Deep Structures of Selected Qur'anic Constructions: Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's Semantic Roles

Qasim Abbas Dhayef Altufayl[1*], Kamal Gatti Nasir[2]

[1] Department of English, University of Babylon, Hilla, Iraq, *qasimabbas@uobabylon.edu.iq*
[2] Department of English, University of Babylon, Hilla, Iraq, *kamal.altamimi@gmail.com*

*Corresponding Author: qasimabbas@uobabylon.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to describe Arabic Qur'anic constructions in terms of deep structure using Fillmore's (1966) base rules and Al-Khuli's (2000) semantic roles. However, the study seeks to determine whether Arabic Qur'anic constructions can be analysed using the theory of semantic roles to determine their deep structures. What if the Qur'anic constructions were analysed in terms of the theory of semantic roles and deep structures? Likewise, the study hypothesises that Qur'anic constructions can be analysed using the theory of semantic roles to determine their deep structures, though this is not an easy task; hence, Al-Khuli modified Fillmore's base rules to make them compatible with Arabic. The data selected for semantic representations in the present study are 40 Qur'anic constructions collected in a table at the end of the study. Some samples are analysed in detail to highlight the analysis method. However, deciding the deep structures requires discussing the constructions' selectional restrictions, co-occurrence restrictions, lexical items, and transformations. However, the present study concludes that Fillmore's and Al-Khlui's semantic roles can be adopted to represent Qur'anic constructions, thereby providing the best way to determine their deep structures, as well as those of other Arabic constructions. In addition, the concepts of semantic roles, selectional and co-occurrence restrictions, lexical items, and transformations can be identified by considering their equivalents in the Arabic linguistic tradition. After all, Arab scholars have noted the necessity of combining semantics with syntax as generativists do.

Keywords: Deep Structures of Qur'anic constructions, Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles.

INTRODUCTION

Regarding semantic-syntactic equivalence, one must clarify this concept in European schools and identify its Arabic equivalents, or identify any Arabic studies that approximate it. However, 'semanto-syntactic equivalence' is a concept or theory of Krzeszowski (1971, 1990). Thus, Krzeszowski's primary concern beyond this theory is to prove the validity of a hypothesis that "equivalent constructions have identical deep structures even if on the surface they are markedly different" (Krzeszowski, 1990, p. 148). The effect of Chomsky's generative grammar on contrastive linguistics is apparent, as Krzeszowski's hypothesis is considered. Therefore, Krzeszowski confesses that he relies on Lakoff's (1968) version of the deep structure rather than Chomsky's deep structure, as Lakoff's deep structure is more abstract than Chomsky's.

In addition, Krzeszowski's theory rests on Fillmore's base rules or semantic roles as far as the former's 'original configuration' is concerned. Moreover, Krzeszowski (1990, p. 168) replaces a 'deep structure' in his theory with 'input structure' or 'semantic structure' to avoid being confused with Chomsky's deep structure in the Standard Theory. Most importantly, Bouton (1976) mentions that Krzeszowski is based on Lakoff's (1968) deep structure

and Catford's (1965) equivalence. Regarding Catford's (1965) textual equivalence, Bouton (1976, p. 152) reveals that Krzeszowski's understanding of this concept is: (1) equivalent constructions are mutually translatable and (2) no comparison can be accomplished across languages without such equivalent constructions as data. Moreover, Bouton depicts the general lines of Krzeszowski's theory as follows:

> One of the more interesting adaptations of recent descriptive theory to the problem of structural equivalence was that of Krzeszowski, who led in the direction of using various [deep structure conditions] to test the possible commonality of deep structure between constructions from two or more different languages (Bouton, 1976, p. 160). (Brackets mine)

However, after this survey of the main concepts on which Krzeszowski relies to establish his suggested theory of 'semanto-syntactic equivalence' in theoretical contrastive studies. This section aims to investigate the approximate concepts or attempts of Arab scholars in these areas. Many thoughts concerning the concept of equivalence in Arabic have been discussed. Now, it is time to shed some light on the semanto-syntactic combination in Arabic and how Arab scholars reveal them. Thus, the primary concern in this paper is how Arab scholars consider 'the hypothesis of identical deep structure across languages' (i.e. the common deep structure of constructions across languages) that may lead to semanto-syntactic equivalence across languages. Some Arab scholars have tackled the issue of 'deep structure' in Arabic tradition, or compared it to Chomskyan deep structure, as did باقر (1990).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Deep Structure in Arabic Tradition:

حسان (1985, ص. 48) argues that it is normal to start a tree diagram of an Arabic sentence's deep structure with a noun phrase rather than with the verb phrase that an Arabic sentence starts with, because he thinks that the difference or variation between the English and Arabic sentences is a stylistic one in terms of 'fronting and backing or extraposition' rather than a grammatical one, and that a variation in grammar is different from that in style.

Moreover, زكريا (1986, ص. 76) conveys the idea, shared by Chomsky and others, that deep structure, which determines meaning, is common to all languages, as it is only a reflection of the origins of ideology. Additionally, he notes that the rules that transform deep structure into surface structure differ from one language to another. Thus, a deep structure held within the actual speech, which is purely mental, carries the semantic content that returns to a sentence.

Another study was conducted by باقر (1990) that compares the deep structure in Chomsky's thoughts with the Arabic deep structure in the thoughts of Al-Jurjani and other scholars. This study argues that the two sentences that share a single deep structure (as a general consideration of the sixties- 1960s) should have a single meaning. However, the author of this paper asserts that this is not a condition that every two sentences have a single meaning and also a standard deep structure (باقر, 1990, ص. 31).

Indeed, a very distinguished work that الخولي (1999) has achieved under the title Transformational Rules for the Arabic Language, in which he notes that a thorny problem is deciding which structural description belongs to deep structure and how much to surface structure. In this respect, linguists who seek to establish transformational rules for the English language disagree. After that, الخولي (1999, ص. 7) classifies the transformational rules into (1) phrase-structure rules, (2) lexical rules, and (3) transformational rules, however, the most important thing is that the author in this book surveys some justifications for the use of transformational rules, such as (a) their distinction between competence and performance of the native speaker, (b) they can interpret how a person can judge that two sentences or more are synonymous [or equivalent] in terms of meaning [deep structure] despite of discrepancy in their apparent [surface] structures. He adds that the justification the transformational theory introduces is that the apparent structures of many sentences differ, yet all have a single underlying structure (الخولي, 1999). Additionally, الخولي mentions some rules of phrase structure and highlights their universality by asserting that the underlying structure in every language must contain common characteristics. In this case, the linguists' role in investigating the common properties among languages with different origins and populations arises, and these common properties constitute the universal deep structure that linguists strive to arrive at (الخولي, 1999). However, another piece of evidence for the existence of the universal deep structure is the ability to translate any language into any other. This also shows that there are many similarities among languages in terms of 'meaning' and 'structure'.

