-ACC  prophet=their
      ‘lit. They pray the praying of their prophet.’
   b. yamʂ=ʊna  mašy-a  qāʔidi=him 
      walk.PRS=3PL  walk.MF-ACC  leader=their
      ‘lit. They walk the walking of their leader.’
c. **hajama** ʕalay=him **hujūm-a** baššār **ṣalā sūriyyā**

attack.PST.3SG on=them attack.BM-ACC Bashshaar on Syria

‘lit. He attacked them the attacking of Bashshaar on Syria.’

d. **ṣḥḥaba=hum** tasḏība feraawna li-qawmi=hi
torture.PST.3SG=3PL torture.BM-ACC Feraon of-nation=his

‘lit. He tortured them Feraon’s torturing of his nation.’

One semantic aspect that characterises the majority of the instances of the construct state cognate objects, and which sets them out as distinct from the other categories of cognate objects, is that the cognate object and the verb do not express a single event; rather, the cognate object expresses an event that is different from the event expressed by the verb.\(^{48}\) For example, in (5a), the event expressed by the cognate object **ṣalāta rasūli=him** ‘the praying of their prophet’ is different from the event expressed by **yuṣall=ūna** ‘they pray’. The participants of the verbal event cannot be simultaneously carrying out the event of ‘the praying of the prophet’. This type of the construct state cognate object NPs can be described as expressing a generic event in the cognate object construction.

In this respect, these cognate objects can also be seen to introduce a comparison between the verbal event and the generic event that the cognate object expresses. For example, the meaning in (5a) is equivalent to ‘they prayed praying that is similar to the praying of the prophet’. In fact, this type of cognate objects has a corresponding expression in the language but one which involves a device that introduces an explicit comparison between the verbal event and the event that it expresses, namely the determinative **mišt** ‘like’ (mostly headed by a preposition, viz. **bi-**) as can be seen in (6).

\(^{48}\) These cognate objects do therefore violate Mittwoch’s single event criterion (see section 1.4.2.1) which holds for the categories of cognate objects found in the literature on the different languages as given in section 1.4.1.4. These cognate objects do however meet properties to be considered cognate objects according to my delimitation of the concept in Arabic, 1.4.1.5., which does not consider the single event criterion definitional of cognate object status. Therefore, I consider these cognate objects as the least canonical type of cognate objects.
6) a. *yuṣall=ūna bi-miṭli ṣalāt-i rasūli=him*  
   pray.PRS=3PL  PRE-like pray.NSDM-GEN prophet=their  
   ‘lit. They prayed like the praying of their prophet.’

b. *inqaḍḍa ṣalā l-liṣṣi bi-miṭli inqiḍāḏ-i l-asadi*  
   pounce.PST.3SG on the-theif PRE-like pounce.BM-GEN the-lion  
   ṣalā farīṣati=hi  
   on prey=its  
   ‘lit. He pounced on the thief the pouncing of a lion on its prey.’

It can also be noted that the implied comparison in some instances extends to the participants in the verbal event. For instance, in (7a) the cognate object *istiqbāla l-?abṭāl,* ‘the receiving of the heroes’, can only be used in situations when the description of ‘being a hero’ applies to the participants which stand as the subject of the verb. Also, in (7b), the property denoted by the derived noun that occurs as the external argument of the cognate object i.e. *al-mutawāḏišīn* ‘the humble people’ must also hold for the participant that stands for the subject of the verb; it cannot be said in a situation where a person is known for his arrogance, for instance. Therefore, as will be demonstrated in section 3.4, this type of cognate objects can be seen as a strategy of not only qualifying the verbal event, but it also facilitates a qualification of the participants involved in the verbal event.

7) a. *istaqbal=ū=hum istiqbāl-a l-?abṭāli*  
   receive.PST=3PL=3PL receive.BM-ACC the-heros  
   ‘lit. They received them the receiving of heros’

b. *yatabassamu tabassum-a l-mutwāḏišīn*  
   smile.PST.3SG smile.BM-ACC the-humble.people  
   ‘He smiles the smiling of humble people.’

Another aspect regarding the interpretation of this type of cognate objects is that
some instances of these cognate objects can have a manner interpretation.\textsuperscript{49} This is evidenced by the propensity of these cognate objects to be paraphrased into a corresponding manner PP adverbial which involves the manner-denoting noun ṭariqati ‘manner/way’ and the same maṣdar that occurs in the cognate object.\textsuperscript{50}

For example, the interpretation of the cognate objects in the examples given in (8) is akin to bi-ṭariqati ṣalāti rasūli=him ‘in the manner of the praying of their prophet’, bi-ṭariqati maṣy-i ẓ-ṣuʕān ‘in the manner of the walking of the courageous’ and bi-ṭariqati, inqiḍā-a l-ʔasadi ẓalā farsati=hi ‘in the manner in which a lion pounces on its prey’; the manner interpretation is indicated in the idiomatic translation of the examples.\textsuperscript{51}

8)

a. yuṣall=ūna ṣalāt-a rasūli=him
   pray=3PL pray.NSDM-ACC prophet=their
   ‘They pray in the manner of the praying of their prophet.’

b. yamš=ūna maṣy-a ẓ-ṣuʕānī
   walk.PRS=3PL walk.BM-ACC the courageous.people
   ‘They walk in the manner of the walking of the courageous people.’

c. inqaḍḍa ẓalā l-liʃši inqiḍā-a l-ʔasadi
   pounce.PST.3SG on the-theif pounce.BM-ACC the-lion
   ẓalā farsati=hi
   on prey=its
   ‘He pounced on the thief in the same manner in which a lion the pounces on its prey.’

The manner interpretation is also evident in the fact these instances of the

\textsuperscript{49} Note that the same applies to the corresponding expression with the determinative miṭl ‘like’.

\textsuperscript{50} The correspondence between these cognate objects and the PPs is that both involve the maṣdar noun which is cognate with the verb in the construction; therefore, the PP can be referred to as a cognate PP but it is a different category from the category under consideration in the present work which is necessarily accusative-case marked NP and not a PP.

\textsuperscript{51} The manner adverbial cognate PP is most likely to be used in interpreting the meaning but not as a common expression in the language. This refers to the fact that the cognate object is a shorter (economic) expression that expresses the same meaning that might be expressed by a manner cognate PP adverbial.
CONSTRUCT STATE cognate objects can be an answer to a question with *kayf* ‘how’, as can be seen in (9) for the example in (8a).

9)

a. **kayfa** yuṣallī hā?ulā?i l-qawm
   how   pray.PRS those   the-people
   ‘How do these people pray?’

b. **yuṣallī=ūna šalāt-a rasūli=him**
   pray=3PL   pray.NSDM-ACC   prophet=their
   ‘They pray in the manner of the praying of their prophet.’

The second type of **UNBOUNDED** cognate objects is that which strictly occurs as an indefinite singular bare NP and is thus referred to as the **BARE** cognate object. The following are examples of this type of cognate objects.

10)

a. **?alā fa-itaḥid=ū itiḥād-an**
   Oh   PRT-unite.IMP=2PL   unite.BM-ACC
   ‘Oh, you unite intensely.’

b. **?abdāfatī ṭ-ṭālibāt-u ?ībdāḥ-an**
   act.outstandingly.PST   the-students   act.outstandingly.PST-ACC
   fī barnāmāji l-bāriḥāti
   in    program   the-yesterday
   ‘The students acted extremely outstandingly in the yesterday program.’

c. **lam ?ahriq l-kitāb-a wa ?innāma**
   not   burn.PRS.1SG the-book-ACC and   EMP.PRT
   **mazzaq=tu=hu tamzīq-an**
   tear.PST=1SG=3SG   tear.BM-ACC
   ‘I did not burn the book; rather I tore it.’

Unlike in the case of the **CONSTRUCT STATE** cognate objects which involve participants that are different from the participants involved in the verbal event, in the **BARE** cognate object the implied actor is the same as that of the verb and the verb and the cognate object can be said to express the same event. Given that this

subtype of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects expresses the same event expressed by the verb and that it occurs as a bare NP with no modifying element, it can be said that it adds no additional information to that contributed by the verb in the sentence. Having said that, the BARE cognate object still performs other semantic functions with regard to the verbal event, as will be indicated in section 3.4, such as that of intensifying the event as in the examples in (10a) and (10b), and also that of focusing a contrast as in the examples in (10c) and (10d). It can be pointed out that the two subcategories exhibit variation in terms of the formal definitional constraint mentioned above, i.e. that it strictly occurs as a ‘bare NP’: while the intensifying BARE cognate object may allow the addition of a degree-modifying adjective without losing the intensified meaning, as can be seen in (12), the BARE cognate object that focuses a contrast bans the use of a dependent.53

11) ?abdaʕati t-ʔalibāt-u ?ibdās-an ḳaʕīman
   act.outstandingly.PST the-students act.outstandingly.PST-ACC great
   fi barnāmajī l-bāriḥati
   in program the-yesterday
   ‘The students acted extremely outstandingly in the program yesterday.’

The third subtype of the UNBOUNDED cognate is that referred to as the MODIFIED cognate object. It is constructed of an indefinite cognate N denoting an event plus an obligatorily dependent which can be an event-modifying adjective, such as one that denotes degree, aspect or manner or can be a quantifier as can be seen in the following instances.

12) 
   a. yusʕāmilu=hum muṣāmalat-an ḳasātnan
      treat.PRS.3SG=3PL treat.BM-ACC good
      ‘He treats them with a good treatment.’

53 The cognate object with the degree adjective can then be classified under the third subtype of the UNBOUNDED cognate object i.e. the MODIFIED cognate object.
b. māta mawt-an mufājī?an
die.PST.3SG die.BM-ACC sudden
‘He died a sudden death.’

c. ikta?abat ikti?āb-an šādīdan
be.depressed.PST.3FSG depression.BM-ACC severe
‘She had been severely depressed.’

d. zāra=hu ṭalāt-a ziyārāt-in
visit.PST=3SG three-ACC visit.BM-GEN
‘He visited him three visits.’

As in the case of the BARE cognate object, the implied ACTOR in the event expressed by the MODIFIED cognate object is the same as that of the verbal event and the verb and the cognate object can be said to express a single event. In terms of interpretation, the MODIFIED cognate object has a similar meaning to adverbials of the verb and hence the cognate objects can be paraphrased into corresponding adverbials without resulting in a change in the meaning as can be seen in (13). The cognate objects which involve an adjective in the sentences in have a corresponding PP adverbial, and the cognate object with the quantifier is equivalent to the quantifying NP with marrat ‘time’. 54

13)

a. yuʕāmilu=hum bi-ṭarīqatin ḥasanatin
treat.PRS.3SG=3PL PRE-manner good
‘He treats them in a good way.’

b. māta bi-šaklin mufājī?in
die.PST.3SG PRE-way sudden
‘He died suddenly.’

c. ?ikta?abat bi-šiddatin
be.depressed.PST.3FSG PRE-severity
‘She had been severely depressed.’

54 Note that a few distinctions still exist between the two types of constructions i.e. the V + the MODIFIED cognate object and the V + adverbial as will be indicated in Chapter 5.
d. zāra=hu ṭalāṭa marrātin  
visit.PST=3SG three time-ACC  
‘He visited him three times.’

3.2.2.2 BOUNDED Cognate Objects

The class of BOUNDED cognate objects involve more heterogeneous subcategories compared to the case with the UNBOUNDED cognate objects. Moreover, the subcategories need be distinguished on the basis of a number of aspects which may not apply to the categories of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects. A characterization and exemplifications of the different subcategories are given below. Firstly, BOUNDED cognate objects as indicated above can be found in four categories which are classified on the basis of the reading of the masdar N and accordingly they are designated. These categories include EVENT cognate objects, PRODUCT cognate objects, MANNER cognate objects and SPECIMEN cognate objects. Examples of the four types are given below.

14)  
a. nāmat hindun nawm-at-an ʕamīqatan  
sleep.PST Hind sleep-TSM-ACC deep  
‘Hind slept deep sleep’

b. ḥalimat hindun ḥulm-an ḡarīban  
dream.PST Hind dream.BM-ACC strange  
‘Hind dreamt a strange dream’

c. mātat hindun mīt-at-an ḥasanatn  
die.PST Hind die.MNM-ACC good  
‘Hind died a good death.’

d. raqaṣat hindun raqs-at-a l-bolkā  
dance.PST Hind dance-TSM-ACC the-Polka  
‘Hind danced the Polka dance.’

Secondly, the categories of the BOUNDED cognate objects are not constrained in terms of the structural patterns in which they can be found in contrast to the case with the UNBOUNDED cognate objects. Also, variations are observed in the
categories which share with the UNBOUNDED cognate objects the same structural pattern. The BOUNDED cognate objects can be found in the different structural patterns mentioned in which include ‘a construct state’, ‘a determiner + NP’, ‘an indefinite + adjective NP’ or ‘a quantifier + NP’ and ‘a bare NP’. BOUNDED cognate objects in the ‘construct state’ are of two types. There are those instances that exhibit nominal properties such as involving a qualifier and those that exhibit verbal properties, hence, resembling in the second case the UNBOUNDED CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object, in that they involve Ns that qualify as arguments which have the same semantic role as the argument of the verb in the construction. Examples of the two subcategories are given in (15).

15)  
   a. ibtasamat hindun ibtisām-at-a  l-intiṣāri  
      smile.PST Hind dance-TSM-ACC the-victory  
      ‘Hind smiled the smile of victory.’  
   b. qabbala=hā qublat-a muḥibbin  
      kiss.PST.3SG=kiss.3SG kiss.NSDM-ACC loving.person  
      ‘He kissed her a kiss of a loving person.’

BOUNDED cognate objects can be found in the pattern ‘determiner + NP’ which is not likely with the categories of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects. Examples of determined BOUNDED cognate objects are given in (16).

16)  
   a. ibtasamat hindun ibtisāmata=ha l-aṭṭifata  
      smile.PST Hind smile-TSM-ACC the-gentle  
      ‘Hind smiled her gentle smile.’  
   b. hindun ḍaḥikat tilka ḍ-ḍiḥk-at-a  
      Hind laugh.PST.3SG that the-laugh-TSM-ACC  
      ‘Hind laughed that laugh.’

55 See Chapter 2 for the verbal and nominal properties of construct states involving maṣdars.
Some instances of event cognate objects need be distinguished also as they exhibit variations in behavior from the other categories of the bounded event cognate objects. These are the cognate objects which I refer to as the quantized event cognate objects. When these cognate objects are quantified, they count individual instances of events. The other type are the categories that count times of events in parallel to the case with the unbounded cognate objects occurring with a quantifier. Examples of the types are given in (17).

17)  
   a. ḏaraba hindun ḏarb-at-ayni  
      hit.PST.3SG Hind hit-TSM-ACC.DUL  
      ‘He hit Hind two hits.’  
   b. saqaṭa saqṭ-at-ayni ṭī ḥayāti=hi  
      fall.PST.3SG fall-TSM-ACC.DUL in life=his  
      ‘He had two falls in his life.’

Some instances of the manner cognate objects such as the example in ( ) and of the event cognate objects such as the example in have the distinct property of indicating a kind interpretation. This can be indicated by the possibility of these cognate object to be associated with the noun nawʕ ‘kind’ or to be an answer to the question ?ayya nawʕ ‘what kind of’ as indicated in (19).

18)  
   a. māta mītatan ḥasanatan  
      die.PST.3SG die.MNM-ACC good  
      ‘He died a good death.’  
   b. ḏaḥikat hindun ḏihk-at-an širrfratan  
      laugh.PST.3SG Hind laugh-TSM-ACC evil  
      ‘Hind laughed an evil laugh.’

19)  
   a. ?ayya nawʕi mītat-in mātat=ḥā hindun  
      which kind die.MNM-GEN die.PST=3FSG Hind  
      ‘What kind of death did Hind die.’
b. ?ayya nawṣi diḥk-at-in ḏaḥikat=hā hindun which kind laugh-TSM-ACC laugh.PST=3SG Hind ‘What kind of laugh did Hind laugh?’

Lastly, the categories of BOUNDED cognate objects can be distinguished on the basis of their relation with the verb event. There are cognate objects that can be seen to have an existence that is independent from the verbal event in the construction such as the examples in (20). The other type of the BOUNDED cognate objects are those that merely owe their existence to the verbal event such as the examples in (21).

20)   
a. raqaṣat hindun raqṣ-at-a l-bolkā dance.PST Hind dance-TSM-ACC the-Polka ‘Hind danced the Polka dance.’
b. ibtasamat hindun ibtisāmat=ha l-aṭīfata dance.PST Hind dance-TSM-ACC the-Polka ‘Hind danced the Polka dance.’

21)  
a. ḥalimat hindun ḥulm-an ḡarīban dream.PST Hind dream.BM-ACC strange ‘Hind dreamed a strange dream.’
b. nāmat hindun nawm-at-an ẓamīqatan sleep.PST Hind sleeping-TSM-ACC deep ‘Hind slept a deep sleep.’

It is known that there exists a dance called raqṣata l-bolkā ‘the Polka dance’ independent of the event expressed by the verb in the construction. Similarly, Hind is known to have a kind of smile that is gentle irrespective of the event of her smiling it as expressed by the cognate object construction. Conversely, the existence of the events expressed by the cognate objects in (21) do not have a prior existence and their existence is dependent on the verbal event in the construction.
From the presentation above it has become obvious that the categories of BOUNDED cognate objects are heterogeneous, some of which exhibit affinity with the instances of the unbounded cognate objects. In fact, the classification of the categories more or less relate to their semantic or syntactic behavior as will be seen in the characterization provided in the present work.

3.3. The Cognate VP

As indicated in Chapter 1, the type of verbs that can be found in the cognate object construction in Arabic is wide and is not restricted to a certain valency type. They can be a one-place predicate, whether unaccusative or unergative, a two-place predicate or a three-place predicate. Nevertheless, the significant observations are related to the type of cognate object that the different verbs take and to the constraints on the distribution of the different types of cognate objects. In order to indicate these constraints, it is important to distinguish the verbs on the basis of a number of parameters that are related to the transitivity and argument structure of the verbs. These parameters include: (i) the number and type of the verb arguments; (ii) the range of the direct objects that the verb can take; and (iii) the (non-)obligatoriness of the object or complement of the verb in the non-cognate object construction. The verbs can generally be classified into one-place predicates and multiple-place predicates.

One-place predicates can widely be found in the cognate object construction whether these are unaccusative verbs or unergative verbs. Unaccusative verbs take an internal argument as their subject, whereas unergatives take an external argument. Unaccusatives represent non-volitional events and represent a change in the state or location of their subject. Unergatives, on the other hand, represent volitional events. Among the various instances of the unaccusative and unergative

\[56\] In contrast to the case with English for instance where the instances of unaccusative verbs that can take a cognate object are limited (see e.g. Kim & Lim 2012).
verbs that can be found in the construction are those given in (1) and (2).

UNACCUSATIVE VERBS


UNERGATIVE VERBS


The main property of one-place predicates and which distinguishes them from the multiple-place predicates is that the only type of object which they can take is a cognate object. This is, in contrast to, for instance, the types of intransitive verbs that have transitive uses as will be seen below. These verbs can be found with cognate objects and a limited set of non-cognate objects, both of which are semantically related. With regard to the unaccusative and unergative verbs, one distinction can be observed between the two types of verbs which relates to the typical type of cognate objects with which they can be found. With unaccusative verbs, the typical type of cognate objects that they take are the UNBOUNDED cognate objects such as the examples in (22).

22) a. namā  numuww-an sarifan
    grow.PST.3SG grow.BM-ACC  fast
    ‘It grew fast growing.’

b. ḏabulat  ḏubula  l-ʔažhari
    wither.PST.3SG wither.BM-ACC the-flowers
    ‘lit. She withered the withering of flowers.’
c. **intašara** 1-ḵabaru **intašaran**

*spread.PST the-news spread.BM-ACC*

‘The news spread intensely.’

Only a few instances of **BOUNDED** cognate objects are found with unaccusative verbs and these are frequently the cognate objects of the verbs *māta* ‘die’ and *saqāta* ‘fall’ as can be seen (23). Other verbs e.g. *irtadda* ‘bounce’, *ranna* ‘ring’, and *dāra* ‘rotate’ which are considered lower in transitivity as they take a [-human] internal argument, and even though a [+b] maṣdar is available for them, are not commonly found with a cognate object.  

This observation indicates that **BOUNDED** cognate objects are constrained in distribution.  

23)

a. *māta* mawt-at-an mufāji?atan

*die.PST.3SG die-TSM-ACC sudden*

‘He died a sudden death.’

b. *saqāt* saq-at-an qawiyyatan

*fall.PST.3FSG fall-TSM-ACC strong*

‘She fell down a strong fall.’

Unergative verbs, on the other hand, are more commonly found with **BOUNDED** cognate objects. For all the instances of the unergative verbs given in (2), a **BOUNDED** cognate object can be found. Some examples of the **BOUNDED** cognate objects of unergative verbs are given in (24).

24)

a. *ibtasamat* ibtīsām-at-an jaḏḏābatan

*smile.PST smile-TSM-ACC attractive*

‘She smiled an attractive smile.’

b. *ṣaraḵa* ṣarak-at-an ṣāliyatan

*scream.PST scream-TSM-ACC loud*

‘She screamed a loud scream.’

---

57 The sequence of *dārat al-ʔarḍu* dawratan ‘The earth rotated a rotation’ (lit. *rotate.PST the-earth rotate.TSM-ACC*) is possible.

58 It also indicates that perhaps a principal criterion for the use of **BOUNDED** cognate objects in contrast to **UNBOUNDED** cognate objects is that the verb is not low intransitivity, an area of research that is not in the remit of the present work.
c. nāmat hindun nāwm-at-an ʕamīqatan
   sleep.PST Hind sleep-TSM-ACC deep
   ‘Hind slept a deep sleep’

This can be related to the fact that unergative verbs are mostly non-terminative events and one of the semantic functions of BOUNDED cognate objects as will be indicated in 3.4 is to delimit the event aspectually. UNBOUNDED cognate objects can also be found with unergative verbs as can be seen in the examples below.

25)
   a. yatabassamu tabassum-a 1-mutwāḏišīn
      smile.PST.3SG smile.BM-ACC the-humble.people
      ‘He smiles the smiling of humble people.’
   b. yamš=ūna mašy-an sarīšan
      walk.PRS=3PL walk.BM-ACC quick
      ‘They walk quickly.’

With regard to the multiple-place predicates, they are not, in contrast to the one-place predicates, constrained to taking only cognate objects but can be found with non-cognate objects such as the direct and/or the indirect objects or a complement. The multiple-place predicates need be distinguished on the basis of other parameters which relate to the non-cognate element that the verb takes such as the obligatoriness or optionality of the direct object or complement, and the form, type and range of the direct objects/complements that the verbs can take. A number of distinct cases will be demonstrated below.

The first case is that of the verbs which, despite other variations as shown below, share one property namely that the type of the cognate objects they take are typically of BOUNDED cognate objects. The BOUNDED cognate object of these verbs is semantically related and is in complementary distribution with the direct object, complement or even obligatory adjunct of the verb. This observation indicates that some verbs may take cognate object in place of their direct objects, complements or adjuncts.
There is the case of the verbs ṣallā ‘perform a prayer’, laṣība ‘play’, and raqaṣa ‘dance’. These verbs can be described as optionally transitive verbs. They take direct objects but ones which are optional. The direct objects of these verbs are of a limited range and they are semantically related. The different instances of the direct object express a specimen of a prayer, dance or game. These aspects of the optionality of the direct object and that they are semantically related can be indicated in the examples in (26)

26)  
   a. ṣallat hindun (al-ṣaṣra/ al-maḥriba/ 
      pray.PST Hind the-afternoon.prayer the sunset.prayer 
      al-fajra) 
      the dawn.prayer) 
      ‘Hind prayed the Afternoon prayer/ the Sunset prayer/ the Dawn Prayer.’
   b. raqaṣat hindun (al-bolkā/ al-bālī) 
      dance.PST Hind the-Polka the ballet 
      ‘Hind danced the Polka/ the ballet’
   c. laṣīb=nā (t-tinisa/ kurata l-qadami) 
      play.PST=1PL the-tennis ball the-foot 
      ‘We played tennis/football.’

The type of cognate objects that these verbs typically take are those referred to as SPECIMEN cognate objects; the cognate objects express a specimen of prayer, dance or game as can be seen in (27); note that the instances of the cognate objects are equivalent to the non-cognate direct objects of the verb.

27)  
   a. ṣallat hindun ṣalāt-a l-ṣaṣri 
      pray.PST Hind pray.NSDM-ACC the-afternoon.prayer 
      ‘Hind prayed the Afternoon prayer.’
   b. raqaṣat hindun raqṣ-at-a l-bolkā 
      dance.PST Hind dance-TSM-ACC the-Polka 
      ‘Hind danced the Polka dance.’
Nevertheless, there are specimens of dances, for instance, which can only be expressed by a cognate object NP and do not have a direct object equivalent, hence referring to another semantic function of cognate objects as will be indicated in the subsequent section namely that of specifying the scope of the process which cannot be specified by the direct object of the verb. Examples for such case include raqsata s-salām ‘the dance of peace’ (lit. ‘dance.TSM the-peace’), raqsata l-ḥarb ‘the dance of war’ (lit. ‘dance.TSM the-war’), raqsatan ṣarqiyyatan ‘an eastern dance’ (lit. ‘dance.TSM eastern’), etc.

In fact, the cognate objects of these optionally transitive verbs can be seen to hold a semantic relation, namely a hyponymous relation, with the set of the direct objects that the verb can take, since both the direct object and the cognate object represent an instance of prayer, dance or game. I refer to these cognate objects as hyponymous cognate objects. These verbs can also be found with UNBOUNDED cognate objects; these are not semantically related with the direct objects of the verb. They express events rather specimens of events. Examples of UNBOUNDED cognate objects with verbs taking hyponymous cognate objects can be given in (28).

28) raqaṣat hindun raqs-an sarītān
dance.PST Hind dance.BM-ACC quick
‘Hind danced quick dancing.’

The verb ʕamilafaṣala ‘do’ is similar to these verbs, but the direct object is obligatory. The direct objects are of a limited, semantically related set and they express instances of deeds e.g. al-kayra ‘the good’. The type of cognate object that this verb take is a PRODUCT cognate object as in (29).
29) faṣalat fišl-an qabīhan raqaṣat
d.o.PST.3FSG do.BM-ACC ugly
‘Hind did an ugly deed.’

Another set of verbs which also typically take a PRODUCT cognate object are those verbs which take, in the ordinary case, an ?an ‘that’-clause complement whether as optional or obligatory. Instances of the verbs include ḥalima ‘dream’, 滹aba ‘request’, sa?ala ‘ask’, daṣṭa ‘supplicate’, qarrara ‘decide’, ?amara ‘order’, waṣada ‘promise’, naṣaḥa ‘advice’, etc. Examples of verbs with their clausal complement can be given in (29).

30) ḥalimat hindun ?anna šaḵṣan daḵala l-manzila
dream.PST Hind that person enter.PST the-house
‘Hind dreamed that someone entered the house.’

The PRODUCT cognate objects of these verbs can also be described as semantically related with the verb clausal complement. They stand for the eventive content expressed in the clausal complement of the verb. Therefore, it can be observed that the cognate objects of these verbs can be used in place of, but not simultaneously with, the verb complement. The same clausal complement of the verb, however, can be included in a sentence following the cognate object as can be seen in (31); the clausal complement in the given structure can be described as an apposition for the cognate object.

31) ḥalimat hindun ḥulm-an ḡarišan wa huwa
dream.PST Hind dream.BM-ACC strange and it
?anna šaḵṣan daḵala l-manzila
that person enter.PST the-house
‘Hind dreamed a strange dream and it was that someone entered the house.’

The verb ʕāša ‘live’ has its distinctive properties but it is similar to the previous cases in that it typically takes a BOUNDED cognate object. It could be said that there are two classes of the verb ʕāša ‘live’. There is the verb that takes a direct object
and it is of a limited range; the set of direct objects can be described as expressing
subcategories of life e.g. ʕāša huλman ‘live a dream’ and that which takes a manner
adverbial e.g. ʕāša bi-sašaδat ‘live in-happiness’. In both cases, the verb cannot
stand alone, both the direct object and the adjunct are obligatory.

The other case of the multiple-place predicates are those of verbs taking a cognate
object are verbs with an internal argument(s) i.e. a monotransitive verb or
ditransitive verb such as the examples in (3).

‘send’, bāla ‘sell’ etc.

BOUNDED cognate objects can be found with these verbs. The main distinction
between the BOUNDED cognate objects of monotransitive verbs and those discussed
above is that the BOUNDED cognate object can co-occur with the argument of the
verb as can be seen in (31). Note that in the case of ditransitive verbs, the BOUNDED
cognate object can occur only when the second internal argument of the verb
which can be a recipient in the case of the verb in (31b) is not expressed. Also, as
can be seen in the given examples, UNBOUNDED cognate objects can be found with
montransitive and ditransitive verbs.

32) a. ẓaraba hindun ẓarb-at-ayni / ẓarb-an
   hit.PST.3SG Hind hit-TSM-ACC.DUL hit.BM-ACC
   ‘He hit Hind two hits/ hitting.’

b. bāla sayyārata=hu bayš-at-an kāsiratn / bayš-an
   sell.PST.3SG car=his sell-TSM-ACC impoverished
   ‘lit. He sold his car an impoverished sell / He did sell his car.’

Given the variation in the distribution of the two types of cognate objects with
respect to the types of the verbs, it can be indicated that a sequence of the two
cognate objects is possible in the single sentence such as the examples given in
(33).
In this respect, the BOUNDED cognate object obligatorily occurs first and the UNBOUNDED cognate object obligatorily follows; alternation in the order results in ungrammaticality. Therefore, it is not only that BOUNDED cognate objects are constrained in their distribution with respect to the different verb types, but they also have a relatively fixed position in the sentence.\(^{59}\)

To summarize, verbs that take cognate objects are varied and they are not restricted to intransitive verbs only, as is the case in other languages, e.g. English. The verb can be a one-place predicate whether as an unaccusative or unergative or it can be a multiple-place predicate including optionally transitive, obligatory transitive, or ditransitive verbs. UNBOUNDED cognate objects can be found with the different types of verbs. BOUNDED cognate objects, on the other hand, are constrained in their distribution. Moreover, it is observed that some verbs take a BOUNDED cognate object in place of its direct object, clausal complement or even its obligatory adjunct; an observation that suggests the variation in the status of the different cognate objects as will be shown in Chapter 5. In the next section I provide a demonstration of the various semantic functions that the different categories of the cognate objects classified in the present work carry with respect to the event expressed by the different verbs.

