A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF ARABIC AND ENGLISH NOMINAL SENTENCES

Mohammed Amer Ahmed Sultan

Directorate of Education in Nineveh District, Department of Preparation and Training

Abstract: Nominal or copular sentences are congruent kind of sentences in both Arabic and English languages. And since all languages have some similarities, since they all are used for same purposes, and differences, since they are related to different language family, I hypothesizes that there are some differences and similarities in both languages at the level of nominal sentences which I tackle in this paper. This paper aims at comparing nominal sentences in Arabic and English language to unveil where these languages are similar and different. The study depends mainly on Abu-Almkarem (2007) in describing standard Arabic and Mikkelsen (2005) for standard English. The study gives results that nominal sentences are similar in realizations of subjects and predicates, order of sentences, case of subjects and predicates and grammatical process like ellipsis and agreement. Yet, they are different in need of English for copular verbs in contrast to Arabic ones. Also, they are different in ways of achieving negation and interrogation.

Key words: nominal sentence, copular verb, predicate, subject, noun, adjective, adverb.

1.1. Preliminaries

The language is a highly systematic means of communication which is used by humans-being. Its systematicity represents when its expressions combine in various sequences like beads known as "sentence". One of these sequences are "nominal sentences". "The nominal sentence" is going to be handled in standard English and Arabic to unveil similarities and differences for this type of sentences. These two languages are originally different since Arabic language is Semitic while English is Germanic.

In spite of different syntactic structure of languages, nominal sentence can be defined as a nonverbal sentence which has a nominal predicate: adjective, an adverbial or prepositional predicate. In Semitic languages, such sentences have no verb (copular) in their structure are known as "zero copula" or "equational sentence" which are available in 175 languages, and does not occur in over 200 other languages. (Mikkelsen, 2005:1) and (Merriam-webster.com).

Ismail (2009:2) states that a non-copulative term is used with those languages which have no copula like Arabic, Russian and Hungarian. Besides, other grammarians say that copula may explicit or implicit i.e., zero copula. For Ibn-Alsiraj (1996:64), the nominal sentence is a construction that composes of Almubtada (subject) and Alkhabar (predicate).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Though English and Arabic are unrelated languages, English is Germanic while Arabic is Semitic, still as most languages do, they show some similarities in one linguistics aspects or in another. So, in the following papers we are going to discover this kind of sentences in both languages.

1.3. Hypotheses

As many languages are similar with each other in some linguistic aspect, I suppose that:

A. Arabic nominal sentences are similar to English copular sentences in one way or in another at least both start with nominal expressions (noun and pronoun).

B. The English nominal sentences differ from Arabic ones since they belong to different languages. For instance, the Arabic sentences do not contain any verb however, English ones will be ungrammatical if they do not have copular verb.

1.4. Aims of the Study

This study aims at:

A. Describe and explain what is Arabic nominal sentences and English copular ones.

B. Exploring similarities and differences between nominal (copular) sentences in Arabic and English.

1.5 The Model

The present study describes Arabic nominal sentences and English copular ones depending on Abu-Almkarem (2007) for Arabic and Mikkelsen (2005) for English.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The present study handles just standard Arabic and English languages.

1.7 Value of the Study

The value of this study is represented in simplifying of teaching Arabic and English languages generally and for nominal sentences specifically for curriculum designers. It also shades lights on convergences and divergences which exist among nominal sentences in the two languages for another high studies. Finally, it is beneficial in translating issues.

2. English Copular Sentences

2.1. What is Copular Sentence

According to Kroeger (2005:173) Mikkelsen (2005:1), copular clause (nominal sentence) is a minor type of sentence whose predicate is AP, NP or PP not a verb. Like:

1. George is tall.
2. Ahmed is teacher.
3. Jane is at home.

Crystal (2008:116), Niimura (2007:203) and Kroeger (2005:173) define the copula as sentences which have copular verbs whose function is to link subjects with predicate complements but it does not have any semantic content. Geist (2015:2) states that such sentences are "source of embarrassment for syntacticians and semanticists".

2.2. Taxonomy of Copular Clauses

Higgins (1979:204–293) classifies nominal sentences into four types. Such classification bases on intuitions and thorough observations of English copular sentences. They are as follows: (Mikkelsen, 2005:48) (Roy, 2013:8) (Niimura, 2007:203)

A. **Predicational**. It involves a predication for property of the subject referent. Its subject is a referential or quantificational NP. (Declerck,1988:2/55), (Mikkelsen, 2005:11), (Niimura, 2007:206), (Roy,2013:11) and (Geist, 2015:2/4)

4. The news / John / My father / He /Everyone/no one was unhappy.

Subject's referentiality is indicated by its capability to pronominalize with gendered pronoun as non-copular sentences:

5. The guard of the president was happy, wasn't she/he/*it?

Mikkelsen (2008:7) says that AP, PP and NP (DP) can be its predicate complement:

6. James is **from Paris** / **an engineer** / **the engineer of the project.**

Moreover, she states that two observations prove that these complements are semantically predicative:

a) They can be ellipted:

7. James is the engineer of the project, but we wish he wasn't.

b) Proposition can be expressed by expressions flanking copula in predicational sentences without copula in embedded context:

8. I consider **James my son.**

Such things can't be applied with other types of copular sentences:

9. I consider **my son *(to be) James**. (Specificational)
10. With **James presence *(being) James**, there isn't much to be discussed. (specificational)
11. I believe **that *(to be) James**. (Identificational)
12. I believe **her *(to be) Helen**. (Equative).