Arabic Conceptualisation Towards Deep Structure and Semanto-Syntactic Equivalence

الخولي asserts that linguists do their best, and the result is the emergence of many postulations about the underlying structure. Then, he concludes that there is neither an available hypothesis for the universal deep

structure of one hundred per cent, nor a hypothesis that is not universal of one hundred per cent. Additionally, he adds that whenever the properties of the deep structure expand in their semantics, and whenever they are depicted with the abstract non-syntactic feature, these properties become nearer to the supposed universality in the postulation or rules of deep structure(الخولي, 1999, ص. 14). That is, to arrive at this universality, the researcher should reduce the properties or features of specific languages to the universal linguistic properties. Therefore, he denotes that a linguist should dismiss some properties or features that are restricted to a particular language rather than another from the rules of the deep structure and permit to endure the features that are common among many languages (الخولي, 1999, ص. 15). Additionally, after(الخولي 1999, ص. 45) surveys Fillmore's base rules of a deep structure, he indicates that this theory (Fillmore's) has mainly set for the English language, then he verifies that it is suitable to do some modifications to make it more convenient to the Arabic language. Thus, he felt the need to adjust Fillmore's base rules to be more convenient for Arabic; otherwise, it would require additional transformational rules (الخولي, 1999). Before departing from this book in the present study, (الخولي, 1999, ص. 93) verifies that "transformational rules start where lexical rules end and lexical rules start where phrase-structure rules end."

Since the semanto-syntactic equivalence is a result of combining syntactic and semantic characteristics of a sentence, a study conducted by حماسة (2000) under the title of *'Syntax and Semantics: Introduction to Syntactic-Semantic Meaning'* may be a sufficient Arabic study to cover such an approach set by Krzeszowski (1990) of Poland. In this study, (حماسة, 2000, ص. 52) sets some conditions through which every sentence is regarded as syntactically and semantically correct:

1. Grammatical functions (functions of grammatical categories), which give the base meaning,
2. Lexemes to be chosen to fill the grammatical functions just above,
3. *S*emantic relations are to be active between the grammatical relations and the chosen lexemes, and
4. A special context in which the linguistic or non-linguistic sentences emerge.

This classification in حماسة (2000) reminds the reader of the four points that Lakoff (1968) mentions of a deep structure, which are cited in Krzeszowski (1990, p. 148) with little difference. At the same time, حماسة (2000) refers to Al-Jurjani's efforts to establish a theory of the interaction between syntactic meaning/reference and lexical meaning, or the theory of *Ordering*, in his book *The Proofs of Inimitability*. In the same respect, حماسة (2000, ص. 59) asserts that he names the interaction of prior syntactic meaning and prior semantics of lexemes in a convenient context, which gives a lexical item a new special meaning in the scope of a sentence as a 'syntactic-semantic meaning' or 'semantic-syntactic meaning'.

Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's Semantic Roles

Concerning the phrase structure rules that constitute the components of the universal deep structure, as far as Fillmore and Chomsky consider, Al-Khuli (2000) attempts to apply them to the Arabic corpus. The latter suggests some phrase-structure, lexical, and transformational rules that might be convenient for the sentences he has illustrated in Arabic. After الخولي (1999) discusses Fillmore's and Chomsky's perspectives on some rules of deep structures which are constructed for the English language, he asserts that Fillmore's five base rules of deep structure are the more suitable for the Arabic language (الخولي, 1999, ص. 45). Then, he translates and modifies Fillmore's five phrase structure rules as follows to be convenient to Arabic (الخولي,1999, ص. 45-48):

1- PS-rule(1): *Jumla,* S. → *Mashroottiyya,* Mod. + *Mussā'id,* Aux. + *Jawhar,* Prop.

2- PS-rule (2): *Mashroottiyya,* Mod. →
- *Al-Rawabitt Al-Khārijiyya,* Sentence Adverbials;
- *Dhuruf Al-Zamān,* Time Adverbials;
- *Adwāt Al-Isstifhām,* Interrogatives;
- *Adwāt Al-Nafii,* Negative Elements.

3- PS-rule (3): *Jawhar,* Prop. → *Fi'il,* V. + (*Mihwar,* Erg.) + (*Maf'ul bihi ghayr mubāshir,* Dat., Indirect Object) + (*Makān,* Loc., the place of the referent) + (*Adāt,* the Inst. of the action) + (*Fā'il,* Ag.) the actual doer of the action.

a - *Mihwar* = Erg;
b - *Maf'ul bihi ghayr mubāshir* = Dat, Indirect Object;
c- *Makān* = Loc, the place of the referent;

4- PS-rule (4): → *Ibārah Issmiyya*; NP

d- *Adāt* = the Inst. of the action;

e- *Fā'il* = Ag., the actual doer of

the action

5- PS-rule (5) *Al-Ibārah Al-Issmiyya*; NP → *Jār*, Prep. + (*Mu'arrif*, Det.) + **(*Jumla*, S)** + *Issm* = N.

After this clarification of the PS rules which constitute the universal deep structure, (50 .ص ,1999) الخولي and Al-Khuli (2000, p. 28) (Arabic and English versions, respectively) has suggested some modifications to Fillmore's phrase structure rules so that they become convenient to Arabic sentences, concerning the rules (3) and (5) above as follows:

3- PS-rule (3): *Jawhar*, Prop. → **Ibārah Fi'liyya**; Vl + (*Mihwar*, Erg.) + (*Maf'ul bihi ghayr mubāshir*, Dat, Indirect Object) + (*Makān*, Loc, the place of the referent) + (*Adāt*, the Inst. of the action) + (*Fā'il*, Ag.).

5- PS-rule (5) *Al-Ibārah Al-Issmiyya*; NP → *Jār*, Prep. + (*Mu'arrif*, Det.) + *Issm* = N + **(*Jumla*, S)**. (الخولي, 1999. ص ,50؛ حماسة, 1990, ص. 77).