### 3.4. Semantic Functions of Cognate Objects

As indicated in Chapter 1, the literature found on the cognate object construction in Arabic mostly consists of works that are carried out in a traditional framework (see e.g. Al-Galāyīnī (1993); Ryding (2005); Salehbeik & Ghorbani (2014)). In these works, cognate objects have mostly been characterised in terms of the semantic

\(^{59}\) I return to this point in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.
functions that they carry with respect to the verbal event and mainly three types are proposed which include: (i) cognate objects that emphasize the verb; (ii) cognate objects that indicate its number; and (iii) cognate objects that indicate its kind. For each semantic function, a specific form is identified namely a bare NP for the first type as in (34a), a cognate object with a quantifier for the second type as in (34b) and a cognate object with an adjective for the third type as in (34c).

34)

a. ibtasamat  ibtisām-an
   smile.PST.3FSG smile.MS-ACC
   ‘She did smile’

b. ibtasamat  ibtisāmat-an wāḥidatan
   smile.PST.3FSG smile.MS-ACC one
   ‘She smiled one smile’

c. ibtasamat  ibtisāmat-an jaḍḍābatan
   smile.PST.3FSG smile.MS-ACC attractive
   ‘She smiled an attractive smile.’

Hence, a one-to-one relation between the formal pattern of the cognate object NP and the semantic function that it carries out is assumed. In this section, I demonstrate the various semantic functions that the categories of cognate objects contribute to the verbal event. I also shed light on the interrelations between the semantic functions and the different categories in contrast to the one-to-one relation between form and semantic function as has frequently been assumed in the literature on cognate objects in Arabic. Five main semantic functions can be identified, some of which involve other sub-semantic functions. These semantic functions include qualification, specification of the scope of the event, aspectual delimitation, intensification, and focusing. A general property of many of the cognate object types is that the same cognate object can be seen to carry out more than a single semantic function. In this respect, this category of cognate objects can be described as a polyfunctional category. The various semantic functions are demonstrated belwo.
3.4.1. Qualification

Qualifying the verbal event is one of the semantic functions that are often indicated in the literature to be carried out by the cognate object (see e.g. Jones 1988; Mittwoch 1998; Horrocks & Stavrou 2010; Kim & Lim 2012). This frequent assumption is correlated with the relation that is observed between some types of cognate objects and adverbials; the cognate object can roughly be paraphrased into a corresponding adverbial as can be seen in (35) and (36).

35)

a. John died a gruesome death
b. Harry lived an eventful life
c. Bill sighed a weary sigh

(Jones 1988:89)

36)

a. John died gruesomely
b. Harry lived eventfully
c. Bill sighed wearily

(Jones 1988:93)

As for the cognate objects in Arabic, there is a number of types that can be said to carry out a qualifying semantic function. They include the types that are indicated to allow for an adverbial paraphrase (see Chapter3). They can be: an UNBOUNDED cognate object such as the MODIFIED cognate object as in (37a) and the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate objects as in (37b) and a BOUNDED cognate object such as the EVENT cognate object as in (38a) and a MANNER cognate object as in (38b).

---

60 It should be noted that the correspondence indicated by the authors or in this section between cognate objects and adverbials does not necessarily mean that the cognate objects are syntactically analysed as adverbials (see section 5.4) for the status of the various types of cognate objects.
37)

a. yamšī mašy-an sarīš-an
   walk.PRS.3SG walking.BM-ACC quickly.BM-ACC
   ‘He walks quickly.’

b. yastaqbil=ūna=hum istiqbāl-a l-?abṭāli
   receive.PRS=3PL receive.BM-ACC the-heroes
   ‘They receive them in the way heroes are received.’

38)

a. hajam=ū ʕalay=him hajm-at-an mubāgitat
   attack.PST=3PL on=them with-attack-TSM-GEN sudden
   ‘They attacked them with a sudden attack.’

b. mṭa mīt-a-t-an ḥasanatan
   die.PST.3SG die-MNM-ACC good
   ‘He died a good death.’

One facet of the qualifying function can also be indicated here for some types of cognate objects, namely those occurring as CONSTRUCT STATE cognates object with a participant represented by a non-referential NP. Note that these can either be a BOUNDED cognate object as in (39) or an UNBOUNDED cognate object as in (40). In some instances of this type of cognate objects, the second N in the construct state is a derived N that inherently provides a description of the actor. Therefore, since it is the same actor as that of the verb, this type of cognate objects can be seen to provide a qualification of the actor of the verb besides its qualifying the verbal event.

39)

a. qabbala=hā qublat-a muḥibbin
   kiss.PST.3SG=kiss.NSDM-ACC loving.person
   ‘He kissed her a kiss of a loving person.’

b. nazara ?ilay=hā nazr-at-a l-muṣfiqi
   look.PST.3SG to=her look-TSM-ACC the-sympathed.person
   ‘He looked at her with a look of a sympathized person.’
40)

a. istaqbal=ū= hum istiqbāl-a l-?abţāl
receive.PST=3PL=3PL receive.BM-ACC the-heros
‘They received them in the manner heroes are received/the receiving of the heros’

b. yatabassamu tabassum-a l-mutwādiţīn
smile.PST.3SG smile.BM-ACC the-humble.people
‘He smiles in the same manner in which the humble people smile’

In fact, these cognate objects are used in situations when the description expressed does apply to the actor of the verb, i.e. when the kisser is also a lover and when the person who looks is the one who is being sympathetic with the other participant as in (39b). Also, in (40) the cognate object istiqbāl a l-?abţāli ‘the receiving of the heroes’ is used in situations when the description of being a hero also holds for undergoers of the verbal event. Also, in (40b), the property denoted by the derived noun mutawādiţīn ‘the humble people’, which stands as an actor in the cognate object, must also hold for the actors of the verb; it cannot be said in a situation where a person is known for his arrogance, for instance.

3.4.2. Specification of the Scope of the Process

Specification of the scope of the process is a rather more general semantic function and it involves different facets of specification. Halliday (1985) points to this function of cognate objects. He identifies the various semantic roles that the nominal groups, which represent the participants in a clause, carry out; RANGE is the semantic role he specifies for cognate objects. Halliday (1985:134) defines RANGE as the element that ‘specifies the range or scope of the process’. He adds that a cognate object either designates the process as in ‘dance the waltz’, or ‘it is merely a nominalization of the process’ as in ‘dance a dance’ (135). He further
classifies RANGE into quality RANGE and quantity RANGE as in ‘he plays tennis/they played a good game’, and ‘they played five games’ respectively.\textsuperscript{61}

The cognate object can be seen to express an individual instance that specifies the scope of the process which is otherwise not specified in the corresponding non-cognate object construction. This type of semantic function can be observed with the BOUNDED cognate objects that are shown to have, in terms of interpretation, a kind reading. Accordingly, SPECIMEN cognate objects is a typical example by which the scope of the event is delimited, as can be seen in the examples in (41).

\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] raqaṣa raqṣ-at-a d-darawīš-i l-kaṭīrā
\begin{flushright}
dance.PST.3SG dance-TSM-ACC the-Darawishi-GEN the-many\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}min l-?īlamiyyīna\end{flushright}
of the-media.people
\begin{flushright}‘Many of the media people danced the dance of the Darawīš.’\end{flushright}

\item[b.] ḍarab=ū alf-a ḍarb-at-i sikkīn-in
\begin{flushright}
hit.PST=3PL thousand-ACC hit-TSM-GEN knife-GEN\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}‘They hit one thousand hits with a knife.’\end{flushright}

\item[c.] saqaṭat saqṭ-at-a l-mawt-i
\begin{flushright}
fall.PST.3FSG fall-TSM-ACC the-death-GEN\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}‘She fell the fall of death; She fell a fall that led to her death.’\end{flushright}

\item[d.] ibtasamat ibtisām-at-a l-?intīṣār-i
\begin{flushright}
smile.PST.3FSG smile-TSM-ACC the-victory-GEN\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}‘She smiled the smile of victory.’\end{flushright}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{61} Halliday qualifies the NP in ‘He played tennis’ as a cognate object based on its semantic relatedness to the verb and it seems that he does consider morphological cognateness as a definitional criterion.

e. yajlisu jals-at-a l-qurfuṣā?-i
sit.PRS.3SG instance.of.sitting.MNM-ACC the-squat-GEN
‘He sits in a squat position.’

(906149122)

f. tuqabbilu=hu qublat-a ṣ-ṣabāḥi wa
kiss.PRS.3FSG=3SG kiss.NSDM-ACC the-morning-GEN and
l-masā?i
the-evening
‘She kisses him the morning and the evening kiss.’

63

(1067919034)

g. rakala Plater rakl-at-a l-bidāyati
kick.PST Plater kick-TSM-ACC the-beginning
‘Plater kicked the starting kick.’

h. yajlis=ūna jalas-āt-a samarin
sit.PRS=3PL sit-TSM.PL-ACC chat.time.in.evening
‘They sit sits of having fun during the night.’

Another type of specification is that when the cognate object is seen to specify an
instance of the event PRODUCT as in (42), an instance of an event MANNER as in
(43a) or an instance of an event KIND as in (43b).

42)

a. ḥalima ḥulm-an ḡarīban
dream.PST.3SG dream.BM-ACC strange
‘He dreamed a strange dream.’

a. ?aḵta?a ḵaṭa?-an kabīran
make.mistake.PST.3SG mistake.BM-ACC big
‘He made a big mistake.’

b. ?aḏḍaba=hum ?aḏāb-an ?alīman
torture.PST.3SG=3PL torture.NSDM-ACC painful
‘He tortured them painful torture.’


As could be seen, the different instances that carry out this semantic role can be found in the patterns construct state or as an N + adjective.

3.4.3. Aspectual Delimitation

Aspectual delimitation is a semantic function that is frequently indicated as being carried by cognate objects in the literature (Massam 1990; Macfarland 1995; Puigdollers 2008; Höche 2009; Horrocks & Stavorou 2010). This effect can be observed with many instances belonging to the class of BOUNDED cognate objects. With BOUNDED cognate object, the use of the expression that indicate boundedness of the event or situation is permitted. The same effect does not hold for the UNBOUNDED cognate objects as can be seen in the sentence in (45) which involves the corresponding cognate object of the BOUNDED cognate object in (44).

44) a. ibtasamt hindun ibtisām-at-an jaddābatan tumma gādarat
   smile.PST Hind smile-TSM-ACC attractive then leave.PST.3FSG
   ‘Hind smiled an attractive smile then left.’

  b. daʕat duʕaʔ-an ʕawilan tumma nāmt
   supplicate.PST.3FSG supplicate.BM-ACC long then sleep.PST.3SG
   ‘She supplicated a long supplication then slept.’

  c. nāmat hindun nawm-at-an ʕamīqatan tumma istayqaʕat
   sleep.PST Hind sleep.TSM-ACC deep then wake.up.PST.3FS
   ‘Hind slept a deep sleep then wake up.’

  d. ʕaraq=tu l-bāba ʕarq-at-an fa-fataḥat
   knock.PST.1SG the-door knock-OTM-ACC then-open.PST.3FSG
   ‘I knocked the door once then she opened it.’
45)  
   a. #nāmat hindun **nawm-an  ṣamīqan ṯumma** istayqaṣat  
      sleep.PST Hind sleep.BM-ACC deep then wake.up.PST.3FS  
      ‘Hind slept a deep sleep then wake up.’  
   b. #ṭaraq=tu l-bāba ṭarq-an fa-fataḥat  
      knock.PST.1SG the-door knock-OTM-ACC then-open.PST.3FSG  
      ‘I knocked the door once then she opened it.’

One specific aspectual semantic role can be observed with some instances of BOUNDED cognate objects namely that of contributing to the aspectual interpretation of the verb in parallel to an incremental theme. It can be observed with the instances of SPECIMEN cognate objects as well as QUANTIZED cognate objects. As can be noted, the verbs given in sentences in (46) are non-terminative; the verb is a continuous activity in (46a) and a semelfactive in (46b). Therefore, a frame adverbial with ʿfī ‘in’ cannot be used in these sentences. Nevertheless, when these BOUNDED cognate objects are used, they result in an alternation in the aspectual interpretation of the verbal events and they are terminative. Consequently, the event in (47a) is an accomplishment and in (47b) it is an achievement; hence, the compatibility of the verbs in (47) with the frame adverbials with ʿfī ‘in.

46)  
   a. *ṣallay=nā  ṣaṣrī daqāʾiṣq  
      pray.PST=1PL in ten minutes  
      ‘We prayed in ten minutes.’  
   b. *ḍarab=ū r-rajula  ṣaṣrī daqāʾiṣqatin  
      hit.PST=3PL the-man for-period 10 minutes  
      ‘They hit the man for 10 minutes.’

47)  
   a. ṣallay=nā  ṣalāt-a l-fajrī ṣaṣrī daqāʾiṣq  
      pray.PST=1PL pray.NSDM-ACC the-Dawn.prayer in ten minutes  
      ‘We prayed the Fajr prayer in ten minutes.’
b. ḍarab=ū  r-rajula ḍarb-at-an qawiyyatan/ ṭalāḥ-a ḍarb-āt-in
hit.PST=3PL the-man hit-TSM-ACC strong three hit-TSM.PL-GEN
fi  daqīqatin wāḥidatin
in minute one
‘They hit the man a strong hit/ three hits in one minute.’

3.4.4. Quantification

Quantifying the event tokens or types is another semantic function that can be performed by the cognate object. As might be expected, the typical constructional pattern of the cognate object that carries out this semantic function is a quantifier-cognate N e.g. ṭalāḥ-a/ṣidata/ istiqbālātin ‘three/several receivings’ (lit. three/several receive.BM’). Likewise, quantized bounded cognate objects occurring as bare NPs such as darbatan ‘a hit’, and dualized or pluralized cognate Ns such as ibtisām-atayni ṣāriḍatayni ‘two wide smiles’ (lit.’smile.TSM.DUL wide’) are obviously quantifying cognate objects.

The counting in a quantifying cognate object can be of different sorts: (i) a mere counting of the times of the event occurrence as in (48a); (ii) a counting of individual event tokens as in (48b); or (iii) a counting of event types as in (48c); or a combination of type and event tokens as in (14d).

48)

a. tanāmu  nawm-at-ayni  fi n-nahāri
sleep.PRS.3FSG sleep.TSM-DUL.ACC in the-day
‘She sleeps twice (two sleeps) in the day’

b. ḍaraba=hā  ṣiddata ḍarb-āt-in  ṣalā wajhi=hā wa
hit.PST.3SG=3FSG several hit-TSM.PL-GEN on face=her and
harab
escape.PST.3SG
‘He hit her several hits on her face and escaped.’

c. kāna yuḥibbu-hā ḥubb-ayn:
  be.PST.3SG love.PRS.3SG=3SG love.BM-ACC.DUL
ḥubb-a l-ḥiṭrati wa n-naš?ati
  love.BM-ACC.DUL the-instinct and the-origin
wa ḥubba id-dīnī wa l-?iriṭ66
  and love.BM-ACC the-religion and the-legacy
‘He loved it two sorts of love: the love of instinct and legacy and the
love of religion and legacy.’
d. rakala rakl-at-ayn: rakl-at-an ?amāmiyyatan
  kick.PST.3SG kick-TSM-ACC.DUL kick-TSM-ACC front
wa ?uḵrā jānibiyyatan
  and another side
‘He did two kicks: a front kick and a side one.’

It should be noted that the variation in the function of counting by the cognate
object is not always similar to quantifying by another expression such as a marrat-
‘time’ phrase, as will be demonstrated in Chapter 5.

3.4.5. Intensification

Intensification of the event is a function that is pointed out in the literature to be
carried out by cognate objects, since the cognate object repeats the verbal content.
Intensification in general can be of quantity or quality, but in the cognate object
construction it is that of quality (see e.g. Höche 2009). A typical instance of the
cognate objects in Arabic that carries out an intensifying function is that of the
BARE cognate object. Examples of BARE cognate objects that intensify the verbal
event are presented in (49).

a. ?īn=ī taṣajjab=tu taṣajjub-an ʕindamā
   EMPH.PRT=1SG be.astonished.PST=1SG be.astonished.BM-ACC when
   ḥalla bi=hi l-ʔajalu
come.down.PST upon=him the-appointed.time
   ‘I was extremely astonished when death came to him.’

b. kam ʔatʃab=ū=nī laqad rakaḍ=tu
   how.much tire.PST=3PL=1SG EMPH.PRT run.PST=1SG
   rakaḍ-an fi mubarāt māyorka l-ʔakīrati
   run.BM-ACC in football.match Mayorkha the-last
   ‘They tired me so much, I had run intensely in Mayorkha last football
   match.’

However, other types can also intensify the event by virtue of involving an
intensifier, as well as by repeating the verbal content, as can be seen in the
‘quantifier + N’ cognate object and the ‘N+adjective’ cognate object.

50)
  a. yuḥibbu=ḥā kullā l-ḥubb-i
     love.PRS.3SG=3SG all the-love.BM-GEN
     ‘He loved her intensely’
  b. iktaʔabat ʔiktiʔāb-an ʃādīdan
     become.depressed.PST.3SG depression.BM-ACC severe
     ‘She had been severely depressed.’

3.4.6. Focusing a Contrast

One pragmatic function of cognate objects, particularly BARE cognate objects is that
of focusing a contrast to the verbal event. It is likely with a contrast-focusing
cognate object that it is followed by a clause negating the contrasting event.
Examples of BARE cognate objects focusing a contrast are given in (51).

51)
  a. lam ʔaḥriqi l-kitāb-a wat ḥ?f กหมา
     not burn.PRS.1SG the-book-ACC and EMP.PRT
     mazzaq=tu=hu tamzīq-an
     tear.PST=1SG=3SG tearing.PST-ACC
‘I did not burn the book; rather I tore it.’

b. fa-mā ?anā bi-šāsirin wa lā ?aktubu š-šīra

and-not 1SG even-poet and not writePRS.1SG the-poetry

?innamā ?ataḏawwaqu=hu ṭadawwuq-an⁶⁷

rather tastePRS.1SG=3SG tastingBM-ACC

‘I am not even a poet nor do I write poetry; I only enjoy reading it.’

In this section, I have pointed out a number of the semantic functions that can be carried out by the different types of cognate objects; some semantic functions can be carried out by more than one type. The semantic function can be related to the cognate N per se, its dependent, or to both of them. Also, I have indicated that the cognate objects carrying out the respective type of semantic function can be found in different constructional patterns, and are not restricted to one form as assumed in the literature.

3.5. Conclusion

In this chapter I have provided a characterization of the constructional properties of the two main elements that make up the construction, i.e. the V and the cognate object. I have shown that cognate objects are of different types in Arabic, and were principally classified on the basis of the quantificational/aspectual type of the cognate N in the cognate object into UNBOUNDED and BOUNDED cognate objects. I have demonstrated that they exhibit variations in a number of aspects. In fact, the different parameters involved in the classification of the cognate object types play a role in revealing semantic, syntactic aspects of these cognate objects. The result is a network of cognate object types.

I have established that the set of verbs that can be found in the construction are varied and are not limited to intransitive verbs, as found in other languages, e.g in

⁶⁷ http://www.muslm.org/vb/archive/index.php/t-309768.html, accessed in 18/10/13. He wrote something like a poem and after someone commented positively on his writing but corrected him in a certain point, he mentioned that he is not actually a poet but he only enjoys reading it.
English. I have also shown that the categories of cognate objects are not equally distributed among the various verb types and that BOUNDED cognate objects, in contrast to the UNBOUNDED cognate objects, are constrained and cannot be found with all verb types.

In the last section I have shown that there are different semantic functions that the categories of cognate objects carry with respect to the verbal event. The semantic functions can be shared by a number of the categories and there is no one-to-one relation between the form of the cognate object and its semantic function as has frequently been assumed in the literature on cognate objects in Arabic.

In the next chapter I will provide a syntactic description of the cognate objects that occur with the various types of verbs and investigate the similarities and distinctions between these cognate object types and the more canonical type of object, namely the ordinary object occurring with an intransitive verb.
CHAPTER 4: COGNATE AND NON-COGNATE OBJECTS

4.1. Introduction

In the present chapter I aim to provide a characterization of the syntactic behaviour of the types of cognate objects presented in Chapter 3.\textsuperscript{1} The venture is principally carried out by investigating the extent to which these cognate object types are akin to, or divergent from the prototypical properties of the syntactic category with which cognate objects share the grammatical label ‘object’, viz. the ORDINARY OBJECT.\textsuperscript{2} The type of ORDINARY OBJECT against which the comparison is drawn is that of an obligatorily monotransitive verb, such as qatala ‘kill’ or kasara ‘break’. The respective objects encompass individuation properties in terms of Hopper and Thompson (1980), such as being singular, countable, referential and/or definite. Examples of ORDINARY OBJECTs are given in (1).

1)

a. qatala ʕaliyy-un ar-rajul-a
   kill.PST Ali-NOM the-man-ACC
   ‘Ali killed the man.’

b. kasarat hind kawb-an
   break.PST Hind cup-ACC
   ‘Hind broke a cup’

Moreover, given that a cognate object in Arabic can occur with another ORDINARY

\textsuperscript{1} It is important to note that the syntactic characterization provided in this chapter does not fall under formal syntax or constituent structure but it mainly focuses on investigating the behavior of the cognate object types with respect to a number of syntactic processes which reveal prototypical properties of the ordinary object.

\textsuperscript{2} As in the case with the types of maṣdars in Chapter 2 and the types of cognate objects in Chapter 3 for which small caps is used to make them stand out clearly, small caps is used with the ORDINARY OBJECT and the other types of non-cognate objects namely OBJECT\textsuperscript{1} and OBJECT\textsuperscript{2} which are included in the description provided in the present chapter.
OBJECT, hence forming what can be called a ditransitive cognate object construction as in (2), I compare these cognate objects to the properties of the second object in an ordinary ditransitive construction, namely the THEME core argument, such as the example in (3). I refer to this object as OBJECT2. Also, throughout the chapter, the ordinary object in the ditransitive cognate object construction is compared to the first object in the ordinary ditransitive construction, i.e. the RECIPIENT/BENEFICIARY core argument. I refer to the two types of objects as OBJECT1.COC and OBJECT1 respectively.

2) ḍaraba ar-rajul-u  l-ḳașm-a  ḍarb-at-an mubriḥatān
   hit.PST the man-NOM the-opponent-ACC hit-TSM-ACC hard
   ‘The man hit the opponent a hard hit’

3) a. bāṣa ar-rajul-u  faliyy-an sayyārat-an
   sell.PST the-man-NOM Ali-ACC car-ACC
   ‘The man sold Ali a car.’

  b. ḥaṭṭa  r-rajul-u  l-walad-a  kitāb-an
   give.PST the man-NOM the-boy-ACC book-ACC
   ‘The man gave the boy a book.’

The network of cognate object types as represented in Chapter 3 are classified on the basis of the quantificational properties of the maṣdar N into two major classes: UNBOUNDED cognate objects and BOUNDED cognate objects. The former class encompasses three types which are classified on the basis of the formal properties of the NP; they are referred to as the BARE cognate object, the MODIFIED cognate object, the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object. BOUNDED cognate objects, on the other hand, incorporate a vast set of types which are classified initially on the basis of their interpretation (see section 3.2.2). However, in this chapter the type of the verb (as characterized in Section 3.3) needs also, in some cases, to be taken into consideration.

Considering the two aims of the chapter, the syntactic characterization provided
here encompasses the distinguishing aspects as indicated in Jones (1989) and Massam (1990), as well as other aspects that are characteristic of ORDINARY OBJECTS, and which highlight similarities or distinctions between the ORDINARY OBJECT and the categories of cognate objects. Accordingly, the phenomena that are considered in providing the syntactic description include: passivization, adverb insertion, fronting, relativization, pronominalization and question formation. Under each of these phenomena, I offer a description of the ORDINARY OBJECT, OBJECT1 and OBJECT2, followed by a description of the various subtypes of cognate objects, which I then distinguish on the basis of the more and less ORDINARY OBJECT-like types. It is found that some types are very much like ORDINARY OBJECTS, other types share with ORDINARY OBJECTS a good number of aspects, while yet other cognate objects vary considerably from ORDINARY OBJECTS.

4.2. Passivization

The possibility of the ORDINARY OBJECT to be promoted to a subject in the corresponding passive construction is perhaps the most distinctive property that characterizes ordinary objects. In Arabic, the passive verb-form is formed by changing the vowels of the verb. In the perfect the vowel sequence is /-u -i-/ whereas in the imperfect it is /-u -a-/ (see Ryding 2005). The ORDINARY OBJECTS given in (1) are made passive subjects as in (4).

4)

a. q<t>l<i> <i,tr>aliyy-un
   <PASS>kill.PST Ali-NOM
   ‘Ali was killed’

b. k<s>r<i>a kawb-un
   <PASS>break.PST cup-NOM
   ‘A cup was broken’
In the ordinary ditransitive construction, it is OBJECT1 but not OBJECT2 that can be made the passive subject parallel to the ORDINARY OBJECT as can be seen in the examples in (5) and in (6).

5)  
   a. b<↓>ʕa ʕaliyy-un sayyārat-an  
      <PASS>sell.PST  Ali-NOM car-ACC  
      ‘Ali was sold a car.’  
   b. ?<u>ʕt<i>ya l-walad-u kitāb-an  
      <PASS>give.PST  the-boy-NOM book-ACC  
      ‘The boy was given a book.’

6)  
   a. *b<↓>ʕa-t sayyāra-t-un ʕaliyy-an  
      <PASS>sell.PST-FSG  car-FSG-NOM  Ali-ACC  
      ‘A car was sold Ali.’  
   b. *?<u>ʕt<i>ya kitāb-un al-walad-a  
      <PASS>give.PST  book-NOM  the-boy-ACC  
      ‘A book was given the boy.’

As for the cognate object subtypes, they vary in their passivizability. The general pattern is that BOUNDED cognate objects incorporate types that may or may not allow passivization whereas UNBOUNDED cognate objects cannot be made a passive subject. Also, it will be seen that some of the instances that cannot be passivized in the way ordinary objects are passivized allow the impersonal passive where the passive subject is realized as the third person pronoun and the cognate object occurs as a PP.

Needless to say, in the ditransitive cognate object construction, it is OBJECT1.COC that is made the passive subject and not the cognate object as can be seen in (7a) and (7b). Therefore, the cognate object in this type of cognate object constructions is comparable to OBJECT2 which also does not allow passivization as indicated in (6) above.
7)

a. ِ<u>r<i>b<i>a   l-کاشم-ع  دارب-اذان مبريحتان
   <PASS>hit.PST the-opponent-NOM hit-TSM-ACC hard
   ‘The opponent was hit a hard hit’

b. *د<u>r<i>b<i>a   دارب-اذان مبريحتان الکاشم
   <PASS>hit.PST.FSG hit-TSM.FSG-NOM hard the-opponent-ACC
   ‘A hard hit was hit the opponent.’

Of the various types of **BOUNDED** cognate objects that represent good candidates for passivization are: (i) **SPECIMEN** cognate objects as can be seen in (8); and (ii) the **QUANTIZED EVENT** cognate objects (9).

8)

a. ِ<u>t<i>s<i>a   شالات-ع  فَتى 1-فِتَر 1-هاذا
   <PASS>pray.PST pray.NSDM-NOM Eid the-breaking.fast of-this
   l-فامي fi l-مـعالا l-بافي the-year in the-prayerground the-far
   ‘Eid Al-Fitr prayer of this year will be prayed in the far prayground.’

b. ِ<u>ق<i>s<i>a   راقشات-ع  1-بولكا 1-؟وسبا l-مادـ
   <PASS>dance.PST-FSG dance-TSM.FSG-NOM the-Polkة the-week the-last
   ‘The Polka dance was danced last week.’

c. ِ<u>y<i>a<i>t   ماـشية-ع 1-قماري bi-mahارatin
   <PASS>walk.PST-FSG walk-TSM.FSG-NOM the-Moon with-skillfulness
   min ~ qـبالي ?چداي fi ـرقاتي l-jawnant
   by members band the-Jawnah
   ‘The Moon walk was walked skillfully by memebers of Al-Jawna band.’

d. ِ<u>n<i>a   نائم-ع 1-قـيـلعلة 1-يزـىـر
   <PASS>sleep.FRS sleep-TSM.FSG-NOM the-nap in the-noon
   wa laysa baشد l- قـشدri
   and not after the-afternoon
   ‘A nap is to be taken at noon and not in the afternoon.’

e. ِ<u>s<i>t   جالسات-ع 1-قورفساي
   <PASS>sit.PST-FSG sit-TSM.FSG-NOM the-squat
   ‘The squat sit was sat.’
One observation can be pointed out here which distinguishes QUANTIZED EVENT cognate object from ORDINARY OBJECTS. It relates to the agreement between the verb and the passive subject. When the passivized cognate object is separated from the verb, the verb does not necessarily agree with the passive cognate subject as can be seen in (10a). The cognate object ṭarāq-at-un ‘knock-TSM.FSG-NOM’ is feminine as indicated by the -at suffix but the feminine agreement marker on the verb i.e. -t is optional. Nevertheless, when the passivized ordinary object is separated from the verb such as tuffāṣha-t-un ‘apple-FSG-NOM’ in (10b), it still triggers subject-verb agreement and the agreement marker -t on the verb is not optional; hence, the ungrammaticality indicated in (10b).
10) 

a. ַ<u>r<i>qa-t(ַ) ֶbābi ֶtaraq-at-un  
<PASS>kock.PST-(FSG) on the-door knock-TSM.FSG-NOM  
‘A knock was knocked on the door.’

b. ַ<u>da-*(t) ֶbā bi ֶaraq- at-un  
<PASS>take.PST-(3FSG) from this the-box apple-FSG-NOM  
‘An apple was taken from this box.’

