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ABSTRACT

The research aims at explicating, for the first time, the crucial roles played by the thematic relations in deciding the grammaticality of structures and determining the meaning of certain collocations found in the first ten verses (Ayas) of Surat Al-Shams from the Glorious Qur’an translated by Al-Hilali (1417, h). Although theta roles are abstract notions that appear at the spell-out level, they are maintained at the logical form because their omission defects not only the structure but also the translated meaning at all levels. Intuitively, collocations are idiosyncratic in nature and may convey meanings in segregation; however, in this work, they are to be studied in structures in relation to a predicate as they constitute arguments, namely, N', T', C' and P' that carry theta roles. It is argued that each argument is assigned a semantic role and each semantic role is assigned to each collocation to avoid confusion of interpretation at LF. The researcher also argues that theta roles are essential to determine the intended meaning in translation; therefore, they cannot be deleted at any level of syntax.
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INTRODUCTION

The term collocation is defined as a sequence of words which occur with each other more often than it would be expected by chance. In other words, the sequence follows certain restrictions on how words can be used together for semantic and syntactic purposes. The term collocation shows the semantic and syntactic relations found between items either in isolation or in relation to a predicate in a structure. Theoretically, a number of linguists are interested in explicating collocations from different perspectives as they constitute a challenge to structures and semantic denotations.

Nida (1964) argues that the meaning of collocated items can be found in the context of a situation and all the other levels of analysis as well; for instance, by looking at the context of words, one can often distinguish between meanings as in ['sat in a chair’, ‘the baby’s high chair’, ‘the chair of philosophy’, ‘the electric chair’, ‘condemned to the chair, and ‘the chairman of the meeting’]. These collocations are obviously placed in pairs in which different meanings of the word are revealed.

Firth (1968), in his lexical views on collocations, argues that one shall know a word by the company it keeps. For instance, the word ‘ass’ normally occurs with ‘you silly ass’ and ‘do not be such an ass’. It also collocates in varieties of English with a number of adjectives such as ‘silly’, ‘obstinate’, ‘stupid’, ‘awful’ and ‘egregious’. This term is a result of a combination of words associated with each other to impart a special meaning.

Halliday (1976) argues that it is part of the meaning of the past that it contrasts with the present. For instance, the item ‘strong’ collocates with 'tea' to form 'strong tea' which means a very red dark color of tea. Intuitions alone cannot define the meaning of the collocated items; therefore, the text, context, cohesion and the grammatical functions of a structure
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contribute to the analysis of collocations. For instance, the term 'strong' can collocate with 'argument' to give the meaning of "influential debate". If this argument is used in any grammatical function in a sentence, the conjoined will take a semantic role as in 'his strong argument is acceptable, or 'we agree with his strong argument' in which 'his strong argument' is the theme.

However, Palmer (1981) argues that collocation is not a matter of association of ideas. For example, although 'milk' is 'white', one should not say '*white milk'; however, the expression 'white paint' is quite common in English. Although a collocation is very largely determined by meaning as in 'lick' collocates with 'tongue', it is sometimes fairly idiosyncratic in nature and cannot easily be predicted in terms of the meaning of the associated words. For instance, the word 'blond' is associated with 'hair'; thus, one cannot talk about '*a blond door', '*a blond dress' even though if the color is exactly that of blond hair. Similarly, the word 'rancid' occurs only with 'bacon' and 'butter', and ‘addled’ with ‘brains’ and ‘eggs’ in spite of the fact that English has the words ‘rotten’ and ‘bad’ but never collocate in place of ‘rancid’. Likewise, ‘milk’ never collocates with ‘rotten’ and ‘bad’ but it only collocates with ‘sour’. The idiosyncratic characteristic of the English collocations is visible in collective nouns as in ‘a flock of sheep’, ‘herd of cows’, ‘school of whales’, ‘pride of lions’ and ‘exaltation of larks’. Another example which is more specific in meaning is ‘exceptional weather’ but an ‘*exceptional child’ is not possible. In short, it would be a mistake to attempt to draw a clear cut distinction between those collocations that are predictable from the meanings of the words that co-occur and those that are not. This is due to the fact that one can provide a semantic explanation to the restricted collocations by assigning a very precise meaning to the individual words. Thus, it could be argued that ‘rancid’ is to be defined in terms of very specific, unpleasant, taste associated with ‘butter’ and ‘bacon’ which are off, and the word ‘white’ in the collocations ‘white coffee’, ‘white wine’ and ‘white people’ is explained as something like with the lightest of the normal colors associated with the entity.

Newmark (1984) explicates that a collocation consists basically of two or three (full, descriptive and substantial) words, usually linked by grammatical (empty, functional and relational) words as in 'a mental illness'. The collocates define and delimit each other within a collocation by eliminating some of their possible meanings; the defining may be mutual and equally balanced, but it is closer for one collocate than that for the other. Thus, 'to pay attention' is a collocation since it reduces the number of senses in which 'pay' can be used to one. The word 'attention' is not radically affected, but it excludes 'attention' in the sense of 'care/ solicitude'. A collocation is the element of system in the lexis of a language. It may be (i) syntagmatic consisting of a common structure; or (ii) paradigmatic consisting of words belonging to the same semantic field which may be substituted for each other or be semantic opposites. These become collocations if they are arranged syntagmatically. Syntagmatic collocations are divided into seven groups as (1) a verb plus a verbal noun as in ‘pay attention’, (2) determiner plus adjective plus a noun as in ‘a good looking man’, (3) adverb plus adjective as in ‘immensely important’, (4) verb plus adverb or adjective as in ‘work hard’/ ‘smell sweet’, (5) subject plus verb as in ‘the dog barks’/ the door creaks’, (6) count noun plus ‘of’ plus mass noun as in ‘a pinch of salt’ and (7) collective noun plus count noun as in ‘a flock of geese or sheep’.