B. **Specificational**. Its predicate complement gives value for a variable which is expressed by the subject. It is used to specify who someone is or what something is rather than saying about that person or thing. The post-copular noun phrase refers to an entity which meets condition represented by pre-copular noun phrase. (Declerck,1988:2), (Mikkelsen, 2005:11), (Niimura, 2007:206), (Mikkelsen, 2008:7), (Heycock,2012:210) and (Roy, 2013:9)

13. The teacher was George.

Mikkelsen (2008:7) states that the non-referentiality status of the subject presents in its pronominalization with "it" and "that" rather than gendered ones "he" and "she" as it was with other kinds of copular sentences:

14. The director of this office, **that**'s James Joe.

Specificational sentences present a particular information, where the ground is constructed from the subject phrase and the post-copular expression receives the focus. (Quirk et al. 1972: 940), (Declerck,1988:13) and (Mikkelsen, 2008:7)

In sum, specificational sentences must specify a value for a variable which presents a known information. (Declerck,1988:19)

Specificational sentences of two NPs are capable to reversed without semantic difference. (Declerck,1988:40)

15. The bank robber is James Joe.
16. James Joe is the bank robber.

C. **Identificational**. Its subject is a demonstrative noun or pronoun that should have a deictic rather than an anaphoric reference. It is used for teaching names of things and people. The function of this sentence is to equate the two referential noun phrases. (Declerck, 1988:96), (Mikkelsen, 2005:11), (Niimura, 2007:206) (Mikkelsen, 2008:10) and (Roy, 2013:9)

17. That (man) is James Joe.

D. **Equative**. It involves equation of the expressions on both side of copular verb. (Geist, 2015:2/9) and (Mikkelsen, 2008:4)

18. "Muhammad Ali is Cassius Clay". (Mikkelsen, 2008:4)

Mikkelsen (2008:4) states that the linguistic status of this type is "murky". It is constructed by two names or a pronoun plus a name as exemplified above. However, others say that there is no truly equative copular sentences like (Moro 1997, den Dikken 2006, Adger and Ramchand 2003).

Higgins (1979:204–293), Mikkelsen (2005:6/49) and Niimura (2007:203) mention three types of copular sentences: Predicational, Specificational and equative. In contrast, Kroeger (2005:175) classifies copular sentences differently into:

A. **Attributive sentence**: it is a clause which its semantic predicate expressed by an adjective phrase. It is used to describe a quality or attribute that is "said to be true of the subject".

19. The boy is tall.

B. **Equative sentence**: it is a clause which its semantic predicate expressed by a noun phrase.

20. Saddam Hussein was the president of Iraq.

When the noun phrase is definite, the two noun phrases refer to single individual. But if it is indefinite, the subject is a member of the predicate.

21. Saddam Hussein was a lawyer.

C. **Locative sentence:** it is a clause which its semantic predicate expressed by prepositional phrase. Such clauses refer to the location of the subject.

22. Saddam Hussein was from Tikrit.

Mikkelsen (2005:55) states that "we are less fortunate" in studying these constructions (types) especially properties of DP independently of copula. Another related problem is that there are no explicit definitions for these kinds of copular sentences in Higgins's taxonomy which is "universal" (available in other languages) She reports:

> *What we have are some examplars (the recurrent examples in the literature) and a set of behavioural diagnostics (most of them from Higgins 1979). This leads to a kind of "boot-strapping" in characterizing the different categories of copular clauses. For instance, when trying to establish the semantic type of the subject of Specificational and predicational clauses, I rely on a contrast in the predicate complement (name vs. adjective) to force the intended readings. When I later investigate the type of the predicate*

complement, I use these same distributional facts (that a name, but not an adjective, can occur as the predicate complement of a Specificational clause) as evidence for the predicate complement being referential. These kinds of interdependencies mean that we cannot build up the semantic analysis of copular clauses from anything like first principles."

<div align="right">

Mikkelsen (2005:55)

</div>

Then she comments on the identity (or equatives) clauses saying that Higgins discussed it very briefly and he just cites examples from Wiggins (1965:262):

23. "Hesperus is Phosphorus".
24. "Cicero is Tully".
25. "Clark Kent is Superman."

And that he relies on specialized cases which need contextual support like an individual or entity that has two names.

2.2.1. Differentiating of Copula Sentences

Mikkelsen (2005:64) and Heycock (2012:226) rely on pronominalization in differentiating between the subject of specificational clauses from that of predicational and equatives clauses. In which, the subject of the former is not referential and denotes a property when it takes neutral pronoun in tag questions but the use of "she" indicates that subject is referential when the subjects of predicational clauses take gendered pronoun as in:

26. "The smallest boy in the class is James, isn't it?
27. The smallest boy in the class is Swedish, isn't (he / *it)?"