Instances of the other types of BOUNDED cognate objects can also be seen to allow passivization, but their occurrence as a passive subject can be described as less common compared to the two types of BOUNDED cognate objects mentioned above. These include PRODUCT cognate objects as in (11a) and (11b); MANNER cognate objects as in (11c) and (11d); and KIND cognate objects as in (11e).

11)

a. ַ<u>l<i>ma ֶmās-u ֶl-ḥulm-i ֶmin-qibali  
<PASS>dream.PST same-NOM the-dream-i by  
three brothers  
‘The same dream was dreamed by three brothers.’

b. ַ<u>f<r<i>lat ֶ?af-u ֶl-ṣayri wa ֶujt<u>n<i>bat  
<PASS>do.PST-FSG deed.BM-NOM the-goodness and <PASS>avoid.PST  
?afalu ֶš-šarri  
deeds the-evilness  
‘The good deeds were done and the evil deeds were avoided.’

c. ַ<u>t<t<i>a>t ֶthyd-dat-u ֶmīt-āt-in ֶbuṭūliyyatin  
<PASS>die.PST-FSG several-NOM death.MNM-FPL-GEN heroic  
fi tilka l-ḥarb  
in that the-war  
‘Several heroic deaths were died in that war.’
d. t<u>&gt;f&lt;&lt;ā&gt;šu  il-mulūki  
fi qaṣrin ka-hāḍa  wa laysa il-tūša-t-u
in palace like-this and not life-MNM.FSG-NOM

1-bu?asā?

‘The life of kings must be lived in such a palace and not the life of the miserable.’

e. wa baḍa kulli haḍā l-kifāḥ rufīfāt ar-rāyatu
and after all this the-fight <PASS>raise.PST the-banner
wa ibt<u>&gt;s&lt;i>m-t  ibtisām-at-u l-intišāri
and <PASS>smile.PST-FSG smile-TSM.FSG-NOM the-victory
‘And after all this fighting, the banner was raised and the smile of victory was smiled.’

However, there are also instances of event cognate objects and product cognate objects that represent ungrammatical structures when they are passivized as can be seen in (12) and in (13) respectively.

12)

a. *m&lt;i&gt;t&lt;a&gt;t  mawta-t-un mufāji?atun fi tilka l-harbi
<PASS>die.PST-FSG die-TSM-NOM sudden in that the-war
‘A sudden death was died in that war.’

b. *ubt&lt;u&gt;&lt;s&lt;i&gt;m-t  l-Ī ibtisām-at-un mufāji?atun
<PASS>smile.PST-FSG to=me smile-TSM.FSG-NOM sudden
‘A sudden smile was smiled to me.’

c. *w&lt;u&gt;q&lt;i&gt;fa-t  waqf-at-un ṭawīlatun
<PASS>stand.PST-FSG stand-TSM.FSG-NOM long
‘A long stand was stood.’

d. *h&lt;u&gt;j&lt;i&gt;m-t  ūlay=him hajm-at-un qawiyyatun
<PASS>attack.PST-3FSG on=them attack-TSM-NOM strong
mudammiratun destroying
‘A strong destroying attack was attacked on them.’
13) a. *<u>ḵṭ<i>a ḳaṭa?-un kabīrūn
<PASS>do.mistake.PST mistake-BM-NOM big
‘A big mistake was done.’
b. *<u>ḏn<i>bat ḏunūb-un ḡaẓīmatūn
<PASS>commit.sin.PST sin.BM.PL-NOM great
‘Great sins were committed.’

Note that the same NPs which occur as PRODUCT cognate objects in (13a) and (13b) and which are shown to disallow passivization can be passivized when they occur with a non-cognate verb such as iqṭaraḥa ‘commit’ as shown in (14).

14) a. ?<u>qtur<i>fa ḳaṭa?-un kabīrūn
<PASS>commit.PST mistake.BM-NOM big
‘A big mistake was done.’
b. ?<u>qtur<i>fat ḏunūb-un ḡaẓīmatūn
<PASS>commit.PST sin.BM.PL-NOM great
‘Great sins were committed.’

An aspect of some instances of EVENT cognate objects can be indicated here which does not hold for ORDINARY OBJECTS namely that they allow the impersonal passive. The passive subject is the third person and the cognate object occurs with a preposition, viz. bi-. This can be seen in the following examples where the EVENT cognate NPs occur in a monotransitive construction with an oblique argument namely l=ī ‘to=me’ and ?išay=hi ‘to=him’ as can be seen in (15). Note that the same cognate NPs can only be accusative-case marked when they are in the corresponding active construction.

15) a. ubt<u>s<i>ma l=ī bi-btisām-at-in jaḍḍābātin
<PASS>smile.PST.3SG to=me with-smile-TSM.FSG-GEN attractive
‘It was smiled to me with an attractive smile.’
In fact, this is not the only case where some cognate objects occur with the preposition bi-. It will be seen throughout the chapter that with respect to a number of the syntactic operations which involve movement or referencing the cognate object, it is a property of some cognate objects which are accusative-case marked in the typical case, that they optionally or obligatorily occur with a preposition bi- which varies in its interpretation as either ‘with’, ‘in’, or ‘by’ depending on the type of the cognate object.\(^3\)

As for the other class of cognate objects i.e. the UNBOUNDED cognate objects which incorporate three types namely the BARE cognate object, the MODIFIED cognate object, and the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object, promotion to a passive subject is not possible as can be seen in (16), (17) and (18) respectively.

16)

a. \(<u>\text{ḍ}<i>\text{r}<i>\text{ba} \quad \text{idrāb-un}\rangle\)
   \(<\text{PST}>\text{strike.PST strike.BM-NOM}\rangle\)
   ‘Striking was striked.’

b. \(*\text{ḍ}<u>\text{ḥ}<i>\text{ka} \quad \text{ḍāḥik-un}\rangle\)
   \(<\text{PST}>\text{laugh.PST laugh.BM-NOM}\rangle\)
   ‘Laughing was laughed.’

---

\(^3\) Given the variation in the interpretation of the preposition, I indicate it in the glossing as PRE and indicate the respective meaning in the idiomatic translation.
c. *m<u>š<i>ya mašy-un  
  <PASS>walk.PST walk.BM-NOM
  ‘Walking was walked.’

17)
a. *r<u>q<i>ṣa raqṣ-un sarišun  
  <PASS>dance.PST dance.BM-NOM quick
  ‘Quick dancing was danced.’
b. *ḍ<u>ḥ<i>ka daḥik-un mutawāšilun  
  <PASS>laugh.PST laugh.BM-NOM constant
  ‘Constant laughing was laughed.’
c. *m<u>š<i>ya mašy-un sarišun  
  <PASS>walk.PST walk.BM-NOM quick
  ‘Quick walking was walked.’
d. *h<u>j<i>ma ʕalay=him hujūm-un mubāgitun  
  <PASS>attack.PST on=them attack-NOM sudden
  ‘Sudden attacking was attacked them.’

18)
a. *y<u>mš<i>a> mašy-u š-suṣfān  
  M<PASS>walk.PST walk.BM.M-NOM the-courageous
  ‘The walking of the courageous people was walked.’
b. *t<u>š<a>llā ṣalā-t-u ir-rasūli  
  F<PASS>pray.PRS pray.NSDM-F-NOM the-prophet
  ‘The prayer of the prophet is prayed.’
c. *h<u>j<i>ma ʕalay=him hujūm-u baššār ʕalā sūriyyā  
  <PASS>attack.PST on=them attack.BM-NOM Bashshaar on Syria
  ‘The attacking of Bashshaar on Syria was attacked them.’

Having said that, instances of the modified or the construct state cognate objects can occur in an impersonal passive construction such as the examples in (19). The passive subject as indicated earlier is the third person singular and the cognate NPs occur as PPs.

19)
a. h<u>j<i>ma ʕalay=him bi-hujūm-in mubāgitin  
  <PASS>attack.PST on=them PRE-attack-GEN sudden
  ‘It was attacked on them with a sudden attack.’
b. y<u>ṣ-a>llā bi-miṭli ṣalāt-i r-rasūli
<PASS>pray.PRS.3SG PRE-like pray.NSDM-GEN the-prophet

‘It is prayed in a similar way to the praying of the prophet.’

To sum up, the cognate object types vary in the possibility to be passivized. Two types of BOUNDED cognate objects represent good candidates for passivization. These include SPECIMEN cognate objects and QUANTIZED EVENT cognate objects. When these types occur in a construction with another ordinary object i.e. with OBJECT1, they cannot be passivized but OBJECT1 is the phrase that can be made the passive subject, hence representing a similar case to that in the ordinary double object construction. Another distinction between these cognate objects and the ORDINARY OBJECT when made a passive subject is that subject-verb agreement is not obligatory in the case of the cognate object when the cognate object is separated from the verb by a PP.

Other types of BOUNDED cognate objects vary in their passivizability, some represent ungrammatical structures when they are passivized, yet other instances can be passivized but their passivization can be described as less frequent than in the case of SPECIMEN and the QUANTIZED EVENT cognate objects. The UNBOUNDED cognate objects do not allow passivization. Moreover, impersonal passive is possible with some instances of the BOUNDED EVENT cognate objects and instances of the UNBOUNDED MODIFIED or CONSTRUCT STATE cognate objects.

4.3. Adverbial Insertion

One of the prototypical properties of ORDINARY OBJECTS in some languages is that they have to be adjacent to the verb; hence, interpolation of an adverbial, for instance, is banned (Anderson 1984; Massam 1990). In Arabic, it can be observed that the constraint of inserting an adverb can be related to the definiteness and specificity of the ORDINARY OBJECT NP; insertion of an adverb is banned when the ORDINARY OBJECT refers to a specific entity that is represented by a definite NP.
When the ORDINARY OBJECT is an indefinite NP, however, insertion of the adverbial is possible. For instance, in (20a) the ORDINARY OBJECT is a proper noun which is definite and the insertion of the temporal NP adverbial al-bāriḥata ‘yesterday’ results in ungrammaticality whereas in (20b), the ORDINARY OBJECT is an indefinite NP and hence insertion of the adverbial is not banned.⁴

20)  
   a. *qatalat aš-šurṭa-tu  l-bāriḥata ʕaliyy-an 
      kill.PST  the-police-NOM yesterday  Ali-ACC  
      ‘The police killed yesterday Ali’
   b. kasarat hindun l-bāriḥata kawb-an 
      break.PST Hind yesterday  cup-ACC  
      ‘Hind broke yesterday a cup’

As for the ditransitive construction, OBJECT2 exhibits the same constraint like the ORDINARY OBJECT; when it is definite, an adverb cannot be inserted as can be seen in (21a). In contrast, the constraint does not apply to OBJECT1 and the adverb can be inserted even when it is definite as can be seen in (21b).

21)  
   a. *bāfa ʕaliyy-un rajul-an al-bāriḥata s-sayyārata 
      sell.PST Ali-NOM  man-ACC yesterday  the-car-ACC  
      ‘Ali sold the man yesterday the car.’
   b. bāfa ʕaliyy-un al-bāriḥata r-rajul-a sayyārat-an 
      sell.PST Ali-NOM yesterday  the-man-ACC  car-ACC  
      ‘Ali sold yesterday the man a car.’

The same constraint does not apply to cognate objects. A definite cognate object can still be separated from the cognate verb by an adverbial as can be seen in (22). Note that OBJECT1.COC behaves like OBJECT1 in that even when it is definite, the insertion of the adverbial is possible as shown in (21a).

---

⁴I use a different type of an adverbial in applying the test with the construct state cognate objects since such cognate objects are more likely to be found in generic sentences and hence they are not compatible with the adverbial il-bāriḥata ‘yesterday’ which represents a temporal specification.
22) ḏarab=tu (l-bāriḥata) l-ḳašm-a (l-bāriḥata)
hit.PST=1SG yesterday the-opponent-ACC yesterday
ḍ-ḍarb-at-a l-qādiyat-a
the-hit-TSM-ACC the-knock.down-ACC
‘I hit (yesterday) the opponent (yesterday) the knockdown hit.’

As for the other types of cognate objects, insertion of an adverb is, as might be expected, possible as indicated in (23) for BOUNDED cognate objects and in (24) for the UNBOUNDED cognate objects.

23)
   a. ṭibtasamat hindun l-bāriḥata ibtisām-at-a=ha l-latīfata
      smile.PST Hind yesterday smile-TSM-ACC=her the-gentle
      ‘Hind smiled yesterday her gentle smile.’
   b. ʕāšat hindun l-ʕāma l-māḏi ʕīsat-a l-mulūk
      laugh.PST Hind the-year the-last live.MNM-ACC the-kings
      ‘Hind lived last year the life of kings.’
   c. māta l-bāriḥata mītat-an ḥasanatan
      die.PST.[3SG] yesterday die.MNM-ACC good
      ‘He died yesterday a good death.’
   d. ḏāḥikat hindun l-bāriḥata ḏīḥ-at-an ʕāliyatagan
      laugh.PST Hind yesterday laugh-TSM-ACC loud
      ‘Hind laughed yesterday a loud laugh.’
   e. nazarat hindun ?ila=yya l-bāriḥata nazr-at-a ʔāfāqin
      look.PST hind to=me yesterday look-TSM-ACC sympathy
      ‘Hind looked at me yesterday a look of sympathy.’

24)
   a. ṭabda=tum al-bāriḥata ʔubdāf-an
      act.outstandingly.PST=2PL the-yesterday act.outstandingly.BM-ACC
      ‘You had yesterday acted extremely outstandingly.’
   b. ḏāḥikat hindun al-bāriḥata ḏāḥik-an mutawāṣilan
      laugh.PST Hind yesterday laugh.BM-ACC constant
      ‘Hind laughed yesterday constantly.’
   a. yams=tūna mašy-a š-šujfāni
      walk.PRS=3PL walk.BM-ACC the-courageous
      ‘They walk the walking of the courageous.’
4.4. Fronting

Fronting is the process whereby a postverbal element is displaced to a left peripheral position with a gap in the sentence (Aoun et al 2010). ORDINARY OBJECTS and OBJECT2 can be fronted as can be seen in (25a) and in (25b). OBJECT1, on the other hand, yields an ungrammatical structure when fronted as can be seen in (25c).

25)

a. šaliyy-an qatalatī š-šurṭa-t-u
   Ali-ACC kill.PST the-police-f-NOM
   ‘Ali, the police killed’

b. sayyārat-an biʃ=tu ?aƙ=ɪ
   car-ACC sell.PST=1SG brother=my
   ‘A car I sold my brother’

c. *?aƙ=ɪ biʃ=tu sayyārat-an
   brother=my sell.PST=1SG car-ACC
   ‘My brother, I sold a car’

The cognate object types vary in their ability to be fronted. Only a few cases are observed to allow fronting. The cases of BOUNDED cognate objects that allow fronting include: (i) HYponymous cognate objects as can be seen in (26); (ii) QUANTIZED EVENT cognate objects; and KIND cognate objects when these types occur in a ditransitive cognate object construction as can be seen in (27) and in (28) respectively.

26)

a. šalāt-a l-fajri ʃallay=nā littaw
   pray.NSDM-FSG-ACC the-Dawn pray.PST=1PL just
   ‘The Dawn prayer, we have just prayed.’

b. raqs-at-an šarqiyyatan raqṣat hindun
dance-TSM-ACC eastern dance.PST Hind
   ‘An eastern dance, Hind danced.’
c. lišb-at-an riyāḍiyyatan lašib=na l-bāriḥata
   play-TSM-ACC sport play.PST=1PL the-yesterday
   ‘A sports game, we played yesterday.’

27) a. ḍarb-at-an mubriḥatan ḍarab=tu hindan
   hit-TSM-ACC hard hit.PST=1SG Hind
   ‘A hard hit, I hit Hind.’

b. qublat-an ḥanūnatan qabbalat hindun ḥaṣṣ-ṣuğrā
   kiss.NSDM-ACC tender kiss.PST Hind sister=her the-young
   ‘A tender kiss, Hind kissed her younger sister.’

28) a. ūšat-a l-mulūki šayyaša šaliyyun zawjat=hu
   live.MNM-ACC the-kings live.CAUS.PST Ali wife=his
   ‘The life of kings, Ali made his wife live it’

b. wakālat-an qāmmatan wakkal=tu ḥaṣṣ=ī
general authorize.PST=1SG brother=my
   ‘A general proxy, I authorized my brother.’

Interestingly, the OBJECT1.COC in the ditransitive cognate object construction in (29a) behave like OBJECT1 in the ordinary ditransitive construction in that it cannot be fronted as can be seen in (29b).

29) a. hind-an ḍarab=tu=*(ha) ḍarb-at-an mubriḥatan
   Hind-ACC hit.PST=1SG=3FSG hit-TSM-ACC hard
   ‘Hind, I hit a hard hit.’

b. hind-an šayyaša=*(ha) šaliyyun ūšat-a l-mulūki
   Hind live.CAUS.PST Ali live.MNM-ACC the-kings
   ‘Hind, Ali made her live the life of kings’

Also, some instances of PRODUCT cognate objects such as those of the verbs ʕadḏab ‘torture’ and kbdama ‘serve’, which occur in a ditransitive cognate object construction, can be fronted. Nevertheless, they differ from the above subtypes in that they may occur preceded by the preposition bi- when fronted as shown in the following examples.
30)  

a. **ʕādāb-an šadīdan/ bi-ʕādāb-in šadīdin**  
torture.NSDM-ACC severe/PRE-torture.NSDM-GEN severe  
sa-yuʕaḍ dibu ?asrā=hu  
will-torture.PRS.[3SG] the-prisoners=his  
‘A severe torture/with a severe torture, he will torture his prisoners.’  

b. **ḵidmat-an ʕaẓīmatan/ bi-ḵidmat-in ʕaẓīmatin**  
service.BM-ACC great PRE-service.BM-GEN great.PST  
ḵadam=tu hindan  
serve.PST=1SG Hind  
‘A great service/ with a great service, I served Hind.’  

BARE cognate objects which represent a subtype of UNBOUNDED cognate objects also allow fronting. However, this is possible when the BARE cognate object is a contrast-focusing BARE cognate object but is not likely when it is an intensifying BARE cognate object as can be seen (31).  

31)  

a. **mawt-an māṭa ʕaliyyun wa lam yantaḥir**  
die.BM-ACC die.PST Ali and not commit.suicide.PRS.[3SG]  
‘lit. dying Ali died and not committed suicide.’  

b. **#?iḥrāj-an ?ahrāja=ni ?aḥ=k=I**  
embarrass.BM-ACC embarrass.PST=1SG brother=my  
‘Extreme embarrassing, my brother embarrassed me.’  

With the other cases of BOUNDED and UNBOUNDED cognate objects, fronting of the cognate object results in an unacceptable structure. For instance, cognate objects of one-place predicates cannot, regardless of their interpretation, be fronted as can be seen in the different examples given in (32).  

32)  

a. ***mītal-an ḥasānatan māṭa hindun**  
die.MNM-ACC good die.PST Hind  
‘A good death, Hind died.’
b. *ibtisām-at-an jāddābātan ibtasamat hindun
   smile-TSM-ACC attractive smile.PST Hind
   ‘An attractive smile Hind smiled.’

c. *ḵaṭa?-an ṣaẓīman ṣaţat hindun
   mistake.BM-ACC great make.mistake.PST Hind
   ‘A great mistake, Hind made.’

d. *mašy-at-a l-qamari mašat firqatu l-jawnati bi-mahāratin
   walk-TSM-ACC the-Moon walk.PST band the-Jawnah with-skillfulness
   ‘The Moon walk, Al-Jawna band walked skillfully.’

e. *saqṭ-at-an qawiyyatan saqaṭat hindun
   fall-TSM-ACC hard fall.PST Hind
   ‘A hard fall, Hind fell down.’

Also, the cognate objects of the otherwise obligatorily transitive i.e. of those verbs
which take an obligatory ORDINARY OBJECT or complement in the non-cognate
object construction, do not allow fronting such as the cognate objects of the verbs

33)

a. *ḥulm-an muḵīfan ḥalimat hindun al-bāriḥa
   dream.BM-ACC scary dream.PST Hind the-yesterday
   ‘A scary dream, Hind dreamed yesterday.’

b. *ṣišat-a l-mulūki ṣāšat hindun
   live.MNM-ACC the-kings live.PST Hind
   ‘The life of kings, Hind lived.’

c. *fīfal-ʕamal-an qabīḥan faṣalat/ʕamilat hindun
   do.BM-ACC ugly do.PST Hind
   ‘An ugly deed, Hind did.’

d. *qarār-an ḥakīman qarrarat hindun
   decide.NSDM-ACC wise decide.PST Hind
   ‘A wise decision, Hind decided.’

Compare the cognate object ṣišata l-mulūki ‘the life of kings’ in (33b) which occurs
as the only object in the construction and thus cannot be fronted, and in (31a)
(repeated in (34) below) when it occurs in the ditransitive construction and allows
fronting.
34) fisat-a l-muluki sayyas$a silyyun zawjat-hu
live.MNM-ACC the-kings live.CAUS.PST Ali wife=his
‘The life of kings, Ali made his wife live it’

Also, the other two subtypes of UNBOUNDED cognate object, i.e. the MODIFIED COGNATE OBJECT and the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object, are not good candidates for fronting as can be seen in (35). However, some instances of the MODIFIED cognate object can occur fronted but in this case they occur as PPs and not as accusative-cased marked NPs as it is the case in the in situ cognate object construction as can be seen in (36a). Also, the corresponding cognate PP of the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object i.e. when the cognate NP is preceded by a preposition and the determinative mitl ‘like’ (see section 3.2.2), on the other hand, the sentence is perfectly acceptable as can be seen in (36b). Also,

35)

a. *istiqbal-an rasmiyyan istaqbal=û l-amira
receive.BM-ACC formal receive.PST=3PL the-prince
‘A formal reception, they received the prince.’

b. *hujum-a bashar sali suriyya hajam=û salay=him
attack.BM-ACC Bashshaar on Syria attack.PST=3PL on=them
‘Bashshaar’s attack on Syria, they attacked them.’

36)

a. bi-istiqbali-in rasmiyyin istaqbal=û l-amira
PRE-receive.BM-GEN formal receive.PST=3PL the-prince
‘In a formal way, they received the prince.’

b. bi-mitli hujum-i bashar sali suriyya hajam=û
PRE-like attack.BM-GEN Bashshaar on Syria attack.PST=3PL
salay=him
on=them
‘In an attack similar to Bashshaar’s attack on Syria, they attacked them.’

To sum up, the various types of objects again exhibit a varying behaviour with respect the process of fronting which involves left-dislocating an element and the element is related to a gap in the construction. The following observations have
been indicated. The ordinary object, object2 can be fronted whereas object1 cannot be fronted. As for the cognate objects, only some instances can be fronted and in the case of the bounded cognate objects, the type of verb plays a role in determining the behaviour of the cognate object. The types of the bounded cognate objects that can be fronted include: (i) the hyponymous cognate objects i.e those of the verbs classified as optionally transitive (see section 3.3); (ii) the quantized and kind cognate objects that occur with a transitive verb i.e. in a ditransitive cognate object construction. Accordingly, the former behaves like the ordinary object and the latter are similar to object2 in the ordinary ditransitive construction. Interestingly, object1coc is also similar to the ordinary object1 as it cannot be fronted.

The other types of bounded cognate objects cannot be fronted. These include the cognate objects with intransitive verbs or an otherwise obligatorily transitive i.e. those cognate objects used in the same position of the ordinary object or complement of the same verb in the non-cognate object construction. These are different from the ordinary object and from the types of cognate objects that can be fronted; it could thus be said that they do not exhibit the syntactic flexibility observed with the latter types of objects.

As for the unbounded cognate object, the bare cognate object can be fronted when it carries out a role of focusing a contrast rather than intensifying the event. Other types cannot be fronted. The cases that allow fronting are when these NPs occur as PPs.

4.5. Relativization

Relativization is one of the syntactic phenomena that highlights substantial discrepancies among the types of cognate objects and it also reveals their similarity to or distinction from the ordinary objects. Prior to providing a description of cognate objects in terms of relativization, I will briefly point out some characteristics of relative clauses in MSA. There are two types of relative
clauses: definite and indefinite relative clauses. The definite relative clause is introduced with a complementizer that agrees in gender (and for some cases in number and case) with the antecedent. The indefinite relative clause, on the other hand, is a bare relative clause. Moreover, the two types of relative clauses differ in the relativization strategies employed; while it is possible to have a gap within the definite relative clause, indefinite relative clauses is always associated with the resumptive pronoun retention strategy (Aoun et al, 2010: 188). The investigation of the behaviour of cognate objects is mostly focused on definite relative clauses since it has a wider scope.

In Arabic, ORDINARY OBJECTS are distinctly characterized by the possibility to be relativized using one of two strategies: the resumptive pronoun strategy or the gap strategy (see e.g. Aoun et al 2010) as illustrated in (37).

37) ?inna r-rajula llaḏī qatalat=(hu) š-šurṭatu huwa
   EMPH.PRT the-man-ACC whom kill.PST=3SG the-police he
   jāru=nā
   neighbor=our
   ‘The man whom the police hit is our neighbour.’

In the ordinary ditransitive construction, it is OBJECT 2 that behaves like the ORDINARY OBJECT as it allows the two types of strategies whereas OBJECT 1 can be relativized using only the resumptive pronoun strategy as can be seen in the examples in (38a) and (38b) respectively.

38)  
   a. as-sayyāra-t-u llaḏī biš=tu=(ha) r-rajul-a hiya l-?awdī
      the-car-F-NOM which sell.PST=1SG=3FSG the-man-ACC 3FSG the-Audi
      ‘The car which I sold the man was the Audi.’
   b. ar-rajul-u llaḏī biš=tu=(ha) sayyārat-an huwa jār=ī
      the-man-NOM which sell.PST=3SG car-ACC 3SG neighbor=my
      ‘The man whom I sold the car was my neighbor.’
As for the types of the cognate objects, they exhibit variations in whether or not they can be relativized in the first place, in the constraints on the type of relative clause with which they can be relativized and thirdly in the possible strategies that are used in relativization. The pattern of relativization within which the behaviour is investigated is that in which the antecedent is related to a cognate object position within the relative clause. It can be noted that the resumptive pronoun strategy is the strategy found with the majority of the relativizable categories whereas the gap strategy is found with only a few cases. Moreover, with a third type of cognate objects a distinctive property can be observed, namely that the resumptive pronoun may be preceded by the preposition bi- which vary in interpretation (either as ‘by’, ‘in’ or with’); this pattern is referred to hereafter as the PRE-RP strategy. In principle, this strategy emerges when there is another ordinary object or an oblique internal argument preceding the cognate object in the construction as can be seen in (39); hence, it is useful to indicate that this PRE-RP strategy does not apply to object2 in the ditransitive construction as in (39).

39) 

a. laqad kānati l-qitlat-u llatī qatal=ū bi=hā  
EMPH.PRT be.PST the-kill-MNM.F-NOM which kill.PST=3PL PRE=3FSG  
l-?asrā wahšiyyatan  
the-internees cruel  
‘The way in which they killed the interness was cruel.’

b. laqad kānat l-hajm-at-u llatī hajam=ū  
EMPH.PRT be.PST the-attack-TSM.F-NOM which attack.PST=3PL  
bi=hā ʕalā  d-dawlati mudamiratun  
with=3FSG on the-country destructive  
‘The attack with which they attacked the country was destroying.’

c. *is-sayyāra-t-u llatī bi=tu bi=hā r-rajul-a  
the-car-F-NOM which sell.PST=1SG PRE=3FSG the-man-ACC  
hiya l-?awdi  
3FSG the-Audi  
‘The car with which I sold the man was the Audi.’
In demonstrating the properties of cognate objects with respect to relativization, I will start with bounded cognate objects as they incorporate categories that share properties with ORDINARY OBJECTS. I will then proceed to characterizing the subtypes of UNBOUNDED cognate objects which do not exhibit ORDINARY-OBJECT properties with respect to relativization.

As for the various types of BOUNDED cognate objects, it can be noted that two types of criteria interrelate in determining the compatible type of strategy with which the cognate object can be relativized: (i) the type of the cognate object per se; and (ii) the type and properties of the cognate VP, particularly the properties related to transitivity as characterized in Chapter 3. A number of distinct cases can be identified which vary in comparability to the ORDINARY OBJECT.

The first case is that of cognate objects that behave like the ORDINARY OBJECT or OBJECT2 in the ditransitive construction in allowing the two strategies i.e. the resumptive pronoun strategy and the gap strategy. Such behaviour can be found with two types of BOUNDED cognate objects: (i) HYPONYMOUS cognate objects; and (ii) QUANTIZED cognate objects and KIND cognate objects when occurring in a monotransitive construction with a [+human] internal argument as in (40). These cognate objects are also similar to OBJECT2 in not allowing the PRE-PRO strategy which can be found with other cognate objects occurring in a transitive construction as shown in (39) above. Examples indicating the behaviour of these cognate objects are given in (40), (41) and (42).

40) a. 

\begin{verbatim}
āṣ-ṣalā-t-u  llatī  ṣallay=tu=(hā)  littaw  hiya
pray.NSDM-FSG-NOM  which  pray.PST=1SG=3FSG  just  3FSG
ṣalāt-u  l-fajri
pray.NSDM-NOM  the-Dawn
\end{verbatim}

‘The prayer which I have just prayed was the Dawn prayer.’

\footnote{Instances in constructions with a [-human] internal argument behave differently.}
b. ar-raqṣ-at-u llatī sa-tarquṣu=(hā) hindun hiya
   the-dance-TSM.FSG-NOM which will-dance.PST=3FSG Hind
   raqṣ-at-u l-bolkā
   dance-TSM-NOM the-Polka
   ‘The dance which Hind is going to dance is the Polka dance.’