Paradigmatic collocations are based on well-established hierarchies such as kinship (‘father and son’), color (‘emerald is a bright green’), scientific taxonomies and institutional hierarchies where the elements of the culture for each language have their own distinct linguistic sameness. Paradigmatic collocations consist of (i) antonyms and (ii) synonyms. Antonyms are classified under three heads: (1) objects that complement each other to form a set (e.g. ‘land, sea, air’) or a graded series (‘rating, petty officers, officers’), (2) qualities which are contrary (e.g. ‘interested/disinterested/uninterested’), or contradictory (e.g. ‘perfect/imperfect’), or contrary polar terms (e.g. ‘hot/ cold’) and (3) action verbs or verbal nouns in two terms (e.g. ‘attack/ defend’) in which the second term is reciprocal and in three terms (e.g. ‘offer/ accept/ refuse’) in which the second and the third terms represent positive and negative responses, respectively. Synonyms are categorized into two groups as follows: (1) the inclusive collocation which includes (a) the hierarchies of ‘genus/ species/ subspecies’. They indicate the degree of generality of any lexical item (e.g. ‘the brass in the orchestra’, ‘pump or grease-gun’ and ‘an equity in the market’. (b) Synecdoche, where part or whole are sometimes used indiscriminately with the same reference (e.g. ‘strings/ violins’; (c) metonymy, where (e.g. ‘the city’ and ‘British bankers’) may be interchanged. The second type of synonym collocation is an old idiom (e.g. ‘with night and main’ and ‘by hook or by crook’). In short, collocations are the lexical tramlines of a language and a translator may find current and equally common corresponding collocations in source and target language texts; it is mandatory to use them as they are among the invariant components of translation.
Newmark (1988) illustrates that new collocations, namely, noun plus compounds or adjective plus noun are common in the social sciences and in computer language such as ‘lead time’, ‘sexual harassment’ ‘domino effect’, ‘acid rain’, ‘machine-readable’, ‘wishful thinking’, ‘jetlag’, ‘narrow money’ ...etc. These kinds of new collocations form difficulties in translation because such collocations appear arbitrarily to juxtapose nouns with verbs-nouns as they indicate the two most significant meaning components but have varied and sometimes mysterious case-relations. Languages which cannot convert verbs to nouns or cannot imitate this kind of procedure will face a problem to have such collocations in its lexicon.

Kharama and Hajaj (1989) argue that each lexical item has tendency to keep regular company with certain other items in utterances. Collocations are a language specific phenomenon, i.e., each language appears to have its own types of collocations although some of them might be similar in two or more languages but with diversities. For instance, in Arabic, the verb *yulqii* ‘to throw’ collocates with nouns in a number of phrases in which the equivalents of English verb does not fit as in *yulqii muhaadaratan / darsan* ‘to give a lecture / a lesson’ but one cannot say ‘*to throw a lecture / a lesson*, *yulqii ar-ra’d* ba fi qalbihi ‘to strike terror in someone’s heart’ and *yulqii alayhi al-mas?u?liyata* ‘to place responsibility on someone’. It is obvious that such collocations cannot exactly be translated to Arabic because of verb problem. In other words, the Arabic verb *yulqii* ‘to throw’ is equal to ‘to give’, ‘to strike’ and ‘to place’.

Hatim and Mason (1990) note that there is always a danger for experienced translators that source language interference may vanish and unnatural collocation will flow the target text. Therefore, a translator must maintain naturalness in the process of translation; otherwise, his/her version will convey unfamiliar and unacceptable ideas to the target readers. For instance, in English the verb ‘break’ collocates with the noun ‘promise’. If this collocation is translated to Arabic, it renders wrong collocation as in *yulqii muhaadaratan / darsan* ‘to give a lecture / a lesson’ but one cannot say ‘*to throw a lecture / a lesson*, *yulqii ar-ra’d* ba fi qalbihi ‘to strike terror in someone’s heart’ and *yulqii alayhi al-mas?u?liyata* ‘to place responsibility on someone’. It is obvious that such collocations cannot exactly be translated to Arabic because of verb problem. In other words, the Arabic verb *yulqii* ‘to throw’ equal to ‘to give’, ‘to strike’ and ‘to place’.

Zughoul (1991) argues that the translation of collocations is a constant problem that stands in front of translators; in that, they find it difficult to match lexical categories of different classes with each other. What creates this problem is the fact that each language configures collocations in a different manner due to its word order and culture. The equivalents of words that collocate in one language do not necessarily collocate in another. For instance, in Arabic, the verb *yamgul* ‘break’ collocates with the NP *qaanun* ‘law’ to give the meaning of *kharg al-qaanun* ‘impeachment of the law’; while, with the NP *‘ahd* ‘promise’ to give the meaning of ‘to become disloyal’ as that of English. The verb *yashrab* ‘drink’ collocates naturally in English with ‘liquids’ like ‘juices’, ‘milk’; however, in Arabic it also collocates with *hisaa* ‘soup’ as in [ *yashrab al- hisaa?* ‘drink the soup*’]. The verbs *maata* and *tuwiffya* ‘died’ are used in different manners; the former is used for both animate and inanimate depending on the quality of the noun that followed while the latter is merely used for human beings. Thus, Arabic is like other languages; it incorporates structures of collocations but somehow in different styles.

