

ARTICLE

The Conceptualization of the Comitative Preposition *ma'a* 'with' in Jordanian Arabic from a Cognitive Semantics Perspective

Adnan Mjali Falah Mbaideen 

Faculty of Art/Language Centre, Mutah University, Al-Karak 61710, Jordan

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the semantics of the comitative preposition *ma'a* 'with' in Jordanian Arabic (JA). It aims to examine how the preposition has the potentiality to denote a primary comitative sense in addition to other secondary comitative ones as a means of coding particular semantic thematic roles of the accompanee and the companion with reference to the main verb. Adopting a Cognitive Semantics approach, the study strives to pinpoint the polysemous nature of the preposition from a holistic constructional perspective. The researcher applies a qualitative research method for the analysis of the data taken from spoken JA. Forty examples were collected and categorized based on Arab linguists' categorization of comitative constructions. The study limits itself to analyzing how the conception of linguistic expressions and the world around us leads to the multifunctional nature of the comitative relator *ma'a*. It is found that *ma'a* is semantically used as a preposition to encode a (non) physical comitative relation between its two arguments. The results show that such a relation, in some secondary comitative constructions, does not necessitate that the two arguments share the same activity, and unity of time is not emphasized. The findings emphasize that it is our cognition of the context that determines the degree of the principality of the two arguments. Arabic Non-native speakers are becoming more interested in learning its vernacular dialects; consequently, focusing on comitative constructions will help them speak more fluently and gain a deeper understanding of the society culture they live in.

Keywords: Cognitive Semantics; Comitative Constructions; Jordanian Arabic; Polysemy; Semantic Thematic Roles

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Adnan Mjali Falah Mbaideen, Faculty of Art/Language Centre, Mutah University, Al-Karak 61710, Jordan; Email: adnanmbaideen@hotmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 15 February 2025 | Revised: 14 March 2025 | Accepted: 1 April 2025 | Published Online: 12 April 2025
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8754>

CITATION

Mbaideen, A.M.F., 2025. The Conceptualization of the Comitative Preposition *ma'a* 'with' in Jordanian Arabic from a Cognitive Semantics Perspective. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(4): 640–651. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8754>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Accompaniment or coincidence is the primary meaning of comitative where a marker (i.e., *ma'a* in Jordanian Arabic (JA)) is utilized to encode a relation between two participants in an event. The two participants are normally recognized in genuine comitative constructions as an accompanee and a companion. While the companion has a peripheral position, the accompanee is the prominent. Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) uses different formal means which denote comitative relations. For example, the object of accompaniment '*al-maf'ul ma'ahu*'() is composed of (DP¹ *wa* DP²-*a*). DP¹ is recognized as the host noun phrase, and DP² is the comitative one which is followed by the accusative morphological case marker -*a*^[1].

The construction of the object of accompaniment must fulfill two criteria: the existence of the particle *wa*, which is equivalent in meaning to *ma'a* that denotes accompaniment, and the occurrence of the object after this particle^[2]. Based on these criteria, the object of accompaniment constructions in MSA may exist in three forms. First, a construction that does not contain the particle *wa*; instead, it contains either the preposition *ma'a* or the preposition *bi* where both of them denote accompaniment as in examples (1) and (2) below:

(1) Ḥaḍara al-ṣaḍīq *ma'a* ṭabīhi

The friend attended with his father

(2) Ṭa'ṭaytuka al-sayyārata *bi*-mafāṭyḥihā

I gave you the car with its keys

Second, a construction where the particle *wa* exists and denotes both accompaniment and coordination due to the meaning of the main verb itself as in (3). Third, a construction where the particle *wa* is followed by a verbal sentence as in (4).

(3) Taṣāra 'a al-jundu *wa* al-qādatu.

Soldiers and commanders were wrestling

(4) Lā taṭkula as-samaka *wa* tashraba al-labana

Do not eat fish and drink milk!

In all these forms unity of time is obligatory; the same event that is carried out by DP¹ and DP² must occur simultaneously. This is what differentiates it from the coordinating *wa* which does not necessitate time unity of the event's occurrence as in (5).

(5) Ṭistwā al-mā'u *wa* al-khashabu

The water and the wood are (of the same) level.

JA, a variety of Arabic that is spoken in Jordan, concep-

tually uses the comitative marker *ma'a* to encode a comitative relation. Such a relation can be conceived as a sort of spatial proximity; hence, the co-presence or co-involvement in a particular situation^[3]. The preposition *ma'a* encodes multiple senses such as comitative, sociative, accompaniment, inclusion, and/or possessive senses in JA. As a comitative marker, JA utilizes *ma'a* to denote variable sorts of relations such as the true comitative sense, in addition to along spectrum of comitative constructions such as instrumental, beneficiary, spatio-temporal, depictive, ingredient, and causative senses.

The significance of this paper lies in shedding light on the different senses that the preposition *ma'a* denotes in JA. Moreover, within the perspective of cognitive semantics (CS) as a modern linguistic theory, this work is significant as it clarifies the manner by which the preposition is conceived in daily usage; thus, contributes for better conceptualization of language in general and comitative constructions in particular for both native and non-native speakers of Arabic.

The paper aims to identify the multiple senses that the preposition *ma'a* conveys in JA. The study aims to adopt a constructional holistic view towards the analysis of *ma'a* constructions where the degree of principality of the two DPs is highlighted.