41)

a. laqad kānati ḏ-ḏarb-at-u llatī ḍaraba=(hā)
   EMPH.PRT be.PST the-hit-TSM.FSG-NOM which hit.PST=3FSG
   r-rajul-u 1-ḵašm-a mubriḥatun
   the man-NOM the-opponent-ACC hard
   ‘The hit which the man gave the opponent was a hard one.’

b. lā ?ansā l-qubla-t-a 1-ḥanūnata llatī
   not forget.1SG the-kiss.NSDM-FSG-ACC the-tender which
   qabalt=nī=ḥā ummi qabal safari=hā
   kiss.PST=1SG=3FSG mother=my before travelling=her
   ‘I do not forget the tender kiss which my mother gave me before she
   travelled.’

42)

a. laqad ʕa<yy>aša=nī zawj=ī 1-šišat-a
   EMPH.PRT live.CAUS.PST=1SG husband=my the-live.MNM.FSG-ACC
   llatī wašada ?ann yuṣayyiš=nī=ḥā
   which promise.PST.3SG INF live.CAUS.PRS=1SG=3FSG
   ‘My husband made me experience the kind of life that he promised me.’

b. laqad kānat l-wakāla-t-u llatī
   EMPH.PR be.PST the-proxy.NSDM-FSG-NOM which
   wakkal=tu=ḥā ʔak=ī ʕāmmatan
   grant.PRS=1SG=3FSG brother=my general
   ‘The proxy which I granted my brother was a general one.’

As in the case of fronting, OBJECT1COC also behaves like OBJECT1 in the ordinary
ditransitive construction in that it can only be relativized with the resumptive
pronoun strategy and relativization with the gap strategy results in ungrammaticality.
43) laqad kānati ḍ-ḍarbat-u  llatī ḍaraba=(ḥā) EMPH.PRT be.PST the-hit-TSM.FSG-NOM which hit.PST=3FSG
r-rajul-u  l-ḵaṣm-a  mubriḥatun
the man-NOM the-opponent-ACC  hard-NOM
‘The hit which the man gave the opponent was a hard one.’

The second case is that of the types of cognate objects that allow only the
resumptive pronoun but not the gap strategy. This behaviour can be found with
the cognate objects of unaccusative and unergative verbs in general regardless of
their semantic type and of the otherwise obligatorily transitive verb such as the
cognate object of the ḥalima ‘dream’ as can be seen in (44).

44)

a. mātat hindun  al-mītat-a  l-ḥasanata llatī kānat
die.PST Hind the-die.MMN-ACC the-good which be.PST
tatamannā ?an tamūta=*(ḥā)
wish.PST.[3FSG] INF die.PST.3FSG=3FSG
‘Hind died in the good manner of death that she wished to die.’

b. laqad kānat  al-ibṭisāma-t-u  llatī ibtasam=ti=*(ḥā)
EMPH.PRT be.PST the-smile-TSM.FSG-NOM which smile.PRS=2FSG=3FSG
l-bāriḥata  ᵆindamā ra?ay=ti=ḥā  ff ḡāyati
the-yesterday when see.PST=2FSG=3FSG in extreme
l-jāḍibiyyāti
the-attractiveness
‘The smile which you smiled yesterday when you saw her was very
attractive.’

c. kāna  l-ḥulm-u  ʾllaḍī  ḥalim=tu=*(ḥu)
be.PST the-dream.BM-NOM which dream.PRS=1SG=3SG
l-ʔusbūša  l-māḍī  ḡariban
the-week  the-last  strange
‘The dream which I dreamed last week was strange.’

A third case is that of BOUNDED cognate objects which, like the previous categories,
allow the resumptive pronoun strategy and disallow the gap strategy, but they
also differ in that they allow the PRE-RP strategy. These are MANNER cognate
objects occurring with a transitive verb.
45) kānat waḥššiyyat-un l-qitla-t-u llatī
be.PST cruel-NOM the-kill-MNM-FSG-NOM which
qatal=ū=*{hā/bi-hā} ṣaliyyan
kill.PST=3PL=3SG/PRE-3SG Ali
‘The way in which they killed Ali was a savage one.’

Note that the cognate object with ṣīšat ‘live.MNM’, which can have a manner reading since its cognate N is a MANNER MAŠDAR, is a distinct category. It does not behave like other MANNER cognate objects in allowing the PRE-RP strategy even when it occurs in a transitive construction. Rather, it shows properties of ORDINARY OBJECTS in allowing the gap strategy and the resumptive pronoun strategy as shown in (42a) above and repeated below.

46) laqad ṣa<yy>aša=nī zawj=ī l-ṣīšat-a
EMPHE.PRT live.CAUS.PST=1SG husband=my the-live.MNM-FSG-ACC
llatī wašada ?ann yuʕayyiš=nī=(hā)/(bi-ha)
which promise.PST.3SG INF live.CAUS.PRS=1SG=3FSG
‘My husband made me experience the kind of life that he promised me.’

The PRE-RP strategy is also the strategy used with BOUNDED cognate objects occurring in transitive constructions with a [-human] internal argument as can be seen in (47).6

47) sa-y<u>f<ā>qab ʕalā ḏ-darba-t-i l-mahīnatī
will<PASS>punish.PST.3SG for the-hit-TSM.FSG-GEN the-insulting
llatī daraba *(bi=hā) wajha ḳashmi=hi
which hit.PST.3SG PRE=3SG face opponent=his
‘He will be punished for the insulting hit with which he hit his opponent’s face.’

6 This the opposite to the case mentioned above of the categories in constructions with a [+human] internal argument and that they are identical to ORDINARY OBJECTS in the strategies employed, the resumptive pronoun and the gap strategy, see (41) above. Such observations point out to the role of transitivity in the distribution of the object-like and least-object like BOUNDED cognate objects.
Also, some PRODUCT cognate objects in a transitive construction such as those of the verbs ʕaḏḏab ‘torture’ and ḵadama ‘serve’, allow only the PRE-RP strategy when they are relativized as can be illustrated with the example in (48).

48) sa-yakūnu šadīdan al-ʕaḏḏab-a  llaḏī  
will-bePRS severe the-tortureNSDM-ACC which  
sa-yuʕaḏḏibu=hum  *(bi=hī)  
will-torturePRS.3SG=3PL PRE=3SG  
‘The torture by which he will torture them will be severe.’

The last case is that of BOUNDED cognate objects which are not considered as good candidates for relativization are the PRODUCT cognate objects of the one-place predicates ʔaḏnaba ‘commit a sin’ and ʔaḵta? ‘make.mistake’ and the two-place predicates faʕala/ʕamila ‘do’ and qarrara ‘decide’ as can be seen in (49).\(^7\)

49)

a. *kāna l-ʔaḵta?-u  llaḏī  ?aḵta?=at=hu  hindun  
bePST the-mistakeBM-NOM which make.mistakePST=3SG Hind  
ʔaẓīman  great  
‘The mistake which hind made was a great one.’

b. *kāna l-ʔiʃl-u/l-ʕamal-u  llaḏī  faʕalat=hu/ʕamilat=hu  
bePST the-deedBM-NOM which doPST=3SG hindun qabīhan  
Hind ugly  
‘The deed which hind did was an ugly one.’

c. *kāna l-ʔaɣar-u  llaḏī  qarrarat=hu  hindun ḥaḳīman  
bePST the-decideNSDM-NOM which decidePST=3SG Hind wise  
‘The decision which hind decided was a wise one.’

Relativization of the same cognate NPs in (49a) and (49b) is possible, with varying strategies, when these NPs occur with a non-cognate verb as can be seen in (50a)

\(^7\) Note that informant A’s judgement differs from that of the author and the other informants in that she considers these sentences to be grammatical.
and (50b). Nevertheless, grammaticality is questionable in the case of qarār ‘decide.NSDM’ as can be seen in (50c).

50)  
(a) kāna  l-kaṭa?-u  llaḏī iqṭarafat=hu  hindun
be.PST the-mistake.BM-NOM which make.mistake.PST=3SG Hind
ṣaẓīman
great
‘The mistake which hind made was a great one.’

(b) kāna  l-fisṭlu/l-ṣamalu  llaḏī qāmat  bi=hi  hindun qabīḥ
be.PST the-do.BM-NOM which do.PST=3SG PRE=3SG Hind ugly
‘The deed which hind did was an ugly one.’

(c) %kāna  l-qaṭar-u  llaḏī ittaḵaḏat =hu  hindun
be.PST the-decision.NSDM-NOM which take.PST=3SG Hind
ḥakīman
wise
‘The decision which hind took was a wise one.’

The types of UNBOUNDED cognate objects, as has been pointed out above, do not exhibit any of the ORDINARY OBJECT properties with respect to relativization. For example, the type referred to as the MODIFIED cognate object do not represent good candidates for relativization as can be seen in (51).

51)  
(a) *laqad  kāna  l-mawt-u  l-mufāji?u  llaḏī māṭat=hu
EMPH.PRT be.PST the-die.BM-NOM the-sudden which die.PST=3SG hindun ṣadmatan li-l-jamīfi
Hind shock to-the-all
‘The sudden death which Hind died was a shock to everyone.’

(b) *yaddullu  n-nawm-u  l-ṣamīqu  llaḏī  ?aṣbaḥat
indicate.PRS the-sleep.BM-NOM the-deep which become.PST.3SG tanām=hu  hindun haḍḥihi l-?ayyām ʕalā taḥḥassuni waḍi=ha
sleep.PRS=3SG Hind these the-days on improving status=her š-ṣiḥḥiyyi
the-healthy
‘The deep sleeping that Hind is sleeping these days points to an improvement in her health status.’
c. *kun=nā naṣjabu min l-?iṣrār-i š-šādīd llaḏī be.PST=1PL wonder.PRS=1PL from the-insist.BM-GEN the-intense whichyuṣirru bi=hi ʕalā ra?yi=hi insist.PRS.3SG PRE=3SG on opinion=his

‘We used to wonder at his constant insistence on his opinion.’

A more straightforward structure is preferred such as the structure given in (52) for the sentence in (51a).

52) kāna mawt-u hindin al-mufāji?u šadmatan li-l-jamīfi be.PST die.BM-NOM Hind the-sudden shock to-the-all

‘Hind’s sudden death was a shock to everyone.’

However, there are instances of the UNBOUNDED MODIFIED cognate objects that may be relativized and they are mostly cognate objects of a two-place predicate with a manner-denoting adjective; when these are relativized, only the PRE-RP strategy can be employed as can be seen in (53).

53) a. ista?=tu kaṭṭran min al-muṣfāmalati s-sayyi?ati llaḏī be.upset.PST=1SG a lot from the-treat.BM-GEN the-bad which ra?ay=tu=ki tuʃāmil=ʔina bi=hā hindan see.PST=1SG=2SG treat.PRS=2SG with-3FSG Hind

‘I was so upset by the bad treatment with which I saw you treating Hind.’

b. saʃidat hindun kaṭṭran bi-l-?istiqbal-i become.happy.PST=1SG Hind a lot by-the-receive.BM-GEN r-rā?iʃi llaḏī istaqbal=tu=hā bi=hi the-great which receive.PST=1SG=3FSG PRE-3SG

‘Hind was pleased with the wonderful reception with which I received her.’

There are instances of cognate objects that formally share the same pattern of the various instances of the unbounded modified cognate object i.e. occurring as an indefinite N + an event-modifying adjective such as ʃalātān kāʃifatān ‘pray.NSDM submissive’, raʃṣan sarʃan ‘dance.BM quick’, darbān mubriḥan ‘hit.BM hard’, ʔubban
śaḡūfan ‘love.BM passionate’, etc. Nevertheless, these cognate objects, unlike the general case with the UNBOUNDED MODIFIED cognate objects, can still be relativized to a resumptive pronoun in parallel to ORDINARY OBJECTS when they are relativized as can be seen in (54a). Those that occur in a transitive construction can be found with either the resumptive pronoun or the PRE-RP strategy as can be seen in (54b).

54)

a. kāna rāfūn ṭ-raqṣ-u s-sarḥu llaḏī
   be.PST wonderful the-dance.BM-NOM the-quick which
dī ṭ-raqṣat-hu hindun al-bārihata
   dance.PST=3SG Hind yesterday
   ‘The quick dancing which hind danced yesterday was wonderful.’

b. ḥabbā=tu l-ḥubb-a š-šāḡūf a llaḏī
   love.PST=1SG the-love.BM.MSG-ACC the-passionate which
   ḥabbā=tu=hu/bi=hi
   love.PST=1SG=3MSG/PRE=3MSG
   ‘I loved the passionate love with/by which I loved my wife.’

In fact, these are the instances of cognate objects that are shown in the previous chapter to have two readings: an UNBOUNDED (MANNER) or a BOUNDED (KIND) reading. When these cognate objects are relativized using the resumptive pronoun, they can only have the BOUNDED reading. Therefore, even though these instances are formally similar, they are semantically and syntactically distinct.

The second type of UNBOUNDED cognate objects are the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate objects; these cognate objects are constrained with respect to relativization. The strategy that can be employed with the instances that allow relativization, namely the categories that involve specific participants, is the PRE-RP strategy with the determinative mīṭl ‘like’ overtly expressed as can be seen (55). Note that two-participant construct states only allow non-restrictive relative clauses.

---

8 The maṣdars that represent them can have two readings either as a [+bound] or [-bound] maṣdar.
Accordingly, this category of cognate objects does not exhibit any of the typical aspects of ordinary objects with respect to relativization.

55) laqad kāna hujūm-u baššār ʕalā sūriyyā,

EMPH.PRT be.PST attack.BM-NOM Bashshaar on Syria

wa llaḏī sa-nahjum ʕalay=him bi-miṭli=hi,

and which will-attack.PST.[1PL] on=3PL with-like=3SG

mudamiran li=l-bilādī
destroying of=the-country

‘lit. Bashar’s attack on Syria, and which we will attack them in a way similar to it, was destroying to the country.’

The last type of unbounded cognate objects is that of bare cognate objects; these are by definition indefinite bare NPs. Therefore, modifying the cognate object with a relative clause represents a category that can involve semantic, syntactic and functional distinctions from bare cognate objects, compare the two sentences in (56).

56)

a. ḍaraba=ha ḍarb-an

hit.PST.3SG=3FSG hit-BM-ACC

‘He HIT her intensely.’

b. ḍaraba=ha ḍarb-an ?awjaʕ=ḥā

hit.PST.3SG=3FSG hit.BM-ACC cause.pain.PST.3MSG=3FSG

‘He hit her hitting that caused her pain.’

For instance, the cognate object in (56b) is modified by the indefinite relative clause and it represents a particular event type which can be seen to contribute to the propositional meaning of the sentence. On the contrary, the bare cognate object as shown in Chapter 3 can give prominence to the verbal event in the sentence, intensifies its quality but adds no additional information and cannot be questioned. Hence, it could be said that bare cognate objects are not accessible to relativization.
4.6. Pronominalization

Distinctions between cognate object types and the ordinary object can also be observed with respect to pronominalization. ORDINARY OBJECTS can freely be pronominalized with a pronoun in a later sentence, in the pronominalization pattern when the noun occurs in the object position as in (57b), or in the pattern when the noun refers to the object from another position as (57c). The two pronominalization patterns as described in Ross (1995) as inbound and outbound pronominalization respectively (see Ross 1995).

57)

a. qatalat š-šurṭatu ʕaliyyan
   kill.PST the-police Ali
   ‘The police killed Ali’

b. qatalat=hu laylata l-bāriḥata
   kill.PST.3SG=3SG night the-yesterday
   ‘They killed him yesterday night

c. kāna huwa man tasababa ʕī dalik
   be.PST.3SG who cause.PST.3SG in that
   ‘It was him who brought about that.’

OBJECT 1 and OBJECT2 can be easily pronominalized with a pronoun; a strong pronoun in the case of OBJECT2 can also be used as can be seen in (58b).

58)

a. biʕ=tu ?aːʃ=ʔ sayyārat-an
   sell.PST=1SG brother=my car-ACC
   ‘I sold my brother a car’

b. biʕ=tu=hu ʔiyāḥā l-bāriḥata
   sell.PST=1SG=3SG 3SG.ACC the-yesterday
   ‘I sold him it yesterday.’

---

9 A strong pronoun is a standing pronoun in contrast to the attached pronoun.
c. lakinna=hu ṭalaba minn=ī ʔann abqiya=hā
   but=3SG  request.PST.3SG from=me INF  keep.PST.1SG=3SG
   ʕind=ī ʔila l-yawmi t-tālī
   with=me till the-day the-next
   ‘But he requested from me to keep it with me till the next day.’

As for the cognate object subtypes, they exhibit variations in the behaviour with respect to pronominalization. More constraints are associated with inbound pronominalization and hence the focus will be on this type in the first place.

Only some categories which belong under BOUNDED cognate objects exhibit the easiness and plausibility of pronominalization with a pronoun similar to the case with ORDINARY OBJECTS. The various categories are indicated below.

Firstly, there are the HYPONYMOUS cognate objects i.e. the objects of the optionally transitive verbs, namely slaught ‘pray’, raqaṣa ‘dance’, and laʕiba ‘play’, which in the typical case take a semantically related ordinary object. The cognate object freely allows inbound pronominalization as can be seen in (59).

59)  
   a. raqaṣat hindun raqs-at-a l-bolkā
dance.PST Hind dance-TSM.FSG-ACC the-Polka
   ‘Hind danced the Polka dance.’
   d. raʔay=tu=hā tarquṣu=hā fi ḥafli l-bāriḥati
see.PST=1SG=3FSG dance.PST.3FSG=3FSG in party the-yesterday
   ‘I saw her dancing it in the yesterday party.’

The other type of BOUNDED cognate objects that can be freely pronominalized are the QUANTIZED EVENT cognate objects as can be seen in (60).

60)  
   a. ḍaraba=nī ẓarb-at-an mubriḥatan
hit.PST=1SG hit-TSM-ACC hard

---

10 Referencing within clause boundaries is shown under relativization and it is obviously less constrained than pronominalization across clause boundaries.
b. ḍaraba=ni=hā/ʔiyyahā ʕalā wajh=i
hit.PST=1SG=3FSG/3FSG.ACC  on  face=my
‘lit. He hit me it on the face.’

Note that the strong pronoun as well as the weak pronoun can be used to refer to this category of cognate objects. Therefore, such cognate objects are comparable in this respect to OBJECT 2 in the ordinary ditransitive construction which was shown in (58b) to allow the strong pronoun.

Also, instances of BOUNDED cognate objects that refer to a SPECIMEN and cognate objects occurring as definite NPs can freely be pronominalized regardless of the verb type as can be seen in the examples in (61) and (62) respectively.

61)

a. mašat hindun mašy-at-a l-qamari laylata l-bāriḥati
   walk.PST Hind walk-TSM-ACC the-Moon night the- yesterday
   ‘Hind walked the Moon walk’

b. laqad mašat=hā bi-mahāratin
   EMPH.PRT walk.PST  with-skillfulness
   ‘She walked it skillfully.’

62)

a. mašat hindun haḏihi l-mašy-at-a laylata l-bāriḥa
   walk.PST Hind this the-walk-TSM-ACC night the-yesterday
   ‘Hind walked this walk yesterday night’

b. laqad mašat=hā bi-mahāratin
   EMPH.PRT walk.PST  with-skillfulness
   ‘She walked it skillfully.’

As for the subtypes of UNBOUNDED cognate objects, pronominalization with a pronoun is banned as can be seen in the examples in (63), (64) and (65).

63)

a. daḥikat hindun daḥik-an mutawāṣilan
   laugh.PST Hind laugh.BM-ACC constant
   ‘Hind laughed constant laughing.’
b. *samiʕ=tu=ha taḍḥaku=hu qabala qalifa hear.PST=1SG=3SG laugh.PST=3SG before awhile
‘I heard her laughing it a while ago.’

The MODIFIED cognate object

64)
a. yamš=ánma mašya š-šuʃʕâni
walk.PST=3PL walk-BM-ACC the-courageous
‘They walked the walk of the courageous people’
b. *laqad mašaw=hu bi-mahâratin
EMPH.PRT walk.PST=3SG with-skillfulness
‘They walked it skillfully.’

The CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object

65)
a. ?abdaʕat t-ṭâlibât-u ?ibdaʕ-an
act.outstandingly.PST the-students act.outstandingly.BM-ACC
‘The students acted extremely outstandingly.’
b. *laqad ?abdaʕat=hu t-ṭâlibât-u fi barnâmaji
EMPH.PRT act.outstandingly.PST=3SG the-students in program
l-?usbūsi l-mâḏî
the-week the-last
‘lit. The students acted outstandingly it in the program of the last week.’

The BARE cognate object

4.7. Question Formation

Similarities and distinctions among the cognate object types and between cognate objects and the ORDINARY OBJECT can be found with respect to the formation of questions. A characteristic property of an ordinary object referring to a [-human] individual is that it can be questioned with māḏā ‘what?’ as can be seen in the question-answer sequence in (66). Similarly, OBJECT2 which is regularly inanimate can also be questioned with māḏā ‘what?’ as shown in (67).

66)
a. māḏā kasarat hindun
what break.PST Hind
‘What did Hind break?’
b. kasarat **kawb-an**
   break.PST.3SG cup-ACC
   ‘She broke a cup’

67)  
a. **mādā** biṣta ?aḵā=ka
   what sell.PST.2SG brother=your
   ‘What did you sell your brother?’

b. biṣ=tu=hu **sayyārat-an**
   sell.PST=1SG=3SG car-ACC
   ‘I sold him a car.’

Of the various categories of cognate objects, only the bounded cognate objects of a few verbs namely **ṣallā** ‘pray’, **raqaṣa** ‘dance’, **lašib** ‘play’, **ḥalima** ‘dream, and **ṭalaba** ‘request’ can be questioned with the interrogative **mādā** ‘what?’ as shown in the examples below.

68)  
a. **mādā** **ṣallay=tum**
   what pray.PST=2PL
   ‘What did you pray?’

b. **ṣallay=nā** **ṣalāt-a** l-fajri
   pray.PST=1PL prayer.NSDM-ACC the-dawn
   ‘We prayed the Dawn prayer.’

69)  
a. **mādā** raqaṣat hindun
   what dance.PST Hind
   ‘What did Hind dance?’

b. raqaṣat **raqs-at-an** šarqiyyatan
   dance.PST.3SG dance-TSM-ACC eastren
   ‘She danced an eastren dance.’

70)  
a. **mādā** lašib=tum l-bāriḥata
   what play.PST=2PL yesterday
   ‘What did you play?’
b. laṣib=nā l-liṣb-at-a l-muṣtāda/
   play.PST=1PL the-play-TSM-ACC the-usual
   liṣb-at-a su?ālin wa jawābin
   play-TSM.ACC question and answer
   ‘We played the usual game/a question and answer game.’

71)
   a. māḏā ḥalim=ti l-bāriḥata kun=ti tabkīna wa ṣanti na?ima
      what dream.PST=2SG yesterday be.PST=2SG cry and you asleep
      ‘What did you dream yesterday? You were crying while you were
      asleep.’
   b. ḥalim=tu ḥulm-an muḳīfan
      dream.PST=1SG dream.BM-ACC scary
      ‘I dreamt a scary dream.’

72)
   a. māḏā ṭalab=ti=hi laqad badā mahmūman
      what request.PST=2SG=3SG EMPH.PRT appear.PST.3SG stressed
      ‘What did you request from him, he looked stressed.’
   b. mā ṭalab=tu=hu ṭalab-an ṣaḥban
      not request.PST=1SG=3SG request.BM-ACC difficult
      ‘I did not request from him a difficult request.’

Note that the UNBOUNDED cognate of the same verbs represents an infelicitous
answer to an interrogative with māḏā ‘what’ as can be seen in (73).

73)
   a. māḏā ṣallay=tum/raqaṣ=tum/ṭalabti=hi
      what pray.PST=2PL/dance.PST/request.PST=2FSG=3SG
      ‘What did you pray/dance/request from him?’
   b. ṣalāt-a muwaddiṣin/*raqṣ-an sarīṣan/*ṭalaban
      pray.NSDM-ACC life.leaver/dance.BM-ACC quick/request.BM-ACC
      mufāji?an
      sudden
      ‘The praying of a life-leaving person/quick dancing/a sudden
      request.’

As for the cognate objects of the other verbs, they cannot be questioned with māḏā
‘what’ regardless of the type of the cognate object per se i.e. whether it is a
BOUNDED cognate object in the various interpretations or it is a type of UNBOUNDED
cognate objects. The ungrammaticality of questioning the various cognate object types is indicated in the following sentences.

**BOUNDED COGNATE OBJECTS**

74) **KIND**

a. *māḏā* mašat hindun  
    what walk.PST Hind  
    ‘What did Hind walk?’

b. *mašat* mašy-at-a 1-qamari  
    walk.PST.3FSG walk.TSM-ACC the-Moon  
    ‘She walked the Moon walk.’

75) **MANNER**

a. *māḏā* qatal=ū ʕaliyyan  
    what kill.PST=3PL Ali  
    ‘What did they kill Ali?’

b. *qatal=ū=hu qitlat-a 1-ʔanʕami*  
    kill.PST=3PL=3SG kill.MNM-ACC the-animals  
    ‘They killed him in the manner they kill animals’

76) **EVENT**

a. *māḏā* ḏāḥikat hindun  
    what laugh.PST Hind  
    ‘What did Hind laugh?’

b. *ḏāḥikat ḏīḥk-at-an ʕāliyatān*  
    laugh.PST.3FSG laugh.TSM-ACC loud  
    ‘She laughed a loud laugh.’

77) **PRODUCT**

a. *māḏā* ḥakṭaʔat hindun  
    what make.mistake.PST Hind  
    ‘What mistake did Hind do?’

b. *ʔaṣṭaʔat ʔaṭan kabīran*  
    make.mistake.PST.3FSG mistake.BM big  
    ‘She make a big mistake.’

‘What mistake did Hind do?’

It can be noted that with some verbs that take a **PRODUCT** cognate object such as the verbs faʕalaʕamila ‘do’ and qarrara ‘decide’, the formation of the question per se represents a grammatical structure as can be seen in (78) and (79); nevertheless,
the PRODUCT cognate object cannot be considered a felicitous answer.

78)  
   a. māḏā faṣalat/ṣamilat hindun li-t<u><f><a>qab  
      what do.PST Hind to-<PASS>punish  
      ‘What did Hind do to be punished?’
   b. #faṣalat /ṣamilat fiṣl-an/ṣamalan qabīḥan  
      do.PST.3FSG do.BM-ACC ugly  
      ‘She did an ugly deed.’
   c. ḏarabat ?aḵāh=ā  
      hit.PST.3FSG brother=her  
      ‘She hit her brother.’

79)  
   a. māḏā qarrarat hindun  
      what decide.PST Hind  
      ‘What did Hind decide?’
   b. #qarrarat qarār-an ḫakīman\textsuperscript{11}  
      decide.PST.3FSG decide.NSDM-ACC wise  
      ‘She decided a wise decision’
   c. qarrarat ?an tusāfira ḡadan  
      decide.PST.3FSG INF travel.PRS.3FSG tomorrow  
      ‘She decided to travel tomorrow.’

This can be attributed to the change in the meaning of the verb in question from the meaning of the verb in the cognate object construction. In (78b), the meaning of the verb in the construction as given in the answer can be roughly interpreted as produce or create a deed whereas in the question the meaning of the verb is that of ACT and the question is similar to what is the action Hind undertook? Accordingly, the clause ḏarabat ?aḵāh=ā ‘she hits her sister, which indicates the action being questioned is an acceptable answer whereas the cognate object construction is not. Similarly, in (79) the meaning represented in the question is similar to ‘what decision did she make’ whereas in the cognate object construction it is similar to ‘take a decision’.

\textsuperscript{11} The answer is considered as acceptable by informant A.
Another observation about some PRODUCT cognate objects can also be indicated here: a question with māḏā ‘what’ can be formatted with the cognate verb but the interrogative phrase is obligatorily preceded by the preposition bi-‘with’; the PRODUCT cognate object represents a felicious answer but it only occurs headed by the preposition. This can be observed with the PRODUCT cognate objects of the verbs ṣaddaba ‘torture’, kadama ‘serve’. An example is given in (80).

80)  
   a. bi-māḏā ṣaḍḍaba=hum  
       PRE-what torture.PST=3PL  
       ‘With what did he torture them?’
   b. ṣaḍḍaba=hum bi-ṣaḍābin ẓażīm  
       torture.PST=3PL PRE-torture.BM-GEN great  
       ‘He tortured them with great torture.’

As for the types of UNBOUNDED cognate objects, the implausibility of questioning them with māḏā ‘what’ can be indicated the following examples.

81)  
   a. *māḏā ḏahikat hindun  
       what laugh.PST.Hind  
       ‘What did Hind laugh?’
   b. *ḏahikat ḏahik-an mutawāšilan  
       laugh.PST.[3FSG] laugh.BM-ACC constant  
       ‘She laughed constant laughing.’

82)  
   a. *māḏā maša l-junūd-u  
       what walk.PST the-soldiers  
       ‘What did the soldiers walk?’
   b. *maša=w mašya š-šujšâni  
       walk.PST.3PL walk.BM-ACC the-courageous  
       ‘They walked the walking of the courageous.’

The MODIFIED COGNATE OBJECT

The CONSTRUCT STATE COGNATE OBJECT
a. *mādā ʔabdaʕati t-ṭālibātu
   what act.outstandingly.PST=3FPL the-students
   ‘What did the students acted outstandingly?’

b. *ʔabdāʕ=na ʔibdāʕ-an
   act.outstandingly.PST=3FPL act.outstandingly.BM-ACC
   ‘They acted extremely outstandingly.’

The BARE COGNATE OBJECT

Having indicated the constraint on questioning the types of cognate objects with the interrogative mādā ‘what’ which is possible with the ORDINARY OBJECT, it can also be pointed out as demonstrated in Chapter 3 that some cognate objects types can be questioned with kayf ‘how’ which is obviously not possible with the ORDINARY OBJECT. The cognate object categories that were shown to allow questioning with kayf ‘how’ include the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object, some instances of the MODIFIED cognate object, and the MANNER cognate object.