Baker (1992) argues that the term collocation is more related to the semantic restrictions which are imposed on the sequence itself. In other words, there is a tendency between words to combine with each other on the basis of their propositional meaning. For example, the transitive verbs ‘carry out’, ‘make’ and ‘perform’ can collocate with the NP ‘task’ but not with the NP ‘visit’ as in [ carry out a task, make a task and perform a task ]. However, it is wrong to say ‘carry out a visit, or perform a visit, or to make a visit’. It is evident that such collocations are of a phrasal level but not of the lexical. The occurrence of any form of collocations in a text is restricted by certain syntactic rules. If the conjoined are NP categories, they fill a syntactic position in the structure to get its actual meaning and thus they need constituent as well as semantic selections. However, if they are VPs, they have to assign semantic roles to the neighboring categories. The rules that hold these lexical collocations together are identified as recurrent patterns. For example, the verb ‘break’ collocates with ‘rules’ and ‘promise’ but not with ‘regulations’. In this case, the verb has to assign a theta role to its complement.

Bahumaid (2007) argues that though collocations have special roles in a language, translators face problems in translating them into the target language. He attributed the problems to the fact that linguists could not put a clear cut distinction between a collocation and a non-collocation. Thus, a translator may face a number of problems vested to either intralingual or interlingual interference. Interlingual problems are those which are related to how to identify collocations within the source language whereby two synonyms overlap as in ‘passed away’ and ‘died’. The former is restricted to human but the latter can be used for both human and non-human. Interlingual problems are related to a different range of words in both the target and the source as well. This is visible in the use of the verb ‘catch’ in the contexts ‘catch a fish’, ‘catch a cold’, ‘catch a train’ and ‘catch fire’. However, the Arabic equivalents are ‘ystaadu’, ‘yusaabu’, ‘yalhaqu’ and ‘tashtu ila’, respectively.
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To sum up, the above literature discusses collocations in terms of their semantic, syntactic or idiosyncratic relations; however, it was vague to see how such collocations are discussed in relation to a predicate in a structure. For this reason, the researcher seeks to explain similar collocations of Surat ash-Shams in Honorific Qur'an in relation to a predicate in a sentence at all syntactic levels, namely, spell-out, S-structure, interface, phonetic and logical form.

Structures of Collocations of Surat Ash-Shams

It is evident that there are a number of collocations in Surat Al-Shams; but, the focus of this study is merely on the following ones:

In Arabic The translated version in English

1. Wash-shmasi wa duhaha by the sun and its brightness
2. Wa alqamari idha talaaha by the moon as it follows.
3. Wan-nahaari idha jallaha by the day as it shows up (the sun's brightness)
4. Wa al-allaili idha yaghshaaha by the night as it conceals it (the sun)
5. Was-samaa'i wa ma banaaha by the heaven and Him Who built it.
6. Wa al-?ardi wa ma tahaaha by the earth and Him Who spread it
7. Wa nafsin wa ma sauwaaha by nafs 'self' (Adam or a person or a soul) and Him Who perfected him in proportion?
8. Fa?alhamaha fujuuraha wa taqwaaha Then He showed him what is wrong for him and what is right for him.
9. Qad aflaha man zakkaaha Indeed he succeeds who purifies his own self (i.e. obeys and performs all that Allah ordered, by following the true faith of Islamic Monotheism and by doing righteous good deeds).
10. Wa qad khaaba man dassaaha And indeed he fails who corrupts his own self (i.e. disobeys what Allah has ordered by rejecting the true Faith of Islamic Monotheism or by following polytheism or by doing every kind of evil wicked deeds). (Al-Hilali, 1417 h, p. 836).

A look at the above collocations illustrates that there are patterns of structures available at the phonetic level. For instance, in (1) the N" as-shmasi 'sun' collocates with the N" duhaha ' its brightness' forming the structure [N"1, N"2]. In (2), there is a match between the N" al-qamarj the moon' and the T" talaaha ' as it follows' and form the structure [N", T"]. In (3), the N" an-nahaari 'the day' collocates with the T" jallaha ' as God shows it up' to get the structure [N", T"]. However, in (4) the structure [N", T"] is resulted from the match between the N" al-allaili 'the night' and the V" yaghshaaha ' as it conceals it' (the sun). In (5), the N" as-samaa'i 'the heaven' collocates with the N" banaaha ' him who built it' to get [N", N" -relative clause]. Likewise, the N" al-?ardi 'the earth' collocates with N" sauwaaha 'him Who spread it' to form the form [N", N" -relative clause] in (6). In (7), the N" nafsin 'self' collocates with the N" sauwaaha ' him who perfected him in proportion' to form the conjoined [N", N" -relative clause]. In (8), there is a collocation between C" fujuuraha 'what is wrong for him' and C" taqwaaha 'what is right for him to get the structure [C", C"]. In (9), there is a collocation between the T" aflaha ' he succeeds' and N" man zakkaaha 'he who purifies his own self' to get [T", N"]. And finally, in (10), the T" khaaba 'he fails' collocates the N" man dassaaha 'he who corrupts his own self' forming [T", N"].