The paper is divided into five sections. Section 1 is the introduction. Section 2 addresses the literature review about comitative constructions in both English and Arabic, and sheds light on CS as a theoretical framework in this study. In Section 3, the researcher attempts to explain the methodology that will be followed in analyzing the data of the study. Section 4 will be devoted for the data analysis. This is followed by Section 5 for the conclusion and recommendations of the study.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Previous Studies

Traditional Arab linguists report that *ma'a* is classified as an adverb of time, adverb of place, a preposition or it could be classified as a noun when the nunnation (*al-tanuin*) attached final such as *ma'an*^[4-8]. Accounting for the distribution of simple prepositions in MSA, Arab linguists clarify that *ma'a* has occupied the eighth place with a total frequency of 2.3081% amongst 55 Arabic prepositions^[9]. *Ma'a* linguistically refers for the place or time of gathering

and denotes the semantic sense of comitative or accompaniment, and grammatically classified as an adverb of time or place^[5]. Sibawayh emphasizes that *ma'a* functions as a true preposition as it is a lexical primitive^[10], and it is used sometimes in verb-preposition expressions such as *nāgasha ma'a* 'discussed with', or *ʔijtama'a ma'a* 'met with'. He also elaborates that it can also be the object of another preposition (i.e., *dhahaba man ma'ahu* 'whoever with him left him'). To elaborate more, *ma'a* in (6) is a locative adverb and in (7) it is an adverb of time. Ibn Manẓūr adds that *ma'a* is a lexical item that adds a particular thing to another to convey the sense of accompaniment^[4]. Example (8) is an account for *ma'a* as a preposition^[11].

(6) Jiʔtu *ma'a* Zaidin

I came with Zaid

(7) Jiʔtu *ma'a* al-fajri

I came at dawn

(8) "Wa-aqīmū l-ṣalata waātū l-zakāta wa-irka'ū *ma'a* l-rāki'īna" (Al-Quran, 2:43:6)

And be steadfast in prayer; practice regular charity; and bow down your heads with those who bow down (in worship)^[12].

Non-Arabic scholars also investigated the issue of comitative constructions in Arabic. For example, the primary sense of *ma'a* is physical accompaniment; however, it designates other senses such as connection in (9), association in (10), at the time of in (11), together with in (12), lateral possession in (13), or concession in (14)^[13].

(9) Badaʔat *ma'a* ʔintāji al-sayyārāti

It began with the production of cars

(10) Al-mubāhathātu jāriyatun *ma'a* al-sharikati

Negotiations are currently taking place with the company

(11) Hathhi al-shajaratu namat *ma'a* murūr al-zaman

This tree grew with passing of time

(12) Jaʔū *ma'an*

They came together

(13) *Ma'ī* alān \$120

I have \$ 120 now

(14) *ma'a* 'ilmihi bil-ʔijtima'i, lam yahḍur mubakkiran

In spite of his knowledge of the meeting, he did not come early.

Buckley approves the aforementioned senses of *ma'a*^[14]; however, it might give rise to adverbial expres-

sions such as (15) and (16), supporting in (17), possession when the thing possessed is actually with the possessor as in (18). Moreover, it precedes noun clauses that are introduced with *ʔanna* to imply adversative sense as in (19).

(15) *Ma'a* al-salāmah

Good by

(16) *Ma'a* al-ʔasaf

Unfortunately

(17) ʔanā *ma'ak*

I am on your side

(18) Kam *ma'aka* mina al-māli?

How much money do you have?

(19) Ḥaḍara mubakkiran *ma'a* ʔanna hidhihi laysat 'adatuhu.

He came early although this is not his routine

Ryding states that *ma'a* is always equivalent to English *with*, and is used to express possession of something concrete that people could have with them, but does not indicate permanency or the concept of 'belonging to'^[15]. The author adds that the word is primarily used to denote association, accompaniment, and a sense of immediate possession on or near a person as in (20). If it is used to convey the meaning of 'together', *ma'a* takes an adverbial indefinite accusative ending (*an*) as (21). Holes illustrates that *ma'a* *ʔanna* (i.e., preposition *ma'a* followed by *ʔanna*) usually introduces MSA concessive clauses and denotes the sense of 'although' or 'despite the fact that'^[16]; hence, they denote completed or existent states as in (22) below.

(20) Hal *ma'ak* qalamun?

Do you have a pencil?

(21) Al-'iayshu *ma'an* fī hadhi al-bilādi muriehun

Living together in this country is relaxing

(22) Saʔūn hunāk *ma'a* ʔanna waqtī ḍaiqun

I will be there although I have little time.

Addressing the preposition within the modern linguistic theories, Esseesy mentions that the preposition *ma'a* implies a concessive sense that is usually expressed by a multi-word-prepositional phrase '*bi-r-raghmi min*' with the meaning of 'in spite of', and it conveys an additive sense which is synonymous with the multi-word prepositional phrase "*bi-l-idafati li*" which translates as 'in addition to'^[17]. However, "the concessive relation that *ma'a* marks is motivated by the absence of a direct reference to a human referent, and some verbal force is retained through the presence of a noun

complement from the verbal noun class". In this sense, expressing concessivity via *ma'a* as a preposition, is limited to a localized context followed by particular verbal nouns, and not amenable to transfer to other contexts that have other complements. Examples (23) and (24) show how *ma'a* denotes concessive and comitative senses, respectively. This is because the verbal noun in (23) has been substituted by a proto-typical noun that denotes a physical entity (i.e., a human participant such as *qa?idihi*/his leader); the sense of concessivity disappears and the comitative sense becomes the most prominent in (24).

(23) Huzima *ma'a* quuatihi

He was defeated despite being strong.

(24) Huzima *ma'a* qā'idihī

He was defeated with his leader.

Al-Rasheedi addresses how *ma'a* expresses predicative possession^[18]. The author states that the use of the preposition *ma'a* can only express temporary possession or the possession of an illness. The temporary possession sense implies that the possessor claims disposing the possessum for a particular limited time without claiming the ownership of it as in (25); this means that the possessor (i.e., Ali) has a pen at his disposal right now, but whether or not he is the actual owner of the pen is not confirmed^[19]. The illness sense in (26) shows that the possessor is suffering from a specific medical condition at the moment of uttering the sentence.

(25) Aliun *ma'ahu* qalamun

Ali has a pen.