4.8. Results

In this chapter, I undertake an investigation of the syntactic behaviour of the various types of cognate objects as classified in Chapter 3, and the manner in which these types are similar to, or distinct from, the ORDINARY OBJECT in an ordinary monotransitive construction. The comparison also involves the two objects in an ordinary ditransitive construction, namely OBJECT1 and OBJECT2, and the two objects in the ditransitive construction involving the cognate object; the first object in this construction is referred to as OBJECT1COC. The cognate object types include the three types of UNBOUNDED cognate objects, namely the MODIFIED cognate object, the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object and the BARE cognate object, and also the numerous types of BOUNDED cognate objects which are classified according to the verb type and the properties of the cognate object, such as its interpretation and its individuation properties.

The syntactic behaviour of these objects is characterized with respect to six
phenomena which include passivization, adverb insertion, fronting, relativization, pronominalization, and question formation. A summary of the results of the comparison between the cognate object types and the other objects is given in Table 4.1

Table 4.1 Syntactic Behaviour of Non-Cognate Objects and Cognate Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYP.CO</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER COs denoting a SPECIMEN</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANNER</td>
<td>fišat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live.MNM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>Quantized COs e.g. darbat hit.TSM</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When quantified</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with kind reading</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCT</td>
<td>ḱalima</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dream.BM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḱalab</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>request.BM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fišl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beginning with the behaviour of the non-cognate objects, it can also be observed from the results presented in the table that OBJECT2 in the ditransitive construction behaves similarly to the ORDINARY OBJECT in the monotransitive construction with regard to the different processes, except for that of passivization. It is OBJECT1 that can be passivized. These observations about the non-cognate objects in Arabic seem to echo Hudson’s (1992) findings regarding the objects in the double object construction, and the way in which they are similar to, or distinct from, the ORDINARY OBJECT. As for the behaviour of the cognate objects, the types of cognate objects that are the least-ORDINARY OBJECT like are the UNBOUNDED cognate objects. This can be attributed to their status as predicates or adjuncts, as will be demonstrated in the subsequent chapter. BOUNDED cognate objects, on the other hand, incorporate categories that vary in their similarity to, or distinction from, the ORDINARY OBJECT. Of the various types, the more ORDINARY OBJECT-like cognate objects are those referred to as the HY-PONYMOUS cognate objects which are the cognate objects of the optionally transitive verbs, i.e. of the verbs ṣallā ‘pray’, raqaṣa ‘dance’, and lafība ‘play’. Except for the constraint on adverb insertion observed with the ORDINARY OBJECT, they are identical to the ORDINARY OBJECTs. The other types of cognate objects that also show great similarity to the ORDINARY OBJECT or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>do.BM</th>
<th>NSDM</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qarrar</td>
<td>decide.NSDM</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kata?</td>
<td>do.mistake.BM</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭaddaba</td>
<td>torture.BM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kadam</td>
<td>serve.BM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to OBJECT2 in the ordinary ditransitive construction are the cognate objects that occur in an otherwise transitive construction. Regardless of differences in interpretation, which can be a QUANTIZED EVENT or a KIND cognate object, they exhibit affinity with these two non-cognate objects in that they ban adverb insertion when they are definite, they can be fronted, relativized with the two strategies possible for these non-cognate objects, and they can be easily pronominalized. It should still be indicated that this is restricted to the types of constructions in which the verb is an obligatorily monotransitive verb taking a [+human] core internal argument. In constructions that are lower in transitivity, the cognate object behaves differently. Moreover, an interesting observation relates to OBJECT1COC in that it behaves like object1 in the ordinary ditransitive construction; this object in the non-cognate object construction stands as an ordinary object.

There are instances of unergative verbs that share with the ORDINARY OBJECT the property of relativization, using the resumptive pronoun, but not the gap strategy. They can allow passivization. These cognate objects cannot be fronted, cannot easily be pronominalized, and cannot be questioned with māḏa ‘what’. The cognate objects of the unaccusative verbs do not normally allow relativization, and they cannot be passivized. One exception is the MANNER cognate object of the verb māla ‘die’, which can be relativized with the resumptive pronoun, and can also be passivized.

Also, the investigation undertaken in this chapter sheds light on a number of properties that were observed with some types of cognate objects, but which do not hold for the different types of the non-cognate objects which are represented by purebred NPs, to use Ross’s (1995) terminology. The first property relates to the possibility of the impersonal passive with some of the cognate objects that cannot be passivized in the typical way. The passive subject is the impersonal third person pronoun and the cognate object occurs as a PP. The second property
that was observed is related to the subject-verb agreement. When the cognate object is made the passive subject (nominative-case marked), agreement with the verb is not obligatory if the cognate object does not occur adjacent to the verb, as when it is separated by an oblique argument or a PP. The third aspect is the occurrence of the cognate object with the preposition bi-, which varies in interpretation depending on the type of the cognate object. The cognate object in the simple cognate object construction occurs as an accusative-case marked NP, and is not likely to occur in the language with a preposition which is then genitive-case marked. Nevertheless, it was observed that some cognate objects optionally or obligatorily occur with the preposition bi- when they undergo a movement, as in fronting, relativization, or when the cognate object is coreferential with a cognate object in a previous sentence, viz in pronominalization. These properties were more or less observed with the types of cognate objects that occur in an otherwise monotransitive construction, i.e. where there is another internal argument in the construction regardless of its type. When the cognate object, regardless of its type, is used in the typical position of an ORDINARY OBJECT, as when the verb is an unergative or unaccusative or an optionally transitive verb, these aspects cannot be observed. Further research can be undertaken to indicate the nature of case-marking in these cognate objects in Arabic, and whether they represent a parallel with ‘the cross-linguistic sample of languages that exhibit, with different functions, case alternation in the domain of Cos’ (Gianollo & Lavidas 2012). In such languages, which have morphological case, there are accusative-cased marked cognate objects as well as other types of cognate objects that bear a different case, e.g. instrumental in Russian and dative in Greek.
CHAPTER 5: STATUS OF THE COGNATE OBJECT IN ARABIC

5.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter I have provided a syntactic characterization of the various types of cognate objects and I have shown how they compare to or diverge from the syntactic behaviour of the ordinary object. I have shown that some types exhibit similar behaviour to the ordinary object, others share with the ordinary object some properties, yet a third group of cognate objects are distinct from ordinary objects in almost every respect. Such observation raises the question of the status of the various types of cognate objects and the type of relation that they hold with the cognate verb.

Therefore, in section 5.2 I first provide an analysis of the various types of cognate objects with respect to the recurrent question of whether they are arguments or adjuncts on the basis of semantic and syntactic diagnostics found in the literature. In section 5.3 I characterize cognate objects with respect to the referentiality or non-referentiality properties as found in the literature. In section 5.4 I propose an analysis of the status of the various cognate object types and of the type of relation that holds between the different types cognate object and the respective verbs followed by a comparison between the cognate object construction and other corresponding constructions.

5.2. Arguments or Adjuncts

A central question that is often investigated in studies on cognate objects is related to the status of the cognate object and whether they are arguments of the verb or adjuncts. According to some proposals, cognate objects are arguments (Massam
1990; Macfarland 1995; Kuno and Takami 2004; Real-Puigdollers 2008; Höche 2009; Sailer 2010) whereas in other works cognate objects are analysed as adjuncts (Zubizarreta 1987; Jones 1988; Moltmann 1989). According to a third approach cognate object constructions are shown to incorporate two types: argument cognate objects and adjunct cognate objects (Pham 1998; Pereltsvaig 1999; Nakajima 2006).

As defined by Radford (2004:3-4), from a semantic point of view, arguments ‘generally represent entities directly involved in the particular action or event described by the predicate’ whereas adjuncts are expressions which serve ‘to provide (optional) additional information about the time or place (or manner, or purpose etc.) of an activity or event’. According to Kroeger (2004:10) the ‘distinction between arguments and adjuncts is important, but not always easy to make. The basic difference is that arguments are closely associated with the meaning of the predicate itself, while adjuncts are not.’ In this section, I attempt to indicate whether the different types of cognate objects count as arguments or adjuncts of the respective verbs. I utilize a number of the standard semantic and syntactic diagnostics that distinguish arguments from adjuncts as found in the literature. The diagnostics employed here include the semantic diagnostics: (i) the core participant test, (ii) existential entailment, (iii) the verb specificity test, and the syntactic diagnostics: (iv) the syntactic obligatoriness test, (v) the iterativity test, and (vi) the relative ordering test. It is observed that the categories belonging under the major class UNBOUNDED cognate objects consistently pattern with adjuncts, whereas the categories belonging under the class BOUNDED cognate objects exhibit varying behaviour with regard to some of the tests. A demonstration of the various tests and the results of applying them on the cognate object types are given in the subsequent paragraphs.
5.2.1. Semantic Diagnostics

5.2.1.1 The Core Participant Test

Among the various semantic tests mentioned in the literature is the core participant test; arguments are participants that qualify as semantically principal for the event to be complete (Dalrymple, 2001; Koenig et al., 2003; Kroeger, 2004). The test relies on speakers’ judgement as to whether or not an element counts as core and is semantically required by the verb. Since it is based on the intuition of a speaker, the test is not used on its own but is frequently used with the other test namely the verb specificity test and/or the syntactic obligatoriness test (Dowty 1982; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Dalrymple 2001; Koenig et al. 2003; Kroeger 2004; Needham and Toivonen 2011; Christie 2013). For example, the event denoted by the verb *kick* as given in the sentence in (1) requires two participants to be complete: an AGENT or a *kicker* and a PATIENT or a *kickee* which are represented respectively by the subject ‘he’ and the object ‘the boy’; without either of the two participants the event of ‘kicking’ cannot be complete. Therefore, these participants are arguments of the verb ‘kick’. In contrast, the phrases ‘so hard’ and ‘yesterday’ which express the manner and the time in which the event occurred are not core elements to complete the event and hence they are adjuncts.

1) He kicked the boy hard yesterday.

The various types of cognate objects vary to whether they are comparable to arguments or adjuncts with respect to the core participant test. Three types of BOUNDED cognate objects are considered to qualify as core elements in the event denoted by the verbs. The first type are the SPECIMEN cognate objects of specific verbs namely those given in the examples given in (2).
2) 

a. šallay=nā šalāt-a l-fajri
   pray.PST=1PL pray.NSDM-ACC the-Dawn
   ‘We prayed the Dawn prayer.’

b. raqaṣat hindun raqs-at-a l-bolkā
   dance.PST Hind dance-TSM-ACC the-Polka
   ‘Hind danced the-Polka dance.’

c. lašib=nā lišb-at-a ḏakā?in
   play.PST=1PL the-play-TSM-ACC intelligence
   ‘We played an intelligence game.’

In (2), the cognate objects šalāta l-fajri ‘the Dawn prayer’, raqsata l-bolkā ‘the Polka dance’ and lišbata ḏakā?in ‘an intelligence game’ represent core participants in the events of ‘praying’, ‘dancing’ and ‘playing’. There cannot be an event of ‘praying’, ‘dancing’ or ‘playing’ without praying a prayer, dancing a dance or playing a game. The second type are the different instances of PRODUCT cognate objects such as the examples given in (3).

3) 

a. ḥalimat hindun ḥulm-an muḵīfan
   dream.PST Hind dream.BM-ACC scary
   ‘Hind dreamed a scary dream’

b. ṭalab=tu ?ḵ=ī ṭalab-an basīṭan
   request.PST=1SG brother=my request.BM-ACC simple
   ‘I requested my brother a simple request.’

c. ẓaḏḏaba l-ʔasrā ẓaḏāb-an ẓadīdan
   torture.PST.3SG the-prisoners torture.NSDM-ACC severe
   ‘He tortured the prisoners with a severe torture.’

d. ẓakad=tu hindan ẓkidmat-an ẓazīmatan
   serve.PST=1SG Hind service.BM-ACC great
   ‘I served Hind a great service.’

In a ‘dreaming’, ‘requesting’, ‘torturing’ or ‘serving’ event, there must be a dream that is being dreamed, a request that is being requested, a torture that is being used in torturing and a service that is being served. Therefore, these cognate
objects are also considered core participants in the event. The same applies to the
PRODUCT cognate objects duṣṭā ‘supplication’, kat? ‘mistake’, ḍanb ‘sin’ which can be
seen as core elements in an event of ‘supplicating’, ‘making a mistake’, or
‘committing a sin’. The third type of BOUNDED cognate objects that are considered
as participants in the event are the cognate objects referred to as QUANTIZED
cognate objects. Examples of these cognate objects are given in (4).

4) 
   a. šaraḵat hindun šark-at-an ṣāliyatan
      scream.PST=1SG Hind scream-TSM -ACC loud
      ‘Hind screamed a loud scream.’
   b. ḍarab=tu hindan ḍarab-at-an
      hit.PST=1SG Hind hit-TSM -ACC
      ‘I hit Hind a hit.’

In an event of ‘hitting’, there is an ACTOR, a RECIPIENT of the hit and the ‘hit’ or
‘hits’ per se which are transferred to the recipient. Also, in an event of ‘screaming’,
there is the ACTOR as well as the ‘scream’ that is screamed. The other set of verbs
whose cognate objects are also considered as representing participants in the event

The other categories of BOUNDED cognate objects namely MANNER cognate objects
such as those given in (5a) and the other EVENT cognate objects such as those given
in (5b) can be compared to adjuncts rather than arguments. They cannot be seen as
core elements in the events of ‘dying’ or ‘sleeping’ but they merely provide
descriptions of the events and that the former occurred in a good manner and that
the latter was deep sleep.

5) 
   a. mātat hindun mītāt-an ḳasanatan
      die.PST Hind die.MNM-ACC good
      ‘Hind died a good death.’
b. nāmat hindun nawm-at-an ʕamīqatan
sleep.PST Hind sleep-TSM-ACC sleep
‘Hind slept a deep sleep.’

Similarly, the different types of UNBOUNDED cognate objects such as the MODIFIED cognate object in (6a), the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object in (6b), and the BARE cognate objects in (6c) are comparable to adjuncts.

6) a. ḍaḥikat hindun ḍaḥik-an mutawāsilan
laugh.PST Hind laugh.BM-ACC constant
‘Hind laughed constant laughing.’

b. yuṣall=ūna ṣalāt-a rasūli=him
pray.PRS=3PL pray.NSDM-ACC prophet=their
‘They pray the praying of their prophet.’

c. ?aḥraja=Īnī ?aḵ=Ī ?iḥrāj-an
embarrass.PST=1SG brother=my embarrass.BM-ACC
‘My brother embarrassed me extremely.’

These cognate objects are not core to the meaning of the verb. The cognate object ḍaḥikan mutawāsilan ‘constant laughing’ provides a description of the verbal event ‘laughing’ and that it is constant. The cognate object ṣalāta rasūlihim ‘the praying of their prophet’ indicates that the verbal event of ‘praying’ is performed by the actors in a way similar to their prophet’s way of praying. The cognate object ?iḥrājan ‘embarrassing’ merely repeats the verbal content and does not introduce a participant in the event.

5.2.1.2 Existential Entailment

The existential entailment is another semantic criterion that distinguishes arguments from adjuncts (Pinker 1989; Macfarland 1994). The test is comparable but not identical to the core participant test. According to this diagnostic, the meaning of an argument is implied in the predicate even if the argument is not
overtly expressed whereas the same does not hold for adjuncts. Pinker illustrates the point with the two sentences below.

7)  
   a. Susan is the sister of Steven
   b. Susan is the sister near the wall

   (Pinker 1989:40)

The noun *sister* implies a relation with a particular person and hence the phrase *of Steven* in (7a) is an argument of *sister* but *sister* does not imply being in a particular place and hence the phrase *near the wall* in (7b) is not an argument.

In the case of cognate objects, Macfarland (1994:101) illustrates this criterion by applying a test where the cognate N is negated. She shows that since the use of the cognate verb entails the existence of the cognate N, the negation results in infelicity as can be seen in the examples in (8).

8)  
   a. ??John laughed but in fact he didn’t laugh
   b. ??John was thinking, but in fact he thought no thoughts

   (Macfarland 1994:102)

Applying this criterion on cognate objects it could be said that the different types of *BOUNDDED* cognate objects, regardless of their interpretation, can be described as being implied in the meaning of the respective cognate verbs. The same does not apply to the types of *UNBOUNDDED* cognate objects. Therefore, it can be observed that when a *BOUNDDED* cognate object is negated, the sentence is completely unacceptable as can be seen in (9), whereas negating the *UNBOUNDDED* cognate object as in (10) is possible and it implies a meaning of negating intensity in performing the event.
9) a. #ḍarab=tu hindan wa lakinn=t fi l-ḥaqqīqati lam ?aḍrib=hā hit.PST=1SG Hind and but=1SG in the-fact not hit.PST=1SG ḍarb-at-an hit-TSM-ACC
‘I hit Hind but in fact I did not hit her a hit.’

b. #ḥalimat hindun wa lakinn=ḥā fi l-ḥaqqīqati lam dream.PST Hind and but=3FSG in the-fact not taḥlum ḥulm-an dream.PRS dream.BM-ACC
‘Hind dreamed but in fact she did not dream a dream.’

c. #mātat hindun wa lakinn=ḥā fi l-ḥaqqīqati lam tamut mīṭat-an die.PST Hind and but=3FSG in the-fact not die.PRS die.MNM-ACC
‘Hind died but in fact she did not die in a manner of death.’

10) rakaḍat hindun wa lakinn=ḥā fi l-ḥaqqīqati lam tarkuḍ rakḍ-an run.PST Hind and but=3FSG in the-fact not run.PST run.BM-ACC
‘lit. Hind ran but in fact she did not ran running= she did not in fact ran intensely.’

5.2.1.3 The Verb Specificity Test

This test posits that arguments are specifically selected by certain verbs or verb classes. For instance, a RECIPIENT argument is restricted to specific but not all verb types e.g. ‘I gave her a book’. Also, an AGENT argument is only possible with volitional verbs as in ‘he walked’. In contrast, adjuncts such as time and location expressions, for instance, can be added to describe any event that a verb denotes (Koenig et al. 2003:73; Needham & Toivonen 2011).

The categories of UNBOUNDED cognate objects as indicated in Chapter 3 are generally not constrained to specific verbs without others. They can be found with a wide range of verbs including unaccusatives, psych-verbs, unergatives, transitives, ditransitives and verbs of different aspectual classes including statives
(see section 3.3). BOUNDED cognate objects, on the other hand, are more constrained in their distribution than the categories of the UNBOUNDEd cognate objects. Nevertheless, a variation is observed among the different categories. For example, KIND and MANNER cognate objects are found with verbs whose subject is [+human] and one which can be seen to take the semantic role of an AGENT or EXPERIENCER. Moreover, PRODUCT cognate objects which express the content of an event are found with specific verbs. EVENT cognate objects are less constrained and can be found with a wide range of predicate types including unaccusatives, unergatives, transitives and ditransitives. In this respect, UNBOUNDEd cognate objects are similar to adjuncts whereas BOUNDEd cognate objects incorporate some categories that are comparable to arguments and other categories that are similar to adjuncts.

5.2.2. Syntactic Diagnostics

5.2.2.1 The Syntactic Obligatoriness Test

The test of syntactic obligatoriness is related to the core participant test and is a very common test in distinguishing arguments from adjuncts (Jackendoff 1990; Dalrymple 2001; Carnie 2002; Kroeger 2004). Arguments are typically obligatory phrases whilst adjuncts are typically optional. Thus, if the NPs ‘Sammy’ and ‘my reputation’ in (11) below are omitted, the sentence is ungrammatical since they are arguments of their verbs, but the adjunct NP ‘last year’ is optional and thus can be omitted.

11) Sammy destroyed my reputation last year
(Example from Needham and Toivonen 2011).

Still, there are arguments that might be optional such as the direct object of the verb ‘eat’ as shown in (12a). Also, there are elements that are considered adjuncts which are obligatory such as the adverb in (12b). Therefore, the diagnostic of
syntactic obligatoriness needs to be used in conjunction with other tests such as the core participant test represented above.

12) 
   a. She ate (an apple)  
   b. He treated her *(badly)

As for cognate objects, the general characteristic of the various categories is that they are optional as can be seen in (19) for BOUNDED cognate objects and in (20) for UNBOUNDED cognate objects. Accordingly, they pattern with adjuncts in this respect.

13) 
   a. māta (mītat-an ḥasanatan)  
      die.PST.3SG die.MNM-ACC good  
      ‘He died a good death.’
   b. šall=ū (ṣalāt-a l-ṣīdi)  
      pray.PST=3PL pray.NSDM-ACC the-Eid  
      ‘They had prayed the Eid prayer.’
   c. ḍahikat hindun (ḍīḥk-at-an ṣāliyatan)  
      laugh.PST Hind laugh-TSM-ACC loud  
      ‘Hind laughed a loud laugh.’
   d. ḍaraba r-rajulu l-ḵaṣma (ḍarb-at-an wāḥidatan)  
      hit.PST the man the-opponent hit-TSM-ACC one  
      ‘The man hit the opponent one hit’

14) 
   a. ḍahikat hindun ḍahik-an mutawāṣilan  
      laugh.PST Hind laugh.BM-ACC constant  
      ‘Hind laughed constantly.’

   b. yamšī l-jund-u (mašy-a qā?idi=him)  
      walk.PRS the soldiers-NOM walk.BM-ACC leader=their  
      ‘The soldiers walk the walking of their leader’
Nevertheless, some instances of bounded cognate objects when omitted yield ungrammatical structures. This is observed as can be seen in the sentences in (21).

15)

a. ḩāšat hindun *(ṭišat-a l-mulūki)
   live.PST Hind live.MNM-ACC the-kings
   ‘Hind lived the life of kings.’

b. ḥalimat hindun *(ḥulman ḡarīban)
   dream.PST Hind dream.BM-ACC strange
   ‘Hind dreamed a strange dream.’

c. ṭalabat hindun ?abī=ḥā *(ṭalab-an basīṭan)
   request.PST Hind father=her request.BM-ACC simple
   ‘Hind requested her father a simple request.’

d. faṣalat/ʿamilat hindun *(ʔaʃl-aʔaʃmāl-a Ḳayrin)
   do.PST Hind do.BM.PL-ACC goodness
   ‘Hind did deeds of goodness.’

e. qarrarat hindun *(qarār-an Ḫakīman)
   decide.PST Hind decide.BM-ACC wise
   ‘Hind decided a wise decision.’

Note that this syntactic obligatoriness is observed with the cognate objects of the set of verbs that are not possible to stand alone in the first place as shown in Chapter 3 (see section 3.3). The cognate objects are shown to be semantically related and are in complimentary distribution with the verbs obligatory non-cognate direct objects, complements or even adjuncts. The verbs faṣala ‘do’ and ḩāša ‘live’ take an obligatory direct object; ḩāša ‘live’ can also be associated by an obligatory adjunct. The verbs ḥalima ‘dream’, ṭalaba ‘request’ and qarrara ‘decide’ take clausal complements. Therefore, the syntactic obligatoriness need be used with other tests before determining whether a cognate object counts or does not count as an argument of the verb.
5.2.2.2 The Iterativity Test

According to this test, also referred to as the uniqueness test, an argument in contrast to an adjunct cannot be iterated (Bresnan 1982; Pollard and Sag 1987; Dalrymple 2001; Zaenen & Crouch 2009; Needham & Toivonen 2011). For example, the position of the object argument cannot be occupied by more than one phrase as can be seen in (16), whereas a number of adjuncts can be iterated as can be seen in (17), (example (17b) from Bresnan 1982:164).

16) a. *He ate an apple a pizza
   b. *She read a book a story

17) a. She ate the pizza in her room on the sofa

Note that the adjuncts can be of the same or different semantic roles, whereas in the case of arguments if two phrases are iterated, they must be of different semantic roles as in the case of double object constructions. As for cognate objects, iteration is impossible in the case of BOUNDED cognate objects, examples are given in (18), whereas with UNBOUNDED cognate objects it is possible to construct examples with a sequence of two cognate objects as can be seen in (19).

18) a. *raqaṣ=tu raqṣ-at-an raqṣ-at-a l-bolkā¹
dance.PST=1SG dance-TSM-ACC dance-TSM-ACC the-Polka
   ‘I danced a dance the Polka dance.’

¹ The sentence is acceptable where there is a pause after the first cognate object and the second cognate object is thus an appositive.
b. *ṭalab=tu=hu ṭ-ṭalab-a nafsa=hu
request.PST=1SG=3SG the-request.BM-ACC same=3SG
ṭalab-an basītan
request.BM-ACC simple
‘I requested him the same request a simple request.’

c. *mašat hindun mašy-at-a l-qamari mašy-at-an sarīṣatan
walk.PST Hind walk.TSM-ACC the-Moon walk.TSM-ACC quick
‘Hind walked the Moon walk a quick walk.’

19)

a. istaqaql=na=hum ṭalāṭat-a istiqbālāt-in istiqbāl-an
receive.PST=1PL=3PL three-ACC receive.BM-GEN receive.BM-ACC rasmiyyan
formal
‘We received them three times in a formal way.’

b. hajam=ū ṣalay=him hujūm-a baššār ṣalā sūriyyā
attack.PST=3PL on=them attack.BM-ACC Bashshaar on Syria
hujūm-an mubāqītan
attack.BM-ACC sudden
‘They attacked them suddenly in a way similar to Baššār’s attacking of Syria.’

In (19a) there is a quantifying cognate object that counts event times plus a
cognate object that provides a description of the manner of the event. In (19b), the
two cognate objects provide descriptions of the manner of the event. Therefore,
according to this test, BOUNDED cognate objects are similar to arguments whereas
UNBOUNDED cognate objects behave like adjuncts.

5.2.2.3 The Relative Ordering Test

According to this test, arguments differ from adjuncts in that they have a
relatively more fixed position than adjuncts; adjuncts typically follow arguments
(Pollard & Sag 1987; Dalrymple 2001) as can be seen in the examples in (20) (taken

2 The sentence would be grammatical if the second cognate object is the
corresponding UNBOUNDED cognate object i.e. mašy an sarīṣan ‘quick walking’ ('lit.
walk.BM quick').
from Pollard & Sag 1987:258–9). For example, the PP ‘on the skydivers’ is an argument of the verb ‘blame’ but the PP ‘without checking the facts’ is an adjunct. Therefore, changing the position of the argument of the verb results in the ungrammaticality of the structure as indicated in (20b).

20)  
a. The authorities blamed the arson on the skydivers without checking the facts.
b. *The authorities blamed the arson without checking the facts on the skydivers.

As for cognate objects, it can be indicated that where there is a sequence of two cognate objects as given in the sentences in (21), the BOUNDED cognate object i.e. raqṣata l-bolkā ‘the Polka dance’ and mašyata l-qamari ‘the Moon walk’ occur first followed by the UNBOUNDED cognate object.

21)  
a. tarquṣu hindun raqṣ-at-a l-bolkā raqṣa-an mutqanan  
dance.PRS Hind dance-TSM-ACC the-Polka dance.BM-ACC perfect  
‘Hind dances the Polka dance perfectly.’
b. mašat hindun mašy-at-a l-qamari mašy-an sariḥan  
walk.PST Hind walk-TSM-ACC the-Moon walk.BM-ACC quick  
‘Hind walked the Moon walk in a quick way.’

In the case of a sequence of two UNBOUNDED cognate objects, alternation of order is possible as can be seen in (22) where there is a sequence of a MODIFIED cognate object and CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object. The test is not applicable to BARE cognate objects as they do not occur in a sequence with another cognate object. Therefore, BOUNDED cognate objects qualify as arguments whereas UNBOUNDED cognate objects qualify as adjuncts according to this test.

22) hajam=ū ʕalay=him hujūm-an  muβāgitan  
attack.PST=3PL on=them attack.BM-ACC sudden  
hujūm-a baššār ʕalā sūriyyā  
attack.BM-ACC Bashshaar on Syria
‘They attacked them suddenly Bashshaar’s attacking of Syria.’

5.2.3. Results

The above section is set out to answer the question frequently asked in the literature namely whether cognate objects qualify as arguments or adjuncts of the verb. I have utilized six semantic and syntactic tests of the standard tests that are found in the literature on the theoretical argument-adjunct distinction. These semantic and syntactic tests include the core participant test, existential entailment, the verb specificity test, the syntactic obligatoriness test, the iterativity test and the relative ordering test. Table 5.1 summarizes the results of applying the tests on the different categories of cognate objects.

Table 5.1 Behaviour of Cognate Object Types with Respect to Argument-Adjunct Diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNBOUND Cognate objects</th>
<th>BOUNDED Cognate objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bare Cos</td>
<td>Modified CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Core Participant Test</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Entailment</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb Specificity Test</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Syntactic Obligatoriness Test</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Iterativity Test</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Relative Ordering Test</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the table, the categories of UNBOUNDED cognate objects do not exhibit any of the argumenthood properties in any of the tests utilized. Rather, they overwhelmingly pattern with adjuncts, in the six tests in the case of the two categories namely the MODIFIED cognate object and the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object and in four tests in the case of the BARE cognate objects. The iterativity and the relative ordering tests are not applicable on the BARE cognate objects as they do not allow co-occurrence with another cognate object whereas the tests are applied to sentences where there is a sequence of two cognate objects. Given that the categories of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects pattern with adjuncts with respect to the different tests, I thus analyse them as adjuncts which vary still vary in other aspects as will be indicated in sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the present chapter as well as in the next chapter.

