

**The Syntax and Semantics  
of the Substance-Removing Verbs (SRV)  
in English and Arabic**

**Abdul-Jawad T. Mahmoud**

*Associate Professor,*

*Department of European Languages and Translation,*

*College of Languages and Translation,*

*King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*

(Received 19/11/A.H. 1422.; accepted 23/1/A.H. 1423)

**Abstract.** The main objective of this study is to characterize and contrast the main syntactic and semantic properties of the Substance-Removing Verbs (SRV) in English and Arabic. The relevance of the syntactic behavior of these verbs to their classification into classes is also explored. It was found that the Predicate Argument Structure (PAS), the Lexical Conceptual Structure (LCS) and the semantic roles associated with these verbs are the same in both languages. Based on the syntactic behavior of the SRV, three classes are identified: the first class allows for two alternations in both languages, the second allows for one alternation in both languages, and the third allows for two alternations in English and one in Arabic. It is assumed that the inherent lexical semantic properties of these verbs determine their syntactic behavior. Thus, despite the surface variation, it seems that the basic principles underlying the syntax and semantics of the SRV are the same in both languages. However, to classify these verbs into classes, their syntactic behavior must be taken into account in addition to the PAS, the LCS and the semantic roles associated with them. It should also be taken into account that listing these verbs in bilingual dictionaries as lexical synonyms does not accurately reflect their syntactic behavior.

## **1. Introduction**

One of the most well-known views of the lexicon is the one articulated by Bloomfield, who stated that: “the lexicon is really an appendix of the grammar, a list of basic irregularities” [1]. This view conforms to a frequently articulated desideratum for an more to lexical knowledge than just knowledge of idiosyncratic word-specific properties. Ideal lexicon –a lexicon that contains

the minimum information necessary. Thus, this type of lexicon proposed by Bloomfield has to provide a record of precisely the idiosyncratic information associated with each lexical item.

However, as pointed out by Levin [2], and other lexical semanticists, the knowledge that a speaker demonstrates with respect to lexical items suggests that there is This characteristic of lexical knowledge is easily illustrated with respect to verbs. Recent research in lexical semantics has shown that there is some correlation between the semantic properties of verbs and the syntactic patterns [3, pp. 97-134; 4, pp. 53-91; 6<sup>3</sup>-9]. Moreover, as demonstrated in these works, it seems that the semantic properties of verbs do not only determine the selection of arguments within sentences (i.e., action participants such as agent, theme, goal), but they also determine the way in which these arguments are organized in syntactic patterns. The syntactic alternations exhibited by the English and Arabic substance-removing verbs illustrate this point.

## 2. The English Substance-Removing Verbs

The substance-removing verbs (SRV) constitute a subclass of the so-called locative verbs. They require three arguments: a subject, a direct object and an object of a preposition. The action depicted by these verbs can simply be described by the Lexical Conceptual Structure (LCS) given in (1):

1. The agent (subject) causes the substance (direct object) to come out from a location (object of a preposition).

Speakers of English know that the SRV express their arguments in two different ways, displaying the so-called SRV alternation. Consider the following alternations exhibited by verb *shave* and verb *empty*:

2.
  - a. John shaved the hair off his head.
  - b. John shaved his head of hair.
3.
  - a. Mary emptied the books from the box.
  - b. Mary emptied the box of books.

It is also noted that the syntactic permutation illustrated in 2.b and 3.b is accompanied by subtle semantic difference. Specifically, the variants given in 2.b and 3.b imply a holistic interpretation, which is not necessarily implied by the variants in 2.a and 3.a. Put differently, the variants in 2.b and 3.b imply that the location argument has become fully empty of the substance, whereas the variants in 2.a and 3.a do not necessarily have this implication.

Furthermore, speakers of English know that some verbs which are apparently closely related to the verbs like *shave* and *empty* do not allow for variants parallel to those given in 2.b and 3.b. For instance, the actions depicted by verb '*steal*' and verb '*remove*' require three arguments and the basic meaning

of these verbs can also be described in terms of the LCS given in (1). However, as shown in (4) and (5), these verbs do not allow for alternations or variants parallel to those in 2.b and 3.b. Consider the examples below:

4. a. The thief stole the painting from the museum.  
b.\* The thief stole the museum of the painting.
5. a. Mary removed the dishes from the table.  
b.\* Mary removed the table of dishes.