The samples in (11) summarize the forms.

11.
1) The number (1) has the form [N"1, N"2].
2) The numbers (2), (3) and (4) have the structure [N", T"- subordinate clause].
3) The numbers (5), (6) and (7) have the structure [N", N"- relative clause in coordinated structure].
4) The number (8) has the structure [C", C"]
5) The numbers (9) and (10) have the structure [T", N"- relative clause- embedded].

In short, the semantic linker " in Arabic is not a preposition; it is regarded as the particle of an oath. Thus, the combinations of collocations are conjoined as per the categorical features of the conjoint. The analysis shows that there is a conjoining between an N" and another as in (i) and (ii), N" and T" as in (iii), C" and C" as in (iv) and T" and N" as in (v). Though there is diversity in the categorical structures, still there are sets of different collocations whose meanings vary in this particular Surat.
The Problems

The translated meaning of the above collocations relies merely on the phonetic form; therefore, it is weak and lacks revision due to the following reasons: (i) the translator’s background is not Arabic, (ii) there are other hidden elements that decide the overt occurrence of collocations which are not taken care of and (iii) the anaphoric relations between N”s are not clear in the version.

Objectives and Questions of the Study

Collocations are normally translated in isolation with or sometimes without equivalents at the logical form as they constitute an idiosyncratic kind of nature. However, if they are used in a structure, they need to be connected with a predicate in a sentence to convey meaning. The notion of thematic roles has been recently imposed into syntax in modern linguistic theory due to this relation; therefore, their impact in translation was not at all visible or taken care of. Thus, this work is meant to illustrate their effect in translating collocations of Surat ash-shams at all levels of syntax with a special focus on the logical form.

It is evident that the translator of the above Surat does not either pay attention to (i) the concept of the semantic roles, (ii) their crucial role in forming the final meaning of the intended collocations at LF or (iii) the covert entities that determine the incorporated meaning. The objectives of this work are to highlight both (i) the effect of theta roles in deciding the grammaticality of the structures (1-10) in which the collocations are translated and (ii) the role of the covert entities that might be of a great significance to decide the intended meaning of the same collocations at the same level.

To find proper answers to such confusions that engulf the translated meaning of the above collocations to English; the researcher posits the following questions.
1. What are the names of theta roles born by the selected collocations in the Surat?
2. Are the assigned theta roles maintained or neglected after translation at LF?
3. Do collocations of argument structures bear one theta role or more?
4. Do theta roles strengthen the translated meaning in English or not?

The Hypotheses

The researcher hypothesizes the following:
1. A number of theta roles are assigned to different collocations in the Surat.
2. Theta roles are maintained to a higher extent in the target language at LF.
3. Each collocation bears one theta role and each theta role is assigned to one collocation before and after being translated.
4. Theta roles are not subject to translation but they regulate it at all levels of syntax.

Methods and Procedures

Chomsky (1995) proposes the concept of thematic relations, namely, the constituent (henceforth c-selection) as well as the semantic selection (henceforth s- selection) to account for the grammaticality of the sentence at all syntactic levels, namely spell-out, surface structure (S-structure), Phonetic Form (PF) and Logical Form (LF). The projection principle guarantees that all syntactic representations are posited at spell-out. Arguments and argument adjuncts occupy argument position; therefore, they carry semantic roles due to locality relations with predicates. S- selection succumbs to selectional restrictions imposed on the predicate; they are essentially syntactic in nature and should be assigned to the syntactic component of the category. Theta roles are assigned to arguments and adjuncts at spell-out. Each argument has to be assigned to a grammatical function in a theta position to give a meaning because words in isolation though constitute conjoins as in collocation still they cannot convey the entire sought meaning. Theta roles are optional features; but, they construct a grammatical sentence at spell-out and also regulate the intended meaning after interpretation at LF. It is evident that the theta roles cannot be assigned to any entity without being connected to predicate in the same sentence. The expected theta roles are: agent (an argument that will affect the action), theme/patient (an argument that undergoes a change of state or is affected by an action indicated by the verb), goal (an argument towards which something moves, source (an argument from which something moves out or originates), experiencer (an argument that experiences some
physical or psychological state), path (an argument through which something moves), location (an argument which indicates the location or time of the event), accompaniment (an argument that accompanies another argument) and instrument (an argument which is used to bring about something).

Any predicate must contain a theta grid in which the constituents as well as the semantic selections are met at spell-out. Thus, each argument, namely, \(N''\), \(P''\), \(T''\) and \(CP\) is to be assigned to a grammatical function in a theta position to carry a semantic role and hence give a meaning. \(N''\) is a lexical category whose phrase is headed by a lexical noun as in \([N'' \textbf{Spec} [N' N]]\) and also \(P''\) is a prepositional phrase whose head is a preposition but its complement is an \(N''\) as in \([P'' \textbf{Spec} [P' P [N']]])\). However, \(T''\) and \(C''\) are functional categories; the former is either finite or a non finite clause and has the structure of \([T'' \textbf{Spec} [T' T V'']]\). If it occupies a grammatical function, it must bear a theta role including [infinitival, gerundival clauses and other nominal clauses etc.]; however, if it does not, it constitutes a separate clause (Chomsky 1995:134-138).