As for the BOUNDED cognate objects, the tests sometimes show varying results with some of the categories. The three tests in which the categories of BOUNDED cognate objects show similar results namely where the BOUNDED cognate objects exhibit similar behaviour to arguments include the existential entailment test, the iterativity test and the relative ordering test. As for the core participant test, which is based on speakers’ judgements, the cognate objects of some verbs are shown to pattern with arguments whilst other cognate objects are compared to adjuncts. The set of cognate objects which are indicated to qualify as core participants include (i) the SPECIMEN cognate objects of the verbs ṣallā ‘pray’, raqaṣa ‘dance’, and laṣiba ‘play’; (ii) the PRODUCT cognate objects of the verbs ḥalima ‘dream’, ṭalaba ‘request’, ṣaḍḍaba ‘torture’, ḳadama ‘serve’, daṣṭā ‘supplicate’, ḥaḳṭa ‘make a mistake’, ṣaḍdanb ‘commit a sin’; (iii) the QUANTIZED cognate objects of the verbs ḍaraba ‘hit’, rakala ‘kick’, ṭaraqa ‘knock’, qabbala ‘kiss’, saḏala ‘cough’, ṣaɾaṣa ‘scream’ tanahhada ‘sigh’. On the other hand, the set cognate objects that are not considered
as participants in the event include the MANNER cognate objects as well as the EVENT cognate objects of other verbs such as nāma ‘sleep’, mašā ‘walk’, waqafa ‘stand’. According to the verb specificity test, slightly different results are obtained. The set of cognate objects that are shown to be restricted to specific verb types are SPECIMEN cognate objects, PRODUCT cognate objects and MANNER cognate objects and hence they are similar to arguments. EVENT cognate objects, on the other hand, are comparable to adjuncts in that they are found with a wider range of verb types. Nevertheless, as will be seen in the subsequent section on the (non-)referentiality related properties of the cognate object NPs that the subcategories of EVENT cognate objects actually vary with respect to the types of verbs with which they can be found and that referential event cognate objects are in fact tied to specific verb types but not others. Lastly, the syntactic obligatoriness test does not indicate similar results among the categories of the BOUNDED cognate objects. The general case is that the categories of BOUNDED cognate objects are optional as is the case with the UNBOUNDED cognate objects. The instances that exhibit syntactic obligatoriness are in fact the few instances of cognate objects whose verbs are shown not to stand alone i.e. they obligatorily occur with a cognate object or with a non-cognate phrase which can even be a clausal complement or a manner adverbial as in the case of the verb ʕāša ‘live’. Therefore, as indicated earlier the optionality of the cognate object cannot be determinant of their adjunct status as there are arguments that can also be optional and adjuncts that can be obligatory.

Given this variation in the results obtained from applying the tests on BOUNDED cognate objects, it can still be pointed out that the results indicate that they are not adjuncts of the verb. Furthermore, it can be said that the theoretical argument-adjunct analysis alone cannot be sufficient in accounting for the varying behaviour and properties of the categories of BOUNDED cognate objects as which are
demonstrated in Chapter 4. Therefore, in the subsequent section, I investigate the properties of the cognate object categories with respect to the concept of referentiality and whether the different categories of cognate objects are referential, non-referential, or more specifically predicative NPs.

5.3. Referential or Non-Referential NPs

The other semantic aspect of cognate objects which needs be investigated relates to the other recurrent question in the literature on cognate objects namely whether cognate objects are referential or non-referential NPs (see Chapter 1). According to Massam (1990), Macfarland (1995) and Sailer (2010) cognate objects are referential NPs. In another view such as Mittwoch (1998) cognate objects are non-referential NPs as they exhibit properties of predicative NPs, which are non-referential NPs. Yet, in other works, like Pereltsviag (1999b, 2002), Matsumoto (1996), Puigdollers (2008), Kim & Lim (2012), cognate objects are shown to be of two types: referential and non-referential cognate object NPs. In this section, I investigate the (non-)referentiality of the different types of cognate object NPs in Arabic as classified in Chapter 3 by utilizing a number of the tests found in the literature which characterize referential NPs as distinct from non-referential NPs. It is found that in Arabic, there are two types of cognate objects with respect the referentiality or not of the NP: referential and non-referential cognate objects. In the subsequent sections, I give an overview of the (non-)referentiality related properties followed by the characterization of the various types of cognate objects with respect to (non-)referentiality related properties.

Matsumoto (1996) points out to the same problem with the argument-adjunct distinction in analysing cognate objects in English and Japanese.
5.3.1. (Non-)Referentiality Related Properties

According to Cinque (1990), referential NPs are associated with a presupposed existence. In a more general definition by Huddelston & Pullum (2002:399), referentiality of a NP or saying that the NP has a referent means that ‘by using it on a given occasion, a speaker intends it to pick out some independently distinguishable entity, or set of entities, in the real world (or in some fictional world)’. Non-referential NPs, on the other hand, are not associated with a presupposed existence and they are not independent distinguishable entities. In the literature there are a number of properties that characterise referential NPs such as the NP in (23a) and distinguish them from non-referential NPs such as the example in (23b) or from one specific type of NPs which also qualify as non-referential NPs namely predicative NPs such as the example in (23c).

23)
   a. Rose hit the ball  
      (Massam 1990)
   b. Kim collected sand.  
      (Kim & Lim 2012:11)
   c. Champagne is a wine.  
      (Massam 1990:169)

The tests that are utilized here relate to the properties and the behaviour of the NPs with respect to pronominalization, question formation, scope and determiners as demonstrated below.

5.3.1.1 Pronominalization

One of the properties of referential NPs that are frequently indicated in the literature relates to their behaviour with respect to pronominalization.\(^4\) Referential

\(^4\) Note that the test of pronominalization is also utilized in Chapter 4. It is used to indicate differences between the ORDINARY OBJECT and the other types of cognate objects. In Chapter 4, focus is mostly on one type of pronominalization namely the...
NPs can easily be referred to with a pronominal in a later sentence (see Doron 1988; Cinque 1990; Massam 1990; Ross 1995; Borer 1994; Macfarland 1995; Aoun et al 2010). Non-referential NPs including predicative NPs, on the other hand, are constrained with respect to pronominalization. The examples in (24) and (25) illustrate this distinction between referential and non-referential NPs.

24)

a. Rose hit the ball. The dog caught it and chewed it up.  
   (Massam 1990:168)

b. Kim collected some sand and it was very clean  
   (Kim & Lim 2012:12)

25)

a. *Kim collected sand and it was very clean  
   (Kim & Lim 2012:11)

b. *John, Daniel, and Morris have all three been president of the club. He is always a distinguished member of the community  
   (Doron 1988:284).

c. *Being computer freaks in the Sahara is a drag. They have to travel so far to be able to buy memory chips  
   (Ross 1995:4) 5

In the examples in (24) the ordinary objects ‘the ball’ and ‘some sand’ are referential NPs and hence they can be easily referred to with the pronoun ‘it’. In (25), the bare NP ‘sand’ and the predicative NPs ‘president of the club’ and ‘computer freaks’ are non-referential NPs and hence they cannot be an antecedent of a pronoun.

 inbound pronominalization i.e. the use of a pronoun in the object position as this is the type which exhibits similarity to or distinction from the ORDINARY OBJECT. In this chapter, the test of pronominalization is used to determine the referentiality or not of the cognate object NP and it is not constrained to inbound pronominalization but it more generally indicate whether a cognate object can be an antecedent of a pronoun whether or not the pronominalization is in an object position and not merely in the object position.

5 Ross (1995) refer to referential NPs as purebred NPs and NPs that exhibit less referentiality properties as defective NPs.
5.3.1.2 Question Formation

The type of interrogative that can be used in questioning a NP is sometimes used in the literature as evidence for the referentiality or non-referentiality of the respective NP (Aoun et al 2010). According to Aoun et al (2010), the wh-phrase *man* ‘who’ and ?*ayy* NP are referential NPs which require that the answer has a specific referent. In the example below with the interrogative ?*ayy* ‘which’, the NP in (26b) is a felicitous answer because it is a referential NP that refers to specific patients namely those in the next room. However, the NP in (26c) is not a felicitous answer because it does not refer to distinguishable or unique patients.

26)  
   a. ?*ayy* marḍā zārat=hum Nada whi  
      which patients visit.PST=3PL Nada  
      ‘Which patients did Nada visit?’
   b. al-marḍā fī l-ḡurfati l-mujāwirati  
      the-patients in the-room the-next  
      ‘The patients in the next room’  
   c. #marḍā fī ḥālatin ḥarijatin  
      patients in state serious  
      ‘Patients in a serious state.’

5.3.1.3 Topicalization

According to Aoun et al (2010) and Frod (n.d.), topicalization is a syntactic process which involves dislocating an element to the left periphery. The topicalized element must be a definite NP that refers to a specific entity and it occurs as

---

6 Having said that, one necessary distinction can be pointed out between two types of questions that both begin with ?*ayy* NP. Only one of the two types can be used as a diagnostic of referentiality. The two types are equivalent to ‘which?’ and ‘what kind of’ in English. While the former can be related to a gap and a resumptive pronoun, the later can only be related to a gap. The first type is the one that can be considered indicative of a NP referentiality.

7 Note that since cognate objects are non-human, only the test of questioning with ?*ayy* ‘which’ is applicable.
nominative-case marked as can be seen for the topicalized direct object in the following example.

27)  
   a. muḥammad wajada l-kitāb-a  
   b. al-kitāb-u wajada=hu muḥammad  
   c. *kitāb-un wajada=hu muḥammad

   (Ford n.d.:5)

The test is particularly useful in distinguishing cognate NPs that are grammatically definite i.e. when they are found with the definite article for instance but ones which are not semantically definite or referential NPs i.e. they are not identifiable entities.

5.3.1.4 Determiners

One specific test that distinguishes referential NPs from one type of non-referential NPs, namely predicative NPs, is related to determiners. Referential NPs can be found with the full range of determiners but predicative NPs are restricted in this respect (Doron 1988; Massam 1990; Ross 1995; Mittwoch 1998). For example, in (28), the direct object ‘pudding’ is a referential NP. It can occur with quantifiers, the demonstrative pronoun, the possessive pronoun and the definite article. In contrast, the predicative NPs in (29) cannot be modified by the different determiners.

28)  
   a. Fred ate every pudding in the house  

   (Massam, 1990:169)
   
   b. Fred ate [the/that/some/Sara’s] pudding  
   c. Fred ate [all/most of] the pudding

29)  
   a. *Chrisanne is/They are/every member of the club.

   (Doron 1988:297)
b. Libby is/They are/many women that I met that day.  
(Massam 1990:168)

c. *My cousins are not yet [the / these / some / Ann’s] drunkards.  
(Ross 1995:4)

Related to this restriction on determiners is the property of predicative NPs pointed out by (McCawley 1988) namely that predicative NPs cannot have a wide scope i.e. specific reading (qtd. in Massam 1990). However, referential NPs can have a wide scope reading. The examples in (30) and (36) illustrate this distinction.

30)  
a. Champagne is a wine.  
b. (*There is a wine such that Champagne is this wine.)  
(Massam 1990:169)

31) A broken cup was found in the cupboard. It was Sara who broke that cup.

The NP ‘a wine’ in (32a) is a predicative NP and hence referring to it by the determined NP ‘that cup’ which picks out a specific instance of wine results in the ungrammaticality of the structure in (32b). In contrast, the NP ‘a broken cup’ in (33) refers to a distinguishable entity and hence can be referred to with the determined NP ‘that cup’.

5.3.1.5 Scope Ambiguities

Another distinction between referential NPs and predicative NPs is that the former can give rise to scope ambiguities whereas predicative NPs need be interpreted in situ (see Williams 1994; Mittwoch 1998; Fox 1999). Mittwoch (1998:324-5) demonstrates the distinction by the two sentences in (32) and in (33) which involve the referential quantifying adverbial NP with ‘time’ and the corresponding quantifying cognate objects which she analyses them as predicative NPs.
32)  
   a. ha-rofe biker xole yapani 6 pe’amim  
      the-doctor visited patient Japanese 6 times  
      ‘The doctor visited a Japanese patient 6 times.’  
   b. ha-rofe biker xole yapani 6 bikurim  
      the-doctor visited patient Japanese 6 visits  
      ‘The doctor visited a Japanese patient 6 visits.’

33)  
   a. A student giggled 3 times in my lecture today  
   b. A student giggled / gave 3 giggles in my lecture today.

Mittwoch (1998:324) demonstrates that while the quantifying adverbials in the given sentences can be ambiguous between two readings; only one interpretation is plausible in the case of the quantifying cognate object. The time expressions in (32a) and (33a) can be distributed over different individuals and hence more than one Japanese patient or student are involved (a wide scope reading); alternatively, the event merely involves the same participant in the different times when the action takes place (a narrow scope reading). In contrast, only the narrow reading is implied in the sentences with the cognate objects in (32b) and (33b).

5.3.1.6 Relation with a Clausal Subject

One aspect of some predicative NPs as indicated by Mirto (2007) is related to the relation that holds between the predicative NP and the subject in the clause. Mirto (2007) demonstrates that in constructions with a support verb such as the light verb construction in The two boxers had a fight, the post-verbal NP assigns the subject the two boxers ‘both a syntactic role and a related thematic role that appear fully comparable to those’ in the corresponding construction i.e. the two boxers fought (123). The post-verbal NP is a predicate and the subject is considered its argument. Therefore, in a sentence such as she gave him a kiss, the interpretation can only be as she is the one who kisses.
5.3.2. Referential and Non-Referential Cognate Objects in MSA

The application of the tests on the types of cognate objects reveal that there are cognate objects that exhibit referentiality related properties with variations in the extent to which they conform to referential NPs and hence they are described as referential NPs. These are some of the cognate objects that fall under the class BOUNDED cognate objects. In contrast, there are other cognate objects that do not exhibit any of the referentiality related properties and are hence described as non-referential NPs. These are the different categories of cognate objects that fall under the class UNBOUNDED cognate objects as well as some of the categories that belong under BOUNDED cognate objects. Therefore, while all UNBOUNDED cognate objects are non-referential NPs, BOUNDED cognate objects can be referential or non-referential NPs. Moreover, of the non-referential cognate objects, there are categories that are specifically similar to predicative NPs. In the below sections I provide a demonstration of the referential, non-referential or predicative nature of the different categories of cognate objects starting with UNBOUNDED cognate objects which exhibit comparable behaviour followed by the categories of BOUNDED cognate objects which exhibit varied behaviour.

5.3.2.1 UNBOUNDED cognate objects

The different categories of UNBOUNDED cognate objects namely the MODIFIED cognate object, the BARE cognate object and the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object such as the examples given in (34) can be described as non-referential NPs; they do not exhibit any of the aspects characteristic of referential NPs.

34)  
a. ḍaḥikat hindun ḍaḥik-an mutawāṣīlan
   laugh.PST Hind  laugh.BM-ACC constant
   ‘Hind laughed constantly.’

   MODIFIED cognate object
b. ?abdaʕat at-țâlibāt-u ?ibdās-an
   act.outstandingly.PST the-students act.outstandingly.BM-ACC
   ‘The students acted extremely outstandingly.’
   BARE cognate object

c. yamš=ūna maš-a š-suʃʕāni
   walk.PRS=3PL walk.BM-ACC the-courageous
   ‘They walk the walking of the courageous.’
   CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object

UNBOUNDED cognate objects cannot be referred to with a pronoun in a later sentence whether in a cognate object position (inbound pronominalization) or in a different position (outbound pronominalization) as can be seen in the examples in (35) and in (36) respectively.

35) INBOUND
a. *samiʕ=tu=ha taɗḥaku=hu qabala qalīl
   hear.PST=1SG=3FSG laugh.PST=3SG before awhile
   ‘I heard her laughing it a while ago.’

b. *laqad ?abdaʕat=hu t-țâlibāt-u fi barnāmaji
   EMPH.PRT act.outstandingly.PST=3SG the-students in program
   l-?usbūʃi l-mādišt
   the-week the-last
   ‘lit. The students acted outstandingly it in the program of the last week.’

c. *laqad raʔay=tu=hum yamš=ūna=hu laylata l-bārihati
   EMPH.PRT see.PST=1SG=3PL walk.PRS=3PL=3SG the-night yesterday
   ‘I saw them walking it yesterday night.’

36) OUTBOUND
   PRE-fortunately that=3SG not be.PST loud or annoying
   ‘Fortunately it was not loud or annoying.’

b. *wa bi-sababi=ḥi tam ikṭiyāru=hum li-l-barnāmaji
   and PRE-reason=3SG have.been choosen=3PL for-the-program
   t-ṭālišt
   the-next
c. *laqad ʕ<ur>i>f=ū bi=hi
   EMPH.PRT <PASS>know.PST=3PL PRE=3SG
   ‘They were known for it.’

Also, UBONDED cognate objects cannot be an answer to a question with the interrogative ?ayy ‘which’. This interrogative phrase requires that the answer has a unique distinguishable reference whereas this property does not hold for the cognate objects ḏāhikan mutawāšilān ‘constant laughing’, ?ibdāʕan ‘acting outstandingly’ and mašya ści-suʃānī in (37), (38), and (39) respectively.

37) a. *?ayya ḏāḥik-in ḏāḥikat=hu hindun
   which laugh.BM-GEN laugh.PST.3SG Hind
   ‘Which laughing did Hind laugh?’

b. *ḍāḥikat ḏāḥik-an mutawāšilān
   laugh.PST.3SG laugh.BM-ACC constant
   ‘She laughed constant laughing’

38) a. *?ayya ?ibdāʕ-in ?ibdāʕat=hu
   which act.outstandingly.BM-GEN act.outstandingly.PST=3SG
   ṭ-ṭalibātu
   the-students
   ‘Which outstanding acting did the students act outstandingly?’

b. *?abdaʃa=na ?ibdāʕ-an
   act.outstandingly.PST=3FPL act.outstandingly.BM-ACC
   ‘They acted extremely outstandingly.’

39) a. *?ayya maʃy-in yamšiya=hu ʃ-junūdu
   which walk.BM-GEN walk.PRS=3SG the-soldiers
   ‘Which walking do the soldiers walk?’

b. *yamʃ=ʊna maʃy-a ści-suʃānī
   walk.PRS=3PL walk.BM-ACC the-courageous
   ‘They walk the walking of the courageous.’

---
8 Note that a question with ?ayy NP that is equivalent to ‘what kind of’ can be formed with the respective verb; nevertheless, the UNBONDED cognate objects are not felicitous answers.
UNBOUNDED cognate objects do not allow topicalization, even when the NPs are grammatically definite NPs i.e. involve the definite article as can be seen in the example in (40).9

40) mašy-u š-šuʃšāni yamšiya=hu l-junūdu
   walk.BM-NOM the-courageous walk.PRS=3SG the-soldiers
   ‘The walking of the courageous, the soldiers walk it.’

UNBOUNDED cognate objects involve restrictions on determiners. As indicated in Chapter 3, the categories of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects are restricted in terms of their structural pattern. The BARE cognate object is by definition an indefinite bare NP i.e. one with no dependents. The test is not applicable to the construct state cognate object since a NP occurring as a construct state in general does not allow the addition of determiners. As for the MODIFIED cognate object, it occurs as an indefinite NP associated with an adjective or quantified with a cardinal; it does not occur with the full range of determiners which can be found with referential NPs as can be indicated by the example given in (41).

41)  
   a. *daḥikat hindun baʃ-d-a  qa-daḥik-i/ kullla
      laugh.PST Hind some-ACC the-laugh.BM-GEN all
      qa-daḥiki/ daḥik-a=ha l-mutawāšila
      the-laugh.BM-GEN laugh.BM-ACC=her the-constant
      ‘Hind laughed some laughing/ all the laughing/ her constant laughing.’
   b. *zur=tu  ṣadīqat=ī kull-a  ziyārat-in ṭalabat=hā
      visit.PST=1SG friend=my every-ACC visit.BM-GEN request.PST.3FSG
      min=nī
      from=me
      ‘I visited my friend every visit that she requested from me.’

9 Note that construct state NPs in general are described grammatically as definite or indefinite on the basis of the second element in the construct state i.e. whether it is found with the definite article or it is a proper noun.
UNBOUNDED cognate objects cannot have a wide scope reading as can be indicated by the ungrammatical structures in (42) where the UNBOUNDED cognate objects given in (34) are referred to by a determined cognate NP which requires its antecedent to be specific and distinguishable.

42)

a. *?annamā jaʕalat taḏḥaku ḍalika d-ḍaḥik-a
   EMPH.PRT keep.PST.3SG laugh.PST.3SG that the-laugh.BM-ACC
   ?aṭnā?a d-darsi
during the-lesson
   ‘She kept on laughing that laughing during the lesson.’

b. *laqad ?abdaʕ=na ḍalika
   EMPH.PRT act.outstandingly.PST=3FPL that
   l-ʔibdaʕ-a fi barnāmaji l-usbūfi l-māḏī
   the.act.outstandingly.BM-ACC in program the-week the-last
   ‘lit. The students acted outstandingly that outstanding acting in the program of the last week.’

c. *laqad raʔay=tu=hum yamš=ũna ḍalika l-mašy-a laylata
   EMPH.PRT see.PST=1SG=3PL walk.PRS=3PL that the-night
   l-bāriḥati yesterday
   ‘I saw them walking that walking yesterday night.’

Also, the MODIFIED cognate object that occur quantified cannot, like predicative NPs, give rise to scope ambiguities and must be interpreted in situ in contrast with the case of the corresponding quantifying adverbial NP with marrat ‘time’ which is a referential NP.

43)

a. zur=tu šaḍiʔatan ʕalājtā marrātīn
   visit.PST=1PL friend three times
   ‘I visited a friend three times.’

b. zur=tu šaḍiʔatan ʕalāt-a ziɣār-āt-in
   visit.PST=1PL friend three-ACC visit.BM-PL-GEN
   ‘I visited a friend three visits.’
In (43a), the sentence is ambiguous between two readings. There is the wide scope reading in which there can be more than one friend who was visited or the narrow scope reading where only one friend is involved. In the sentence with the cognate object in (43b), there is no ambiguity in the meaning of the sentence and it is the same friend that was visited in the three visits.

The last aspect which the types of the unbounded cognate objects can be said to show affinity with predicative NPs is that the implied subject in these cognate objects is the same as that of the main clause as can be observed in the examples in (44).

44)
   a. ḍaḥikat hind ḍaḥik-an mutawāšilan
      laugh.PST Hind laugh.BM-ACC constant
      ‘Hind laughed constantly.’
      MODIFIED cognate object
   b. ?abdašati it-tālib-u ?ibdāš-an
      act.outstandingly.PST the-students act.outstandingly.BM-ACC
      ‘The students acted extremely outstandingly.’
      BARE cognate object

The same does not apply to all categories of the construct state cognate objects, which by definition involve participants that are different from the participants in the main clause. As indicated in Chapter 3, the NPs representing the participants can be referential or non-referential NPs as can be seen in (45a) and in (45b) respectively.

45)
   a. yamṣ=ōna mašy-a qā?idi=him
      walk.PRS=3PL walk.BM-ACC leader=their
      ‘They walk in the way of their leader’s walking.’
   b. yamṣ=ōna mašy-a l-ṣujšān
      walk.PRS=3PL walk.BM-ACC the-courageous
      ‘They walk the walking of the courageous.’
In the former case, such as in the example in (45a), the cognate object cannot be described as sharing the same subject of the verb since the participant qāʾid ‘leader’ refers to a specific leader and no single event can be carried out by two participants. In the second case the participant in the cognate object is represented by a non-referential NP i.e. l-šuṣān ‘the-courageous’ which does not refer to specific courageous people, it could still be said that there is a relation between the cognate object and the clausal subject. It is the subject of the clause that undertakes the event of walking in the manner of the courageous people. This can further be supported by the fact that the type of the cognate object in (45b) is used in situations when the property denoted by the derived noun šuṣān ‘courageous.people’ also holds for the participant representing the subject of the clause. A similar case can also be indicated here which relates to the relation between the cognate object and the internal argument of the main verb as can be seen in (46).

46) yastaqbil=ōna=hum ʿistiqbāl-a ʿl-ʔabtāli
   receive.PRS=3PL=3PL receive.BM-ACC the-heros
   ‘They receive them in the manner of how heros are received.’

In one interesting case as in the corpus example in (47), the cognate object shares the verb its obligatory oblique internal argument li-ʔaṣḏāʔi=ḥā ‘to-enemies=its’. The occurrence of the verb or the cognate object without the oblique argument results in ungrammaticality.

47) ?inna haḍa it-taṭarrufa … yusallimu ʿl-qaḍiyyatā
   PRT this the-extremism deliver.PRS.3SG the-issue
   l-filistinyyati ʿtaslim-a muftāḥ-in
   the-Palestinian deliver.BM-ACC key-GEN
   li-ʔaṣḏāʔi=ḥā
   to-enemies.GEN=her
   ‘This extremism delivers the Palestinian issue just as the delivering of a key to its enemies.’
As has been seen, UNBOUNDED cognate objects do not exhibit properties of referential NPs and they exhibit properties of predicative NPs in that they cannot have wide scope and that in the case of the MODIFIED cognate object, restrictions on determiners are involved. Therefore, UNBOUNDED cognate objects can be described as non-referential NPs.

5.3.2.2 BOUNDED cognate objects

Bounded cognate objects exhibit heterogeneous nature. There are categories that can be described as referential NPs and other categories that can be described as non-referential NPs. Also, of the non-referential NPs, there are types that are similar to predicative NPs. A demonstration of the different cases is given below.

The first type of BOUNDED cognate objects that can be described as referential NPs are those cognate objects referred to as SPECIMEN cognate objects. Examples of these cognate objects include the following.

48)  
a. raqaṣt hindun raqṣ-at-a l-bolkā  
dance.PST=3FSG Hind dance-TSM-ACC the-Polka  
‘Hind danced the Polka dance.’

b. mašat firqatu l-jawnati mašy-at-a l-qamari  
walk.PST band the-Jawnah walk-TSM-NOM the-Moon  
bi-mahāratin  
with-skillfulness  
‘The Jawna band walked the Moon walk successfully.’

These cognate objects can be referred to with a pronoun in a later sentence whether in the cognate object position (inbound pronominalization) or in a different position (outbound pronominalization) as can be seen in (49) and in (50) respectively.
49) INBOUND
   a. ra?ay=tu=hā  tarqṣu=hā  fi ḥaflati l-bāriḥati
      see.PST=1SG=3FSG  dance.PRS=3FSG  in party  the-yesterday
      ‘I saw her dancing it in the yesterday party.’
   b. laqad  maša=w=hā  bi-mahāratin
      EMPH.PRT  walk.PST=3PL=3FSG  with-skillfulness
      ‘They walked it skillfully.’

50) OUTBOUND
   a. qālat  ?anna=hā  tadarrabat  ʕalay=hā  kaṭīran
      say.PST.3FSG  that=3FSG  practice.PST.3FSG  PRE=3FSG  a lot
      ‘She said that she practiced it alot.’
   b. laqad  tadarrab=ū  ʕalay=hā  kaṭīran
      EMPH.PRT  practice.PST=3PL  PRE=3FSG  a lot
      ‘They practiced it alot.’

   The pronoun hā ‘3FSG’ in the sentences in (49) and (50) refers to the SPECIMEN cognate objects raqṣata l-bolkā ‘the Polka dance’ in (48a) and mašyata l-qamari ‘the Moon walk’ in (48b).  

   Also, SPECIMEN cognate objects are felicitous answers for questions with the interrogative NP ?ayy ‘which’ as can be seen in the examples below. The cognate objects in (51b) and (52b) refer to a specimen which can be seen as a member of a presupposed set of specimens of dances and specimens of walks.

51)
   a. ?ayya  raqṣ-at-in  raqṣat=ha  hindun
      which  dance-TSM-GEN  dance.PRS=3FSG  Hind
      ‘Which dance did Hind dance?’
   b. raqṣ-at-a  l-bolkā
      dance-TSM-ACC  the-Polka
      ‘The Polka dance.’

---

10 It is pointed out in Chapter 4 that pronominalization in the object position (inbound pronominalization) is the type of pronominalization that involve constraints with some types of cognate objects. Therefore, where a cognate object allows inbound pronominalization, it also allows outbound pronominalization.
52)  
   a.  ?ayya  mašy-at-in  mašat=hā  firqatu  l-jawna  
      which  walk-TSM-GEN  walk.PST=3FSG  band  the-Jawna  
      ‘lit. Which walk did the Jawna band walk?’  
   b.  mašy-at-a  l-qamari  
      walk-TSM-ACC  the-Qamar  
      ‘The Moon walk’  

SPECIMEN cognate objects can have a wide scope i.e. a specific reading as indicated by the examples in (53). The cognate objects raqṣata l-bolkā ‘the Polka dance’ and mašyata l-qamari ‘the Qamar walk’ are referred to with the determined cognate object NPs tilka r-raqṣata ‘that dance’ and tilka l-mašyata ‘that walk’ which refer to a specific distinguishable instance of a dance and a walk.

53)  
   a.  hindun  hiya  man  raqṣa-t  
      tilka  r-raqṣ-at-a  
      Hind  3FSG  who  dance.PST-3FSG  that  the-dance-TSM-ACC  
      ‘It was Hind who danced that dance’  
   b.  firqatu  l-jawnati  hum  man  maša=w  
      tilka  l-mašy-at-a  
      band  the-Jawna  3PL  who  walk.PST=3PL  that  the-walk-TSM-ACC  
      ‘It was the Jawna band who walked that walk.’  

Also, SPECIMEN cognate objects can be topicalized as can be seen in the examples in (54).

54)  
   a.  raqṣ-at-u  l-bolkā  raqṣa-t=ha  hindun  al?-usbūqa  l-māḍī  
      dance-TSM-NOM  the-Polka  dance.PST=3FSG  Hind  the-week  the-last  
      ‘The Polka dance, we danced it last week.’  
   b.  mašy-at-u  l-qamari  mašat=hā  firqatu  l-jawnati  
      walk-TSM-NOM  the-Moon  walk.PST=3FSG=3FSG  band  the-Jawna  
      bi-mahāratin  
      with-skillfulness  
      ‘The Moon walk, the-Jawna band walked it skillfully’  

Another case of BOUNDED cognate objects that can be described as referential NPs are those instances that occur with a definite determiner such as the below examples.
55)  

(a) ibtasamat hindun | **ibtisāmata=ha l-aṭīfata** |

_smile.PST_ Hind _smile-TSM-ACC_ the-gentle

‘Hind smiled her gentle smile.’

(b) hindun ṣaraḵat | **tilka ṣ-ṣaraḵ-at-a** |

Hind _scream.PST.3FSG_ that _the-scream-TSM-ACC_

‘Hind screamed that scream.’

These cognate objects are semantically definite and they refer to distinguishable entities that have a presupposed existence. The cognate objects in the two examples can be pronominalized with a pronoun in a later sentence as can be seen in (56). Also, the definite modified cognate object in (57a), which has a kind reading and can be seen as a member of a set of different kinds of smiles, can be an answer to a question with _?ayy_ ‘which’ as can be seen in (57). Besides, topicalization of the cognate object in (56) is possible as can be seen in (58).