### 3. Objective of the Study

The investigation of the English SRV alternations has received considerable attention in the current lexical semantic studies. (See, among others [10, pp. 153-95; 11, pp. 1-27; 12, pp. 715-29; 13, pp. 547-619; 14; 15, pp. 373-93]. In languages other than English, few works on the SRV alternations are available. The following works are examples [16, pp. 341-425; 17; 18, pp. 241-73; 19, pp. 97-114]. As far as I know, no work was done on the Arabic SRV. The Arabic locative alternations examined in [20, pp. 37-59] did not include the SRV alternations. The main objective of this study is to characterize the syntactic and semantic properties of the Arabic SRV. Emphasis will be placed on the similarities and differences between Arabic and English with respect to the syntax and semantics of these alternations, as well as the classification of these verbs. The relevance of the syntactic behavior of these verbs to their classification will also be explored. I will also try to see if the findings of this study would reveal any implications that might be relevant to the Arabic/English bilingual dictionaries.

### 4. The Arabic SRV Verbs

Just like English, the Arabic SRV require three arguments: a subject, a direct object and an object of a preposition. The action depicted by these verbs can be described by the LCS given in (1), which is repeated here in (6):

6. The agent (subject) causes the substance (direct object) to come out from a location (object of a preposition).

As illustrated below, the Arabic SRV express their arguments in two different ways, displaying two different alternations. Consider the following examples:<sup>1</sup>

7. a. Halaqa aHmad-u shsha'r-a min ra?s-i-hi  
shaved Ahmad-Num. the hair-Acc. from head.Gen.-his

1 The variety of Arabic used in this study is Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). The phonetic symbols used to represent the Arabic data appear in Appendix I with their corresponding Arabic letters.

- “Ahmad shaved the hair off his head.”
- b. Halaqa aHmad-u raʔs-a-hu min ashshaʾr-i  
Shaved Ahmad-Nom head-Acc.-his from the hair-Gen.  
“Ahmad shaved his head of hair.”
8. a. farragha aHmad-u lkutub-a min aSSunduq-i  
emptied Ahmad-Nom. The books-Acc. from the box-Gen.  
“Ahmad emptied the books from the box.”
- b. farragha aHmad-u SSunduq-a min al-kutub-i  
emptied Ahmad-Nom. the box-Acc. from the-books-Gen.  
“Ahmad emptied the box of books.”

It should be pointed out that the syntactic permutation illustrated in 7.b and 8.b is accompanied by a subtle semantic difference. Specifically, the variants in 7.b and 8.b imply that the location argument is completely affected by the action depicted by the verb. By contrast, the variants in 7.a and 8.a do not necessarily have such an implication. This means that the Arabic SRV *Halaqa* ‘shaved’ and *farragh* ‘emptied’ have the same syntactic and semantic properties as their English counterparts given in (2) and (3). In both languages, these verbs exhibit the same syntactic permutations and the same semantic difference associated with the b-variants. (Compare the English data in (2) and (3) with the Arabic data in (7) and (8)).

It is interesting to note that, just like English, some Arabic SRV which are closely related to *Halaqa* ‘shaved’ and *farragha* ‘emptied’ do not allow for variants parallel to those given in (7.b) and (8.b). For instance, the action depicted by the Arabic SRV *saraq* ‘stole’ and *?azaala* ‘removed’ require three arguments and the basic meaning of these verbs can be described in terms of the LCS given in (6). However, by virtue of the ungrammaticality of 9.b and 10.b below, these verbs do not allow for variants parallel to those given in (7.b) and (8.b). Consider the following examples:

9. a. Saraqa aHmad-u nnuquud-a min arrajul-i  
Stole Ahmad-Nom. the money-Acc. from the man-Gen.  
“Ahmad stole the money from the man.”
- b.\* Saraqa aHmad-u rrajul-a min annuquud-i  
Stole Ahmad-Nom. The man-Acc. from the money-Gen.  
\*“Ahmad stole the man of the money.”
10. a. ?axaTHa aHmad-u lʔawraaq-a min aSSunduq-i  
removed Ahmad-Nom the papers-Acc. from the box-Gen.  
“Ahmad removed the papers from the box.”
- b.\* ?axaTHa aHmad-u SSunduq-a min alʔawraaq-i  
removed Ahmad-Nom. the box-Acc. from the papers-Gen.

\*“Ahmad removed the box of papers.”

## 5. Analysis of the SRV in English and Arabic

In addition to the theoretical background, this section will provide a detailed contrastive analysis of the SRV in English and Arabic including a classification of these verbs in both languages.