Such constructions also found in question-answer pair when subject of the answer is pronominal:

28. Q: Who is the smallest boy in the class?
29. A: (That / It)'s James.

Variety of expressions in the predicate complements and tag questions are used by Mikkelsen (2005:94-95) to differentiate between specificational and predicational clauses. For instance, specificational clauses allow for personal pronouns, names, indefinite DPs and definite DPs but disallow for APs, NPs or PPs:

30. The loser is James, isn't it?
31. The loser is you, isn't it?
32. The loser is the Mayor of Paris, isn't it?
33. The loser is a blonde, isn't it?
34. *The loser is Mayor of Paris, isn't it?
35. *The loser is blonde, isn't it?
36. *The loser is behind the wall, isn't it?

However, Mikkelsen (2005:94-95), Niimura (2007:207) and Giest (2015:5) say that predicational clauses permit APs, PPs, definite DPs and indefinite DPs to be their complement but not personal pronouns, or names:

37. *The loser is you (and right here), isn't she?
38. The loser is the Mayor of Paris, isn't she?
39. The loser is a blonde, isn't she?
40. The loser is Mayor of Paris, isn't she?
41. The loser is blonde, isn't she?
42. The loser is behind the wall, isn't she?

It can be concluded that predicate complements of specificational clauses have expressions that denote individuals, while those of predicational have expressions denote properties.

Park (2010:166) states that at least one of the two DPs should be definite in copular sentences whether the pre-copula or the post-copula. However, it is not acceptable for both DPs to be indefinite.

According to Heycock and Kroch (1999) and Rothstein (2010), Mikkelsen (2005:43), Park (2010:166) and (Heycock, 2012:210) argue that inverted predicational sentences do not produce specificational sentences. Rather, they see specificational sentences as subtype of equative sentences of definite phrases.

Niimura (2007:208) states that according to Higgins (1979), "become" can replace the copular "be" in predicational sentences. In contrast, such substitution is not allowed in specificational and identificational sentences.

43. Jack becomes the shop robber.
44. The shop robber becomes Jack.
45. This man becomes Helen's dad.

Declerck (1988:90) and Kroeger (2005:176) add that there are other copular verbs rather than "be" as in the following examples:

46. "Arthur *became* [the Governor of Texas]".
47. "The mayor *seems* [extremely angry]".
48. "We *elected* John [chairman of the board]".
49. "They all *consider* me [crazy]". (Kroeger, 2005: 176)

Niimura (2007: 235) uses his own test to differentiate between types of copular sentences as the following:

Test \ Type	Reversed order	Complement of "become*"*	Paraphrase with "following*"*
Predicational	*	Ok	*
Specificational	Ok	*	Ok
Identificational	Ok	*	*

Niimura (2007:236) Fig.1

50. John is a teacher. ⎤ Predicational do not allow for reversed order
51. * A teacher is John. ⎦
52. The new teacher is Jake Joe. ⎤ Specificational allows for reversed order
53. Jake Joe is the new teacher. ⎦
54. That boy is my son. ⎤ Identificational allow for reversed order
55. My son is that boy. ⎦
56. Jane became beautiful. Predicational accepts of copular "become"
57. * The new teacher became Jake Joe. Specificational do not accept of copular "become"
58. * That boy becomes my son. Identificational do not accept of copular "become"
59. The following person is the new teacher: Jake Joe. specificational accepts for "following" paraphrasing.

2.3. Syntax of Copular Sentences

Mikkelsen (2005:167) mentions that all copular sentences have "verbal element" which cannot select predicational DP directly, while other languages like Arabic, Russian, Hebrew, Irish, Polish, Scots and Zapotec do not have "any verbal element" which in turn, can select predicational DP directly. Kroeger (2005:173) argues that grammatical function of the copula is being inflected for tense and agreement. It just fulfils the requirement of every English sentence which does not hold for other languages. Mikkelsen (2005:167) says if a subject of a finite predicational sentence is a pronoun, it should be in nominative case as in:

60. She / *Her is a doctor.
61. He / *Him is a doctor.

She also claims that referential DP in specificational sentences gets default case which is accusative:

62. The winner isn't (HIM / *HE).

Kroeger (2005:175) shows syntactic category of a predicate complement which is of three types as follows:

A. Attributive sentence: its predicate complement is an adjective phrase.
B. Equative sentence: its predicate complement is a noun phrase.
C. Locative sentence: its predicate complement is a prepositional phrase.

Relying on Moro's work (1997), Mikkelsen (2005:192) and Park (2010:166) argue that both predicational and specificational sentences have same core structure and have one referential and predicative element. When the referential element moves to subject position, we get a predicative sentence but when predicative DP moves to subject position, we get a specificational sentence. Such DP should be semantically predicative and capable for constructing topic. Giest (2015:3) expands the idea when she says that predicational, equative and specificational sentences are superficially alike in surface morpho-syntax.

The syntactic and semantic work of copula is done by "functional head which has no overt exponent (in English)" this shows the "possibility of non-verbal copular sentences cross-linguistically". Syntactically, this copula is an unaccusative light verb in which it cannot assign theta role and case which make it distinctive from transitive clauses and permitting for moving of predicative DP to subject position. (Mikkelsen, 2005:162)

Following Higgins (1979:55), Mikkelsen (2005:55) and Niimura (2007:207) see identity sentences (or equatives) as special kind. When he just cites unoriginal and ambiguous examples.

