

## Binomials in Iraqi and Jordanian Arabic

Dinha T. Gorgis and Yaser Al-Tamimi

The Hashemite University, Jordan

### Abstract

Binomials, or contrastive lexical couples, in both Iraqi and Jordanian Arabic colloquials, are formulaic expressions comprising of two lexical items, A and B, whereby the presence of 'and' is optional in some cases and obligatory in the majority of the 150 collected binomials. A and B belong to the same grammatical category. The most frequent grammatical pattern is found out to be a noun plus a noun (75.33%). Contrary to the claim made by Bakir (1999), formal principles pertaining to syllabic structure are not seen to govern word order preferences. Rather, pragmatic, and to a lesser degree semantic, constraints determine order. An in-depth analysis has revealed that direction of fit, viz. word-to-world, provides the most viable explanation for why item A ought to be ordered before item B. This we call 'naturalness' condition or a 'replica' which, in addition to accounting for natural sequences, including spatio-temporality phenomenon, can resolve some ordering paradoxes. Semantic criteria, e.g. positiveness, proximity, oppositeness, etc. are not given much credit. Only 'markedness' is semantically capable of accounting for ordering A before B, especially in case of neutralization, i.e. the more A spreads along a scale, the more unmarked it is. Differences between Iraqi Arabic and Jordanian Arabic are mainly formal. Cultural harmony is crystal clear. The only difference is manifest in the availability of a restricted set of binomials peculiar to each sub-culture. This conclusion does not lend support to Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, but the question whether Arabic grammar determines our worldview remains debatable. Equally so, Cooper and Ross's (1975) 'ME - First Orientation Principle' cannot be generalized; for if we did apply it, the Arabs would be described as a people who take more than they give, for example, because 'take' has precedence over 'give' in Arabic.

### Introduction

(Irreversible) binomials (Malkiel 1959; Bolinger 1962; Gustafsson 1984; Kadi 1988; Sa'ied 1997), 'freezes' (Cooper & Ross 1975; Oden & Lopes 1981; Gill 1988), and 'conjoined lexical pairs' (Bakir 1999) are labels that encompass a set of formulaic expressions, e.g. 'black & white', socially acquired as such and stored in long-term memory. These expressions are composed of two<sup>1</sup> lexical items having the same grammatical membership (with or without 'and' or

---

<sup>1</sup> Infrequently, there can be three in a strict order and, hence, a trinomial, e.g. /?almā?u wa lxadrā?u wa lwaḡh ul hasin/ 'water and greenness, and a beautiful face/ (Standard Arabic); and /?alla w muḡammad iwḡali/ 'God, (prophet) Mohammad, and (Imam) Ali/' (IA; religious practice).

infrequently 'or' between them). Order preferences, i.e. which occurs first and which second, has been claimed to be determined by a hierarchy of semantic preferences (Malkiel), by an interplay of phonological and semantic factors (Cooper & Ross), by prosodic features (Gill) and, additionally, by pragmatic factors (Sa'ied 1997; Gorgis 1999; and Bakir 1999), which partly relate to Cooper & Ross's ME-First Orientation Principle (MFOP).

MFOP, picked up by George Lakoff & Mark Johnson in "Metaphor We Live By" (1980) and explored elegantly from a philosophical perspective such that 'up' precedes 'down' because Americans see themselves more of 'up' than 'down', accounts for a world view, viz. western, which is assumed to be different (?) from an eastern view were we to follow Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. If the Americans are conceptually grounded in this way, then the Arabs, unlike the English, are people who view themselves as taking more than giving, e.g.

1. /ʔaxΔ iw ʕata/ 'take & give'.

But such an interpretation is counterfactual; for there is ample evidence in the literature on Arabs which highlights their generosity and hospitality. Therefore, unless substantiated by, e.g. anthropologists and/or social psychologists, MFOP can be challenged. To save face, however, there can be possible interpretations at this juncture. One may consider the Arabic reversal of lexical items as a natural output of translation from English into Arabic, whereby the second English word, viz. 'take' becomes first in Arabic. Still, this insightful speculation remains highly tentative; for some Arab linguist may argue saying that Arabic words starting or containing mainly fortis fricatives are positioned first, which is the case in /ʔaxΔ/. Someone else (cf. Bakir 1999) may claim that /ʔaxΔ/ is placed first because it is monosyllabic whereas /ʕata/ is disyllabic. And a further argument in favour of such preference may rest with frequency of occurrence and distribution and, hence, markedness has a word to say<sup>2</sup> (but see below).