### 5.1. Theoretical Background

As pointed out in (1) and (6), the action depicted by the English and Arabic SRV requires three arguments: a subject (agent), a direct object (substance) and an object of a preposition (location). According to [21, pp. 767-811], among others, the term ‘locatum’ is mapped with the substance which is removed (i.e., the *hair* and the *books* in (2) and (3) and *?ashsha’r* and *?alkutub* in (7) and (8)). On the other hand, the term location is mapped with the argument from which the substance is removed. Thus, the Predicate Argument Structure (PAS) and the semantic roles associated with the English and Arabic SRV are shown in (11):

11.	Argument 1	Argument 2	Argument 3
	↓	↓	↓
Grammatical	Subject	Direct object	Object of a
function:	↓	↓	preposition
Semantic role:	Agent	Locatum	↓
	↓	(Substance)	Location
	↓	↓	↓
[e.g.	– John emptied/ removed	the books	from the box.
	– farragha/?axaTHa aHmadu	lkutuba	min aSSunduuqi]

The PAS structure and the semantic roles illustrated in (11) capture the a-variants which the English and Arabic SRV allow for. (See the English examples in 2.a-5.a and the Arabic examples in 7.a-10.a). The LCS of these variants is given in (1) and repeated in (6). Variants that imply holistic interpretation such as the English 2.b and 3.b and the Arabic 7.b and 8.6 can be described in terms of the PAS and the semantic roles shown in (12):

12.	Argument 1	Argument 2	Argument 3
	↓	↓	↓
Grammatical function:	Subject	Direct object	Object of a preposition
	↓	↓	↓
Semantic role:	Agent	Location	Locatum (substance)
	↓	↓	↓
[e.g.	– John emptied/ *removed	the box	of books.
	– farragha/*?axaTHa aHmadu	SSunduuga	min alkutubi]

The LCS associated with these variants is given in (13):

13. The agent (subject) causes the location (direct object) to become free from the substance (object of a preposition).

Thus, two distinct classes of the SRV in both languages are identified. The first class allows for two variants or alternations, while the second allows for one alternation only. Precisely, verbs of the first class allow for the occurrence of the location argument either as an object of a preposition or as a direct object. Members of this class are *shave*, *empty*, *Halaqa* and *farragha*. By contrast, verbs of the second class allow for the occurrence of the location argument as an object of a preposition only. Members of this class include verbs like *remove*, *steal*, *?azaala/?axaTHa*<sup>2</sup> and *saraqa*. Let us refer to the first class as the ‘shave-class’ and the second as the ‘remove-class’.

The PAS and the semantic roles given in (11) and (12), as well as the LCS given in (6) and (13) constitute the lexical representation on the basis of which the two classes of the SRV are distinguished. Specifically, in both languages, the ‘shave class’ allows for two alternations, which are associated with the lexical representations given in (11) and (12). The LCSs of these alternations are given in (6) and (13), respectively. On the other hand, the ‘remove-class’ in both

<sup>2</sup> It should be pointed out here that Arabic employs *?axaTHa* and *?azaala* as counterparts for the English *remove*, depending on the nature of the relationship between the substance and the location. For instance, *to remove books from the box* corresponds to *?axaTHa lkutuba min aSSunduugi*, but *to remove grass from the soil* corresponds to *?azaala lHashaa?isha min atturbati*.

languages allows for one alternation only.<sup>3</sup> This alternation is associated with the lexical representation given in (11). The LCS of this alternation is stated in (6).

## 5.2 Classification of the SRV in English and Arabic

So far, two classes of the SRV have been identified in English and Arabic, namely the 'shave-class' and the 'remove-class.' As pointed out in 5.1, the PAS, the LCS and the semantic roles associated with each class are the same in both languages. Similarly, in both languages, the first class allows for two alternations, while the second allows for one. By virtue of allowing for two alternations, the 'shave-class' in both languages implies 'holistic interpretation', while the 'remove-class' does not.

In this section, I will examine more SRV in both languages in an attempt to explore the relevance of the syntactic behavior of these verbs. Put differently, I will see how the syntactic behavior of these verbs is relevant to their classification. I will also try to see to what extent English and Arabic are similar with respect to the class membership of these verbs.

### 5.2.1 SRV with Two Alternations in Both Languages

As pointed out before, these verbs are referred to in this study as the 'shave-class.' The two alternations which these verbs allow for are shown in the English examples in (2) and (3) and the Arabic examples in (7) and (8). The PAS and the semantic roles associated with the first and the second alternations of these verbs are given in (11) and (12), respectively. The LCS's of these alternations are given in (6) and (13), respectively. In addition to the English verbs *shave* and *empty* and their Arabic counterparts *Halaqa* and *farragha*, this class comprises the following English verbs and their Arabic counterparts: *wash* (*ghasala*), *wipe* (*masaHa*), *clean* (*naTH THafa*), *rinse* (*shaTafa*), *mop* (*masaHa*), *wring* (*'aSara*), *prune* (*qallama*), and *filter* (*Saffa*). Consider the following alternations in English and Arabic:

14 a. John washed the grease off his hands.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> It should be pointed out that in both languages the SRV allow for other alternations where some arguments are expressed implicitly, e.g., *John shaved his head*, *John shaved his hair* or *John shaved*. Likewise, Arabic allows for similar alternations, e.g., *Halaqa aHmadu ra?sahu*, *Halaqa aHmadu sha'rahu* or *Halaqa aHmadu*. This paper is restricted to the alternations where the three arguments are expressed explicitly.