Justifying the selection of Fillmore's model of base rules, Al-Khuli (2000, p. 30) states, "Chomsky's model does not suit Arabic, and uses misleading notions that do not suit English or Arabic deep structure." After all, he (2000, p. 31) highlights that "Fillmore's base is simpler, more efficient, and more universal than other competing models. In addition, it can be a common base to both English and Arabic." Moreover,(ص. 77 ,1990) حماسة conveys that الخولي selects Fillmore's hypotheses of deep structure and justifies his selection of Fillmore's hypotheses over Chomsky's hypotheses of deep structure as a result of Chomsky's theory, which focuses on the ideas of Subject (*Mubtada'*) and Predicate (*Khabar*) while Arabic, as الخولي justifies has: a- Nominal Sentence (i.e. Subject + Predicate) and b- Verbal Sentence (i.e. Verb+ Subject). However,(ص. 77, 1990) حماسة verifies what الخولي says, and he agrees with him that the concepts of Subject and Predicate are related to the surface structure rather than the underlying or deep structure that Fillmore's sample provides, rather than Chomsky's.

Furthermore, Al-Khuli (2000, p. 32) analyses the deep structures of 52 sentences applying the above-suggested rules as in the selected sentences below:

1. ?al kita:bu + 9ala ?al Ta:wilati

   Erg + Loc1

2. ? aTa + ?al waladu + sami:ran + kata:ban

   Aux Vl + Ag + Dat + Erg

3. ?inqaTa9a + ?al jhablu

   Aux Vl + Erg

4. fataha + ?al mifta:hu + ?al ba:ba

   Aux Vl + Inst + Erg

5. qta9a + sami:run + hablan

   Aux Vl + Ag + Erg

6. ?al waldu + yakburu

   Erg + Aux Vl

7. ?al waladu + Dahu:kun

   Ag + Aux Vl12

8. kataba + sami:run

   Aux Vl + Ag

9. ka:na + sami:run + huna:

   Aux + Erg + Loc

10. maša + haða + ?al walad

    Aux Vl + Ag1 + Ag1

11. maša + haða

    Aux Vl + Ag

In this respect, الخولي (1999) and Al-Khuli (2000) verify that the rules that construct sentences in any language, as far as generative-transformational grammar is concerned, are phrase-structure rules (PS-rules), lexical rules (L-rules), transformational rules (T-rules), and morphophonemic rules, and he asserts that PS-rules may not describe all sentences in languages so that L-rules and T-rules may describe. So, phrase-structure rules cannot describe some categories that are subject to transformational rules.

After all, Al-Khuli (2000, p. 35) announces that "these descriptions of the previous sentences are not meant to be detailed or complete. The purpose has been merely to get a further quick clue of the suitability of Fillmore's model to Arabic." Despite this, عكاشة (2014) makes a study concerning a comparison between the subject in Fillmore's Case Grammar and in Arabic, in which he revealed the semantic roles of case grammar and the modifications made by Fillmore himself later on, and in which he (عكاشة) also states that the subject in Arabic can be Actual and Tropical. Moreover,عكاشة (2014) mentions that the number of these cases may vary from one scholar to another. Then, he verifies that scholars agree on five cases (semantic roles) for a sentence: Agent (A),

Experiencer (E), Benefactive (B), Object (O), and Locative (L) (422 .ص ,2014 ,عكاشة). In this respect, عكاشة (2014, ص. 429) highlights that Fillmore (1968) proposes six cases: Agentive, Instrumental, Dative, Factitive, Locative, and Objective; he later changes some old terms, such as Dative into Experience, Factitive into Result, and Object Agents into Objective Agentive. Then, he states that Fillmore (1971) adds three other cases: Counter-Agent, Source, and Goal (430 .ص ,2014 ,عكاشة).

However, this illumination shows that Fillmore's cases (semantic roles) pass through three stages (1966), (1968), and (1971). Lastly, عكاشة (2014, ص. 449) concludes that the subject in Case Grammar is subject to mental conceptual criteria through which different names alternate for rule order as Agent, Instrument, and Object; he elaborates that this succession of utterances for the subject in case grammar may not be matched with the convention of all languages in expression. Then, the author states that Arab scholars describe the subject as doing the action. Thus, he explains that the figurative subject may involve every verb to which it stands as a predicate concerning real meaning and metaphor. The fact of the 'subject' may be understood logically or with verbal context or co-text (449 .ص ,2014 ,عكاشة). However, Al-Mogarry (2024, p. 217) states, "Arabic tends to use syntactic functions to refer to the agent or subject less than English."

METHODOLOGY

Research Questions and Hypotheses:

The current study adopts a mixed qualitative and quantitative approach. In this method, the researcher will provide in-depth explanations and descriptions of the randomly selected original constructions from the Arabic Qur'an, followed by their semantic representations in terms of Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's base rules. Moreover, as far as the semantic-syntactic view is concerned, the selected Qur'anic verses will be analysed in terms of selectional and co-occurrence restrictions, lexical items, and transformations. Therefore, the present study attempts to answer the following research question: 1- How can Arabic Qur'anic constructions be analysed within the theory of semantic roles? 2- How can describing Qur'anic constructions in terms of semantic roles, selectional and co-occurrence restrictions, lexical items and transformations yield the deep structures? 3- How can Arabic conceptualisations of specific terms like deep structures and semantic-syntactic combination echo the theories of general linguistics in Europe? Thus, the present study hypothesises that: 1- Arabic Qur'anic constructions despite of the diificult task can be represented in terms of the theory of semantic roles (i.e. Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles), 2- Describing the Arabic Qur'anic constructions in terms of semantic roles, selectional restrictions, co-occurrence, lexical items, and transformations may represent their deep structures, 3- Arab scholars may invent similar Arabic concepts to those in general linguistics in Europe.

Data Collection

For the deep structures of Arabic Qur'anic constructions, 40 texts are randomly selected for investigation. Four of these texts are analysed in detail in the present study. It is followed by a long table concerning the description of all 40 texts in terms of Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles. In addition to representing the target Qur'anic texts in terms of semantic roles, selectional and co-occurrence restrictions, lexical items, and transformations, the following will also be taken into consideration: the target texts' linguistic features, such as word order, and their textual features, such as the presence of a narrator. The present study addresses the difficulty of describing the deep structures of Qur'anic constructions, which may help determine the semantic-syntactic equivalence with their English translations in other studies. Thus, the main objective or concern of the present study is to explore how Arabic Qur'anic constructions are described in terms of Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles, which, to the researcher's humble knowledge, is the first attempt to describe Qur'anic constructions in terms of semantic roles. Likewise, this semantic description or representation may later help identify the constructions' deep structures or semantic inputs. However, the justification for selecting Qur'anic expressions in Arabic, rather than other genres, in the present study is their highly standard Arabic and their difficult comprehension for non-Arab learners. Consequently, (40) Qur'anic constructions are selected from *The Quranic Arabic Corpus* [https://corpus.quran.com/publications.jsp], which includes the original Qur'anic texts as well as their famous translations into English. Therefore, (4) samples of analysis are illustrated in this study, whereas others are just given in the results and discussions.