---

<sup>2</sup> Markedness is conceived differently by different scholars (cf. Lyons 1977; Cruse 1986; and Lehrer 1985). In this paper, we use it in three senses. We shall consider term B marked because it is more restricted in its distribution. Compare /kalb/ 'dog' with /kalba/ 'bitch'. Unlike English, this example shows at the same time formal marking shown by the feminine suffix. The third sense has to do with items spreading more on scales than their counterparts, e.g. 'how hot' vs. 'how cold', whereby 'cold' is the marked member.

The present paper is, therefore, another attempt towards finding out answers to some of the intriguing questions which have so far been answered unsatisfactorily. To accomplish this task successfully, the authors have collected 200 binomials<sup>3</sup> from both Iraqi Arabic (IA) and Jordanian Arabic (JA). On a second thought, we have decided to exclude 50 of them on grounds of lexicality, i.e. if the second word was found meaningless, though pragmatically functional because it rhymes with the first and reinforces its meaning, e.g. /šaku māku/ 'What's up' (IA); cf. English 'tit for tat' or 'fiddle-faddle', the pair was ignored. Left with 150 (see Appendix), which we have examined very carefully from different perspectives, we planned to answer the following questions:

1. What lexical structure(s) do these expressions exhibit, and which grammatical sets are more frequent?
2. Which constraints on ordering preference override which, the linguistic or pragmatic?
3. Does ordering embody (or reflect) cultural values and beliefs? If in the affirmative, what differences and/or similarities are there between the Iraqi and Jordanian sub-cultures?
4. What is the impact of 'markedness', as envisaged by Lyons (1977), Cruse (1986), and most importantly by Lehrer (1985), on assigning initial position to one of the two lexical items contributing to the formation of a binomial?

Prior to answering these questions, we would like to assert that all the 150 binomials we have collected display a contrast between item A and item B. Therefore we are very much inclined to call them 'contrastive lexical couples'. We shall only be using 'binomials' throughout for convenience because it is more or less established in the literature.

## Description

Expectedly, nominals are found out to have scored the highest percentage (75.33%). These nominals pattern as either a verbal noun (Vn) followed by another Vn (22.12%) or a noun (N) followed by another (77.87%). The former manifest three sub-patterns, viz. Vn and Vn (9.82%), Vn-Vn (9.82%), and Vn (and) Vn (2.67%), whereby 'and' is optional. The latter are represented by nine sub-patterns, of which the most frequent are the obligatorily conjoined by 'and' singular

---

<sup>3</sup> The list is not exhaustive but it is quite representative.

countable N followed by a similar one (44.82%), or an uncountable N followed by another (32.18%). Taken together, these two sub-patterns represent the majority of all nominal instances (59.82%).

Paired adjectives (Adj), mostly obligatorily conjoined by 'and', have scored (13.33%) of all the data, verb (V) and V (6.0%), adverb (Adv) and Adv (4%), and one instance each for a quantifier (Q) followed by another and a demonstrative (D) conjoined with another (see Table 1).

Contrary to the claim made by Bakir (1999: 13), no single instance of a prepositional pattern has been attested in either IA or JA. Bakir seems to have been influenced by English equivalents of Arabic binomials, e.g. 'in and out', 'off/on', 'up and down', etc., which function as adverbials rather than prepositions in the contexts in which they are used. Below, however, are representative examples of all the patterns mentioned above:

2. /barq iw raʕad/ 'lightning and thunder' (IA: Nsg & Nsg = JA: / βαρυ iw ραʕid/).
3. /ʕumm iw buku/ 'the deaf and dumb' (IA, JA: Npl & Npl).
4. /ʕāy iw šakar/ 'tea and sugar' (IA: Nun & Nun = JA: /šāy iw sukkar/).
5. /lēl (w) inhār/ 'night (and) day' (IA, JA: Nsg (&) Nsg).
6. /ʕammak xālak/ 'your father's brother, your mother's brother' (IA, JA: Nsg-Nsg).
7. /bāb iw šabābik/ 'door and windows' (IA, JA: Nsg & Npl).
8. /qātil (w) maqtūl/ 'killer (and) the killed' (IA, JA: Vn (&) Vn).↑
9. /dārib iw maḍrūb/ 'beater and the beaten' (IA, JA: Vn & Vn).
10. /šāʕid nāzil/ 'going up, coming down' (IA: Vn-Vn).
11. /tiwīl iw giṣīr/ 'tall and short' (IA, JA: Adj & Adj).
12. /šāhi sakrān/ 'conscious and drunk' (IA, JA: Adj-Adj).
13. /taʕbān (w) zahgān/ 'exhausted (and) bored' (IA: Adj (&) Adj).
14. /γammuḍ fattih/ 'close, open (your eyes)' (IA: V-V).
15. /yizraʕ iw yiḥṣid/ '(he) grows and harvest' (IA: V & V; JA: /ʔizraʕw ʔiglaʕ/).
16. /hissa w baʕḍēn/ 'now and then' (IA: Adv & Adv; JA: /hassāʕ w baʕḍēn/).
17. /hnā wi hnāk/ 'here and there' (IA: Adv & Adv; JA: /hōn wi hnāk/)

Grammatical Category	Grammatical Pattern	Number
Nominals	Nsg and Nsg	40
	Nun and Nun	28
	Npl and Npl	6
	Nsg and Npl	6
	NN	2
	N&N	2
	Nun and Nun	2
	Npl(&) Npl	1
	N (or) N	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>88</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>

*Table 1A: Binomial Grammatical Patterns*

Grammatical Category	Grammatical Pattern	Number
Adjectives	Adj and Adj	16
	Adj and Adj	2
	Adj (&) Adj	1
	Adj(or) Adj	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>
Verbs	V and V	8
	V V	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>
Adverbs	Adv Adv	5
	Adv (&) Adv	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>
Quantifiers	Q and Q	1
Demonstratives	D and D	1
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>150</b>

*Table 1B: Binomial Grammatical Patterns*

Constraints (or principles) governing word order in binomials are reportedly said to be mostly semantic (Malkiel 1959) because the relation between the conjoined (or paired) lexical items could be one of synonymy, antonymy (especially polarity, including markedness), complementarity, directionality, agent-patient, etc. (cf. Lyons 1977, Cruse 1986, and Lehrer 1985). Bakir (1999: 32) claims that his data, the bulk of which is unknown, have shown "that, generally, formal ordering principles override semantic/pragmatic principles." His claim, at the time unsupported statistically, cannot be taken seriously; for our data have shown that neither phonology nor morphology plays any role in determining order (cf. Kadi 1988 who also considers binomials, including rhythmic reduplicatives, from phonological and morphological perspectives in addition to syntax and semantics). Accounting for word order in terms of the

number of phonemes shorter the first, the longer the second) is, for us, untenable. However, we do agree with him that spatio-temporality is an important factor in imposing order. This factor, subsumed under one of our five general categories, viz. presuppositions (see Table 2), dictates that term B ought to follow term A by definition. To follow Searle (1979), the direction of fit is word-to-world, i.e. the words match facts of life, e.g.

18. /yījraḥ w yidāwi / '(he) injures and heals' (IA; JA: /biksir iw bujbur/).

This example, just one of the 42 instances attested in the data, clearly shows the fact that unless you injure someone, healing does not naturally come into play. Notice that both terms have an equal number of phonemes. Though the second term has a long vowel, it cannot be taken as good a reason as our naturalness criterion. Irreversibility is, of course, not possible. In fact, reversibility has shown up in two expressions only, viz. (cf. 4 above) and

19. /kbār (wi) ṣyār/ 'adults (and) children' or 'the big and small ones' (IA, JA).

Category	No. of instances
Contrasts*	47
Basics	43
Presuppositions	42
Gender	13
Agent-Patient	5

Table 2: *General Binomial Categories*

The order in (4) is natural; unless you have tea, you will not need sugar as an additive. But if you have sugar first, which in contradistinction with tea is a multi-purpose substance, we do not necessarily expect it to trigger tea. However, the reversal, if it ever occurs, will be a distributionally marked order. The same applies to (19), but with a qualitative difference. Like English, at least, 'big', 'hot', 'tall', 'large', etc. are unmarked terms. In both IA and JA, we ask how big (hot, tall, or large) a thing is, not how small (cold, short, or little) a thing is (cf. Lehrer 1985; and Cruse 1986).