<sup>4</sup> To confirm the grammatical acceptability of the English constructions, I have consulted a number of native speakers of American English, among them Professor Sarah G. Thomason (University of Michigan) and Mr. Omar Johnston (King Saud University). As to the Arabic constructions, in addition to my own judgement, I have also checked with other native speakers of MSA.

- b. John washed his hands of grease.
15. a. ghasalat maryam-u dduhuun-a min yadayhaa  
washed Mary-Nom. the grease-Acc. from her hands  
“Mary washed the grease off her hands.”
- b. ghasalat maryam-u yadayhaa min adduhuun-i  
washed Mary-Nom. her hands from the grease-Gen.  
“Mary washed her hands of grease.”
16. a. John wiped the fingerprints off the glass.  
John wiped the glass of fingerprints.
17. a. masaHat maryam-u lbaSamaat-i mina zzujaaj-i  
wiped Mary-Nom. the prints-Acc. from the glass-Gen.  
“Mary wiped the prints off the glass.”
- b. masaHat maryam-u zzujaaj-a mina lbaSamaat-i  
wiped Mary-Nom the glass-Acc. from the prints-Gen.  
“Mary wiped the glass of prints.”

(More examples of these alternations in both languages are given in Appendix 2).

This means that in both languages the verbs that belong to the ‘shave-class’ allow for the occurrence of the location argument either as an object of a preposition (as in 14.a – 16.a), or as a direct object (as in 14.b–16.b) The a-alternations are associated with the lexical representation given in (11), while the b-alternations are associated with the lexical representation given in (12). The LCS associated with the a-alternations is stated in (6), while the LCS of the b-alternations is given in (13).

### 5.2.2 SRV with One Alternations in Both Languages

As pointed out earlier, these verbs are referred to in this study as the ‘remove-class.’ Apparently, these verbs are closely related to the ‘shave-class,’ in terms of basic meaning and argument structure. Just like the ‘shave-class,’ the action depicted by the ‘remove-class’ in both languages requires three arguments and the basic meaning of these verbs can also be described in terms of the LCS stated in (1) and repeated in (6). The PAS and the semantic roles associated with these verbs are given in (11). However, as illustrated by the English examples in (4) and (5) and the Arabic examples in (9) and (10), these verbs allow for one alternation only. Let us consider more examples of the SRV that allow for one alternation in both English and Arabic:

18. a. John deleted the names from the list.  
b.\* John deleted the list of names.

19. a. shaTaba aHmad-u l?asmaa?-a mina lqaa?imat-i  
 deleted Ahmad-Nom the names-Acc. from the list-Gen.  
 “Ahmad deleted the names from the list.”  
 b.\* shaTaba aHmad-u lqaa?imat-a mina l?asmaa?-i  
 deleted Ahmad-Nom. the list-Acc. from the names-Gen.  
 \*“Ahmad deleted the list of names.”
20. a. John dismissed the people from the place.  
 b. John dismissed the place of people.
21. a. Tarada aHmad-u nnaas-a mina lmakaan-I  
 dismissed Ahmad-Nom. the people-Acc. from the place-Gen.  
 “Ahmad dismissed the people from the place.”  
 b.\* Tarada aHmad-u lmakaan-a mina nnaas-i  
 dismissed Ahmad-Nom. the place-Acc. from the people-Gen.  
 \*“Ahmad dismissed the place of people.”
22. a. John removed the grass from the soil.  
 b.\* John removed the soil of grass.
23. a. ?azaala aHmad-u lHashaa?ish-a mina tturbat-i  
 removed Ahmad-Nom. the grass-Acc. from the soil-Gen.  
 “Ahmad removed the grass from the soil.”  
 b.\* ?azaala aHmad-u tturbat-a mina lHashaa?ish-i  
 removed Ahmad-Nom. the soil-Acc. from the grass-Gen.  
 \*“Ahmad removed the soil of grass.”

(More examples of these alternations in both languages are given in Appendix 3)

Thus, by virtue of the ungrammaticality of the b-alternations in (18-23), verbs that belong to the ‘remove-class’ in both languages allow for one alternation only, namely the a-alternations. This means that these verbs allow for the occurrence of the location argument as an object of a preposition only, as shown in (18.a-23.a). The location argument of these verbs cannot occur as a direct object; hence the alternations in (18.b-23.b) are ungrammatical. Thus, based on the data presented in the two preceding sections, English and Arabic exhibit striking similarity with respect to the syntax and semantics of the SRV.