The category \(C''\) is also a functional category but it does not enter into theta marking. Its presence or absence is determined by principles of universal grammar but with some parameterization. It has certain selectional properties: it takes certain kinds of complements, and it may or may not take a specifier. The specifier is a target for a movement; hence, it has no independent theta role at all. However, a full clause of \(C''\) is headed by a complementizer \(C\), hence is \(C''/\ CP\), satisfying X-bar theory. \(C\) may have a specifier and must have a complement; this complement is propositional phrase which is headed by any other functional category, namely, \(I''\) (Inflection). This \(I''\) must have the obligatory complement \(V''/\ VP\) in its components. Thus, the final form of the clause is: \([C'' \textbf{Spec} [C' C [I'' \textbf{Spec} [I' I V'']]]]\) (c.f Chomsky 1995: 54-55). Specifiers are optional; this is true for \([\text{Spec}, C'']\). The extended projection principle states that \([\text{Spec}, I'']\) is obligatory as it is the subject. If \(C''\) and \(I''\), as full clauses, occupy any grammatical function such as subject, object, object of a preposition etc., they are liable to theta marking as the constitute arguments.

The theta theory accounts for the crucial role played by the thematic relations in deciding the meaning of the above-mentioned collocations at the logical form. The Full Interpretation (FI) as a principle of theta theory is related to phonology as well as Logical Form (LF). If a symbol in a representation has no sensorimotor interpretations, the representation does not qualify as a Phonetic Form (PF). This is called the interface condition in syntax; the same principle is also applied to LF which entails that every element of the representation has interpretation. The researcher makes use of the principles and parameters of the thematic relations to analyze a few ayahs of Surat ash-Shams in the Holy Qur’an translated by Al-Hilali (1417, h) in which a number of collocations are used in relation to a predicate and not in segregation. The theory projects the following factors:

1. Each argument bears one and only one theta role and each theta role is assigned to one and only one argument (theta criterion).
2. \(V''\) assigns theta roles to \(N''\)’s, \(T''\)’s and \(C''\)’s at spell-out.
3. Theta roles are assigned to arguments under government.

In short, theta roles cannot be checked out without theta checkers available at the structure.

The Analysis

There is no doubt that there is a crucial effect for the theta roles in translation, particularly, when collocations are used in a context as is the case in the above-mentioned Surat from the Holy Qur’an.

The Effect of Theta Roles in the Interpretations of Collocations

A look at the actual version of interpretation illustrates that the translator did not pay attention to the concept of theta roles at all; this is due to the fact that he relied merely on the phonetic form of the verses. This is evident in the sense that none of the deleted \(V''\)’s that are related to theta marking are mentioned in his version. The researcher may argue that \(V''\)’s determine the type of theta role essential for the grammaticality of structure in which a collocation is used; but, after performing theta checking to their arguments, they can be omitted. For instance, in the specimen (i) is represented in (12):

12a. \(wa\ as-\ shmasi\ wa\ duhaha\)

‘By the sun and its brightness'
In (12a), the collocation *ash-shmai wa duhaha* 'the sun and its brightness' carries the theta role of instrument. The question that arises here is that: how does such a collocation have been assigned a theta role? The researcher argues that the structure lacks the theta assignor which is the predicate. This indicates that the actual structure is not (12a) but the spell-out (12b):

**Spell-out**

12b. [\( \text{T} \) [\( \text{V} \) uqsim -u pro wa [\( N_1 \) ash-shmasi wa [\( N_2 \) duha-ha]]]].

'I swear by the sun and its brightness'

In (12b), the verb *uqsimu* 'swear' assigns the theta role of instrument to the collocation *bi ash-shmasi wa duhaha* 'by the sun and its brightness' and the V" *uqsim bi ash-shmasi wa duhaha* 'swear by the sun and its brightness' assigns the theta role of agent to pro 'I'. After checking the features of theta marking, the predicate is to be deleted at LF as it is implicitly absorbed by the particle *wa* 'by'. In other words, the theta roles of instrument and agent are essential to guarantee the grammaticality of the sentence at all levels of syntax. Suppose they are deleted while the predicate is retained, the resulting sentence is wrong as in (12c):

12c. * [\( \text{T} \) [\( \text{V} \) uqsim -u wa ]].

Swear by

It is important to realize that the argument pro 'I' cannot be visible in the Arabic syntax if the verb is covert which is the property of pro-drop language; however, it can be replaced by a full-fledged N" as in \( \text{aqsama ash-shaahidu} \) 'the witness took an oath'. If the verb alone is overt, it indicates that the embedded subject is either third person singular or plural. It is also significant to notice that the particle *wa* can be used in this context as it has the ability to stand without a predicate; but, the particle *bi* 'by' can be used with the overt help of the predicate *yuqsimu* 'swears' as the former has a specific reference to God but the latter can be used to illustrate an oath by any one.

In short, though the theta roles of instrument and agent are abstract entities and carry non-interpretable features at LF, still they convey a very significant contribution to the interpretation of the collocation in (12b). The speaker made it so clear that such instruments can only be created by one and only one God and therefore he took the oath upon himself. A person may swear by anything but cannot swear by such instruments. The kind of speech in (12b) can merely be said by God.