56)

(a) ibtasamat=ḥā ṣīndamā ra?at=ni

_smile.PST.3FSG=3FSG_ when _see.PST.3FSG=1SG_

‘She smiled it when she saw me.’

(b) ṣaraḵat=ḥā ṣīndamā ra?at=ni

_scream.PST.3FSG=3FSG_ when _see.PST.3FSG=1SG_

‘She screamed it when she saw me.’

57)  

(a) _?ayya ibtisām-at-in_ ibtisāmata=ha hindun

_which_ _smile-TSM-GEN_ smile.PST=3FSG Hind

ṣīndamā ra?at=ki

_when_ _see.PST.3FSG=2SG_

‘Which scream did Hind scream when she saw you?’

(b) ibtasamat | **ibtisāmata=ha l-aṭīfata** |

_smile.PST_ _smile-TSM-ACC_ the-gentle

‘She smiled her gentle smile.’

58)  

**tilka ṣ-ṣaraḵ-at-a** ṣaraḵat=ḥā hindun

_that_ _the-scream-TSM-ACC_ _scream.PST=3FSG_ Hind

‘That scream Hind screamed it.’
As for the other cases of the BOUNDED cognate objects i.e. those cognate objects in the different interpretations i.e. the MANNER, the EVENT and the PRODUCT cognate objects and which vary in their constructional properties, the cases are heterogeneous. Exemplifications of different cases are given below.

There are instances of MANNER cognate objects which more or less exhibit aspects of referential NPs. For example, the MANNER cognate object in (59), can be pronominalized with a pronoun as in (59a) and can have a wide scope reading as in (59b).

59)

a. mātat mītāt-an ḡasanātān wa lakinna=hā
die.PST.3SG die.MNM-ACC good and but=3FSG
lam takun buṭūliyyatan
not be.PST.3FSG heroic
‘He died a good death but it was not a heroic one.’

b. man māta tilka l-mītāt-a
who die.PST that die.MNM-ACC
‘Who died that death.’

Also, MANNER cognate objects can be found topicalized when used in a context where the cognate object can be seen as a member of a presupposed set such as the example in (60).

60)

a. sa-yaqtulu ḡaliyyan ?ašrra qitlat-in
will-kill.3SG Ali most.evil kill.MNM-GEN
‘He will kill Ali in the most evil manner of killing’

b. ?ašrra qīlātīn sa-yaqtulu=hā ḡaliyyan
most.evil kill.MNM-GEN will-kill.3SG=3FSG Ali
‘The most evil way of killing, he will kill it Ali’

For instance, in a context where a tyrant has a number of prisoners and he specified different instances of the manners in which the different prisoners should be killed. The topicalized cognate object in (60b) refers to the most evil of
the different specified manners of killing the prisoners.

MANNER cognate objects such as the example in where the NP involves a participant that is different from the actor of the verbal event, such as the example in (61), behave differently from referential NPs. They cannot be pronominalized and when questioned with *ayy ‘which’, they obligatorily occur as PPs modifying the manner of the event rather than in their regular form.\(^{11}\) Hence, I classify them as non-referential NPs.

\[61\]

a. ţāša ʕišata ʔabī=hi
   live.PST.3SG live.MNM-ACC father=his
   ‘He lived in the manner of his father’s manner of living.’

b. *ţāša=hā ſilata ḥayāti=hi
   live.PST.3SG=3FSG all life=his
   ‘He lived it all his life.’

\[62\]

a. *ayya ʕišatin ţāša=hā ſaliyyan
   which live.MNM-ACC live.PST Ali
   ‘Which life did Ali live?’

c. ţāša bi-miṭli ʕišat-i ʔabī=hi
   live.PST.3SG in-like live.MNM-GEN father=his
   ‘He lived in a manner similar to his father’s manner of living.’

As is the case with MANNER cognate objects, there are instances of PRODUCT cognate objects that can be described as referential NPs and other instances that can be described as non-referential NPs. The variations in the instances of the PRODUCT cognate objects more or less relate to the individual instances of the verbs taking PRODUCT cognate objects. The different cases can be summarized here. The cognate objects of the verbs ħalima ‘dream’, ūlabā ‘request’ are referential NPs.

\(^{11}\) See Chapter 4 on these properties of the manner cognate objects which are also indicated for other categories of UNBOUNDED cognate objects.
These cognate objects can be pronominalized with a pronoun in a later sentence, and can have a wide scope reading as can be seen in the examples in (63) for the cognate object of the verb ḥalima ‘dream’.

63)

a. ḥalimat hindun ḥulm-an ǧarīban
dream.PST Hind dream.BM-ACC strange
‘Hind dreamt a strange dream’

b. wa lakinna=hu kāna jamīlan
and but=3SG be.PST.3SG beautiful
‘But it was a beautiful one.’

c. laqad kānat hindun hiya man ḥalimat ǧalika
EMPH.PRT be.PST Hind 3SG who dream.PST.3FSG that
l-ḥulm
the-dream.BM-ACC
‘It was Hind who dreamed that dream.’

On the other hand, the PRODUCT cognate objects of the verbs ḥaḏnaba ‘commit a sin’, ḥaḏra‘a ‘make a mistake’, qarrara ‘decide’ and faṣal/ṣamil ‘do’ are non-referential NPs. They cannot be pronominalized and cannot have a wide scope reading. The examples below demonstrate the behaviour of the cognate object of the verb qarrara ‘decide’.

64)

a. ḥalimat hindun ḥulm-an ǧarīban
dream.PST Hind dream.BM-ACC strange
‘Hind dreamt a strange dream’

b. wa lakinna=hu kāna jamīlan
and but=3SG be.PST.3SG beautiful
‘But it was a beautiful one.’

c. laqad kānat hindun hiya man ḥalimat ǧalika
EMPH.PRT be.PST Hind 3SG who dream.PST.3FSG that
l-ḥulm
the-dream.BM-ACC
‘It was Hind who dreamed that dream.’

The last case is that of EVENT cognate objects. Similar to two previous cases, EVENT
cognate objects have instances that behave like referential NPs and instances that are similar to non-referential NPs, more specifically like predicative NPs. For example, of the cases of EVENT cognate objects that are unambiguously non-referential NPs are: (i) the indefinite EVENT cognate object which is modified by the event-modifying adjective *mufāji?* ‘sudden’ e.g. *mawtatan*/*mufāji?atan* ‘a sudden death’ (lit. ‘die.TSM sudden’); and (ii) the EVENT cognate object in a construct state pattern where the second *N* denoting the participant is interpreted as an argument of the *maṣdar N* rather than a possessor e.g. *naẓrata muḥibin* ‘the look of a loving person’ (lit. ‘look.TSM loving.person’). These cognate objects cannot be pronominalized, cannot be an answer to a question with *?ayy* ‘which’, and cannot have a wide scope reading where the cognate object is referred to with a determined cognate object.

Event cognate objects in the pattern *N* + adjective also differ. For example, those I refer to as QUANTIZED EVENT cognate objects are different form the other non-quantized EVENT cognate objects in the same pattern.

Also, EVENT cognate objects that can have a kind reading, exhibit properties of referential NPs and are hence classified as referential NPs. An exception to this are the cognate objects involving abstract NPs which are non-referential NPs.

5.3.3. Results

In this section, I have investigated the behaviour of the cognate object types with respect to the properties of referential NPs vs. non-referential and/or predicative NPs as found in the literature. A number of diagnostics were applied which include pronominalization, question formation, scope, topicalization, determiners, and clausal-subject sharing. I have demonstrated that the categories of cognate objects vary in their behaviour. The types of UNBOUNDED cognate objects do not show any of the properties characteristic of referential NPs: they cannot be
pronominalized, cannot be questioned with the question phrase ?aayy NP ‘which’, cannot be topicalized and cannot have wide scope reading. Also, they cannot be associated strong determiners and cannot give rise to scope ambiguities when quantified. Also, some categories of UNBOUNDED cognate objects are shown to share with the verb the same subject. The types of BOUNDED cognate objects, on the other hand, do not exhibit the same homogenous behaviour observed with the categories of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects but there are referential NPs and non-referential NPs; of the non-referential NPs, there are cognate objects that are similar to predicative NPs. The different cases can be summarized below. SPECIMEN cognate objects and definite cognate objects, regardless of interpretation, are referential NPs. MANNER cognate objects can have a referential reading except in the cases when the MANNER cognate object cannot have a kind reading. The classification of PRODUCT cognate objects into referential or non-referential cognate objects correlate more or less to the verb type. And lastly, there are instances of EVENT cognate objects that are referential NPs namely the quantized cognate objects or those that can have a kind reading. Other event cognate objects are similar to predicative NPs. One important observation that can be indicated here is the distribution of the referential and non-referential cognate objects among the different types of verbs. While it is likely to find a referential cognate object with unergative and monotransitive verbs, unaccusative verbs do not take a referential cognate object. One exception is that of the MANNER cognate object of the verb māt ‘die’; the EVENT cognate object of the same verb is a non-referential NP.

5.4. Discussion

5.4.1. The Relationship between the Verb and the Cognate Object

In the first section of the present chapter, the categories of cognate objects which belong to the two major classes that are proposed in the present work namely BOUNDED and UNBOUNDED cognate objects are analysed according to the
theoretical distinction between arguments and adjuncts. In the second section, the
cognate objects are characterized in terms of whether they are referential or non-
referential NPs. Based on the results obtained from applying the various
diagnostics in this chapter as well as the findings of Chapter 3 and 4, the status
and the type of relationship that holds between the verb and the different
categories of cognate objects can be discussed in the subsequent paragraphs. It can
be pointed out that in the three chapters, the categories belonging under
UNBOUNDED cognate objects are shown to exhibit comparable behaviour, and, hence, a unified treatment of these cognate objects is proposed. In contrast, the
categories of BOUNDED cognate objects exhibit varying behaviour which points to
their heterogeneous nature and so a unified treatment of the different cases is not
appropriate.

UNBOUNDED cognate objects are analysed as non-arguments, more specifically as
adjuncts of the verb, which means that they are not selected by the verbs and are
not entities that participate in the event. The evidence for the adjunct status of the
UNBOUNDED cognate objects lies in the fact that these cognate objects can be found
with a wide range of verb types. Also, the observations that they can co-occur
with the arguments of the verb, that they typically follow the arguments of the
verb and that they can be iterated despite similarity in their semantic roles also
support the claim that the UNBOUNDED cognate objects are adjuncts. Since these
cognate adjuncts are attached to a verbal head as opposed to the adjuncts of the
noun, in the sense of the term ‘adverbial’, they can be described syntactically as
adverbials. In fact, the semantic functions that these categories of cognate objects
are shown to carry out (see Chapter 3) are similar to the semantic functions carried
out by adjuncts of the verb. Compare the correspondence between the cognate
adverbials and the non-cognate adverbials in the sentences below. The different
functions include qualification as in (65), quantification as in (66), and
intensification as in (67).
Also, it is indicated in Chapter 4 that some categories of the unbounded cognate objects can be answers to questions with kayf ‘how’; that they can be pronominalized with the adverbial PP anaphoric expression ka-ḏalik ‘like-that’; and that when they are relativized, the resumptive pronoun appears with the preposition bi- in parallel to the manner-denoting N ṭariqat ‘way’. These various aspects further indicate correspondences with adverbials.

In fact, the adverbial adjunct analysis of the unbounded cognate objects explains directly their distinct syntactic behaviour compared with ordinary objects with respect to the various objecthood diagnostics tackled in the previous chapter.
Adjuncts cannot be passivized, topicalised, pronominalised with a pronoun, questioned with māḏā ‘what’ or relativized with the gap or the resumptive pronoun strategy.

Concerning the other major class of cognate objects, viz. BOUNDED cognate objects, it is seen that some categories pattern with arguments and are consequently assigned an argument status. On the other hand, there are other categories that are described as non-arguments of the verb in that they do not qualify as entities that participate in the event and are not selected by the respective verbs. I analyse the categories of the BOUNDED cognate objects that are assigned an argument status as thematic objects. With regard to the other categories which are described as non-arguments, I analyse one set of these cognate objects as coverbs that form with the verb a complex predicate, while I analyse another set as adverbials in parallel to the categories of the UNBOUNDED cognate objects.

For the argument cognate objects, I particularly refer to the analysis proposed for English cognate objects in Massam (1990), Höche (2009), Sailer (2010), and Kim & Lim (2012) (for one type of cognate objects). These cognate objects are participants that are directly involved in the event expressed by the verb and they are assigned a theta-role by the respective verbs. Syntactically, these cognate objects function as objects. The set of the BOUNDED cognate objects for which the thematic object analysis is proposed are principally those instances that are described as referential NPs. Examples of these cognate objects are given below.

---

12 This is, however, not to say that all cognate objects that are proposed a thematic object analysis status are referential NPs. There are instances of argument cognate objects which can be described as non-referential NPs. One instance is that of the KIND cognate objects occurring in the pattern ‘indefinite construct state’ which involves the cognate N plus an abstract N e.g. tanhīdata irtiyāḥīn ‘a sigh of relief’ (lit. ‘sigh-TSM relief’) and ibtisāmata ʿiqatin ‘a smile of confidence’ (‘lit. ‘smile.TSM confidence’).
68) a. ṣaraḥat hindun ṣark-šat-an ṣāliyatan
   scream.PST Hind scream-TSM-ACC loud
   ‘Hind screamed a loud scream.’

b. ṣallay=nā ṣalāt-a l-fajri
   pray.PST=1PL pray.NSDM-ACC the-Dawn
   ‘We prayed the Dawn prayer.’

c. ḏarab=tu=hu ḏ-ḍarab-at-a l-qādīyata
   hit.PST=1SG=3SG the-hit-TSM-ACC the-knock.down
   ‘I hit him the knockdown hit.’

d. māta mītat-an buṭūliyyat
   die.PST.3SG die-MNM-ACC heroic
   ‘He died a heroic death.’

These cognate objects are shown to be found with specific verbs and not with all verb types. The verbs in this type of the cognate object construction can be seen to have meaning of ‘creation’ through a ‘coercion’ process whereby the meaning of an element is affected by the association of another element (see Höche 2009). The meaning of the verbs is affected by the association of the cognate object. The cognate objects, in their various interpretations, are objects of result or effected objects. In their bounded referential nature, they can be conceptualized as concrete entities through a construal operation in which intangible concepts are grasped as objects (see Goldenberg 1995; Höche 2009; Lakoff & Johnson 1980). These entities come into existence as a result of the verbal event and hence hold with the verb a [CAUSE TO EXIST] relation. This [CAUSE TO EXIST] relation between the verb and the cognate object can be represented formally by the following notation which is based on Sailer (2010) for the sentence in (68a).

69) ∃e (ṣarakat ‘scream’ (e) ∧ Arg(e, Hind) ∧ CAUSE (e, ∃x. (ṣarkatān ‘scream’ (x) ∧ Arg(x, Hind) ∧ ʕāliyatan ‘loud’ (x))))

The formalization reads as follows: there is an event e which is a ‘screaming’-event; this event has a participant which is the subject ‘Hind’. The event causes the
existence of an object \( x \) which is a scream; the eventive effected object, as pointed out by Sailer (2010:198) ’need not exist longer than the duration of the process’.

Since a change of state from non-existence to existence is involved which is one of the properties of the Patient proto-role as identified by Tenny (1989; cited in Massam 1990:178), these cognate objects carry out a Patient theta-role. A number of the instances of these cognate objects are shown to contribute to the aspectual interpretation of the verb in the construction, hence, serving as an incremental theme, being another property that defines constituents with a Patient-theta role (see Tenny 1989). The subjects in this type of construction can be seen to carry out an Agent role as in the examples (68a) or an Experiencer role as in (68d) i.e. the subject experiences the particular instance of death.

Syntactically, these thematic cognate objects function as objects. They are shown to allow passivisation provided structural conditions are fulfilled. The fact that some instances of these cognate objects are more or less Ordinary Object-like than others with respect to the other syntactic processes tackled in the previous chapter can be attributed to whether or not these cognate objects can have an independent existence of the verbal event. For example, \( \text{ṣalāt-a l-fajr} \) ‘the Dawn prayer’ is a kind NP as indicated in section (see section) that can have an existence independent of the verb and in the cognate object construction it is a realisation of the kind expressed by the cognate NP that is caused to exist by the verbal event.

The second type of Bounded cognate objects are the categories analysed as cognate coverbs.\(^\text{13}\) They are not entities that participate in the event expressed by the verbal predicate; rather, they are event nouns that combine with a verb, which can be described as a support verb (see e.g. Mirto (2007)), and hence form a

\(^{13}\) I use the syntactic term coverb in the same sense as the syntactic term ‘predicate’ is used, i.e that which combines with a subject in the sentence.
complex predicate. In this respect, these cognate coverbs are comparable the postverbal noun in light verb constructions. Therefore, I particularly refer to the ‘lexicalised’ light verb construction approach proposed for cognate object constructions in e.g. Mittwoch (1998), Mirto (2007), Horrocks & Stavrou (2010) and Kim & Lim (2012) (for one type of cognate objects). In light verb constructions ‘a verb occurs with an event nominalisation as object; the understood agent (or, sometimes, patient) role of the nominalisation is identical with that of the verb; verb and object appear to be one lexical unit at lexical cognitive structure’ (311). Moreover, as described in (Horrocks & Stavrou (2010:7), light verb constructions are ‘complex predicates in which the grammatical and lexical information normally combined in a single verb form is distributed, with grammatical features (tense, etc.) carried by the verb and lexical content by the nominal head of its object’. However, unlike light verb constructions, where the light verb carries little information and the content is carried by the event nominal, in the case of the cognate object construction, as indicated in Mittwoch (1998:326), there is ‘a spreading of the lexical content over verb and noun’.

The categories of the BOUNDED cognate objects for which this analysis is proposed are principally those described as EVENT cognate objects but ones which are characterised as non-referential NPs. Examples of these cognate objects are given below.

70)

a. nāmat hindun nāwm-at-an ʕamīqatan
   sleep.PST Hind sleep-TSM-ACC deep
   ‘Hind slept a deep sleep.’

14 In terms of dependency, it could be said that, while in the case of the argument and the adverbial it is the argument that is dependent on the verb or it is the verb that is dependent on the verb, in the case of the coverb there is a kind of ‘mutual dependency’ between the verb and the coverb (see e.g. Höche 2009).

15 Since the verb carries lexical content, I prefer to use the term ‘support verb’ to describe the cognate verb, as used in Mirto (2007), rather than to describe it as a light verb.
b. saqatat hindun  **saqt-at-an  qawiyynan**  
                            fall.PST Hind fall-TSM-ACC hard  
    ‘Hind fell down a hard fall.’

    c. nazara  ?illay=h  **nazr-at-an  širrīratan**  
                             look.PST.3SG to=me look-TSM-ACC evil  
    ‘He looked at me with an evil look.’

The several correspondences between this type of cognate objects and the event nominal in light verb constructions can be used as evidence that these cognate objects also function as coverbs with support verbs. Firstly, there is the event interpretation of the cognate coverb; it expresses the same event as that expressed by the verb. The meaning of the cognate coverb (apart from the modifier) is identical with that of the verb, as can be indicated by the following formal representation which is based on Mittwoch (1998:309) for the sentence in (70a). The notation expresses the proposition that there is an event $e$ which is a ‘sleeping’-event. The event occurred deeply and Hind is its participant.

\[\exists e (\text{nawm} \text{‘dying’ (e)} \& \text{Actor (Hind ,e)} \& \text{samīq \text{‘deep’ (e)})}\]

Secondly, there is the relation between the cognate coverb and the clausal subject. One aspect of noun predicates as indicated by Mirto (2007), is related to the relation that holds between the noun predicate and the subject in the clause. Mirto (2007:123) demonstrates that in constructions with a support verb, such as the light verb construction, in *The two boxers had a fight*, the post-verbal NP assigns the subject *the two boxers* ‘both a syntactic role and a related thematic role that appear fully comparable to those’ in the corresponding construction i.e. *the two boxers fought*. The post-verbal NP is a predicate and the subject is considered its argument. Similarly, with these cognate coverbs, it is indicated that there is an implied agent in the cognate object and it is the same as that of the verb. Moreover, there is also the correspondence related to indefiniteness of the NP. It is shown that these cognate objects occur as indefinite NPs just as the typical case with the noun in light verb constructions is to occur as indefinite. Also, the
modifiers in the cognate object, like those in the noun with the light verb, ‘do not introduce a referential entity into the discourse and they can be predicates of event types’ (Mittwoch 1998:317). Moreover, one other obvious similarity between these cognate objects and light verb constructions is related to the semantic function of these cognate coverbs. In Chapter 3, it is shown that a number of the categories of BOUNDED cognate objects, including the instances that are analysed as coverbs here, carry out the function of delimiting the event. Light verb constructions also express events with an endpoint as will be indicated in the next section. The cognate coverbs are mostly found with verbs expressing non-terminative events. Therefore, as suggested by Horrocks & Stavrou (2010), it is the cognate coverb rather than the support verb that carries out the aspectual information.

In fact, as in the case with the cognate objects that are analysed as adverbial adjuncts, analysing these cognate objects as cognate coverbs directly explains their distinct behaviour with regard to the objecthood diagnostics presented in the previous chapter.

The other type of the non-argument BOUNDED cognate objects is that which is analysed as adverbial adjuncts in parallel to the categories of UNBOUNDED cognate objects. These are the MANNER cognate objects which cannot have a kind reading as indicated in Chapter 3 such as the examples given in (72).

72)

a. māta mītata ?abī=hi
   die.PST.3SG die.MNM-ACC father=his
   ‘He died in the manner of his father’s death.’

b. ūša ūšata ?abī=hi
   live.PST.3SG live.MNM-ACC father=his
   ‘He lived in the manner of his father’s manner of living.’

c. qatal=ū=hu qitlata ?abī=hi
   kill.PST=3PL=3SG kill.MNM-ACC father=his
   ‘They killed him in the manner in which his father was killed.’
They carry out the semantic function of qualifying the manner of the verbal event, and they can be an answer to a question with *kayf* ‘how’. Being cognate adverbials, these cognate objects do not behave like ordinary objects as demonstrated in Chapter 4. For the **MANNER** cognate objects which can have a kind reading, it could be said that they alternate between a thematic object analysis and an adverbial adjunct analysis. They are shown to allow passivisation when structural conditions are fulfilled but they can also be an answer to a question with *kayf* ‘how’.

As could be seen, the classification into the two major classes viz. **UNBOUNDED** cognate objects and **BOUNDED** cognate objects correlates to some extent with the statuses of the different categories of cognate objects. **UNBOUNDED** cognate objects are always cognate adverbials. **BOUNDED** cognate objects, on the other hand, can be cognate thematic objects, cognate coverbs or cognate adverbials. In the subsequent section, I provide a demonstration of some distinctions between the cognate object construction and three corresponding constructions, which also shed light on the motivations behind the use of the construction. The corresponding constructions include: (i) the light verb construction; (ii) V + adverbial; and (iii) V + *marrat* ‘time’-phrase.

### 5.5. The Cognate Object Construction and Corresponding Constructions

It has been seen that some types of cognate objects have alternating expressions to which they are paraphrasable or that the type of the cognate object construction has another corresponding type of construction. In the present section I indicate some of the distinctions revealed in the literature between the cognate objects and the alternating expressions or between the cognate object construction and the corresponding construction. Indicating these distinctions shed light on some of the motivations behind the use of the cognate object construction. Three types of
constructions are tackled here which include the light verb construction, the V+ manner adverbials and the V + the quantifying adverbial marra(t) ‘time’.

5.5.1. The Light Verb Construction

It is worth noting that many of the instances of NPs that occur as cognate objects carrying out the function of delimiting the scope of the process, are likely to occur with a non-cognate verb in a parallel and commonly used construction in other languages, for example, the light verb construction. Light verb constructions are not as common in Arabic.\(^{16}\) The examples of the English light verb constructions (from Höche 2009:232) in (73) do not have an equivalent light verb construction in Arabic.

73)

a. give a cough  
b. give/have a cry  
c. have a dream  
d. have a fight  
e. do/make a jump  
f. do/have/make a run  
g. have/take a sleep  
h. have a smel  
i. have/take a taste  
j. do/have/take/make a walk

As for those cases where a cognate object construction has a corresponding light verb construction, such as the examples in (74), it would be useful to indicate

\(^{16}\) In Arabic, light verb constructions are not as common as they are in some languages. It is often the case that the cognate object construction has a corresponding light verb construction with a PP complement but not an accusative NP. Light verb constructions are mostly constructed of a light verb plus a denominal rather than a maṣdar; the denominal does not occur in a cognate object construction.
some of the distinctions between the two types of constructions so as to highlight motivations behind the use of the construction.

One principal distinction between the two types of constructions is indicated by Höche (2009), which she shows to proceed from the iconicity principles of language. In the cognate object construction, the cognate N repeats the ‘components of the conceptual content of the verb’, and hence this reduplication results in an intensification of the action (251). In contrast, the action is de-
emphasized or ‘trivialized’ (in terms of Kearn’s (1988) description) in the light verb construction since, instead of the original verb, a light verb is used and the actual action is expressed by the deverbal noun and not the verb.

Perhaps related to this intensification or trivialization of the action is the aspectual properties claimed for the two constructions. Both constructions express bounded events which is not necessarily the same case with the event expressed by the simple verb construction, as can be seen in the examples in (75). The verb ‘dance’ is inherently unbounded and using it in one of the two constructions impose boundaries on the event.

75)
   a. She had a dance
   b. She danced a dance
   c. She dances

However, the event expressed by the light verb construction is characterized by a shortness of duration (Wierzbicka 1982; Kearns 1988), whereas in the cognate object construction, the event is described as continuing over a timespan (Macfarland 1995).

Macfarland (1995:66) exemplifies such distinction by the semelfactive verb cough which can either have a reading of an atelic activity or it can have a telic reading, as can be seen in the simple verb constructions in the sentences below.

76)
   a. She coughed for a long time
   b. She coughed once

In the light verb construction in (77) only the interpretation of a single instance of coughing is implied, but in the cognate object construction in (77c) the coughing continues for some time.
a. *She gave a hacking, irritating cough for a long time
b. She gave a/one hacking, irritating cough

(Macfarland 1995:66)

c. She coughed, a hacking, irritating cough which reddened her face and gyrated her full breasts until they bounced dangerously close to the typewriter keys.

(J. Grisham, The Firm, 140, qtd. in Macfarland 1995:66)

Similarly, in Arabic the [+bound] maṣdar qublat ‘a kiss’ denotes a single instance of the punctual activity qabbala ‘to kiss’. The activity can still be presented as an ongoing activity and as being extended over some time when used in the cognate object construction. Therefore, it is plausible to have the adjective ṭawīlat ‘long’ with the cognate object N qublat ‘a kiss’ but not with the same noun when occurring with the light verb ?aṭṭā ‘give’.

Höche (2009:241) explains ‘the COC itself does not impose particular limits on the stretch between beginning and ending of the action, except for the fact that some bounded portion of the event is presented’.

Moreover, while focus in the light verb construction is on the endpoint and perfectivity of the process, in the cognate object construction focus is on representing the relation between the process and the outcome or the endpoint of that process. Therefore, the cognate object construction involves a sense of ‘creation’, which is absent in the light verb construction (see Höche 2009: 239).
Accordingly, the choice between the two constructions is contingent on how
speakers want to verbalize ‘a particular construal of a scenario’ (Höche 2009:251).

5.5.2. Modifying Cognate Objects and Manner Adverbials

As indicated in Chapter 3, there are cognate objects that allow paraphrase into an
adverbial; nevertheless, the expressions involve some variations. While in the
former a kind of repetition of the verbal content is involved and hence the cognate
object construction can be indicated to involve intensification, the same does not
hold for the adverbial expression. Additionally, a cognate object that qualifies the
event can also be one that delimits it aspectually but the event adverbials do not
have a similar effect. Also, many of the instances of cognate objects that allow for
an adverbial paraphrase also allow for a kind interpretation, but this polysemous
nature is absent in the adverbial phrase.

Having said that, one reason that is indicated in the literature for the use of
cognate objects is that a particular language does not have many lexical adverbs
(Horrocks & Stavorou 2010). This applies for Arabic; the number of adverbs is
extremely limited (see Al-Shurafa 2005); this is obviously one reason why there is
huge reliance on cognate objects as a modifying strategy in Arabic. Mittwoch
(1998) suggests for Hebrew that the frequent use of cognate objects can be said to
be motivated by a gap in the structure of the respective language. This may also be
ture for Arabic. Mittwoch (1998:327) states that

COs may be said to fill a gap in the structure of Hebrew. Hebrew does not have
a fully productive method of adverb formation analogous to the English suffix –ly,
the French-ment, the Ancient Greek –ūs, etc. Hebrew has a variety of devices to
express adverbial modification with the choice between them depending partly on
the semantic type of the adverbial, and partly on the register. COs represent one of
these; making overt a cognate lexical predicate of the event position may thus be
thought of as a reserve strategy for expressing non-referential adverbial
modification (327).
Also, using cognate objects can be related to the tendency in the Arabic language for ‘lexical repetition’, parallel to what Mittwoch (1998:328) suggests for Hebrew,

COs reflect a pervasive Hebrew penchant for lexical repetition … English and other more modern European languages seem to have a principle of parsimony — use pro-forms rather than lexical repetition wherever possible.

Mittwoch (1998:328) points out that ‘it appears that some languages are more tolerant of redundance than others, or even make a stylistic virtue of it ‘.

5.5.3. Quantifying Cognate Objects and the Quantifying Adverbials with *marrat* ‘time’

One of the functions that some types of cognate object are said to carry out is that of quantifying the event as indicated in 6.2.4.

An ostensibly corresponding expression which also quantifies the verbal event is the adverbial expression with *marrat* ‘one.time’. Mittwoch (1998:318) makes that point that ‘there is a potential difference between cardinality specification by means of COs and by means of *times* phrases’ and that, therefore the quantifying expressions in the sentence in (79) are not necessarily ‘equivalent in all contexts’ (318).