### 5.2.3 SRV with Two Alternations in English and One Alternation in Arabic

As illustrated in 5.2.1 and 5.2.2, verbs of the ‘shave-class’ in both languages allow for two alternations, while those that belong to the ‘remove-class’ allow for one alternation only. The question arises: if a given SRV allows for two alternations in either language, does this mean that its counterpart in the

other language will necessarily allow for two-alternations? Similarly, if a given SRV allows for one alternation only in either language, does this mean that its counterpart in the other language will necessarily allow for one alternation only?

Careful examination of the members of the 'shave-class' and the 'remove-class' in both languages has revealed that if a given English verb allows for one alternation only, its Arabic counterpart will exhibit the same syntactic behavior. In other words, as far as the data examined is concerned, if a given English SRV allows for one alternation only, its Arabic counterpart will also allow for one alternation only. (For details, see Section 5.2.2 and Appendix 3).

However, with respect to the 'shave-class' the situation is different. On the one hand, if a given Arabic SRV allows for two alternations, its English counterpart will also allow for two alternations. (For details, see Section 5.2.1 and Appendix 2). On the other hand, if a given English SRV allows for two alternations this does not mean that its Arabic counterpart will necessarily allow for two alternations. In fact, careful examination of the 'shave-class' in both languages has shown that there are some English SRV that allow for two alternations, whereas their Arabic counterparts allow for one alternation only. The rest of this section is concerned with these verbs. Compare the following English examples with their Arabic counterparts:

English example:

24. a. John scrubbed the rust off the car.  
b. John scrubbed the car of rust.

Arabic counterpart:

25. a. maHaa aHmad-u SSada?-a min assayarat-i  
scrubbed Ahmad-Nom. the rust-Acc. from the car-Gen.  
"Ahmad scrubbed the rust off the car."  
b.\* maHaa aHmad-u ssayyarat-a min aSSada?-i  
scrubbed Ahmad-Nom. the car-Acc. from the rust-Gen.  
"Ahmad scrubbed the car of rust."

English example:

26. a. John shoveled the snow from the pavement.  
b. John shoveled the pavement of snow.

Arabic counterpart:

27. a. jarafa aHmad-u OOalj-a min arraSiif-i  
shoveled Ahmad-Nom. the snow-Acc. from the pavement-Gen.  
"Ahmad shoveled the snow from the pavement."  
b.\* jarafa aHmad-u rraSiifa-a min aOOalj-i

shoveleld Ahmad-Nom. the pavement-Acc. from the snow-Gen.  
 “Ahmad shoveled the pavement of snow.”

English example:

28. a. John scraped the mud off the shoes.  
 b. John scraped the shoes of mud.

Arabic counterpart:

29. a. kashaTa aHmad-u TTiin-a min al HiTHaa?-i  
 scraped Ahmad-Nom the mud-Acc. from the shoes-Gen.  
 “Ahmad scraped the mud off the shoes.”  
 b.\* kashaTa aHmad-u lHiTHaa?-a min aTTiin-I  
 scraped Ahmad-Nom. the shoes-Acc. from the mud-Gen.  
 “Ahmad scraped the shoes of mud.”

It is interesting to note that if the verbs in the Arabic ungrammatical alternations in 25.b, 27.b and 29.b are replaced by the appropriate verbs from the ‘shave-class,’ such alternations become acceptable. Compare the alternations below where the verb *naTH THafa* is used instead of *maHa*, *jarafa*, and *kashaTa*.

30. a.\* maHaa aHmad-u ssayyarat-a min aSSada?-i  
 scrubbed Ahmad-Nom. the car-Acc. from the rust-Gen.  
 “Ahmad scrubbed the car of rust.”  
 b. naTH THafa aHmad-u ssayyarat-a min aSSada?-i  
 cleaned Ahmad-Num. the car-Acc. from the rust-Gen.  
 “Ahmad cleaned the car of rust.”
31. a.\* jarafa aHmad-u rraSiifa-a min aOOalj-i  
 shoveleld Ahmad-Nom. the pavement-Acc. from the snow-Gen.  
 “Ahmad shoveled the pavement of snow.”  
 b. naTH THafa aHmad-u rraSiif-a min aOOalj-i  
 cleaned Ahmad-Nom. the pavement-Acc. from the snow-Gen.  
 “Ahmad cleaned the car of rust.”
32. a.\* kashaTa aHmad-u lHiTHaa?-a min aTTiin-I  
 scraped Ahmad-Nom. the shoes-Acc. from the mud-Gen.  
 “Ahmad scraped the shoes of mud.”  
 b. naTH THafa aHmad-u lHiTHaa?-a min aTTiin-i  
 cleaned Ahmad-Num. the shoes-Acc. from the mud-Gen.  
 “Ahmad cleaned the shoes of mud.”