"The morning star is the evening star."

"Hesperus is Phosphorus."

In fact, such examples are difficult to interpret "without explicit contextual support" since they are involved two names where these names are for same individual or entity.

Roy (2013:11) states that there are three views on copular be: first, some researchers propose of more than one kind of *be* depending on various kind of arguments flanking *be* in different copular sentences. Second, others say that there is just one *be* whose function is to apply subjects to predicates. Third, a radical view that say that there is no "lexical auxiliary *be*" at all and what is available is just the "realization of tense/aspect".

2.3.1. Agreement

Unlike other languages, English copular sentences have a fixed agreement of number and gender that lies between copular verb and pre-copular noun phrase. And the post-copular noun phrase must be in tonic form. (Quirk,1985:149) and (Heycock,2012: 213)

63. Jack is an engineer.
64. She is a princess.

Heycock (2012:15) says that the post-copular pronoun in identity sentences is in accusative case and has no agreement with the verb.

2.3.2. Inversion-Structures

Birner (1996:12) and Park (2010:165) say that inversion takes place in a sentence when its logical subject takes final position after verbal position, whereas post verbal constituent (a PP, an AP, or a DP (NP)) takes initial position.

A. PP-inversion:
   65. "**With the Nobel Peace Prize winner** are Archbishop Francis Stafford, Mother Mary Thomas Beil and the Very Rev. Marcian O'Meare, who is vicar for religious affairs for the Denver archdiocese." (Birner 1996:34)
B. AP-inversion:
   66. "**More impressive to me** was Tom Conti in the thankless role of Mr. Lawrence, the audience's alter ego." (Birner 1996:40)
C. DP-inversion:
   67. "**One of the people killed** was Filimon Delgadillo, the mayoral candidateof Belaunde's party, Popular Action, in Huamanguillo." (Birner 1996:252)

According to Birner (1996:90), such inversion has a connective function in which, it is used to present familiar information before that is unfamiliar. Mikkelsen, (2005:135) states that Heycock and Kroch (1999) and Partee (2000) say that it is ungrammatical for DPs to be indefinite in subject position.

68. *A teacher is James.

She explains that such indefinites can't be subject because they do not have "discourse-old material" not for being semantically predicative. However, there are some rare examples for indefinites occupy subject position as they have "discourse-old material". Like:

69. "One example of someone who started with a Humanities Fellow position at Stanford (actually a Mellon) is Ivan Sag." (Mikkelsen, 2005:156)

The above example's subject is indefinite "one" which has "Discourse-old material" in which the DP is "Humanities Fellow position at Stanford" which is mentioned previously in the email exchange.

Declerck (1988:62) states that the subject is a referring NP and the predicate is not, so predicational sentences cannot be reversed.

70. James is a teacher.
71. *A teacher is James.

Note: reversion must not be confused with Preposing in which an element moves to initial position with keeping of subject position before the verb.

72. JAMES is the goalkeeper. (specificational)
73. The goalkeeper is JAMES.
74. He is a goalkeeper. (predicational)
75. A goalkeeper he is.
76. *A teacher is he.

However, when the preposition applied for a predicate element which is an obligatory adverb of place, the result is similar to reversion.

77. The book is on the roof.
78. *On the roof the book is.
79. On the roof is the book.

As the predicational NPs denote properties, they are similar adjectives in having adjectival characteristics like grading constructions:

80. He is such a baby.

2.4. Ellipsis

It is well-known that this process targets verb phrases. However, Rothstein (2001:64-65) and Kay (2002:465) suggest that such process can be applied on phases which are not VPs since they are predicative semantically. (Mikkelsen, 2005:99-100)

81. "You aren't a fool, but he is". (ellipted NP)
82. "You aren't [crazy], but he might be". (ellipted AP)
83. "You clearly aren't [in the mood], but he might be". (ellipted PP)
84. "Susie makes a lot of things [her business] that shouldn't be". (Mikkelsen, 2005:99-100)

Niimura (2007:217) adds that according to (Rothstein 1995), omission cannot be applied in matrix clauses, it can just apply in embedded predicational clauses.

85. The loser *(is) a bad runner. (predicational sentence)
86. The loser *(is) Helen. (specificational sentence)
87. That man *(is) James. (identificational sentence)
88. I consider the loser (to be) a bad runner. (predicational sentence)
89. I consider the loser *(to be) Helen. (specificational sentence)
90. I consider that man *(to be) James. (identificational sentence)

Moreover, Niimura (2007:233) gives some expressions mentioned by Tang (2000) where there is no copular or verb at all which come under certain circumstances.