(26) Khalidun *ma'ahu* šuda'

Khalid has got a headache.

Examining how the preposition *with* expresses the relation of central coincidence in English, Rapoport claims that it "connects two arguments in a relation of coincidence^[20]; relating two entities in a constant, unchanging way". The preposition describes a situation where the event or the action is not heading for any particular endpoint, and so designates atelic notion. In this sense, *with* expresses senses of accompaniment or association (27), possession (28), manner (i.e., supportive) (29), simultaneousness (30), and instrument (31). Such relations imply the involvement of a second participant^[21]. Considering the different interpretations of *with* in (27–31), Seilor and Svenonius confirm that the dissimilar meanings that *with* constructions convey are the result of the meaning of the verb heading the sentence in addition

to all the linguistic terms in a particular construction^[22, 23]; thus, they adopt a holistic constructional view concerning the interpretations of the examples below. This is in turn the constructional grammar perspective of meaning in general adopted in this work^[24].

(27) The boy you were with.

(28) The girl with the book

(29) I totally agree with you.

(30) The trees become bigger with water (i.e., by watering it)

(31) The man is walking with a crutch.

2.2. Cognitive Semantics

Within the broader field of Cognitive Linguistics (CL), CS, as a framework of this study, is a collection of methods and research topics that have a set of presumptions and a similar perspective^[25]. Language according to CS is a description of the world as conceived by people, and the meaning of a construction may be understood as the conditions which the proposition conveyed by the sentence hold true^[26]. Evans explains that "Cognitive Semantics has employed language as the lens through which these cognitive phenomena can be investigated"^[27]. Within the perspective of CS, the only function of grammar is to show how a conception of the world is. CS is concerned with the investigation of the relationships that hold between experience, the conceptual system, and the semantic structure that language encodes. Meaning is 'encyclopedic' in scope according to CS; a person's linguistic knowledge would be coextensive with his total world knowledge, and everything known about a concept is part of its meaning; hence, the explanation of any meaning must be related to our general understanding. Accordingly, a concept cannot be understood unless being within a larger system of concepts as it is an extension of our bodily and cultural experiences^[28]; therefore, studying the linguistic semantics is studying common sense of human experience^[29].

Words exhibit a range of different meanings in the contexts in which they are used according to lexical polysemy and the linguistic meaning has always been approached in terms of the correspondence between an expression and the situation it designates. Taylor elaborates that meaning is the way that "speakers construe a conceived situation and how this construal receives linguistic expression as a function

of the conventional resources of a particular language”^[25]. Expressions do not mean by themselves, they are prompts for us to construct meaning^[30]. It is the nature of our experience; how we move, perceive, understand, think which fundamentally shapes the language we use^[31]. Embodiment in CS is an important theme that stresses the importance of the relation between words and the world as mediated by the language user, and it shows how our cognition is shaped by our bodily sensorimotor experience. Taylor elaborates that “we search for the linguistic resources that most closely match our intentions^[25], accepting that some discrepancies and imprecisions are likely to occur, we trust to the inferences powers of our interlocutors to achieve the fit between the expression and the intended conceptualization”. CS views prepositions as relators that profile a kind of prototypical spatial relationship between two entities referred to as a Trajector (TR) and a Landmark (LM). In our case, *ma’a* encodes a relation between a companion as a (TR) with a peripheral position and an accompanee as an (LM) encoding a prominent item. This relationship is dependent and not autonomous as it requires reference to other entities such as the verb heading the construction^[32].

One characteristic of the semantic structure which CS emphasizes is language-specificity and construction-specificity. To elaborate more, different conceptualizations of the world lead to different syntactic structures that appear in various languages. On the other hand, similarities of human languages are viewed as a reflection of a common cognitive endowment. A distinction here is made between ‘conceptual structure’ and ‘semantic structure’. While the conceptual structure is universal and based on shared capacities that people use to perceive and cognize their world, semantic structure refers to the way in which conceptual structure is formatted to be consistent with the conventionalized resources of a given language.

Lemmens summarizes CS in four principles^[33]. First, conceptualization which entails that meaning is encyclopedic. Second, construal which refers to the cognitive capacity that conceptualizes experience in alternate ways. Third, image schemas that are referred to as the semantic patterns of bodily experience. Finally, the structured categorization as prototype. The aforementioned principles cover lexical items and all levels of linguistic structures from morphemes to highly schematic grammatical patterns. To end with here,

CS is as a usage-based approach since it is based on authentic data which are documented in corpus, recorded in a file, or elicited in controlled situation rather than being based on invented or constructed data^[32].

3. Methodology

The researcher will apply a CS approach to the analysis of comitative *ma’a* in JA. The data were collected from the researcher’s, as a native speaker of JA, daily observations of the Jordanians’ speech while spontaneously addressing various daily issues, and then they were validated by ten native speakers of JA. The JA native speakers were randomly chosen and were asked whether they believe the data collected are correct based on their intuition. The data collected then validated by two professors in the Faculty of Arts in Mutah University who are experts in Arabic language to examine their validity and authenticity. The study adopts a holistic constructional view for the analysis of the data by addressing the comitative construction as a whole, not as individual linguistic items. However, it keeps in mind the polysemous nature of the preposition *ma’a* as a relator that encodes a relation between two participants in an event (i.e., an accompanee and a companion). The researcher adopts Mansour’s categorization and classification of comitative constructions encoded by comitative *wa* in MSA for the analysis and discussion of the data in this study^[1].

The analysis of the data is not restricted to the co-participant of the verb of the clause, and there are no animacy restrictions on the accompanee; the combinations of the non/human combination of both the accompanee and the companion are plausible. The adpositional strategy which considers *ma’a* a preposition is mainly approved in this work. During the course of the analysis and based on Langacker’s perspective, the researcher is cognizant that the structure of the real world around us helps in creating an interface amongst the semantic participant roles that is beyond the boundaries of language^[34]; hence, there is no definite or unique set of the role conception. This does not imply that the world is viewed in terms of these distinct classifications, but there is a wide variety of meanings.