This means that, unlike their English counterparts, when the location argument of *maHa*, *jarafa*, and *KashaTa* is moved to the direct object position,

the resultant alternations – as shown in 30.6 -32.b – are unacceptable. However, as illustrated in 30.a - 32.a, when these verbs are replaced by the verb *naTH THafa*, which belongs to the “shave-class,” these alternations become acceptable. (Appendix 4 presents more examples of the English SRV that allow for two alternations, while their Arabic counterparts allow for one alternation only).

Thus, based on the data and discussion presented in this study, the English and Arabic SRV can be classified into three classes. The first class includes verbs that allow for two alternations in both languages, i.e. the ‘shave-class.’ The second class includes verbs that allow for one alternation in both languages, i.e., the ‘remove-class.’ The third class comprises verbs that allow for two alternations in English and one alternation in Arabic.

The question arises: why do some SRV allow for two alternations, while others allow for one alternation only, despite the fact that the PAS, the LCS, and the semantic roles of all these verbs are the same? The reason for this could simply be attributed to the lexical semantic properties of these verbs. In other words, it is assumed here that the lexical semantic properties of the ‘shave-class’ are compatible with the ‘holistic interpretation’ implied by these verbs; hence, verbs that belong to this class allow for two alternations in both languages. (See 5.5.2.a). By contrast, the lexical semantic properties of the ‘remove-class’ are not compatible with the ‘holistic interpretation’; therefore, verbs that belong to this class allow for one alternation only (See 5.2.2).

The assumption made here is supported by the syntactic behavior of the third class of the SRV discussed in 5.2.3. This class includes verbs that allow for two alternations in English, whereas their Arabic counterparts allow for one alternation. As illustrated in 30-32, when these Arabic verbs are replaced by an appropriate verb from the ‘share-class’, the ungrammatical alternations become acceptable. (Compare 30.a – 32.a with 30.b – 32.b). This means that, unlike their English counterparts, the lexical semantic properties of the Arabic verbs used in 30.a – 32.a are not compatible with the ‘holistic interpretation.’ As shown in 30.b – 32.b, when these verbs were replaced by *naTH THafa*, which belongs to the ‘shave-class’ these alternations became acceptable, simply because the lexical semantic properties of the ‘shave-class’ are compatible with the ‘holistic interpretation’ implied by the second alternation.

## 6. Conclusion

The main objective of this study was to characterize and contrast the main syntactic and semantic properties of the Substance-Removing Verbs (SRV) in English and Arabic. The relevance of the syntactic behavior of these verbs to their classification into semantic classes was also explored.

Based on the syntactic behavior of the SRV, three classes of these verbs were identified. The first class was referred to as the 'shave-class,' and it includes verbs that allow for two alternations in both languages. The second class includes verbs that allow for one alternation only in both languages, and it was called the 'remove-class.' The third class includes verbs that allow for two alternations in English, while their Arabic counterparts allow for one alternation only. This means that despite the fact that the SRV have the same PAS, the same LCS, and the same semantic roles, these verbs exhibit significant syntactic variation. It is assumed in this study that this syntactic variation could be attributed to the inherent lexical semantic properties of these verbs. In other words, if the lexical semantic properties of a given SRV are compatible with the 'holistic interpretation' implied by the second alternation, such a verb will allow for two alternations. If not, the verb will allow for one alternation only.

Therefore, to classify these verbs into classes, the syntactic behavior of these verbs must be taken into account in addition to the PAS, the LCS and the semantic roles associated with them. It should also be taken into account that listing these verbs as lexical synonyms in bilingual dictionaries does not accurately reflect the syntactic behavior of these verbs. Thus, despite the fact that English and Arabic are typologically different, and despite the surface variations exhibited by some of the SRV, it seems that the basic principles underlying the syntax and semantic of these verbs are the same in both languages.

### Appendix 1

The phonetic symbols used to represent the Arabic data are listed below with their corresponding Arabic letters in parentheses.