91. You idiot!
92. You Martha, me professor.

2.5. Information-Structure.

In work on copular, the notion of "topic and focus" and "theme and rheme" were handled prominently by Halliday 1967; Akmajian 1979; Declerck 1988; Partee 2000. All of them agree that predicational clauses differ from specificational ones in that the later have a fixed information structure. Where the subject is topic or theme and the predicate complement is focus or rheme. Typically, this characterization base on question-answer pairs like:

93. Who is the loser?
    a-The loser is JAMES. (specificational)
    b-JAMES is the loser. (predicational)
94. What is James?
    a-The LOSER is James. (specificational)
    b-James is the LOSER. (predicational)

And on the notion of question-answer congruent, in the answer the **focus** is the constituent that corresponds to the **wh-phrase** in question. Thus, JAMES is the focus in both (89a) and (89b), while it is LOSER in (55a) and (55b) because they correspond to the wh-phrase. The predicational clauses in (56 and 59) are answers. As that predicational clause "James is the loser" is the answer for both questions (45) and (55), both the subject or the predicate complement can be the focus. (Declerck,1988:13) and (Mikkelsen, 2005:135)

3. Arabic Nominal Sentence
3.1. What is Nominal Sentence

In Arabic, a nominal sentence is a linguistic structure that composed of two components: a definite noun phrase called subject and a noun phrase, an adjective phrase or a prepositional phrase called predicate. The subject is in nominative case and the predicate can be in nominative, accusative or genitive. Such cases are realized morphologically. (Beamont, 1861:155), (Sterling,1904:151), (Khan, 2004:64), (Al-Hoary, 2016:28) and (Abu-Chacra, 2018:41)

3.2. Taxonomy of Nominal Sentences

Since Arabic nominal sentences can combine with Annullers (verbs or particles), Abu-Almkarem (2007:21) divides nominal sentences into two types:
  A. **The absolute nominal sentence**. It is a sentence that composes of a subject and a predicate which does not combine with any annullers (verbs or particles). So, the subject-predicative relation still as it is, it is not affected.
  95. زيد مدرس
  B. **The annulled nominal sentences**. It is a sentence that composes of a subject and a predicate which is combined with one of annullers (verbs or particles). So, the subject-predicative relation does not still as it is, it is affected by annullers.

Sterling (1904:159), Fischer (2002:189), (Khan, 2004:67) and (Al-Samara'ai, 2014:168) mention that a nominal sentence designates an existed or a desired condition and there are certain verbs like " كان and يكون" or particles like "ليس and لا" that come before predicate or subject to change their declension and meaning. They are of three kinds:
  A. Those make nominative subject and accusative predicate: (Beamont, 1861:155), (Socin, 1922:91) and (Al-Hawary,2016:38)
  - "كان" and its sisters.
  96. كان الوقتُ قريب
  - "كاد" and its sisters.
  97. كاد الرجلُ يقع
  - Those similar "ليس".
  98. ما محمد الا رسول
  B. Those make accusative subject and nominative predicate. (Socin, 1922:91), (Al-Horais, 2006:105) and (Al-Hawary, 2016:38)
  - "إنَّ" and its sister.
  99. كأن القمر بدر
  - "لا" of generic negation.
  100. لا نار في البيت
  C. Those make both subject and predicate in accusative case as its object:
  - "ظَنَّ" and its sisters.
  101. ظن الضالمَ اننا نخافه
  - "صيَّر" and its sisters.
  - "اعلم" and its sisters.
  102. اعلم الطالب ان المدير قادما

Sterling (1904:157) states that a nominal sentence can be composed of an interrogative or a negative particle followed by an adjective plus a noun or a pronoun to be its predicate. Without particle, the adjective will be the predicate and the noun will be the subject.

103. هل قادرون انتم؟

3.3. Syntax of Nominal Sentences

Al-Horais (2006: 102), Al-Hoary (2016:28) and Abu-Chacra (2018:41) argue that a nominal sentence indicates of present tense and isn't in need of a copular verb. Still, in past or future tense, there should be an obligatory overt copular verb. Moreover, Al-Horais (2006: 102) reports differentiations whether nominal sentences (or verbless sentence as Al-Horais and others name it) have copular verbs or not in present. On one side, Sibawayh (1977) argues of no verb phrase in nominal sentences. On the other side, Bakir (1980), Fassi Fehri (1993) and Bahloul (1993) argue of availability of a hidden copular verb.

3.3.1. Subject

The subject according to Ibn-Alsiraj and Ibn-Burhan who cite it from Ibn-Jini saying that subject is whatever a noun, a pronoun or a demonstrative pronoun that you begin your sentence and put it initially. (Abu-Almkarem, 2007:23), (Gully et al., 2010:310-311) (Al-Samara'ai,2014,168) and (Al-Hoary,2016:29)

104. زيد قائم.

105. نحن مهندسون.

106. هذا ابي.

Abu-Almkarem (2007:24) adds that Al-Zamakhshri focuses on some point of the above definition such as that the nominal sentence is bare of " كان and أن " and their sisters which change the nominative case in nominal sentences. He also reports Ibn-Asfor's view that subject can be explicit or implicit.

3.3.2. Predicate

Sterling (1904:148) Ibn-Hisham (1979:44) and Al-Hoary (2016:30) state that the predicate completes the meaning of the nominal sentences in combination with subject. It should be indefinite and comes after subject which may be:

A. A word: that is singular, dual or plural. (Al-Samara'ai,2014,173)

107. الدرس ممتع.

108. الولدان طيبان.

109. المؤمنون اخوة.