Another basic foundation of this study is semantic thematic roles due to the fact that they identify various semantic roles in a predication where a sentence includes one verb

and one or more than one noun phrases that are connected with the verb in a definite relationship^[28]. This relationship will be emphasized, and the role of the researcher will be to pinpoint how the preposition *ma'a* relates two noun phrases in a particular comitative construction based on the perception and conception of the linguistic expression and how it is formatted to be consistent with the world around us. In some secondary comitative constructions, the analysis will be supported and motivated by referring to conceptual metaphors.

4. Findings, Discussion and Data Analysis

This section is a presentation of the multiple senses that comitative *ma'a* designates in JA. It discusses and analyzes data collected from daily speech, and shows how *ma'a* is used in particular constructions to convey various functions.

4.1. The Comitative Senses of *ma'a*

Comitative constructions are generally judged according to three principles: (i) the shared and unified activity, (ii) the principle of the addition, absorption, and assignment of a second participant, (iii) and the representation of the speaker's self^[35]. The first principle suggests that there must be two animate participants who are involved in the same spatio-temporal activity^[36], and the speaker intends to highlight the role of the other agent. Within this perspective, the comitative construction is conceived as a relation of accompaniment where the accompanee participates an event with a companion with the use of a relator (i.e., *ma'a*) to give more prominence to the accompanee. Comitative constructions express the essence of one event or activity mutually performed by two equal, but in some cases unequal, participants where the second participant participates in the activity performed by the main participant. In a comitative construction both the accompanee and the companion are conceived grammatically "as morpho-syntactical unit reflecting relations of the protagonists and the share of participants in the activity expressed with a predicate"^[35]. Stolez et al. exemplify for the comitative relation (R) as in the structural diagram as $(R = X \text{ r } Y)^{[36]}$; (X) stands for the first participant, (Y) for the second participant, and (r) for the relator which can be a preposition, an affix, or a coordinator in some languages.

The first participant stands for the subject of the verb, but the second participant usually stands for the adverbial of accompaniment. Syntactically, while the core NP has got a higher structural rank and is assigned a (+control) marker, the comitative NP has got a lower structural rank with a (-control) marker^[37].

Semantically, the comitative construction designates the shared activity of the first and second participants. However, it is the pragmatics of the speaker's preference that assigns who is the first or the second participant without exerting any sort of power on any of them by the other one. For example, it is the speaker's decision or the pragmatic knowledge that decides whether the relations between the two participations are equal (i.e., parents, children, friends), or socially unequal (i.e., superiors and subordinates), hence assigning the role of the first and second participants in a particular construction^[35]. Adding a pragmatic aspect to the explanation and interpretation of comitative constructions shows that the speaker's preference is strongly personally motivated.

Mansour investigates the CS of comitative constructions in MSA where the particle of accompaniment *wa* is used, and followed by an accompaniment object (i.e., *maf'ulun ma'ahu*)^[1]. He states that comitative constructions imply the notion of an individual in whose company something is done, and syntactically represented as $[DP^1 \text{ wa } DP^2 -a]$. The author elaborates that "DP¹ is the host noun phrase, and DP² is the comitative phrase that is followed by the accusative morphological case marker *-a*" (p.1). Within the notion of the semantic structure of comitative constructions, the author lists 13 semantic thematic roles that $[DP^1 \text{ wa } DP^2 -a]$ constructions can denote (i.e., instrumental, agentive, causative, beneficiary, affected, percept, goal, experiencer, locative, temporal, ingredient, theme, and true comitative). The following subsections are dedicated to showing how *ma'a* is used to denote the multiple constructional functions in JA.

4.1.1. The Primary Comitative Sense of *ma'a*

The primary comitative sense implies that the second participant in the event (i.e., DP²) does not assume any semantic role; hence, it is a passive participant^[1]. In (32) DP² (i.e., Ali) seems as an unconscious participant or person accompanied by DP¹ (i.e., 'ammuh/his uncle); the second participant didn't benefit at all from going to the hospital since he was not the patient. Example (33) also shows that

it is the father (i.e., DP²) (*ʔabūh*) who is usually responsible for going shopping, hence denoting the semantic role AGENT. However, Ali (i.e., DP¹) is a passive participant since he has not got any responsibility towards shopping; he only went there for sight-seeing or enjoyment as a child. In (34) DP¹ (*alraḍīʿ* ‘the infant’) is also a passive participant in the event since it is the mother (DP¹) who carries out the action (i.e., AGENT) of keeping him, while he does not imply any semantic role. The conception of 32–34 can represent the conceptual metaphor of TOGHERNESS; mental locative comitative.

(32) Ali rāḥ *maʿa* ‘ammuh al-marīḍ *alā* al-mustashfā

Ali went with his sick uncle to the hospital

(33) Ali rāḥ *alā* al-sūq *maʿa* ʔabūh

Ali went to the market with his father.

(34) Al-ṭifl alraḍīʿ jālis *maʿa* ʔummuh.

The infant is sitting with his mother.

However, in some cases, DP² fully involves or participates in the same action with DP¹. In (35) both DP¹ and DP² have a compatible semantic role AGENT. Such a comitative relation is referred to as symmetrical due to the fact that they are both equally important in satisfying the collective verb requirement. On the other hand, comitative relations could be asymmetrical as in (36); DP² is an unreal participant in the event of walking with DP¹. This is due to the requirement of the head verb *masha* ‘walk’, in JA in particular cases, which allows an asymmetrical relation between two noun phrases regardless of having the same semantic feature [animacy]; DP¹ is [+animate] but DP² is [-animate]. In (37) DP¹ (i.e., Khalid) accompanies DP² (i.e., Ali) by involving in a conceptual target event (i.e., the topic of the journey). Such a relation is considered symmetrical since both DP¹ and DP² are of equal importance in the eventuality; it is a principal-to-principal comitative relation^[1].