In another pattern mentioned in (2) above, the collocated entities are of a different type as in (13):

13a. wa al -qamari idha talaaha.

'By the moon as it follows.'

In (13a), the translator does not mention the effect of any hidden entities that may be of a great help to his version. He gave to the reader literally what is visible at LF. The researcher argues that the actual spell-out structure is in (14b):

**Spell-out**

13b. [\( \text{T}_1 \) [\( \text{V} \) uqsim -u pro wa [\( N_1 \) al-qamari] [\( \text{T}_2 \) idha tala -a pro -ha]]]].

'swear pres. I by the moon if follow past the sun'

'I swear by the moon if it followed.'

In (13b), the V *uqsimu* 'swear' theta marks the instrument theta role of the N" *al-qamari* 'the moon' and theta role of agent is assigned to the subject of the main clause the pro 'I' by V" *uqsimu wa al-qamari idha tala- pro-ha* 'swear by the moon if it follows the sun'. In the adverbial conditional clause *idha talaaha* 'if it follows the sun', the V *talaah* 'followed' assigns the theta role of goal to the argument ha 'the sun' and the V" *talaaha* 'followed the sun' assigns the theta role of instrument to the subject of the embedded clause pro 'it' which has an anaphoric relation with *al-qamari*. The main verb *uqsimu* of the main clause is to be deleted at this level as the particle *wa* 'by' is the actual substitute. In case, the theta roles of instrument, agent and the goal are omitted, the sentence becomes incorrect as in (13c).

13c. * [\( \text{T}_1 \) [\( \text{V} \) uqsim -u wa [\( N_1 \) al -qamari] [\( \text{T}_2 \) idha tala -a pro -ha]]]].

'Swear by if followed'

'swear by if followed'
(13c) is wrong as the Vsim 'swear' of the super clause, Vtlaa 'followed' of the subordinate clause and the semantic conditional linker idha 'if' cannot make the sentence grammatical. It is evident that the conditional clause is in the present finite tense since it carries the possibility of taking place. Thus, the theta roles are essential to maintain the associated meaning intended to be translated. The researcher argues that the collocated entities in (3) and (4) above are treated in the same manner as in (13b) as they have the same structures.

However, the third pattern of collocation is written in (5, 6 and 7) from which (5) is taken as a specimen to be explicated and repeated here as (14):

14a. wa as- samaa?i wa ma banaa ha
by the heaven and him who build it.

'I by the sun and him who builds it'

In (14), the translator made it clear that as if there is no verb that can take these two entities as complements. The significance of the theta roles in explaining the ambiguity in this verse is essential. For instance, the covert predicate is still the same as that of the main clause with which the Surat has already started. Thus, the actual form is visible in (14b):

Spell-out
14b. [T\1 \T' [V” uqsim u pro bi [N’1 as- samaa?i ] wa
swear pres. I by the heaven and
[N’2 ?ana ] [C\1 allathi banaa -a - ha]]].
I who build past it.

'I swear by the heaven and I who built it'

In (14b), the verb uqsim 'swear' checks the theta role of instrument with the argument N’1 as-samaa?i 'the heaven' and the theta role of theme with N’2 wama banaaha 'I who built it'. The V” uqsimu bi as-samaa?i wa ?ana allathi banaaha 'swear by the sun and I who built it' checks the theta role of agent with pro 'I' that refers to God. In the C", the theta role of theme is assigned to ha 'it' by the V banaa 'built'. If any of the theta roles is deleted in relation to (14b), say the theme, the sentence becomes incorrect as in (14c):

14c. *uqsimu pro bi wa ?ana allathi banaa ha
'swear I by and I who built it.

'I swear by and I who built it'

In short, whether the theta role is assigned to an N", T" or C", it cannot be deleted. It is evident that the sentences (6) and (7) of the Surat are treated in the same manner.

The fourth category of collocation visible in the Surat is represented in (15):

15a. Fa alhamaha fujuuraha wa taqwaa ha
then he showed him what is wrong for him and what right for him.

'Then he showed him what is wrong for him and what right for him.'

In (15a), the translator explicitly shows the role of the predicate alham ‘showed’ and the collocations fujuuraha ‘what is wrong for him’ and taqwaaaha ‘what is right for him’. The context in this verse in relation to verse (7) in the Surat illustrates that the referent is the nafs ‘self’ which is treated here as masculine which is, in fact, feminine in gender in Arabic. The significance of the notion of the theta roles in this verse is visible in the spell-out (15b):

Spell-out
15b. [ADV” fa [T’1 [T’ [V” alham a pro - ha [C’1 C’1 [T’2 fujuuraha ha
then show past he her what is wrong her
wa [C’2 C’1 [T’3 taqwaa ha]]]].]
and what is good her.

Literally,
'He showed her which bad deeds she will have and which good deeds she will have'

‘Then he showed the self what bad deeds and what good deeds she will have.’

In (15b), the subject pro ‘he’ checks the theta role of agent by V” ?alhamaha fujuuraha wa taqwaaha ‘showed her what bad deeds and what good deeds’. However, the theta role of theme is assigned to the C”s fujuuraha wa taqwaaha ‘what is bad and what is good’ by the verb ?alham ‘showed’. If any one of these theta roles is deleted, the sentence will be incorrect as in (15c) and (15d), respectively:

Spell-out

15c. *{ADV} fa [T” [T’ [V” ?alham ha [C”1 fujuura ha]
then showed her which bad deeds her
wa [C”2 taqwa ha]][]]].
and which good deeds her.