[ b ]	voiced bilabial stop .....	[ب]
[ t ]	voiceless alveo dental stop .....	[ت]
[ T ]	voiceless alveo dental velarized stop .....	[ط]
[ d ]	voiced alveo dental stop .....	[د]
[D]	voiced alveo dental velarized stop.....	[ض]
[ k ]	voiceless velar stop .....	[ك]
[ q ]	voiceless uvular stop .....	[ق]
[ ? ]	voiceless glottal stop .....	[ء]
[ j ]	voiced alveo-palatal affricate .....	[ج]
[ H ]	voiceless pharyngeal fricative .....	[ح]
[ ' ]	voiced pharyngeal fricative .....	[ع]

[ f ]	voiceless labio-dental fricative .....	[ف]
[ θ ]	voiceless dental fricative .....	[ث]
[ TH ]	voiced dental fricative .....	[ذ]
[ TH ]	voiced dental velarized fricative .....	[ظ]
[ s ]	voiceless alveolar fricative .....	[س]
[ S ]	voiceless alveolar velarized fricative .....	[ص]
[ z ]	voiced alveolar fricative .....	[ز]
[ sh ]	voiceless alveo palatal fricative .....	[ش]
[ x ]	voiceless uvular fricative .....	[خ]
[ gh ]	voiced uvular fricative .....	[غ]
[ h ]	voiceless glottal fricative .....	[هـ]
[ r ]	voiced alveolar trill .....	[ر]
[ l ]	voiced alveolar lateral .....	[ل]
[ m ]	voiced bilabial nasal .....	[م]
[ n ]	voiced alveolar nasal .....	[ن]
[ y ]	voiced palatal glide .....	[ي]
[ w ]	voiced bilabial round glide .....	[و]
[ i ]	high front vowel .....	كسرة
[ a ]	low back vowel .....	فتحة
[ u ]	high back rounded vowel .....	ضمة

Note: Consonant germination and vowel lengthening are represented by doubling the respective consonant or vowel.

## Appendix 2

More examples of the SRV that allow for two alternations in both languages.

First: the English Examples:

- clean:
  - a. to clean papers from the desk.
  - b. to clean the desk of paper.
- rinse:
  - a. to rinse coffee out of the cup.
  - b. to rinse the cup of coffee.
- comb:
  - a. to comb tangles out of the hair.
  - b. to comb the hair of tangles.
- filter:
  - a. to filter dirt from the water.
  - b. to filter the water of dirt.
- wring:
  - a. to wring water out of the towel.
  - b. to wring the towel of water.
- drain:
  - a. To drain water from the pool.
  - b. To drain the pool of water.



- ?ista?Sala:
- b.\* ?intaza'a ddajaajata min arriishi
  - \* "to pluck the chicken of feathers."
  - a. ?ista?Sala l?irhaaba min baladihi
  - "to uproot terrorism from his country."
  - b.\* ?ista?Sala baladahu min al ?irhaabi
  - "to uproot his country of terrorism"
- ?istaxlaSa:
- a. ?istaxlaSa assa?ila min annabaati
  - "to extract the liquid from the plant"
  - b.\* ?istaxlaSa annabaata min assa?ili
  - \* "to extract the plant of liquid."
- xaTafa:
- a. xaTafa nnuquuda min yadihaa
  - "to snatch the money from her hand."
  - b.\* xaTafa yadaha min annuquudii
  - \* To snatch her hand of the gift
- ?axraja:
- a. ?axraja nnaasa min almakaani
  - "to expel the people from the place."
  - b.\* ?xraja lmakaana min annaasi
  - \* "to expel the place of people."

#### Appendix 4

More examples of the English SRV that allow for two alternations while their Arabic counterparts allow for one only.

English Examples:

- a. to skim the cream off the milk.
- b. to skim the milk of cream.

Arabic counterpart:

- a. naza'a ddasama min alHaliibi
- "to skim the cream off the milk."
- b.\* naza'a lHaliiba min addasami
- "to skim the milk of cream."

English example:

- a. to clear the dishes from the table.
- b. to clear the table of dishes.

Arabic counterpart:

- a. shaala l?aTbaaqa min aTTawilati
- "to clear the dishes from the table."
- b. \*shaala TTawilata min al?aTbaaqi
- "to clear the table of dishes."

English example:

- a. to strip the bark from a tree.
- b. to strip a tree of its bark.

Arabic counterpart:

- a. naza'a lqushuura min ashshajarati
- "to strip the bark from the tree."
- b. \*naza'a shshajarata min alqushuuri
- "to strip the tree of its bark."

English example:

- a. to con the money from the man.
- b. to con the man of his money.

Arabic counterpart:

- a. ?ibtazza nnuquuda mina rrajuli  
“to con the money from the man.”
- b. \*?ibtazza rrajula mina nnuquudi  
“tocon the man of his money.”