(35) ʔakalit *maʿa* ʔahlī al-zuhur.

I ate with my family at noon.

(36) Mashayt *maʿa* al-shāriʿ al-khalfi

I walked from the back street

(37) Khalid nāqash *maʿa* Ali mauḍūʿ al-riḥlih bukraḥ

Khalid discussed with Ali the topic of the trip tomorrow

Symmetrical relation is also prominent in (38) where a typical comitative case is expressed with the sense of coexistence or co-presence of two DPs with the involvement only of a secondary participant expression^[20]. Moreover, comita-

tive can express a symmetrical but non-collective relation as in (39). Despite the fact that DP¹ (i.e., Ahmed) and DP² (i.e., Khalid) did the same action of coming back to the house, the context implies that it is not necessary to be taken for granted that they share the same action or event at the same time (i.e., each one of the two DPs came back alone; may be in different time). Examples (40) and (41) stand for coordinate comitative. However, while the entire win is JD100 for both participants in (40), (41) designates that the entire win for both could be JD 100, or that every one of them wins JD 100 alone.

(38) ʔakalt baṭāṭā *maʿa* bandurah

I ate potatoes with tomatoes.

(39) Ahmed rajaʿ *alā* al-bāit *maʿa* Khalid

Ahmed came back to the house with Khalid

(40) ʔanā *maʿa* Muḥammad rabiḥnā 100 Dīnār.

Mohammed and me won 100 dinars.

(41) ʔanā *maʿa* Muḥammad rabiḥit 100 Dīnār.

With Muhammad, I won 100 dinars.

4.1.2. The Secondary Comitative Senses of *maʿa*

This section is dedicated to discussing the data that exemplify the different senses of *maʿa* other than the primary comitative sense in the daily usage in JA. The subsections provided below are categorized based on the conception of the different senses of the preposition.

a. The Instrumental Comitative Sense

Instrumental case is not isolated from other categories due to the fact that there is a massive interaction between the comitative sense and other senses especially the instrumental sense^[36]. Expressing instrumentality as a cross-linguistic phenomenon can be achieved via formal grammatical expressions; the same word or device that indicates accompaniment may indicate instrumentality, too. For example, in English the preposition ‘with’ can express both readings in examples (42) and (43) respectively.

(42) John completed his homework with the help of his mother.

(43) Mike opened the door with the key.

In MSA, while the preposition ‘*bi*’, which is attached to the instrument itself and translated into English as *with* is used to indicate only instrumentality, the grammatical morpheme marker *wa* of the morphological accusative case marker-*a* can express both comitative in (44) and instrumen-

tal senses in (45)^[1]. It is apparent in (45) that *al-mazāri'a* 'the farms' is not conceived as DP² of the action of walking, but it is the tool by or with which DP¹ accomplishes or carries out the action of walking itself^[24].

(44) Sāra Moḥammadun *wa* zawjatihi
Mohammed walked with his wife.

(45) Sāra 'Alīun *wa* al-mazāri'a li-yaṣāl ʔilā al-tarīqi
al-raʔīsī

Ali walked along the farms to reach the main road.

In JA, the preposition *ma'a* can be used to denote asymmetrical comitative along with the preposition *bi*. For example, in (46) it is the medical crutch '*aṣṣātuh*' by or with which DP¹ carries out the action of walking. In (47) the medical eyeglasses '*nazzārat ṭibbīyah*' are the tool by which the action of reading is carried out or accomplished. Similarly, it is the stove '*aṣṣubbah*' as a tool in (48) that is used for heating the bread. Finally, in (49) it is the wheelchair '*kursī mutaḥarrik*' that aids DP¹ to move from one place to another. Examples 46-49 represent instrumental comitative sense in which a particular tool or medium aids or helps the first participant to carry out the action or event, without conceiving DP² (i.e., the tool) as a real participant in the same action.

(46) Khalid mā bimshī ʔillā *ma'uh* 'aṣṣātuh

Khalid only walks with his medical crutch

(47) Mā bi'rif yiqra? ʔillā *ma'a* nazzārat ṭibbīyah

He can only read with medical eyeglasses.

(48) Al-khubiz ṣār sākhin *ma'a* al-ṣubbah

The bread became hot with the stove

(49) Bitnaqqal *ma'a* kursī mutaḥarrik

He moves (i.e., from one place to another) with a wheelchair.

b. The Causative Comitative Sense

The topic of causation has attracted linguists who are interested in the philosophy of grammar and the psychology of language. According to Wierzbicka causation constructions "show how the speakers of this language draw distinctions between different kinds of causal relations, how they perceive and interpret causal links between events and human actions"^[38]. Causative constructions can denote a mishap blamed on an object or an event; something that happened to a person and something else which happened to the same particular person where the second event may not only appear undesirable, but also unexpected^[39]. The event itself can be a local or a bodily event. However, the data provided below

(50-53) do not necessitate or entail that the causer must be animate or that the thing that happened is bad or unwanted. Moreover, they show how the main causer (DP²) and the secondary causer (DP¹) are linked in a close association. In this sense, DP¹ occurs as a result of active causation of DP²^[40].

(50) Shaybak zāyid *ma'a* al-ham.

Your gray hair increases due to being solicitous.

(51) Talawuth al-hawā kathran *ma'a* al-sayyārāt.

Air pollution has increased due to the presence of cars.

(52) Jismuh bitrā 'ad *ma'a* al-barid.

His body is trembling due to cold

(53) Musa mish qādir yimshī *ma'a* al-himma.

Musa is unable to walk due to fever.