Literally,

‘Then showed the self the bad deeds which she will have and the good deeds which she will have’

‘*Then showed the self her bad deeds and her good deeds.’

In (15c), the theta role of agent is deleted but the theme is kept while in (15d), the theta role of theme is deleted but the agent is retained.

Spell-out

15d. *{ADV} fa [T” [T’ [V” ?alhama pro - ha
then showed he her

‘He showed the self’

It is evident that the verb is mentioned here to indicate different semantic roles to avoid repetition of the theta role of instrument. The verb ?alaham ‘show’ assigns the agent and theme while the verb uqsim ‘swear’ assigns the theta roles of agent and instrument in its theta grid. In the latter, the agent is deleted at spell-out as it is identical with the verse (8) given above.

The researcher shifts to explicate a verse verb of a different structure in (16):

Spell-out

16a. qad aflaha man zakkaa ha
indeed he succeeds who purifies his own self

Literally,

‘Indeed, he succeeds he who purifies his own self’

In (16a), the translator uses the imperfective tense for the verb aflaha ‘succeeded’ and zakkaa ‘purifies instead of the correct form of present yuflhu ‘succeeds and yuzakki ‘purifies’, respectively. Another mistake committed by the translator is the imposition of the subjects ‘he’ for the matrix and the same for the embedded in the English version without showing their actual occurrence in the source language, i.e. Arabic. He does not also realize the gender of the pronoun ha is ‘her’ but not ‘his’ which is visible in the verse ‘alim-at (fem) nafsun maa qadam-at(fem) wa’akhar-at (fem) ‘ a person will know what he has sent forward and (what has he) left behind (of good or bad deeds); (Al-Hilali, 2007: 820, verse 5). The lexical word ‘self’ is visible in the target but not in the source language. Thus, the actual structure is (16b):

Spell-out

16b. {ADV} qad [T” [T’ [V” aflah a pro [N” allathi man zakka -a - ha]][]].
indeed succeed past he the one whoever purify past her
‘Indeed he succeeded who purified her’

In (16b), the V” aflaha allathi man zakkaaha ‘succeeded the one who purified her’ checks the theta role of agent with the pronoun pro ‘I’. Whereas the V aflaha ‘succeeded’ alone checks the theta role of theme with N” allathi man zakkaaha ‘the one who purified her’. In this N”, the V zakk checks the theta role of theme with complement ha ‘her’ which, of
course, refers to *nafsin* in the verse (7) with which it has an anaphoric relation. As tested above, none of these theta roles can be deleted, or else, the sentence is ungrammatical as in (16c) and (16d):

16c.*\[ADV\ 
\[T\ 
\[T' \ 
\[V\ aflaha 
\[N' allathi man 
zakkaa 
a[ha]].
\]

indeed 
succeeded 
the one 
who 
purified 
her

‘*Indeed succeeded the one who purified her’

(16c) is entirely incorrect as the agent pro ‘I’ is omitted. (16d) is incorrect in connection with the anaphoric relation with *nafsin* ‘self’ in the verse (7); however, the sentence can be acceptable if it does not have this kind of relation. The researcher argues that the V zakka is transitive and absorbs the specific theme *al-*?iymaan bi wahdaaniyati allahi waficl al-?acmaala al-khaiyerah allati yuriduha al-creator ‘following the true faith of Islamic monotheism and doing the righteous good deeds that are accepted by the creator’ (Jalabneh, 2007: 130-140 for the concept of absorption of the theme of specific reference).

16d.*\[ADV\ 
\[T\ 
\[T' \ 
\[V\ aflaha 
pro 
]].
\]

indeed 
succeeded 
he

‘*Indeed he succeeded’

In (16d), the theme which is the N” is deleted; thus, the sentence is bad. It is evident that this N” cannot be absorbed due to the fact that the verb aflah may also sub-categorize a P” as in *fi al-*?mthaani ‘in the exam’; the same verb behaves as an intransitive and selects no complement as in aflaha ar-raju ‘the man succeeded’.

In short, though the predicate in (16) is covert, none of the theta roles can be deleted as they constitute essential arguments in the verse. Likewise, the matter is in (17):

17a. wa qad 

and 
indeed 
he 
fails 
who 
corrupts 
his own 
self

‘And indeed he fails who corrupts his own self.’

The actual spell-out structure of (17a) is (17b) given below:

17b. wa \[ADV\ 
\[T 
\[V' \ 
\[V \ 
\[N -a allathi [c- man 
dassa -a pro 
ha]].
\]

and 
indeed 
fail 
past 
he 
the one 
who 
corrupt 
past 
her 
her

‘And indeed he failed who corrupted her.’