Model of Analysis

It can be said that the present study is based on Fillmore's model of semantic representation, as well as on Al-Khuli's adaptation for representing Arabic sentences semantically, which is an uneasy task. After all, the present study aims to investigate the deep structures underlying the selected Qur'anic constructions. Thus, it seems necessary here to shed light on Fillmore's (1966) and Al-Khuli's (2000) models of base rules and semantic roles:

1- PS1: S → (Mod) Aux. Prop.
　　　　Where S = sentence
　　　　　　Mod. = modality
　　　　　　Aux. = Auxiliary
　　　　　　Prop. = proposition
　　　　　　The arrow → = is rewritten
　　　　　　The parentheses ( ) = optionally included.

2- PS2: Mod →
$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{Sentence Adverbials} \\ \text{Time Adverbials} \\ \text{Interrogatives} \\ \text{Negative Elements} \end{bmatrix}$$

The braces indicate free choice within them. Sentence adverbials modify all sentences rather than a particular word, such as 'therefore'.

3- PS3: Prop → V (Erg) (Dat) (Loc) (Inst) (Ag)
　　　　Where V = verb
　　　　　　Erg. = ergative (i.e. the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive
　　　　　　　　　verb; it is an NP that is most attached to V. what Fillmore symbolised later
　　　　　　　　　on as Obj.)
　　　　　　Dat. = dative; the indirect object
　　　　　　Loc. = locative; the place referent
　　　　　　Inst. = the instrument of the action
　　　　　　Ag. = the actual doer of the action

4- PS4:
$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{Erg.} \\ \text{Dat.} \\ \text{Loc.} \\ \text{Inst.} \\ \text{Ag.} \end{bmatrix}$$
　　　　Where NP = nominal phrase

5- PS5: NP → P (Det) (S) N
　　　　Where P = preposition
　　　　　　Det = determiner
　　　　　　S = sentence
　　　　　　N = noun

Furthermore, Krzeszowski (1990), in his construction of a Contrastive Generative Grammar, depicts another way of representation based on what he calls 'the Original Configuration', which may rest on Fillmore's semantic roles as follows: the uppermost Agent (A), Patient (P) the one below, Resident (R) the one below, and the three fL (from Locus) (source), atL (at Locus), and tL (to Locus) (goal) from left to right, respectively.

Meanwhile, the procedures followed in the present study are the description of the target linguistic phenomena in Arabic tradition in terms of their existence in linguistic theory. After selecting them in a literature review, an adopted model will be used to analyse and describe the selected data (i.e., Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles). However, the selected data —40 Qur'anic constructions — are analysed in terms of semantic roles, selectional and co-occurrence restrictions, lexical items, and transformations. The steps for analysing these constructions are regarded as the best way to analyse Arabic deep structures, as will be illustrated below.

Data Analysis

This section is devoted to the analysis of four Qur'anic constructions in detail, taking into consideration Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles, selectional and co-occurrence restrictions, lexical items, and transformations. However, these four samples are drawn from 40 Qur'anic texts that exhibit the linguistic phenomena above and were extracted from a larger study. This section is followed by a long table concerning the description of all 40 Qur'anic constructions in terms of Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles:

1- (Qur'an 2: 43) ﴿ وَأَقِيمُواْ ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ وَءَاتُواْ ٱلزَّكَوٰةَ ﴾

This Qur'anic construction is a compound sentence coordinated with (و) (and), composed of the Arabic main imperative and imperfect verb (اقيم) and the attached pronoun (و) (you) indicates the pluralisation for the first proposition as an agentive subject, and the Arabic imperative and imperfect verb (أتي) and the attached pronoun (و) which indicate the pluralisation of males as an agentive subject of the second clause. In addition, the other

arguments (الصلاة) (prayer) and (الزكاة) (charity) are two ergative semantic roles for the two clauses, respectively. Thus, the semantic representations of these clauses are:

وَ+ أَقِيمُ+ وأ + ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ+ وَ + ءَاتُ+ وأ+ ٱلزَّكَوٰةَ

Wa+ aqim+ u+ alsalaat+ wa+ aat+ u+ alzakaat

Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Erg.+ Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Erg.

Thus, selectional restriction and co-occurrence of the clauses in (37) show that the verbs (اقيم) and (اتى) require subjects with the semantic features (+animate, +human, +concrete, +pronoun, +plural), and the other arguments (صلاة) (prayer) with the semantic features (-animate, -human, -concrete, +deeds, +noun, +singular), and (الزكاة) (charity) with the semantic features (-animate, -human, -concrete, +finance, +noun, +singular).

2- (Qur'an 8: 11) ﴿ وَيُنَزِّلُ عَلَيْكُم مِّنَ ٱلسَّمَآءِ مَآءً لِّيُطَهِّرَكُم بِهِۦ﴾

This Qur'anic construction is composed of the operational category or the Arabic main imperfect verb (ينزل) (send down), the arguments include the implicit agentive subject (الله) (God) or (هو) (He) that indicates (God), and the object or the agentive noun (ماء) (water). However, the source represents other semantic roles or locative (من السماء) (from sky), (عليكم) (to/ on you) as a goal or locative, and the clause (ليطهركم به) as a goal semantic role. Thus, this Arabic construction can be represented semantically as in the following pattern:

وَ+ يُنَزِّلُ+ (الله/هو)+ عَلَيْكُم+ مِّنَ ٱلسَّمَآءِ+ مَآءً+ لِّيُطَهِّرَكُم بِهِ

Wa+ yunazzilu+ (Allah)+ alaykum+ min alsmaa'+ maa'an+ li yutahirukum bihi

Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ (Ag.)+ Loc.+ Source + Erg.+ Goal

Regarding the selectional and co-occurrence restrictions of this Qur'anic construction, the verb requires two arguments: subject and object. The subject has the semantic features (+power, +superior, +deity, +abstract, ±noun, +singular), whereas the object has the semantic features (-animate, -human, +concrete, +noun, +singular).