It is DP² (*al-ham* 'being solicitous' in (50), *al-sayyārāt* 'the cars' in (51), *al-barid* 'cold' in (52), and *al-himma* 'fever' in (53) that cause DP¹ (*shaybak* 'your gray hair', *talawuth al-hawā* 'air pollution', *jismuh* 'his body', and Musa to increase in (50) and (51), to tremble in (52), and to be unable to walk in (53). Mansour refers to such comitative relation as Causative Comitative^[1]. To elaborate more, in (50) the change in the hair color results from being solicitous. In (51) the increase of car numbers makes air pollution increase. In (52) DP¹ (i.e., his body) is affected by DP² (i.e., cold) and so it is trembling. In (53) DP² (i.e., fever) is the causer of the inability to walk by the causee (i.e., Musa).

Simultaneousness entails the constant relation between two elements might refer to events and may be used in order to avoid implication of causal relationship^[20]. However, (54) shows how DP¹ (i.e., the snow, its color, and the ball) is caused by the effect of DP² (i.e., the heat, washing, and blowing), and entails the occurrence or existing of events at the same time; they are coincident.

(54) a. Al-thalij dhāb *ma'a* al-ḥarārah.

The snow melted due to the heat.

b. Mumkin lūnuh yitghayyar *ma'a* al-ghasīl.

Its color may change due to washing it.

c. ʔ'taqid al-kurah mumkin tinfaḡir *ma'a* al-nafikh.

I think the ball will explode due to blowing it.

c. The Beneficiary Comitative Sense

One prominent aspect of benefactive thematic role is that its ability to show how an argument benefits from what another argument does as a participant or an argument of the verb. Kurniasih defines benefactive as the "entity for whose benefit the action was performed"^[41]. Beneficiary is the

entity that receives the benefit and is usually marked with a preposition to serve as an object of preposition. The recipient is cognized as the entity which receives the argument moved or transferred. In JA, the benefactive thematic role is the case of an entity for whose sake a process, an experience, or an action is carried out by a verb. Within this conception, DP² benefited from the accompaniment of DP¹ in carrying out the action in (55) and (56), and so it is recognized as beneficiary comitative.

(55) Muḥammad nām *ma'a* akhūh al-marīḍ fī al-mustashfā

Mohammad slept with his sick brother in the hospital.

(56) ʔabūy qā'id *ma'a* Omar bidarsuh

My father is sitting with Omar teaching him.

d. The Spatio-Temporal Comitative Sense

As a preposition, *ma'a* can denote locative and temporal comitative senses in JA using the Metaphoric Mapping Theory (MMT). According to Kemmerer^[42], the theory “maintains that humans have a cognitive predisposition to structure temporal concepts in terms of spatial schemas through the application of a TIME IS SPACE metaphor”. With respect to this work, the semantic locative role identifies the orientation of the action or the state that is identified by the verb. Mansour states that both physical and mental locative semantic roles are found in MSA when the particle *wa* is used in (57)^[1].

(57) ʔistayqaz Ahmad *wa* al-maḍīnata

Ahmed woke up as he reached the city.

Similarly, *ma'a* implies locative comitative semantic role in JA in 58-60. In 58 and 59, proximity of location is prominent; DP¹ (i.e., Omar/Hassan) is sitting or sleeping close to DP² (i.e., his wife/Ali). Mental locative sense is also represented in (60); DP¹ (i.e., Jamal) is mentally or physically located with his father.

(58) Omar qā'id *ma'a* maratuh 'alā al-shaṭṭ

Omar is sitting with his wife on the beach.

(59) Hasan nāyim *ma'a* Ali fī al-ṣālūn.

Hasan is sleeping with Ali in the living room.

(60) Jamal ba'duh *ma'a* ʔabūh fī al-nādi

Jamal is still with his father in the club.

The preposition *ma'a* can also denote temporal comitative sense as in (61) as a result of permitting the anomaly between DP¹ (i.e., Muhammad/+animate) and DP² (i.e., at dawn/-animate) in JA. The context of (62) explains how

DP¹ is patient and not in a hurry with DP² concerning the fulfillment of his debt; thus denoting non-proximity of time.

(61) Muhammad raja' 'alā al-bayt *ma'a* al-fajir.

Muhammad returned home at dawn

(62) *Ma'āk* lamma tithassan zurūfak.

Don't be in a hurry. Will wait until your conditions improve.

e. The Depictive Comitative Sense/State

Depictives are recognized as a type of adjuncts that denote a predication in relation to a participant of the main predication, and thus they are known as ‘depictive secondary predicates’^[43]. While a true or genuine comitative construction shows that the same situation as described by the main predicate for the core participant also holds for the one introduced by the comitative NP, the time frame of the depictive construction and the time frame of the main predicate overlap. Depictive constructions discuss an emotional or a physical state of the participant who controls the event situation (i.e., the controller participant). Arkhipov states that such expressions “seem to be indeed depictive^[39], as they convey a spatial configuration and/or a situation of causative locomotion limited by the time frame of the main predicate”.

According to Rappoport, *with* denotes manner or circumstances as in (63)^[20]. It also involves the expression of a secondary nonphysical participant as in (64) and (65), or it might be used to denote a state of agreement as in (66)^[23].

(63) The children shouted with joy

(64) She ate the cake with gusto

(65) We sprayed the dog with glee.

(66) I am with you

The semantic range of depictives, as participant-oriented adjuncts, can include expressions that imply emotional or mental conditions, manner, comparison, function, location and time amongst others. Based on this conception, JA utilizes *ma'a* to denote several functions in (67-70). In (67) *ma'a* is used conceptually to denote the metaphor STATES ARE LOCATIONS^[44, 45]; DP¹ (Ahmed) is conceived as the place or location of the worry of the world, or the depression^[18]. In (68), *ma'a* stands for the metaphor STATES ARE KNOWLEDGE or UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING^[46]. A state of agreement or supported by evidence is indicated by using *ma'a* in (69). The metaphor INTENSITY OF ACTIVITY, being immersed or preoccupied with an activity, is prominent in (70)^[47].