## References

- [1] Bloomfield, L. *Language*. New York: Holt, 1933.
- [2] Levin, B. *English Verb Classes and Alternations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993
- [3] Levin, B., and H. Rappaport. “Building Verb Meaning.” In M. Butt and W. Geuder, eds., *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 1998, 97-134.
- [4] Levin, B. “Approaches to Lexical Semantic Representation.” In D. Walker, A. Zampalli, and N. Calzolari, eds., *Automating the Lexicon I: Research and Practice in a Multilingual Environment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, 53-91.
- [5] Pustejovsky, J. “The Construction and the Logic of Concepts.” Published on the Internet at 2001.<http://www.cs.brandeis.edu/~jamesp/articles/>
- [6] Pustejovsky, J., and C. Tenny. “A History of Events in Linguistic Theory.” Published on the Internet at <http://www.cs.brandeis.edu/~jamesp/articles/2000>
- [7] Jackendoff, R. *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997.
- [8] Harley, H., ed. *Papers from the U Penn/MIT Roundtable on Argument Structure and Aspect*. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, Cambridge, MA. 1998.
- [9] Harley, H., and R. Noyer. “Formal vs. Encyclopedic Properties of Vocabulary: Evidence from Nominalizations.” Published on the Internet at <http://W3.arizona.edu/~ling/hh/PDFs/>, 2000.
- [10] Gropen, J., S. Pinker, M. Hollander, and R. Goldberg. “Affectedness and Direct Objects: The Role of Lexical Semantics in the Acquisitions of Verb Argument Structure.” *Cognition*, 41 (1991), 153-95.
- [11] Tenny, Carrol. “The Aspectual Interface Hypothesis.” In I.A. Sag and A. Szabolcsi, eds., *Lexical Matters, CSLI Lecture Notes 24*. Stanford: Stanford University, Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1992, 1-27.
- [12] Jeffries, L., and P. Willis. “A Return to the Spray Paint Issue.” *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8 (1984), 715-29.
- [13] Dowty, D. “Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection.” *Language*, 67 (1991), 547-619.
- [14] Croft, W. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations*: Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- [15] Fillmore, C. “Lexical Entries for Verbs.” *Foundation of Language*, 4 (1968), 373- 93.

- [16] Postal, P.M. "Some Are Pair Grammar Descriptions." In P. Jacobson and G. Pallum, eds., *The Nature of Syntactic Representation*. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1982, 341-425.
- [17] Becker, D. "Case Grammar and German be." *Glossa*, 5 (1971), 125-45.
- [18] Veyrenc, J. "Sur la Double Diathèse d'Object des Enonces Translocatifs." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 72 (1976), 241- 73.
- [19] Maruta, T. "The Syntax and Semantics of Spray/Load Verbs." *Verb Semantics and Syntactic Structure*. T. Kageyama. Tokyo: Kurocio Publishers (1997), 97-114.
- [20] Mahmoud, A.T. "The Syntax and Semantics of Some Locative Alternations in Arabic and English." *Journal of King Saud University, Languages and Translation*, 11 (1999), 37-59.
- [21] Clark E., and H. Clark. "When Nouns Surface as Verbs." *Language*, 55 (1979), 767-811.

## السمات الدلالية والنحوية للأفعال "الدالة على إزالة مادة ما" في الإنجليزية والعربية

عبدالجواد توفيق محمود

أستاذ مشارك، قسم اللغات الأوروبية والترجمة، كلية اللغات والترجمة،

جامعة الملك سعود، الرياض، المملكة العربية السعودية

ملخص البحث. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى توصيف ومقابلة السمات الدلالية والنحوية للأفعال "الدالة على إزالة مادة ما"، SRV في الإنجليزية والعربية وعلاقة ذلك بتصنيف هذه الأفعال إلى فئات دلالية، وقد تبين أن هذه الأفعال متماثلة من حيث الأدوار النحوية PAS والأدوار الدلالية semantic roles والتمثيل المعجمي LCS، واستناداً إلى السمات النحوية لهذه الأفعال، أمكن تصنيفها إلى ثلاث فئات، حيث تسمح الفئة الأولى بنمطين نحويين في كلتا اللغتين، وتسمح الفئة الثانية بنمط نحوي واحد في كلتا اللغتين، أما الفئة الثالثة فقد تضمنت الأفعال التي تسمح بنمطين نحويين في الإنجليزية في حين أن مرادفاتهما العربية لا تسمح إلا بنمط نحوي واحد. على أساس أن هذا التباين النحوي يرجع إلى السمات الدلالية - المعجمية للفعل، وعليه فإنه على الرغم من التباين السطحي بين الإنجليزية والعربية بخصوص هذه الأفعال إلا أنه يبدو أن المبادئ الأساسية التي تحكم السمات الدلالية والنحوية لهذه الأفعال متماثلة في اللغتين، ومع ذلك فإنه لا بد أن نأخذ في الاعتبار أن سرد هذه الأفعال في المعاجم الثنائية على أنها مرادفات معجمية لا يعكس بدقة السمات النحوية لهذه الأفعال.