In (17a), the translator made very clear that not only did he translate every overt item but also he included the covert subjects ‘he’ for the main clause and ‘who’ for the embedded N” as they are inflected in the verbs khaaba ‘fails’ and dassaaha ‘corrupts, respectively. The English version of translation indicates that the translator is not much aware of the Arabic tense system. The present forms of the verbs are actually yakhiibu ‘fails’ and yadussu ‘corrupts’, respectively. However, (17b) illustrates the actual spell-out structure of the verse in which all covert as well as overt items are posited. For instance, in T’, pro ‘he’ checks the theta role of agent with the V” wa qad khaaba ‘and indeed failed’ and, in the embedded N”, pro ‘I’ checks the identical theta role but by the V” dassaha ‘corrupted her’. In it, the theta role of theme is marked to ha ‘her’ by the V dassa ‘corrupted’. The attached pronoun ha is posited as it has an anaphoric relation with *nafsin* in (7). The meaning of yukhaalif awaaamiru al-khaaliq way u?minu bita’daadi al-creator way ya’amaulu kullu ‘amalin saiye?in ‘disobeying God’s orders, following polytheism and doing every kind of evil wicked deeds’ is absorbed by the verb dassa and refers to the entity *nafsin*. As usual, if any of the theta roles are cancelled, the sentence is wrong as in (17c) and (17d) respectively.

17c. *wa \[ADV\ 
\[T 
\[V' \ 
\[V \ 
\[N -a allathi man 
dassa -a pro 
ha]].
\]

and 
indeed 
fail 
past 
the 
one 
who 
corrupt 
past 
he 
her

‘*And indeed failed who corrupted her.’

17d. *wa \[ADV\ 
\[T' \ 
\[V \ 
\[V' \ 
\[N -a allathi man 
dassa -a pro 
]].
\]

and 
indeed 
fail 
past 
he 
the 
one 
who 
corrupt 
past 
he

‘*And indeed he failed who corrupted.’

It is evident that in (17c) pro ‘I of the T’1 is deleted while in T’2, it is the theme ha ‘her’ which is deleted.

To sum up, it is evident that the theta roles that are assigned to the collocations are the agent, theme and the instrument. Such notions are abstract but borne by arguments which have to be overt at all levels of syntax in *Surat ash-shams*. It is
argued that the deletion of any of the them at spell-out or LF results in the ungrammaticality of the sentences as in (13c), (14c,d), (15c,d), (16c,d) and (17c,d). Thus, they are maintained at LF without the knowledge of the translator. Theoretically, each theta role is borne by one collocation and each collocation bears one theta role at all levels of syntax and this stipulation has been met all throughout. The presence of the theta roles enforces other arguments to be posited like the predicate *uqsimu* ‘swears’ or else the collocations cannot be overt. In other words, the meaning of the oath is implicitly dominant because the theta role of instrument prevails it at all levels. This is evident in the sense that the verb *uqsimu* does the function of theta marking and then deleted at LF without defecting the sentence. In brief, theta roles do strengthen the translated meaning, as they cannot be deleted.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The structural occurrences of collocations found in Surat Al-Shams are not at all lexical; they are phrasal and clausal explicated in relation to a predicate in the structure. There are basically four types including: (i) [N", N"], (ii) [N", T"], (iii) [C", C"] and (iv) [T", N"]. They constitute arguments and bear semantic roles. This work has tested the validity of the roles in shaping the translated meaning of such collocations at the logical form. It was clear that Al-Hilali (1417 h) did not at all go beyond the visible items of the phonetic form; therefore, the translated meaning of such collocations lacks revision. To achieve this objective, the researcher has taken an account not only of overt but also covert items as they significantly contribute to the delimitation of the intended meaning of collocations in the processes of translation.

It has been argued that the translated meaning of collocations in the verses (1-7) is entirely relying on the deleted predicate *uqsimu* ‘swear’ whose syntactic effect is visible in the translated meaning. It has been noticed that the verb checks the semantic roles with the collocations at spell-out before being deleted at LF. The verb has been substituted by the particle *wa* to indicate the oath taken upon God and to consolidate the intended meaning as in (12b, 13b, 14b, 15b, 16, and17b). If any of the checked theta roles is omitted at any level, the resulting sentence is ungrammatical as in (12c, 13c, 14c and d, 15c and d, 16c and d and 17c and d). The checked theta roles agent, theme, instrument and goal. They are assigned either to N" as in *ash-shamsu* ‘the sun’, I” *qad aflaha* ‘he succeed’ or C” *fujuraha* ‘what is good for the self’.

The researcher has tested the validity of thematic relations in consolidating the translated meaning of the collocations of *Surat ash-shams* and it is found fit for this work. Though such notions are abstract, non interpretable features and checked at spell-out, still they are needed in translation to get the exact meaning intended because the meaning is determined by both visible as well as non visible entities. It has been proved that without knowing the crucial roles of the covert verb *uqsimu* and the particle *wa*, the oath meaning cannot be achieved easily. This particle alone cannot check the semantic roles; it is an indicator to theta marking because only the verb has this kind of power. The particle has specific reference to God as a means of showing a direct oath. This is due to the fact that such instruments are created by him and not by anyone else. A person can make an oath by using the verb *uqsimu* ‘swear’ but cannot use such instruments.

**Abbreviations**

ADV": Adverb phrase  
CP/C": Complementizer phrase  
C-selection: constituent selection  
Fem: Feminine  
FI: Full interpretation  
LF: Logical form  
N": Noun phrase  
P": Prepositional phrase  
Pres. Present  
S-selection: constituent selection  
T": Tense phrase  
V": verb phrase  
V: Verb
Transliteration of the Arabic Written

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Phonetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ء</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>Θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ħ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>χ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>Θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ħ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice: the researcher has a reference only to the transliteration symbols while writing the Arabic items in the text but not the phonetic ones.
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