- (67) a. Ahmed *ma'uh* ham al-dunyā kulhā
 Ahmed with him the worry of the whole world
 b. Ahmed *ma'uh* ?ikti?āb
 Ahmed is suffering from depression.
- (68) a. Omar *ma'uh* 'ilim bil-akhbār
 Omar knows the news
 b. Fakkar *ma'a* nafsuh wa qarrar al-safar.
 He thought to himself and decided to travel abroad.
- (69) a. ?anā muttāfiq *ma'ak* tamāman
 I completely agree with you
 b. *Ma'ak* ḥaqq
 You are right.
- (70) Qā'id *ma'uh* ktāb biqrā fīh.
 He is sitting with a book reading it.

f. The Ingredient Comitative Sense

Speakers of JA may also use *ma'a* to encode an ingredient comitative sense in certain constructions especially when talking about two constituents that constitute together one entity. Such a relation may particularly exist when talking about meals in the Jordanian culture. For example, in (71) the speaker intends to imply the ingredients of his meal (i.e., tomatoes and eggs). Both DP¹ and DP² play the role of the ingredient participant. Here, shared activity (i.e., being cooked) and unity of time are both prominent. In (72), Meant and the other constituents of tea (i.e., tea, sugar, and water) are all conceptualized as constituents of the same item (i.e., tea drink).

- (71) Fatimah ṭabakhat bandurah *ma'a* bayḍ
 Fatimah cooked tomatoes and eggs.
- (72) ?anā ṭalabit shāy *ma'a* na'na' mish mayramyyah
 I ordered tea (drink) with meant not sage.

5. Conclusions

The present study addressed the semantics of the comitative preposition *ma'a* 'with' in JA. It discussed the manner in which the preposition denotes primary and secondary comitative senses to code particular semantic thematic roles of the two arguments (i.e., a companion and an accompanee) in relation to the main verb. The study adopted a holistic constructional view emerged from CS to the analysis of the data gathered from the Jordanians' spontaneous daily speech. In this sense, the researcher intended to stress the primacy of semantics, the encyclopedic nature of meaning, and adopted

a non-objective view towards discussing and analyzing the data. In addition, the researcher accounted for the preposition *ma'a* as polysemous; a network of distinct, but related senses of a particular linguistic form that are paired at the conceptual level. Such a polysemy appeared as guided by the interlocutors' intention for a mutual understanding of the context and a real conception of the world around them.

The researcher attempted to highlight the role of embodied experience and conceptual processes when they intersected to account for the meanings that the preposition *ma'a* conveyed, and to shed the light on how a particular construction may be conceptualized by means of both the linguistic forms used and the interlocutors' conception. The total available conventions of language users when addressing issues of text structure and interpretation, the impacts of cultural knowledge on language usage, and the encyclopedic nature of meaning, and the primacy of semantics are essential factors that the researcher took in consideration during the analysis.

As a comitative relator, *ma'a* was recognized in this study as a linguistic item with a multifunctional nature which can denote a primary comitative sense in addition to other secondary comitative ones. A primary comitative sense necessitates that both the companion and the accompanee share equally the same activity, and the unity of time is obligatory. In this sense, the accompanee is more prominent than the companion; consequently, in most cases the comitative sense is symmetrical. However, secondary comitative senses of *ma'a* can be symmetrical or asymmetrical as the relation between the two DPs does not require that they share the same event, or that the same event occurs simultaneously.

The results revealed that variations in construction specificity appeared obviously in the different semantic thematic roles that the interpretation of the constructions convey; thus, following Rapoport the semantics of *ma'a* as a comitative relator is subject to the construction in which it appears (i.e., meaning is constructional)^[20]. Moreover, the analysis showed that the conception of certain secondary comitative constructions of *ma'a* resulted from the speakers' conception of conceptual metaphors (i.e., meaning is encyclopedic).

The researcher recommends a thorough investigation of other linguistics functions that the preposition *ma'a* may imply such as possession, instrumentality, attribution, etc. It is also recommended that the same preposition be addressed

in MSA within the new linguistic theories. With the increased interest of the non-native speakers of Arabic to learn both MSA and vernacular dialects of Arabic, addressing the theme of comitative constructions of *ma'a* in JA in particular will enhance their ability to speak MSA and JA more fluently, consequently having a better understanding of the culture of the society they live or work in.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

The study does not need ethical approval.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