3- (Qur'an 33: 33) ﴿ وَقَرْنَ في بيوتكن﴾

The underlying structure of this Qur'anic construction is composed of the appositive (و) *Wa* (and), the principal, imperative verb (قر), and the Arabic attached pronoun (ن) indicates the feminine plural which addresses the prophet's wives (الكرباسي, 2010, ج. 6). This pronoun is an agentive subject, and (في بيوتكن) (in your houses) has a locative semantic role. However, the semantic representation of this construction is:

وَ+ قَر+ ن+ في بيوتكن

Wa+ qar+ na+ fi buyutikuna

Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Loc.

After that, the selectional and co-occurrence restrictions highlight that the Arabic verb (قر) *qar* (stay) requires a subject with the semantic features (+animate, +human, +concrete, +pronoun, +female, +plural), another argument is involved in the (بيوتكن) (your houses) with the semantic features (-animate, -human, +concrete, +noun, +plural).

4- (Qur'an 33: 33) ﴿ إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ ٱللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنكُمُ ٱلرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ ٱلْبَيْتِ ﴾

This Qur'anic text is intended to be the last example in the present study, analysed according to Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles and the deep structures of the original and target constructions, to investigate the hypothesis of identical deep structures and semanto-syntactic equivalence. However, this construction is composed of the Arabic main imperfect verb (يريد) *yureed* (want). After this, (انما) is used for emphasis; the agentive subject or the doer is the exalted name of (Allah), and (ليذهب عنكم الرجس اهل البيت) is a secondary clause as a goal in which (ل) is an extra letter that has no function, (يذهب) is an imperfect verb of the secondary clause, the subject of the secondary clause is an implicit pronoun (you), (عنكم) is locative, (الرجس) is ergative or a direct object of the secondary clause. Then, (اهل البيت) is a vocative which cannot be represented semantically according to Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles, and signed as (?) in the pattern below. Likewise, the secondary clause serves as the goal within the main clause, as illustrated above, and its details will not be compared with those in the renderings; instead, they will be discussed as a whole.

Furthermore, the semantic representations of this construction will be set as follows:

إِنَّمَا+ يُرِيدُ+ ٱللَّهُ+ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنكُمُ ٱلرِّجْسَ+ أَهْلَ ٱلْبَيْتِ

Innamaa+ yureedu+ Allah+ li yuthihib ankum alrijss+ ahl albayt

Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Goal+ ?

As far as selectional restrictions are concerned, the verb (يريد) in this construction requires a subject (الله) (Allah) which has the semantic features (+power, +superior, +deity, +abstract, +noun, +singular) and the object is a clause which has the function of a goal, that cannot be described in terms of semantic features in which (الرجس) may have the features (-animate, -human, -concrete, +noun, +singular).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After the analyses of the (40) selected texts that shed light on the representations of deep structures of Qur'anic constructions in terms of Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles. It is necessary here to remind the reader that Fillmore's semantic roles are specified for English rather than the Arabic language, and Al-Khuli's version of semantic roles or base rules is a modified form of Fillmore's base rules and semantic roles for compatibility with the Arabic language in general and Qur'anic texts in particular, as the following table reveals:

Table 1. Deep Structures of Qur'anic Constructions in terms of Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's Semantic Roles:

Deep Structures, Transliterations, and Semantic Roles	Qur'anic Constructions	Text No.
اياك + (نحن) + نعبد + و اياك نستعين *Iyyak+ (nahnu)+ na'bud+ wa iyyak nasta'iin* Erg. + (Ag.) + Aux. Vl + S.	﴿ إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ ﴾ (Qur'an 1:5)	**1.**
على الله + ل + يتوكل + المتوكلون *Ala Allah+ li+ yatawakal+ al-mutawakilun* (Loc./ tL/Goal + Mod. + Aux. Vl + Ag.)	﴿ وَعَلَى ٱللَّهِ فَلْيَتَوَكَّلِ ٱلْمُتَوَكِّلُونَ ﴾ (Qur'an 14: 12)	**2.**
ألا + الى + الله + تصير + الأمور *Ala+ Ila Allah+ tasiir+ al-umur* Mod. + Loc./ Goal + Aux. Vl + Ag.	﴿ أَلَا إِلَى ٱللَّهِ تَصِيرُ ٱلْأُمُورُ﴾ (Qur'an 42:53)	**3.**
أما + اليتيم + لا + تقهر + (أنتَ) *Amma+ al-yatiim+ laa+ taqhar+ (anta)* Mod. (conditional) + Erg. + Mod. (Neg.) + Aux. Vl + (Ag.) implied	(فأما اليتيم فلا تقهر) (Qur'an 93: 9)	**4.**
يغفر + (الله) + لمن يشاء + و + يعذب + (الله) + من يشاء *Yaghfir+ (Allah)+ liman yashaa'+ wa+ yu'aththib+ (Allah)+ man yashaa'* Aux. Vl. + (Ag.) + Goal or Erg. + Mod. + Aux. Vl. + (Ag.) + Erg.	(يغفر لمن يشاء و يعذب من يشاء) (Qur'an 5:18)	**5.**
ف + أوجس + في نفسه + خيفة + موسى *Fa+ awjasa+ fii nafsihi+ khifata+ Musa* Mod.₁ + Aux. Vl. + Mod.₂ + Erg. + Ag.	(فأوجس في نفسه خيفة موسى) (Qur'an 20:67)	**6.**
و + ورثَ + سليمانُ + داودَ *Wa+ waritha+ Sulaymanu+ Dawooda* Mod. + Aux. Vl. + Erg. + Source	﴿ وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَٰنُ دَاوُۥدَ ﴾ (Qur'an 27:16)	**7.**
و + ألفي + ا+ سيدها + لدى الباب *Wa+ Alfay+aa+ sayyidaha+ lada al-baab* Mod. + Aux. Vl. + Ag. + Erg. + Loc.	﴿ وَأَلْفَيَا سَيِّدَهَا لَدَا ٱلْبَابِ ﴾ (Qur'an 12:25)	**8.**
وَ+ رَءا+ ٱلْمُجْرِمُونَ+ ٱلنَّارَ+ فَ+ ظَنُّ+ و+ أنَّهُم مُّوَاقِعُوهَا *Wa+ ra'aa+ al-mujrimun+ alnaar+ fa+ dhann+ u+ annahum muaqi'uhaa* Mod₁ + Aux. Vl. + Ag. + Erg./Loc. + Mod.₂ + Aux. Vl. + (Ag.) + S.	﴿وَرَءَا ٱلْمُجْرِمُونَ ٱلنَّارَ فَظَنُّوٓا۟ أَنَّهُم مُّوَاقِعُوهَا﴾ (Qur'an 18:53)	**9.**
إنَّهُمْ + يَرَوْنَهُ + بَعِيدًا (*) و+ نَرَىٰهُ + قَرِيبًا *Innahum+ yarawnahu+ ba'iidan+ wa+ narahu+ qariiba* Mod. + Aux. Vl. + Ag. + Erg. + Loc. (*) Mod. + Aux. Vl. + Ag. + Erg. + Loc.	﴿إِنَّهُمْ يَرَوْنَهُۥ بَعِيدًا (*) وَنَرَىٰهُ قَرِيبًا﴾ (Qur'an 70:6&7)	**10.**
إِنِّي + ظَنَنْ+تُ+ أَنِّي مُلٰقٍ حِسَابِيَهْ *Inni+ dhanant+u+ anni mulaaqin hissabiyah* Mod. + Aux. Vl. + Ag. + S.	﴿ إِنِّي ظَنَنتُ أَنِّي مُلَٰقٍ حِسَابِيَهْ ﴾ (Qur'an 69:20)	**11.**