    B. A sentence which in turn can be:

        a) Informative: which is divided into the following:

I. Nominal sentences. (Sterling, 1904:148), (Socin, 1922:91), (Fischer,2002:189) (Al-Samara'ai,2014,175)

110. الرجل سيارته جديدة.

II. Verbal sentences. (Al-Afghany,1971:199) (Al-Samara'ai,2014,175)

111. الرجل يصلي.

III. Conditional sentences.

112. الرجل ان اعطيته يذكرك.

        b) Creative sentence: It expresses volition or beginning.

I. Imperative.

113. زيد ليدرس.

II. Interrogative.

114. زيد هل هو قائم.

III. Prohibitive.

115. انتم لا مرحبا بكم.

    C. Quasi-sentence: a prepositional or an adverbal phrase. (Sterling, 1904:148), (Socin, 1922:91), (Al-Afghany,1971:199), (Fischer,2002:189), (Al-Horais,2006:104) and (Gully et al., 2010:313)

116. الرجل في البيت.

117. الرحيل اليوم.

Besides, subordinate, relative clause or coordinate adjectives can represent predicate.

118. أن الله غفور رحيم.

It can be negated by adding "غير". (Fischer,2002:19)

119.سيارتنا غير قريبة

Al-Horais (2006:106) mentions that if a predicate is a prepositional phrase, it assigns a genitive case.

120.الولد في الدار

Al-Suywty (1998:346) and Ibn-Ya'aish (2001:249) state that a subject can have more than one predicate.

121.زيد عالم و شاعر و خطيب

3.3.3. Agreement

Because of direct feature-valuing relation, there is a full agreement of number and gender between a predicate AP or NP and a subject. (Sterling, 1904:149-150), (Khan, 2004:66-67) (Al-Horais, 2006:107) (Gully, 2010:307) and (Al-Hoary, 2016:29)

122.مريم كريمة

123.الولدان جالسان

For Sibawayh (1977), a subject takes its nominative case because of an abstract governor "inception" i.e., because it comes initially. Because of agreement with subject, a predicate becomes nominative too. However, when there are two subjects of different gender (feminine and masculine), the predicate will be masculine. (Al-Horais, 2006:108)

124.الابنُ و الابنةُ حسنان

A subject and a predicate can be single (a word) or compound (a phrase). (Khan, 2004:67) (Gully et al., 2010:307) and (Al-Hoary, 2016:30)

125.الرجل طيب

126.الرجل الطيب حاضر

Abu-Almkarem (2007:49) claims of two kinds of agreements:

A. **The direct agreement**. When both subject and predicate resemble each other i.e., a singular subject goes with a singular predicate and a feminine subject goes with a feminine predicate and so on and so forth.

127.هذه امرأة فضلى

128.هذا رجل عظيم

B. **The indirect agreement**. When a predicate has a connection (a pronoun or repetition of an expression) with its subject which expresses concord of number and gender. This happens when a predicate has a different construction from its subject.

129.الطالبة ابوها مسافر

However, Arab grammarians mention cases where a predicate does not agree with its subject in number and gender.

A. **Disagreement in gender**:

a) When the subject is the predicate in the meaning.

130.الاسم كلمة

b) When the expression is used for glorification.

131.هذه المراة رجل

c) When the expression is used for vilification.

132.هذا الرجل امرأة

B. **Disagreement in number**:

a) When the subject is composed of parts.

133.هذا الثوب اخلاق

b) When the pluralization is used to mean its member individually.

134.الرجال صديق

3.3.4. Inversion Structures

Arab grammarians see that usual order of nominal sentences is that a subject comes first then followed by its predicate to make speech clear-cut. Yet, sometimes such order must be reversed as in the following cases. Such usage is rhetorically motivated:

A. If a predicate is an adverbial or a prepositional phrase and its subject is indefinite. (Sterling, 1904:154), (Abu-Almkarem,2007:56) and (Gully et al., 2010:313)

135.بين موت و حياة انفاس

136.عندي سيارة

B. If a subject has a pronoun indicates to its predicate. (Sterling, 1904:154) (Ibn-Malik,2000:159) and (Abu-Almkarem,2007:56)

137.للبيت حرمته

C. If a predicate is restricted for its subject by "الا and أنما" with a negative particle " لا and ما". (Sterling, 1904:155), (Ibn-Malik,2000:159) and (Abu-Almkarem,2007:56)

138.لا اله الا الله

D. If a predicate is an expression that come initially like interrogative nouns. (Sibawayh, 1979:128), (Ibn-Ya'aish, 2001:237) and (Abu-Almkarem,2007:56)

139.أين محمد

E. If a predicate is a prepositional or an adverbial phrase and its subject is indefinite. (Ibn-Ya'aish, 2001:237) and (Al-Samara'ai, 2014:188)

140.في الدار السيارة

g) The predicate comes first in ostentation. (Al-Samara'ai, 2014:188)

141.طائي انا

3.6. Ellipses

Arab grammarians say that originally both subjects and predicates must be available in the nominal sentences. Still, one or both of them can be deleted in some cases like:

A. if a predicate is qualifying adjective, its subject should be deleted (Sterling, 1904:155)

142.رأيت بنت (هي) جميلة

B. If a subject comes after "بأس" and "نعم" and its predicate is restricted for blame or praise, the subject must be deleted. (Sterling, 1904:156) (Al-Mubarred,1920:143) and (Abu-Almkarem,2007:62)

143.نعم الطالب (الممدوح) عمرو

C. If a predicate is a noun of action replaces a verb, its subject should be deleted. (Sterling, 1904:156) and (Abu-Almkarem,2007:62)

144.(صبري) صبر جميل

D. When one of a subject or a predicate is an oath, the other must be omitted. (Sterling, 1904:156), (Ibn-Malik,2000:155) and (Abu-Almkarem,2007:62)

145.لعمرك ما الانسان الا بدينه

E. When a subject comes after "لولا" showing simple existence, its predicate can be deleted. (Sterling, 1904:156), (Al-Radhi,1998:250) and (Abu-Almkarem,2007:64)

146.لولا الحبل (موجود) لمتنا

F. When a predicate comes after "و" that has meaning "with". Its subject should be deleted. (Sterling, 1904:155) (Al-Radhi,1998:250) and (Abu-Almkarem,2007:65)

147.كل واحد و نيته (يحاسب)

G. Both subject and predicate can be deleted if their context refers to one of them. For example, when someone says "whoever defends for his country is glorious and whoever assists humanity……… " the completion of the speech which is deleted subject and predicate is "فهو عظيم". (Al-Samara'ai,2014:200)

3.7. Information-Structure

In Arabic, a subject should be definite or known-information to make a comprehensible speech. Though, it can be indefinite or has a new-information in more than thirty cases. These are some of them:

A. If it is preceded by interrogative, negative particles or an adverbial or prepositional phrase. (Sterling,1904:151), (Socin, 1922:91), (Ibn-Hisham, 1979:612), (Ibn-Ya'aish,2001:224), (Khan, 2004:64) and (Abu-Almkarem, 2007:35)

148. ما سيارة لي

149. هل عمل غير مسبوق

150. لكل جواد كبوة

B. It is acceptable for subjects to be indefinite noun phrase and Predicates definite, by adding an article "ال" to it to get an adjectival noun phrase. (Socin, 1922:92) (Khan, 2004:65) and (Al-Horais, 2006:105)

151. الرجلُ هو الصالحُ

152. زيدُ الحسن

C. When an indefinite is described or an adjective. (Abu-Almkarem, 2007:34) and (Badawi, Michael G. Carter and Adrian Gully, 2010:308) and (Al-Mubarred,1399H,127/4)

153. كريم افضل من بخيل

D. When an indefinite is diminutive. (Abu-Almkarem, 2007:34)

154. كتيب قراة خالد

E. When an indefinite is additive. (Abu-Almkarem, 2007:34) (Al-Samara'ai,2014,185)

155. اربع كتب اشتريتها منك

F. When an indefinite is attached with Reducer and Reduced. (Abu-Almkarem, 2007:34)

156. امر بمعروف صدقة

G. If a nominal sentence is a praying. (Ibn-Hisham, 1979:612), (Al-Suywty,1998:327), (Abu-Almkarem, 2007:34) and (Al-Samara'ai,2014,186)

157. "ويل للمطففين".

In contrast to subjects, predicates should be indefinite or has new-information. Abu-Almkarem (2007:40) states that there is general agreement by Arab grammarians that when there are two noun phrases one of them is new-information and the other is old-information; the former must be the predicate and the later must be the subject. However, Sibawayh argues of two exceptions:

A. If a subject is one of the interrogative nouns "كم".

158. كم مالك

B. In superlative structure.

159. خير منك عمرو

4. Comparison

When we put both English copular sentences face to face with Arabic nominal sentences, we find the following:

A. In comparing definitions of nominal sentences, we find that copular sentences' function is to link subjects with predicates by copular verbs. Besides, these verbs do not have any semantic content and cause of embarrassment for syntacticians and semanticists. In contrast, Arabic nominal sentences are defined as those sentences which begin with nouns.

B. The English copular sentences are divided into:

1- Predicational.

2- Identificational.

3- Specificational.

4- Equative.

In contrast, Arabic nominal sentences are divided into:

1- The absolute nominal sentences.

2- The annulled nominal sentences.

C. In comparing syntactic structures of nominal sentences in the two languages, we find that in both languages, the sentences start with noun phrase called *subject* and end with a noun, an adverb or a

prepositional phrase called *predicate*. However, the English sentences have verbs that link the two expressions which is not available in Arabic language.

D. Subjects in both languages are in nominative case. though, the predicate in Arabic can be nominative, accusative or genitive while in English it must be nominative.

E. In English and Arabic, there is agreement of gender and number between subjects and predicates.

F. The order of the copular sentences in both languages is not stable i.e. the order could be inverted for some linguistic purposes.

G. In English there is omission in predication complement in subordinate clause only and copular verb. However, in Arabic the omission takes place in both subjects and predicates.

H. In English copular sentences, a subject may be a definite noun phrase if it is mentioned for second time or refers for something unique. On the other hand, Arabic copular sentences must start with a definite noun phrase.

I. In both languages, we have process of negation but by using different items. In English, it is achieved by adding "not" after copular verbs. While in Arabic, it is achieved by adding particles such as "ليس".