The data are not created, or available due to ethical restrictions.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Mansour, M.A., 2011. The Syntax and Cognitive Semantics of Comitative Constructions in English and Arabic. *Arab Journal for the Humanities*. 29(115), 185–216. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34120/ajh.v29i115.2251>
- [2] Abu Al-Makarim, A., 2007. *Al-Jumlah Al-Fi'liyyah*, 1st ed. Al-Mukhtaar Establishment: Kuwait.
- [3] Stolz, T.S., Cornelia-Urdze, A., 2009. Varieties of comitative. In: Malchukov, A., Spencer, A. (eds.). *The Oxford handbook of case*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. pp. 601–608.
- [4] Ibn Manẓūr, 1994. *Lisān Al-'arab*, 3rd ed. Dar Sadir: Beirut, Lebanon.
- [5] Al-Samirāī, F., 2000. *Ma'anī al-Naḥu*. Dar al-Fikr for Publishing and Distribution: Amman, Jordan.
- [6] Al-Suyūfī, J., 1998. *Al-Muz'hir fī 'ulūm al-lughah wa-anwā'hā*. In: Mansur, F.A. (ed.). *Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmīyah*: Beirut, Lebanon.
- [7] Al-Mubarrad, A., 1994. *al-Muqtaḍab. Wizārat al-Awqāf al-Miṣrīyah*: Cairo, Egypt.
- [8] Al-Zubaidī, M.M., 2001. *Taj al-Arus min jawahir al-Qamus*. In: Hijazi, M. (ed.). Ministry of Media: Kuwait.
- [9] Modhaffer, M., Sivaramakrishna, C.V., 2017. Distribution of Simple Prepositions in Modern Standard Arabic. *Language in India*. 17(9), 68–78.
- [10] Sibawayh, A., 1988. *Al-Kitab*, 3rd ed. In: Harūn, A. (ed.). *Dar al-Kutub al-'ilmīyah*: Beirut, Lebanon.
- [11] Al-Naḥḥas, A., 2001. *I'rab Al-Quran*, 1st ed. Dar al-Kutub al-Imeah: Beirut, Lebanon.
- [12] Ali, A.Y., 1934. *The Holy Qur'an: translation and commentary*. The Holy Quran Publishing House: Cairo, Egypt.
- [13] Badawi, E., Carter, M.G., Gully, A., 2004. *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge: London, UK.
- [14] Buckley, R., 2004. *Modern Literary Arabic: A Reference Grammar: 'Arabīyah al-fuṣḥa al-ḥadīthah: mar-jī' fī al-naḥw al-'Arabī*. Librarie du Liban Publishers: Beirut, Lebanon.
- [15] Ryding, K.C., 2005. *A reference grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [16] Holes, C., 2004. *Modern Arabic: Structures, functions, and varieties*. Georgetown University Press: Washington, DC, USA.
- [17] Esseesy, M., 2010. *Grammaticalization of Arabic prepositions and subordinators: A corpus-based study*. Brill: Leiden, Netherlands.
- [18] Al-Rasheedi, E.S., 2019. *Possessive constructions in Najdi Arabic* [PhD Thesis]. Newcastle University: Newcastle, UK.
- [19] Stassen, L., 2009. *Predicative Possession*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- [20] Rapoport, T., 2014. Central coincidence: The preposition with. *Faits de Langues*. 44(1), 159–173. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/19589514-044-01-900000016>
- [21] Kidd, E., Cameron-Faulkner, T., 2008. The acquisition of the multiple senses of with. *Linguistics*. 46(1), 33–61. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2008.002>
- [22] Seiler, H., 1974. The principle of concomitance: instrumental, comitative, and collective. *Foundations of language*. 12(2), 215–247.
- [23] Svenonius, P., 2007. Adpositions, particles, and the arguments they introduce. In: Reuland, E., Bhattacharya, T., Spathas, G. (eds.). *Argument structure*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Netherlands. pp. 63–103.
- [24] Croft, W., 1991. *Syntactic categories and grammatical relations: The cognitive organization of information*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA.
- [25] Taylor, J., 2006. Cognitive Semantics. In: Brown, K. (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Elsevier: Oxford, UK. pp. 569–582.
- [26] Croft, W., 2004. *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge Uni-

- versity Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [27] Evans, V., 2007. *Glossary of cognitive linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, UK.
- [28] Fillmore, C., 1977. The case for case reopened. In: Cole, P., Sadock, J.M. (eds.). *Grammatical relations*. Brill: Leiden, the Netherlands. pp. 59–81. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368866_005
- [29] Croft, W., 1993. The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies. *Cognitive Linguistics*. 4(4), 335–370. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1993.4.4.335>
- [30] Evans, V., Green, M., 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: An introduction*. Routledge: London, UK.
- [31] Peate, J., 2012. *A construction grammar approach to spatial prepositions in modern standard Arabic* [PhD Thesis]. University of Salford: Salford, UK.
- [32] Langacker, R.W., 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Volume I: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA, USA.
- [33] Lemmens, M., 2015. Cognitive semantics. In: Riemer, N. (ed.). *The Routledge handbook of semantics*, 1st ed. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 90–105. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315685533>
- [34] Langacker, R.W., 1991. *Cognitive linguistics research*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, Germany.
- [35] SokolovĽ, J., 2019. On Comitative Constructions in Slovak. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*. 16(3), 1–15.
- [36] Stolz, T., Stroh, C., Urdze, A., et al., 2006. On comitatives and related categories: A typological study with special focus on the languages of Europe. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, Germany.
- [37] Arkhipov, A., 2009. Comitative as a cross-linguistically valid category. In: Epps, P., Arkhipov, A. (eds.). *New challenges in typology: Transcending the borders and refining the distinctions*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, Germany. pp. 223–246. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219067.4.223>
- [38] Wierzbicka, A., 2017. The semantics of English causative constructions in a universal-typological perspective. In: Tomasello, M. (ed.). *The new psychology of language*. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 113–153.
- [39] Al-‘OtaibĽ, Y., 2022. Causative Constructions in Modern Standard Arabic. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. 12(3), 46–57. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v12n3p46>
- [40] Wechsler, S., 1997. Prepositional phrases from the twilight zone. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*. 20(2), 127–153. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S033258650000408X>
- [41] Kurniasih, N., 2009. Benefactive verbs in double object construction (DOC) in English sentences. *Jurnal Sosioteknologi*. 8(16), 575–586.
- [42] Kemmerer, D., 2005. The spatial and temporal meanings of English prepositions can be independently impaired. *Neuropsychologia*. 43(5), 797–806.
- [43] Himmelmann, N.P., Schultze-Berndt, E.F., 2005. Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts. In: Himmelmann, N.P., Schultze-Berndt, E.F. (eds.). *Secondary predication and adverbial modification: The typology of depictives*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. pp. 1–67.
- [44] Johnson, M., 1987. *The body in the mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA. pp. 233.
- [45] Lakoff, G., 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA.
- [46] Bratianu, C., 2018. *Knowledge Metaphors. Organizational Knowledge Dynamics: Managing Knowledge Creation, Acquisition, Sharing, and Transformation*. IGI Global: Hershey, PA, USA.
- [47] Mueller, C.M., 2016. A Semantic Account of the English Preposition FOR Based on a Cognitive Linguistics Framework. *The Bulletin of the Faculty of Humanities*. 53, 1–24.