وَ+ نُقِرُّ+ (نحن)+ فِي ٱلْأَرْحَامِ+ مَا نَشَاءُ+ إِلَىٰ أَجَلٍ مُّسَمًّى Wa+ nuqirru+ (nahnu)+ fi al-arhaam+ maa nashaa'+ ila ajalin mussamaa Mod.₁ + Aux. Vl. + (Ag.) + Loc. + Erg. + Mod.₂ (T Adv.)	﴿ وَنُقِرُّ فِي ٱلْأَرْحَامِ مَا نَشَاءُ إِلَىٰ أَجَلٍ مُّسَمًّى ﴾ (Qur'an 22:5)	12.
و +(اذكر)+ اذ+ ابتلى+ ابراهيمَ+ ربهُ+ بكلماتٍ+ فاتمهن Wa+ (uthkur)+ ith+ ibtalaa+ Ibrahim+ rabbahu+ bi kalimaat+ fa atamahun Mod.₁+ (Aux. Vl.)+ Mod.₂₊ Aux. Vl. + Erg. + Ag. + Inst. + S.	﴿ وَإِذِ ٱبْتَلَىٰ إِبْرَٰهِۦمَ رَبُّهُۥ بِكَلِمَٰتٍ فَأَتَمَّهُنَّ ﴾ (Qur'an 2: 124)	13.
تَنَزَّلُ+ ٱلْمَلَٰئِكَةُ وَٱلرُّوحُ+ فِيهَا+ بِإِذْنِ رَبِّهِم Tanazzalu+ al-malaa'katu wa al-roohu+ fihaa+ bi ithni rabbihim Aux. Vl. + Erg. + Time + Inst.	﴿ تَنَزَّلُ ٱلْمَلَٰئِكَةُ وَٱلرُّوحُ فِيهَا بِإِذْنِ رَبِّهِم ﴾ (Qur'an 97:4)	14.
ٱدْعُ+ (أنتَ)+(النَّاسَ)+ إِلَىٰ سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ+ بِٱلْحِكْمَةِ وَٱلْمَوْعِظَةِ ٱلْحَسَنَةِ Id'u+ (anta)+ (alnaassa)+ ila sabiili rabbika+ bil hikmati wal maw'ithatu al-hassana Aux. Vl. + (Ag.) + (Erg.)+ Goal+ Inst.	﴿ ٱدْعُ إِلَىٰ سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِٱلْحِكْمَةِ وَٱلْمَوْعِظَةِ ٱلْحَسَنَةِ ﴾ (Qur'an 16:125)	15.
و+ جَاءَ+ رَبُّكَ+ وَ+ (جاء)+ ٱلْمَلَكُ+ صَفًّا صَفًّا Wa+ jaa'+ rabbuka+ wa+ (jaa')+ al-malaku+ saffan saffa Mod.₁ + Aux. Vl. + Ag.₁ + Mod.₂ + (Aux. Vl.) + Ag.₂ + Mod.₃	﴿ وَجَآءَ رَبُّكَ وَٱلْمَلَكُ صَفًّا صَفًّا ﴾ (Qur'an 89:22)	16.
إِنَّ+ ٱللَّهَ وَمَلَٰئِكَتَهُ+ يُصَلُّونَ+ عَلَى ٱلنَّبِيِّ Inna+ Allaha wa Malaa'katahu+ yusaloona+ ala al-nabii Mod.+ Ag.+ Aux. Vl. + Goal.	﴿ إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ وَمَلَٰئِكَتَهُ يُصَلُّونَ عَلَى ٱلنَّبِيِّ ﴾ (Qur'an 33:56)	17.
وَ+ يُطْعِمُونَ+ (هم)+ ٱلطَّعَامَ+ عَلَىٰ حُبِّهِ+ مِسْكِينًا وَيَتِيمًا وَأَسِيرًا Wa+ yut'imuna+ (hum)+ alta'aama+ ala hubbihi+ misskinan wa yatiman wa assyraa Mod. + Aux. Vl. + (Ag.) + Erg. + Goal+ Dat.	﴿ وَيُطْعِمُونَ ٱلطَّعَامَ عَلَىٰ حُبِّهِۦ مِسْكِينًا وَيَتِيمًا وَأَسِيرًا ﴾ (Qur'an 76:8)	18.
وَ+ أَعْبُدْ+ (انت)+ رَبَّكَ+ حَتَّىٰ يَأْتِيَكَ ٱلْيَقِينُ Wa+ a'abud+ (anta)+ rabbaka+ hatta ya'tiyaka al-yaqiin Mod. + Aux. Vl.+ (Ag.)+ Erg.+ Goal/ Time	﴿ وَٱعْبُدْ رَبَّكَ حَتَّىٰ يَأْتِيَكَ ٱلْيَقِينُ ﴾ (Qur'an 15:99)	19.
يَوْمَئِذٍ+ يَصْدُرُ+ ٱلنَّاسُ+ أَشْتَاتًا+ لِّيُرَوْاْ أَعْمَٰلَهُمْ Yawma'ith+ yasduru+ al-naassu+ ashtaatan+ li yuraw aa'maalahum Time+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Mod.+ Goal.	﴿ يَوْمَئِذٍ يَصْدُرُ ٱلنَّاسُ أَشْتَاتًا لِّيُرَوْاْ أَعْمَٰلَهُمْ ﴾ (Qur'an 99: 6)	20.
(يكون)+ فِي قُلُوبِهِم+ مَّرَضٌ+ فَ+ زَادَ+ هُمُ+ ٱللَّهُ+ مَرَضًا (Yakunu)+ fi qulubihim+ maradhun+ fa+ zaada+ hum+ Allah+ marathon Aux. Vl.+ Loc.+ Erg.+ Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Dat.+ Ag.+ Erg.	﴿ فِى قُلُوبِهِم مَّرَضٌ فَزَادَهُمُ ٱللَّهُ مَرَضًا ﴾ (Qur'an 2:10)	21.
وَ+ (يكون)+ لَكُمْ+ فِي ٱلْأَرْضِ+ مُسْتَقَرٌّ وَمَتَٰعٌ+ إِلَىٰ حِينٍ Wa+ (yakun)+ lakum+ fi al-arth+ mustaqar wa mataa'+ ilaa hiin Mod.+ (Aux. Vl.)+ Goal+ Loc.+ Erg.+ Time.	﴿ وَلَكُمْ فِى ٱلْأَرْضِ مُسْتَقَرٌّ وَمَتَٰعٌ إِلَىٰ حِينٍ ﴾ (Qur'an 2:36)	22.
وَ+ مِنْ ءَايَٰتِهِ+ أَنَّكَ+ تَرَى+(أنت)+ ٱلْأَرْضَ+ خَٰشِعَةً Wa+ min ayaatihi+ annaka+ taraa+ alardha+ khaashi'at Mod.₁ (appositive)+ Source/Loc.+ Mod.₂ (emphasis)+ Aux. Vl.+ (Ag.)+ Erg.+ Vl.	﴿ وَمِنْ ءَايَٰتِهِۦ أَنَّكَ تَرَى ٱلْأَرْضَ خَٰشِعَةً ﴾ (Qur'an 41: 39)	23.
إِذَا+ ٱلسَّمَاءُ+ ٱنشَقَّتْ Ithaa+ al-Samaa'+ Inshaqqat Condition/ Mod.+ Erg.+ Aux. Vl.+ Erg.	﴿ إِذَا ٱلسَّمَآءُ ٱنشَقَّتْ ﴾ (Qur'an 84: 1)	24.
وَ+ إِلَىٰ رَبِّكَ+ فَ+ ٱرْغَب+ (أنت) Wa+ ilaa rabbika+ fa+ rghab+ (anta) Mod.+ Goal/ Loc.+ Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Erg.	﴿ وَإِلَىٰ رَبِّكَ فَٱرْغَب ﴾ (Qur'an 94: 8)	25.
وَ+ جَعَلْ+ نَا+ مِنَ ٱلْمَاءِ+ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ حَيٍّ Wa+ ja'al+ na+ min almaa'+ kulla shay'in hay Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Source+ Erg.	﴿ وَجَعَلْنَا مِنَ ٱلْمَاءِ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ حَيٍّ ﴾ (Qur'an 21: 30)	26.
وَ+ أَرْسَلَ+ (الله)+ عَلَيْهِمْ+ طَيْرًا أَبَابِيلَ Wa+ arsala+ (Allah)+ alayhim+ tayran ababeel. Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Goal+ Erg. or Inst.	﴿ وَأَرْسَلَ عَلَيْهِمْ طَيْرًا أَبَابِيلَ ﴾ (Qur'an 105: 3)	27.
ٱضْرِب+ (أنت)+ بِّعَصَاكَ+ ٱلْبَحْرَ Adhrib+ (anta)+ bi'asaaka+ al-bahr 	﴿ ٱضْرِب بِّعَصَاكَ ٱلْبَحْرَ ﴾ (Qur'an 26: 63)	28.