J. The interrogation in English is achieved by inversion of subject-verb order. While in Arabic, it is achieved by adding particles " أ , هل " to be at the beginning of the nominal sentence.

5.1. Conclusion

What is described in previous papers and in the light of the hypotheses, I can conclude that hypothesis No.1 is confirmed in that nominal sentences in both languages are similar in their realizations of subjects, order of sentences, case of subjects and predicates and have same grammatical process like ellipsis and agreement. Besides, hypothesis No. 2 is also confirmed in that there are some differences in nominal sentences between the two languages when English nominal sentences are in need for copular verbs in contrast to Arabic ones and different way of achieving negation and interrogation in both languages.

5.2. Recommendations and Further Researches

From what has been studied in the previous papers, I recommend of the following:

A. Translators should take into consideration the divergences available between the two languages in translating.

B. It is recommended for more comparison studies in other languages for nominal sentences to help in teaching this type of sentences.

C. It is recommended for detail studies for phrases flank nominal sentences to reveal more information about them at various levels of linguistics: semantics, morphology, …….etc.

References

Abu-Almkarem, A. (2007). *Al-Jumlah Al-'Asmyiah.* Cairo. Al-Mukhtar.

Abu-Chacra, F. (2018). *Arabic: An Essential Grammar.* (2ndE). London. Routledge.

Al-Afghany, S. (1971). *Al-Mujaz fi qawa'id al-luqa al-arabiyah.* Beirut. Dar-Al-Fiker.

Al-Hoary, M. (2016). *Arabic Grammar in Context*. London. Routledge.

Al-Horais, N. (2006). *Arabic Verbless Sentences: is there a null VP?* University of Newcastle.

Al-Mubarred, M. (1920). *Al-Muqtathab*. The supreme council for Islamic issues. Cairo.

Al-Samara'ai, F. (2014). *Al-Nahw Al-Arabi: Ahkaam wa Ma'ani.* Sharjah. Dr-Ibn-katheer.

Al-Suywty, J. (1998). *Hma Al-hwama' fi shrh jma'a al jwam'a.* Beirut. Dar-alkutub al Almiyh.

Al-Radhi. (1998). *Shrh kafiat ibn al-hajib.* Beirut. Dar-alkutub al-Almiyh.

Badawi, Elsaid, M. G. Carter, and Adrian Gully. (2010). *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar is a complete reference guide to the grammar of Modern Written Arabic.* New York. Routledge.

Beamont, W. (1861). *A Concise grammar of the Arabic language*. London. Cambridge press.

Birner, B. J. (1996). *The Discourse Function of Inversion in English*. New York. Garland.

Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics.* (6th E) Oxford, Blackwell.

Declerck, R. (1988). *Studies on copular sentences, clefts and pseudo-clefts.* Leuven University Press. Dordrecht.

El-Dahdah, A. (1988). *A dictionary of terms of declension and structure: in universal Arabic grammar (Arabic-English) (English-Arabic).* Bierut. Maktabat-lubnan.

Fischer, W. (2002). *A grammar of classical Arabic.* London. Yale university press.

Geist, L. (2015). *Predication and Equation in Copular Sentences: Russian vs. English.* Stuttgart university.

Higgins, R. F. (1979). *The Pseudo-cleft Construction in English*. New York.

Garland.Ibn-Alsiraj, M. (1996). *Al-Asool fi Al-Nahw.* Beirut. Al-Risalah.

Ibn-Hesham, J. (1590- AD), Awdaho al-Masalik. vol 1,(1994) impression. Beirut. Daral-fi kr.

Ibn-Malik. (2000). *Shreh al-kaafia al-shafia.* Beirut. Dar-alkutub al-Almiyh.

Ibn-Ya'aish, M. (2001). *Sharh al-mufasal l-lzmkhshari.* Beirut. Dar-alkutub al Almiyh.

Ismail, I. (2009). *Copula in standard English and its counterpart in standard Arabic*. AL-Fatih Journal. No. 39 April 2009.

Kay, P. (2002). *English subjectless tagged sentences*. Language 78(3), 453–581.

Khan, M. (2004). *Arabic Tutor*. Academy for Islamic Research. KwaZulu Natal, South Africa.

Kroeger, P. (2005), *Analyzing Grammar: An Introduction*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Mikkelsen, L. (2005), *Copular Clauses: Specification, predication and equation.* Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Mikkelsen, L. (2008). *Nominal sentences*. UC Berkeley. January 16.

Niimura, M. (2007). *A Syntactic analysis of copular sentences.* Nanzan University.

Park, Y. and Sung, T. (2010). *DP in Copular Sentences*. Nam Seoul University.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1972). *A Comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London. Longman.

Rothstein, S. (1995). Small clauses and copula constructions. San Diego, CA. Academic Press.

Roy, I. (2013). *Nonverbal Predication: Copular Sentences at the Syntax Semantics Interface*. Oxford. Oxford university press.

Sibawayh, A. (741-AD), *Al-Kitab*. (1977) impression, Cairo. Dar Al-Qalam Press.

Sterling, R. (1904). *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. New York. Routledge.

WWW.Merriam-webster.com