79) šaloš pe’amim kara-ti et mixtav-xa ve-xalakim axadim
    three times read-I OM letter-your and-parts some
    mimenu kara-ti šaloš keri’ot
    of.it read-I three readings

(Mittwoch 1998:316)

The distinction that Mittwoch (1998) seems to point to in this example is related to the interpretation of the counting in the two expressions and to whether or not the event is over separate occasions. For example, in the *time* adverbial in (8b), the

---

17 Mittwoch (1998) states in her work one distinction between the two expressions which relates to their scope properties and which is suggested by her as test for the non-referentiality of the quantifying cognate object in contrast to the quantifying adverbial expression (see Chapter 5).
event can be distributed over discrete occasions or it can be interpreted cumulatively i.e. the three events occur together with no significant time intervals, but as for the cognate object in this context only the cumulative reading applies.

A parallel distinction can be observed for Arabic, which can be demonstrated by the following pair of sentences.

80)  

a. ḍarab=tu l-liṣṣ-a ṭalāṭa marrātin  
   hit.PST=1SG the-thief-ACC three times  
   ‘I hit the thief three times’

b. ḍarab=tu liṣṣ-an ṭalāṭa ḏarb-āt-in  
   hit.PST=1SG thief-ACC.INDF three hit-TSM.PL-GEN  
   ‘I hit a thief three hits’

The sentence with the marra(t) ‘time’ phrase is ambiguous: it can be that the three times of hitting took place within a single occasion; hence, the phrase is cumulatively interpreted, or that the discrete hitting events took place over separate occasions and thus it is distributively interpreted. Conversely, no such ambiguity is involved in the sentence with the cognate object; only the cumulative reading is implied. Note also that the number of the event tokens involved in the single set of hitting is specified in the cognate object but it is vague in the case of the marra(t) ‘time’ adverbial.

Also, it is worth noting that when the two expressions quantify the set of events taking place on a single occasion, it is more likely in the case of the marra(t) ‘time’ expression that some timespan intervenes between the separate sets of the event, whereas no significant time intervals exist in the case of the cognate object.
Cognate objects are not restricted to having a cumulative reading as might be assumed from the above representation; rather, there are still quantifying cognate objects which denote events that are distributed over separate occasions comparable to the marra(t) phrase, as can be seen in the following examples.

82)

a. tanāmu nawm-at-ayni fi n-nahāri
sleep.PRS.3FSG sleep-TSM.DUL.ACC in the-day
‘She sleeps twice (two sleeps) in the day’

a. zāra=نا ziyārat-ayn mutaqāribatayn
visit.PST.3SG=1PL visit.BM-ACC.DUL close.to.another
‘He visited us two visits that are close to one another.’

---

b. milān bi-ḵīlāl ?ubūsīn fāza fawz-ayn
   Milan within a week win.PST.3SG win.BM-ACC.DUL
   ‘Within a week Milan won twice.’

c. hajam-ū ʕalay=him sidda hajam-āt-in
   attack.PST=3PL on=them several attack-TSM.PL-ACC.DUL
   fī šahrin wāḥidin
   in month one
   ‘They attacked them several attacks in one month’

However, as there is a distinction between the two expressions in their cumulative reading which is related to the length of the time intervals, they also differ, in the distributive reading, in terms of the length of the overall timespan in which the individual events took place. While a marra(t) phrase can be used whether the timespan is long or not, a cognate object counting the times of the event can only be used when the timespan of the separate times is not very long. Such distinctive property of cognate objects is indicated by the temporal adverbials fī in-nahār ‘in the-day’, bi-ḵīlāl ?usbūs ‘within a week’ and fī šahrin wāḥidin ‘in one month’ and the adjective mutaqāribatayn ‘temporally close to one another’ in the examples given in (82). Therefore, as shown in the following sentences, it is unacceptable that the cognate object nawmatayn ‘two sleeps’ is used in the given context in (83a) but it is acceptable in (83b).

83)

a. munḏu ?an intaqal=nā ?ilā manzili=nā l-jadīd mā nāmat
   since INF move=1PL to house=our the-new not sleep.PST.3SG
   fī ǧurfatī=hā ?illā marratayn/*nawm-ayn
   in room=her except twice sleep-TSM-ACC.DUL
   ‘Since we moved to our new house she never slept in her room except for two times/two sleeps.’
b. tanāmu ṭiflat-ī nāwmataynī/marraynī fi n-nahāri sleep.PST kid.FS=my sleep-TSM-ACC.DUL/twice in the-day wa nāwmat-an wāḥidatan/marratan wāḥidatan fi l-layli and sleep-TSM-ACC one time one in the-night ‘My daughter sleeps two sleeps/twice in the day and one sleep/once in the night.’

Accordingly, it could be said that it is more likely the case that a cognate object rather than a marra(t) ‘time’ phrase is used in contexts where it is obvious that the time intervals involved as well as the overall timespan of the event is quite short, as seen in the examples below.

84)  

a. fa-šaḥaqaṭ šaq-at-an ?aw šaq-at-ayn  
and-suffle.PST.3SG snuffle-TSM-ACC or snuffle-TSM-ACC.DUL  
ṯumma mātät then die.PST.3SG  
‘and she snuffled a snuffle or two then died.’

b. wa ?aḏkur ?anna l-?iṭisāla ranna rannt-ayn wa  
and remember that the-call ring.PST ring-TSM-ACC.DUL and  
inqatāsa cut.off.PST.3SG  
‘and I remember that the phone rang two rings then the call was cut off.’

This constraint on the cognate object in the cumulative or distributive reading and the fact that it cannot be long can be attributed to the inherited bounded property of the noun that represents the cognate object, i.e. the maṣdar noun which is a T-SUFFIXED MAṢDAR in these examples, (see Chapter 2).

It is also worth noting that this constraint on the use of the cognate object regarding the overall timespan does not necessarily hold when the counting in the

---

quantifying cognate object is not a merely a counting of event tokens but also a
counting of event types. Therefore, it is possible to find cognate objects in contexts
in which the timespan seems to be relatively long, as exemplified in the sentences
in (83). Similarly, the sentences below involve quantifying cognate objects used in
contexts where the timespan is relatively long.

85)

a. kāna y<PASS>&staqb<BM>&lu ḥāʃidatan
was <PASS>receive.PST.3SG receive.BM-PL-ACC crowded
fi 1-ʕālami kulli=hi ḥall
in the-world all=it wherever stay.PST.3SG
‘He used to be given a crowded reception in the whole world wherever he stayed’

b. saqaṭa ḥāšidatan ḥall
fall.PST.3SG three fall-TSM.PL-ACC in life=his the-work
‘He fell three falls in his work life.’

In fact, the differences between the use of a cognate object and the use of a
marra(t) ‘time’ phrase are not confined to the ones represented here. However, due
to time and space limitations, they cannot be pursued further. Moreover, the ones
highlighted in this section are deemed sufficient to display one of the diverse
motivations for the utilization of the construction in the language. Therefore, the
distinctions pointed out in this section can be summarized as follows: (1) a
marra(t) ‘time’ expression can be ambiguous in terms of distribution over
occasions, but with a quantifying cognate object the interpretation is
unambiguously cumulative or distributive; (2) where the expressions are
cumulatively interpreted, some time intervals between the separate events are
likely to exist in the case of the marra(t) ‘time’ phrase, but no significant timespan
intervenes with a quantifying cognate object; (3) with a quantifying cognate object
that counts the event times, the overall timespan cannot be very long; (4) the
number of event units within an eventive set is specific in the case of the cognate
object but is vague in the case of the *marra(t)* ‘time’ phrase; (5) a cognate object can represent a simultaneous counting of event types and of the times of the event but the same does not hold for the *marra(t)* ‘time’ phrase.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUDING REMARKS

The present work, which focuses on cognate object constructions in Modern Standard Arabic, incorporates three main aims. The first of these aims is to provide a comprehensive characterization of the construction. The second aim is to display the similarities and distinctions between the cognate objects and the ORDINARY OBJECT in the monotransitive construction and OBJECT2 in an ordinary ditransitive construction. The third aim is to identify the status of the various types of cognate objects. In this final chapter, I summarize and discuss the results of the present work and offer suggestions for future research.

6.1. Main Results and Future Research

6.1.1. Scope of the Cognate Object Construction in Arabic

In the present work I have shown that the concept of the cognate object construction is delimited differently by different authors working on cognate objects cross-linguistically. The delimiting criteria can be morphological, semantic and/or syntactic. Some NPs are excluded on the basis of their syntactic distinctive behaviour from other cognate objects e.g. ‘dream a dream’ (Jones 1989), although they possess sufficient morphological and semantic properties to be considered cognate objects. Other types are included when the only property they share with cognate objects is that of formal cognateness, e.g. ‘feed some food’ (Höche 2009) and ?irtadā ridāran ‘He dressed a dress’ (lit. ‘dress.PST.3SG dress’) (Al-Sammak 2012).

Nevertheless, I have indicated that the principal criterion, for which there is a consensus among the various authors, is that of semantic relatedness between the verb and the cognate object. As a consequence, and as found in Arabic, the cognate object can be an element that denotes an event, an abstract product of the
event or a manner of the event. For Arabic, I indicated that this criterion of semantic relatedness correlates with a derivational constraint; the head N in the cognate object can be represented only by nouns belonging to a class of deverbal derived nouns referred to as the maṣdars in Arabic grammar. The verb and the maṣdar N share the same root.

Moreover, with respect to the predicate in the construction, I have indicated that it can be a verb or it can be a nominal or an adjectival represented by deverbal derived forms. Nevertheless, this study is limited to the investigation of the cognate object construction involving verbs; therefore, further research might be carried out to investigate the non-verbal cognate object construction types, and how they are similar to or distinct from the type of the construction considered in the present work.

6.1.2. The Morphological Classes of the Cognate N: the Maṣdars

Five classes of maṣdars were indicated to represent the head N of the cognate object in the construction. The five maṣdars were designated in the present work as the BASIC MAṢDAR, the NON-STEM DERIVED MAṢDAR, the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDAR, the MANNER MAṢDAR and, the MĪM MAṢDAR. Of the five masdars, the MĪM MAṢDAR was shown to be largely constrained in its occurrence as a cognate object. Besides indicating the aspects of the maṣdars that are related to their derivation, denotation and morpho-syntact which are extensively tackled in the literature, a characterization was given of the polysemous nature as well as the quantificational and/or aspectual properties of these maṣdars, being the features that were shown to significantly interrelate with the semantic, syntactic and functional variations among the cognate object types.

Three readings were identified for the maṣdars when they occur as a cognate object, namely the EVENT, the MANNER and PRODUCT reading and clues were
mentioned which can be used in identifying the respective reading in the polysemous instances of the maṣdars. It was observed that the constraint on the MĪM MAṢDAR does not hold when the instance has a PRODUCT or an EVENT reading. The constraint holds, on the other hand, for the instances of MĪM MAṢDARS that denote a STATE, which is the case with the majority of the various instances that represent this morphological class. Further research is required to investigate the reasons behind the constraint on the occurrence of the MĪM MAṢDAR as a cognate object (and the constraint on its taking a cognate object as well) and whether that can be related to the aktionsart (aspectual) properties of the event expressed by the construction as a whole and its characteristic dynamicity (see e.g. Macfarland 1995; Höche 2009) which is also beyond the scope of the present work.

Moreover, the quantificational and/or aspectual characterization of the masdar classes that I provided was based on types of evidence presented in Brinton’s (1995) work on derived nouns in English, and those found in Fassi Fehri’s (2004) work on a few instances of the maṣdars in Arabic. The types of evidence relate to form, type of quantifier, pluralization and its interpretation, constraint in numbering, aspectual effect, and finally the type of context in which the maṣdar N occurs. Fassi Fehri’s (2004) quantificational characterization, which gives insight into the properties of the other maṣdars, is constrained to the T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS and two cases of the productive class, viz. the BASIC MAṢDAR. Also, T-SUFFIXED MAṢDARS are characterized as a homogenous class in Fassi Fehri (2004). Nevertheless, I showed that those that are derived from activity verbs are different from the instances that are derived from semelfactives. The distinction between those types can also be observed in their behaviour when occurring as cognate objects. The result of the characterization provided here is a synthesizing of the various cases into the two general categories [-bound] maṣdars and [+bound] maṣdars, of which the latter involve other subcategories. The quantificational categories are then mapped to the respective semantic reading of the maṣdars.
In fact, the systematic characterization of the various aspects of the maṣdar classes as carried out in this work highlights some aspects that have not, to my knowledge, previously been indicated in the literature. Moreover, the characterization brings to the foreground certain distinctions among the various classes, some of which have sometimes been characterized homogenously in the grammatical literature.

6.1.3. Constructional Properties of the V + Cognate Object

Cognate objects are of various types in Arabic. The types vary in their aspects at the different levels of the linguistic description, including the morpho-syntactic, constructional, semantic, syntactic and the functional. The classification proposed in this study contrasts with the classification frequently found in the literature which posits three types based on the function of the cognate object (see section 1.1.). Cognate objects were principally classified on the basis of the quantificational/aspectual type of the maṣdar N that occurs as the head N in the cognate object and whether it is a [+bound] or a [-bound] maṣdar. In accordance, the two major classes suggested were BOUNDED cognate objects and UNBOUNDED cognate objects, of which each class incorporates further types. In UNBOUNDED cognate objects, the cognate N always has an EVENT reading; nevertheless, they differ in terms of the NP constructional properties, interpretation possibilities and their relation with the verbal event. Therefore, they were classified on the basis of their formal patterns into the BARE cognate object, the MODIFIED cognate object and the CONSTRUCT STATE cognate object. The types of UNBOUNDED cognate objects express the same verbal event and the external argument of the verb is the same as the implied or expressed ACTOR in the cognate object, except in the case of CONSTRUCT STATE cognate objects involving participants that are represented by referential NPs.
BOUNDDED cognate objects, on the other hand, were shown to be a more heterogeneous class. The cognate N can denote an EVENT, PRODUCT or MANNER or can have a more abstract reading, i.e. that of denoting a kind. They can be found in different formal patterns that can be shared by the types in their different interpretations. As for the cognate verb, it was demonstrated that the scope of the verbs that are likely to be found in the construction is rather wide in Arabic. The verb types with which a cognate object can be found are as follows: (i) an intransitive verb whether as an unaccusative or unergative; (ii) an otherwise optionally or obligatorily transitive or ditransitive verb; (iii) a transitive verb with its expressed internal argument; and (iv) a ditransitive verb. It was shown that UNBOUNDDED cognate objects are not constrained in their distribution in the same way as that observed with the types of BOUNDDED cognate objects: this can be demonstrated as follows. Unaccusative verbs mainly take EVENT or MANNER cognate objects. The cognate objects of unergative verbs can be of any of the four interpretational types i.e. EVENT, MANNER, PRODUCT or KIND. Transitive verbs take EVENT cognate objects, MANNER cognate objects, KIND cognate objects. BOUNDDED cognate objects do not occur with a ditransitive verb.

6.1.4. Semantic Functions of the Cognate Objects

The different types of semantic functions that the cognate objects in their different constructional patterns carry out with respect to the verbal event were identified. I have shown that the frequent assumption in the literature on cognate objects in Arabic regarding the three strictly identified functions (see section 6.1) and the one-to one relation between form and the functional categories does not hold. I have pointed out the functions that can be carried out by the cognate objects occurring as BARE COGONATE NPS, whether as UNBOUNDDED or BOUNDDED cognate objects, and those carried out by cognate objects occurring as EXTENDED COGONATE NPS in the various patterns. The interrelation between the functions identified for
the two formal classes of the cognate objects are mandatory. In addition, many
types were shown to represent more than one function and were hence described
as being polyfunctional. The various functions that were identified include
intensification of the event, quantification of the event, qualification of the event,
aspectual delimitation of the event, specification of the scope of the event and the
pragmatic function of focusing a contrast. Intensifying the verbal event is the
function characteristic of the unbounded bare cognate object, but can also be
carried out by the UNBOUND MODIFIED cognate object, as well as by BOUNDED
bare NPs. Qualification of the event is the function typically identified for those
cognate objects that involve an event-modifying adjective such as the UNBOUND
MODIFIED cognate object, and the BOUNDED cognate objects in an EVENT or MANNER
interpretation. A metaphorical qualification was indicated to be achieved by
different types of CONSTRUCT STATE cognate objects. For instance, the UNBOUND
CONSTRUCT STATE cognate objects were shown to represent a metaphorical
comparison between the verbal event and another event. CONSTRUCT STATES which
involve participants represented by non-referential NPs in general, whether as
BOUNDED or UNBOUND, were demonstrated to provide a description that applies
to the argument(s) of the verb. The function of specifying the scope of the verbal
event was identified as a principal function that is carried out by the different
instances of BOUNDED cognate objects that denote a kind, which is often seen as a
member of other related kinds. Moreover, aspectual delimitation was identified
with the many instances that belong under BOUNDED cognate object, and
quantification of the event is carried out by cognate objects involving a quantifier
or cognate objects represented by an inherently quantized maṣdar.

6.1.5. Syntactic Properties

Additionally, I have demonstrated that the cognate object types vary in their
syntax. In this regard, I have undertaken the task of characterizing and comparing
the syntactic behaviour of the cognate object types wi that of the object in the
monotransitive construction which I referred to as the ORDINARY OBJECT, e.g. the
postverbal NPs occurring with the verbs daraba ‘hit’ or kasara ‘break’. Moreover, I
compared the cognate objects which occur with a transitive verb with OBJECT2 in
an ordinary ditransitive construction and I also compared the first objects in the
two types of constructions; I referred to the two objects as OBJECT1COC and object1
respectively. Note that OBJECT1COC is what stands as an ordinary object in the
corresponding non-cognate object construction. The characterization was carried
out with respect to six syntactic operations, some of which were indicated in
Massam (1990) to distinguish one type of cognate objects that are analysed in the
literature as ORDINARY OBJECTS from another type of cognate objects that are
analysed as adjuncts (see e.g. Jones 1988). The six operations include passivization,
adverb insertion, fronting, relativization, pronominalization and question
formation.

The observed behaviour of ORDINARY OBJECTS in Arabic is as follows: (i) they can
be passivized; (ii) they ban adverb insertion when they are definite; (iii) they can
be fronted; (iv) they can be relativized using either the resumptive pronoun
strategy or the gap strategy; (v) they can be freely pronominalized with a pronoun
in a later sentence; and (vi) they can be an answer to a question with māḏa ‘what?’.

As for the two objects in the ordinary ditransitive construction, it is OBJECT2 that
shows more affinity with the ORDINARY OBJECT. The only aspect which is not
ordinary-object like is that they cannot be passivized. This observation (i.e. on
which of the two objects in a ditransitive construction is more similar to the
ordinary object), seems to echo the findings reached by Hudson (1992) on the
objects in English.

As for cognate objects, it was indicated that there are some types that belong in the
class of BOUNDED cognate objects which exhibit similarities to the ordinary object;
exthe same, they vary in the extent to which they are of an ORDINARY-OBJECT like
type. There are the hyponymous cognate objects of the verbs ṣallā ‘pray’, raqaṣa ‘dance’, and laṣība ‘play. They were shown to be similar to the ordinary object in every aspect except for the constraint on adverbial insertion; when these cognate objects are definite they still allow separation from the verb by an adverbial. Also, some types of cognate objects which occur in a transitive construction were demonstrated to indicate similarity to the ordinary object or to object 2 in the ordinary ditransitive construction. These are the cognate objects which were classified kind cognate objects or quantized event cognate objects. They exhibit affinity with these two non-cognate objects in that they ban adverb insertion when they are definite, they can be fronted, relativized with the two strategies possible for these non-cognate objects, and they can be easily pronominalized. It should still be indicated that this is restricted to the types of constructions in which the verb is an obligatorily monotransitive verb taking a [+human] core internal argument. In constructions that are lower in transitivity, the cognate object behaves differently. Moreover, an interesting observation relates to object 1 coc in that it behaves like object 1 in the ordinary ditransitive construction; note object 1 coc corresponds to an ordinary object in the non-cognate object construction. The third group of cognate objects that indicate properties of the ordinary object, though not as much as the previous two types, are instances occurring with unergative verbs. They share with the ordinary object the property of relativization, using the resumptive pronoun but not the gap strategy. They can allow passivization. These cognate objects cannot be fronted, cannot be easily pronominalized, and cannot be questioned with māḏā ‘what’. Also, one instance of the cognate object occurring with unaccusative verbs behaves like those of the unergative verbs referred to above. This is the manner cognate object of the verb māta ‘die’, it can be relativized with the resumptive pronoun and can also be passivized. On the other hand, there are also instances of bounded cognate objects which do not share the ordinary object properties highlighted in this
study. Among these cognate objects and the types of UNBOUNDED cognate objects, a number of properties were observed which do not hold for the characterized non-cognate OBJECTS. These properties include: (i) the possibility of the impersonal passive; (ii) the non-obligatoriness of subject-verb agreement when the passivized cognate object is separated from the verb; (iii) the occurrence of the cognate object with the preposition bi-, rather than an accusative-case marked NP, when it undergoes a movement as in fronting, relativization, or when the cognate object is coreferential with a cognate object in a previous sentence, viz in pronominalization. Further research can be undertaken to indicate the nature of case-marking in these cognate objects in Arabic, and whether they represent a parallel to ‘the cross-linguistic sample of languages that exhibit, with different functions, case alternation in the domain of Cos’ (Gianollo & Lavidas 2012). In such languages, which have morphological case, there are accusative-cased marked cognate objects as well as other types of cognate objects that bear a different case, e.g. instrumental in Russian and dative in Greek.

6.1.6. Semantics of the Cognate Object

The cognate objects are investigated in terms of the two frequently asked questions in the literature regarding their semantic status: (i) whether the cognate object is an argument of the verb or whether it is an adjunct; and (ii) whether the cognate object is a referential or a non-referential NP. In terms of the argument-adjunct distinction, I have employed a number of the semantic and syntactic standard diagnostics found in the literature. The UNBOUNDED cognate objects largely pattern with adjuncts and hence they are analysed as adjuncts whereas BOUNDED cognate objects exhibit variations with respect to the various tests. A set of the BOUNDED cognate objects pattern with arguments; yet other categories were shown not to exhibit properties of adjuncts, but they are still not arguments in the sense that they are entities that participate in the event. Therefore, the unbounded
cognate objects and the latter type of the bounded cognate objects are described as the non-argument cognate objects whereas the other categories of bounded cognate objects were described as argument cognate objects. I have also indicated that the argument-adjunct distinction is not sufficient in accounting for the variations in the behaviour of the various categories of bounded cognate objects as shown in Chapter 4. Therefore, the cognate objects were also characterized in terms of the (non-)referentiality related properties. I have demonstrated that the unbounded cognate objects do not exhibit any of the properties characteristic of referential NPs and hence they are classified as non-referential NPs. The bounded cognate objects, on the other hand, were also shown to vary with respect to the (non-)referentiality diagnostics. I have shown that there are categories that exhibit referentiality-related properties with a variation in the extent to which they are similar to referential NPs and hence these are described as referential NPs. There are other categories of bounded cognate objects that are non-referential NPs. I have also shown that the referential bounded cognate objects are constrained in their distribution with respect to the verb types. They were principally found with optionally transitive verbs such as raqaṣa ‘dance, and obligatorily transitive verbs taking a [+human] internal core argument e.g. ḍarab ‘hit’. They can also be found with unergative verbs such as ṣaraḵa ‘scream’. Of the different unaccusative verbs taking a bounded cognate object, only the verb māta ‘die’ takes a referential cognate object, namely its manner cognate object which can have a kind reading, but not the event cognate object of the same verb.

6.1.7. Status of the Cognate Object: A Tripartite Classification of Cognate Objects in MSA

One of the central questions in most works on cognate objects is related to the status of the cognate object. Different proposals are suggested in the literature which attempt to analyse the relation that holds between the cognate object and
the verb. According to some views, cognate objects present a homogenous category and are thus proposed a unified treatment. For example, cognate objects are analysed as internal arguments of the verb which are assigned a theta-role as in e.g. Massam (1990), Macfarland (1995) and Höche (2009). These thematic argument cognate objects are also analysed syntactically as structural objects by Massam (1990). In another analysis, cognate objects are analysed as predicate NPs occurring with a support verb in parallel to the postverbal NP in light verb constructions as in e.g. Mittwoch (1998), Mirto (2007), and Horrocks & Stavrou (2010). Yet, in a third view, cognate objects are analysed as adjunct predicates in parallel to manner adverbials as in e.g. Zubizarreta (1987), Jones (1988) and Moltmann (1989). In other approaches, cognate objects are treated as a heterogeneous category and it is argued that cognate objects are of two types regarding their status. For example, in Nakajima (2006) there are argument cognate objects and adjunct cognate objects. In Kim & Lim (2012) there are cognate objects that function as structural objects and those that function as predicates that form with the verb a complex predicate in parallel to light verb constructions and in Pereltsvaig (2016) there are cognate objects that are ordinary objects and cognate objects that function as a secondary predicate over the event argument of the verb in parallel to adverbials.

Similarly, the nature of the cognate objects in Arabic, as has become clear, is not alike in all cases. In fact, the heterogeneity is even greater than in languages described in the literature. Accordingly, I argued that a unified treatment is not possible for cognate objects in Arabic, and hence I proposed, with regard to their status, a tripartite classification which includes: (i) cognate objects as thematic objects; (ii) cognate objects as coverbs; and (iii) cognate objects as adverbials.

Firstly, I proposed the thematic object analysis for one set of BOUNDED cognate objects which are principally referential NPs. In this respect, I refer to the analysis proposed in Massam (1990), Höche (2009), Kim & Lim (2012) and Pereltsvaig
According to this analysis, the verb in the cognate object construction is a verb of ‘creation’ and the event expressed by the cognate object is conceptualized as the eventive entity that comes into existence by the activity of the verb. Therefore, a change of state is involved which is described as a change from non-existence to existence. These cognate objects are thus described to carry out a PATIENT theta-role (Massam 1990).

Although, the referential cognate objects were shown to vary in the extent to which they are similar to the ORDINARY OBJECT, there is still enough evidence to analyse them as structural objects, for example passivizability in the case of the types exhibiting less ORDINARY OBJECT properties, namely those occurring with unergative verbs. As demonstrated by Massam (1990), other variations can be attributed to the semantic nature of the various types of referential cognate objects. Such as those that have a previous existence cognate objects from the types that are only caused to exist by the action of the verb.

With that said, it is still significant to point to crucial observations made in this study regarding distinctions between the cognate structural objects occurring with unergative verbs and those occurring with the optionally and the obligatorily transitive verbs. The latter exhibit more syntactic flexibility than the former. Also, the latter type of objects contributes to the aspectual interpretation of the verbal predicate and act as incremental themes for the respective verbs. In fact, the comparability between the ordinary ditransitive construction e.g. ʔaʕṭa=hu kɪtāban ‘He gave him a book’ and a ditransitive construction with a cognate object e.g. stackpath=hu ɗarbatan ‘He hit him a hit’ cannot be overlooked. Semantically, OBJECT1 in the two types of constructions performs a RECIPIENT role and OBJECT2 is a THEME argument. Syntactically, OBJECT1 in the two constructions can be passivized but they cannot be extracted and they require adjacency to the verb. OBJECT2, on the other hand, is more flexible and it can be extracted.
Given that these cognate objects occur with an unergative verb, optionally transitive verbs and obligatorily transitive verbs, the resulting constructions can be described, as often indicated in the literature as valency-changing constructions (Goldenberg 1995; Höche 2009; Sailer 2010). These types of the cognate object constructions represent means whereby new participants are added to elaborate event structure. Further research can be undertaken to investigate the transitivity level of the cognate object constructions (e.g. Höche 2009 on English).

Secondly, I proposed the coverb analysis for one set of the non-referential BOUNDED cognate objects namely the cognate objects that were shown to express the same event expressed by the verb. The cognate object is a coverb that combines with a support verb and forms a complex predicate in parallel to the event postverbal NP in light verb constructions. In this respect, I particularly build on Mittwoch (1998), Mirto (2007), Horrocks & Stavrou (2010) and Pereltsvaig (2016). The similarity between these cognate objects and light verb constructions lies in the sharing of the clausal subject, the event interpretation of the NP, the restriction on definiteness, and the possibility of paraphrase into an adverbial event predicate. Unlike in light verb constructions, where the light verb carries little information and that the content is carried by the event argument, in the case of the cognate object construction, as indicated in Mittwoch (1998:326), there is ‘a spreading of the lexical content over verb and noun’. One principal semantic function of these cognate coverbs is to aspectually delimit the event, a property which it also shares with the event postverbal noun in light verb constructions. It was indicated that these cognate coverbs are mostly found with verbs denoting non-terminative events and hence it is the cognate coverb, that carries out the aspectual information. Therefore, the actual aspectual properties of the event expressed by the cognate object construction are those involved in the cognate coverb. In fact, it was shown that a number of the instances of the cognate object construction of this type have corresponding light verb constructions in other
languages which are not available in Arabic. Hence, it was suggested that this type of the cognate object construction fills a gap in the language.

Thirdly, I proposed the adverbial analysis for the different categories of UNBOUNDED cognate objects as well as one category of the BOUNDED cognate objects namely the non-referential MANNER cognate objects. These cognate adverbials were shown to vary in the type of semantic functions which they carry out though an overlap between the functions and the categories exists sometimes. The various functions include event modification, event quantification, event intensification, and focusing a contrast.

6.2. Final Remarks

The type of linguistic characterization that is achieved in the present work which covers the morpho-syntactic properties of the cognate N, the formal properties and constraints of the cognate NP, the various interpretations of the cognate object, the functions with respect to the verbal event, the syntax, semantics, status of the cognate objects and their similarity or distinction from other OBJECTS has not to my knowledge previously been carried out for the phenomenon in MSA. The linguistic work on Arabic cognate objects that is presented is that of Al-Sammak (2012).

The task undertaken in the present work has aimed to provide a linguistic characterization and analysis of a construction which, despite its frequency in the language, has hitherto been understudied in Arabic linguistic literature, namely that of the cognate object construction. I believe the present work has achieved its objectives and that it represents a contribution to the Arabic linguistic literature.
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