Idhrib+ (anta)+ bi assaak+ al bahr Aux. Vl.+ (Ag.)+ Inst.+ Erg.		
عَلَّمَ+ (الله)+ ٱلْإِنسَٰنَ+ مَا لَمْ يَعْلَم *Allama+ (Allah)+ alinsaan+ ma lam ya'lam* Aux. Vl.+ (Ag.)+ Dat.+ Erg.	﴾عَلَّمَ ٱلْإِنسَٰنَ مَا لَمْ يَعْلَمْ﴿ (Qur'an 96: 5)	**29.**
إِنَّآ+ أَعْطَيْ+نَا+ كَ+ ٱلْكَوْثَرَ *Inna+ a'tay+ naa+ k+ al-kawthar* Mod. (emphasis)+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Dat.+ Erg.	﴾إِنَّآ أَعْطَيْنَٰكَ ٱلْكَوْثَرَ﴿ (Qur'an 108: 1)	**30.**
وَ+ ءَاتَيْ+نَا+ دَاوُۥدَ+ زَبُورًا *Wa+ 'aatay+ naa+ Dawooda+ zabura* Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Dat.+ Erg.	﴾وَءَاتَيْنَا دَاوُۥدَ زَبُورًا﴿ (Qur'an 17: 55)	**31.**
وَ+ أَتِمُّ+ (انتم)+ ٱلْحَجَّ وَٱلْعُمْرَةَ + لِلَّٰهِ *Wa+ 'atimu+ (antum)+ alhajj wal umrah+ lilaah* Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Erg.+ Goal	﴾وَأَتِمُّوا۟ ٱلْحَجَّ وَٱلْعُمْرَةَ لِلَّٰهِ﴿ (Qur'an 2: 196)	**32.**
وَ+ ءَاتُ+ وأ+ (انتم)+ ٱلنِّسَآءَ+ صَدُقَٰتِهِنَّ+ نِحْلَةً *Wa+ aat+ u (you)+ alnisaa'+ saduqatihina+ nihla* Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Dat.+ Erg.+ Mod. (adv.)	﴾وَءَاتُوا۟ ٱلنِّسَآءَ صَدُقَٰتِهِنَّ نِحْلَةً﴿ (Qur'an 4: 4)	**33.**
وَ+ جُهِدُ+ وأ +فِي ٱللَّهِ+ حَقَّ جِهَادِهِ *Wa+ jahid+ u+ fi Allah+ haqa jihadihi* Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Goal+ Adv. (manner).	﴾وَجَٰهِدُوا۟ فِي ٱللَّهِ حَقَّ جِهَادِهِۦ﴿ (Qur'an 22: 78)	**34.**
وَ+ ٱسْتَعِينُ+وأ +بِٱلصَّبْرِ وَٱلصَّلَوٰةِ *Wa+ issta'iin+u+ bil sabri wal salat* Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Inst.	﴾وَٱسْتَعِينُوا۟ بِٱلصَّبْرِ وَٱلصَّلَوٰةِ﴿ (Qur'an 2: 45)	**35.**
يَٰمَرْيَمُ+ ٱقْنُت+ي+ لِرَبِّكِ *Ya Maryam+ iqnut+ i+ li rabbiki* ?+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Goal/ Loc.	﴾يَٰمَرْيَمُ ٱقْنُتِى لِرَبِّكِ﴿ (Qur'an 3: 43)	**36.**
وَ+ أَقِيمُ+ وأ + ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ+ وَ+ ءَاتُ+ وأ+ ٱلزَّكَوٰةَ *Wa+ aqim+ u+ alsalaat+ wa+ aat+ u+ alzakaat* Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Erg.+ Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Erg.	﴾وَأَقِيمُوا۟ ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ وَءَاتُوا۟ ٱلزَّكَوٰةَ﴿ (Qur'an 2: 43)	**37.**
وَ+ يُنَزِّلُ+ (الله/هو)+ عَلَيْكُم+ مِّنَ ٱلسَّمَآءِ+ مَآءً+ لِّيُطَهِّرَكُم بِهِ *Wa+ yunazzilu+ (Allah)+ alaykum+ min alsmaa'+ maa'an+ li yutahirukum bihi* Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ (Ag.)+ Loc.+ Source + Erg.+ Goal	﴾وَيُنَزِّلُ عَلَيْكُم مِّنَ ٱلسَّمَآءِ مَآءً لِّيُطَهِّرَكُم بِهِۦ﴿ (Qur'an 8: 11)	**38.**
وَ+ قَرْ+ نَ+ في بيوتكن *Wa+ qar+ na+ fi buyutikuna* Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Loc.	﴾وَقَرْنَ فِى بُيُوتِكُنَّ﴿ (Qur'an 33: 33)	**39.**
إِنَّمَا+ يُرِيدُ+ ٱللَّهُ+ لِيُذْهِبَ + عَنكُمُ ٱلرِّجْسَ+ أَهْلَ ٱلْبَيْتِ *Innamaa+ yureedu+ Allah+ li yuthihib ankum alrijss+ ahl albayt* Mod.+ Aux. Vl.+ Ag.+ Goal+ ?	﴾إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ ٱللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنكُمُ ٱلرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ ٱلْبَيْتِ﴿ (Qur'an 33: 33)	**40.**

CONCLUSIONS

The present study concludes that Qur'anic constructions can be analysed as subjects or according to Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles, which is regarded as the best way to highlight deep structures in Arabic, a topic that has not been addressed in linguistic studies of Arabic constructions. Likewise, the study highlights that the selected 40 Qur'anic constructions may vary according to the semantic roles they play, whether verbal or nominal. Moreover, the present study employs theories of semantic roles, selectional restrictions, co-occurrence, lexical items, and transformations as strategies for revealing the deep structures or semantic inputs of Qur'anic structures, an idea that some Arab scholars, like حماسة, agree with.

Recommendations for future studies include implementing Fillmore's and Al-Khuli's semantic roles to help establish Arabic deep structures in other genres beyond the religious one, such as the literary or political genres. In addition, the present study or future studies may be subject to corpus linguistic analyses that can precisely detect semantic roles and the deep structures of constructions in real time.

REFERENCES

English References

Al-Khuli, M. A. (2000). A Contrastive Transformational Grammar: Arabic and English. Dar Al-Falah.

Al-Mogarry, H. Sh. S. (2024). An Application of a Syntactic Semantic Analysis in English and Arabic Translation. Sana'a University Journal of Human Sciences, 1(1), 212-222.

Bouton, L. F. (1976). The Problem of Equivalence in Contrastive Analysis, IRAL 14(2), 143-163.

Catford, J. C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. Oxford University Press.

Fillmore, C. J. (1966). A Proposal Concerning English Prepositions. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, 19, 19-34.

Fillmore, C. (1968). I968. The Case for Case. Universal* in Linguistic Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, I-90.

Krzeszowski, T. P. (1971). Equivalence, Congruence, and Deep Structure. In G. Nickel (ed.), Papers in Contrastive Linguistics (pp. 37-48), Cambridge University Press.

Krzeszowski, T. P. (1990). Contrasting Languages: The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics. Mouton de Gruyter.

Lakoff, G. (1968). Instrumental Adverbs and the Concept of Deep Structure. Foundations of language, 4 (1), pp. 4-29. Springer.

Arabic References

[10]باقر, مرتضى جواد. (1990). مفهوم البنية العميقة بين جومسكي و الدرس النحوي العربي [The Concept of Deep Structure between Chomsky and Arabic Grammar]. *اللسان العربي, جامعة الدول العربية, 34*, 5-35.

[11]حسان, تمّام. (1985). وحدة البنية و اختلاف الانظمة [Common Structure and different Systems of Languages]. *مجلة مجمع اللغة العربية في القاهرة, 57*, 22-56.

[12]حماسة, محمد حماسة عبد اللطيف. (1990). *من الانماط التحويلية في النحو العربي* [Of Transformational Patterns in Arabic Grammar]. مكتبة الخانجي.

[13]حماسة, محمد حماسة عبد اللطيف. (2000). *النحو و الدلالة مدخل لدراسة المعنى النحوي-الدلالي* [Syntax and Semantics: Introduction to the Study of Syntactic-Semantic Meaning]. دار الشروق.

[14]الخولي, محمد علي (1999). *قواعد تحويلية للغة العربية* [Transformational Rules for Arabic Language]. دار الفلاح للنشر و التوزيع.

[15]زكريا, ميشال. (1986). *الالسنية التوليدية و التحويلية و قواعد اللغة العربية (النظرية الالسنية)* [Generative-Transformational Linguistics and Arabic Grammar (Linguistic Theory)]. المؤسسة الجامعية للدراسات و النشر و التوزيع.

[16]عكاشة, محمود ابو المعاطي احمد. (2014). الفاعل النحوي و الفاعل المنفذ في "نظرية الحالة الاعرابية" "دراسة الفاعل عند تشارلز فيلمور في ضوء اراء النحاة" [Grammatical Subject and Factual Subject in Case (Grammar) Theory: A Study of the Subject of Charles Fillmore in terms of (Arab) Grammarians Opinions]. *مجلة كلية الاداب/ جامعة بنها, 38*, 395-452.

[17]الكرباسي, محمد جعفر الشيخ ابراهيم. (2010). *اعراب القرآن* (مجلد 8-1) [Parsing of Qur'an (Vols. 1-8)]. دار و مكتبة الهلال.