Examples (4) and (19), among others, have been grouped under the category of 'Contrasts' for economy of description, on the one hand, and avoiding uncertainty about oppositeness and/or antonymy, on the other hand. We may all intuitively agree that (4) can count as a case of

contrast whereas (19) as gradable antonymy. It is worth mentioning here that one binomial can belong to more than one category. As such, ordering relation will be confirmed. For example, 20 /ʔswad w abyad/ 'black and white' (IA, JA) falls within both the 'Contrasts' and 'Basics' classes. In the former, it is an obvious case of antonymy, whereas in the latter 'black' has experimentally been established as most basic; 'white', perceptually, ranks third in the Jordanian colour system<sup>4</sup>. And this lends support to the Jordanian popular saying: Black is the king of all colours. The argument may equally extend to 'Gender'. In:

21. /muΔakkar iw muʔannaθ/ 'masculine and feminine;
22. /zilim iw niswān/ 'men and woman' (IA, JA); and
23. /niθya w faħal/ 'female and male' (IA),

the contrast is obvious. In (21), Arabic grammar dictates that the feminine (F) ought to be derived from the masculine (M) noun or adjective, e.g.

24. /ʔālib iw ʔāliba/ '(M) student and (F) student' (IA, JA).

'ʔāliba' is formally (morphologically) marked for the suffix. Yet in (22) and

25. /wild iw banāt/ 'boys and girls' (IA, JA: ʔawlād iw banāt/),

among many others, we do not find any formal difference. To account for ordering (M) before (F), we tend to say that the Arabs' world view is either determined by their grammar (cf. Sapir-Whorf hypothesis), or that the Arab social life is patriarchal. We are more for the second interpretation because the Arabs, generally, prefer males to females. But why is sex reversed in (23) and in the trinomial:

26. /sayyidāti ʔānisāti sādātī/ 'Ladies, Misses, and gentlemen' (Standard Arabic)?

---

<sup>4</sup> Two of our undergraduate students were instructed to carry out a small-scale research on the perception of colours by their peers at the Hashemite University. 100 students were presented with 32 different colours, for each of which was given a number. They were asked to order them numerically in terms of preferences that come up to mind instantly. The results, based on Z-test hypothesis, have shown six basic colours ordered as follows: black, blue, white, red, green, and yellow. This order is seen to be determined by social, political, and emotional aspects as well as by natural phenomena. Ordering 'black' before 'white' seems to be universal. Potter (1960: 165) believes that this expression "became early associated in the mind of man with night and day, darkness and light, evil and good."

Simply, (23) is applicable to a non-human world, often used in two different domains in Iraq, viz. the world of birds, in particular, and the world of mechanics and their customers. In the former, speakers are after sex differentiation while, in the latter, speakers focus on which spare part goes into (fits in with) which; this view is obvious personification grounded in sexuality; for a spare part (F) requires another part (M) and, hence, the desirable order. (26) is a loan translation meant to observe the status of females in the Arab world along western lines: Ladies first, men follow.

The question of whether the Arabs are under the mercy of their grammar or not remains debatable; for if it were the case, then the English would be characterized as such. Compare 'Romeo and Juliet', 'Jack and Jill' with:

- 27. /qays iw layla/ 'Qais and Layla'; and
- 28. /ʕantar iw ʕabla/ 'Antar and Abla',

which are two famous love stories in Arabic literature. The 'Agent-patient' relation, for example, though a semantic one, is syntactically based. Arabic is often described as a VSO language; this is an unmarked order. Therefore, it is expected to find the 'agent' placed before the 'patient', e.g.

- 29. /ḥākīm iw maḥkūm/ 'the judge and the judged' (IA, JA); cf. also (8) and (9) above.

Such instances are, intuitively, opposites and, hence, may, like 'Gender', be safely classified under the 'Contrast' category. Additionally, they may be treated as presuppositions; for, naturally, someone to have been murdered, there must be a killer to initiate the act of killing. Obviously, such word order is a replica of world order (cf. Sa'ied 1997; Bakir 1999; and Gorgis 1999).

Replica is an important concept; for in addition to accounting for natural sequences as in above, it can resolve seemingly ordering paradoxes: Compare:

- 30. /ʔiddinya wi lāxra/ 'here and hereafter' (IA, JA);
- 31. /ḥaya w mōt/ 'life and death' (IA, JA), with
- 32. /yimūt w yiḥtiyi/ '(he) dies and comes to life (again)'; (IA, JA: /bimūt iw biḥyi/)

If we were to justify order in terms of positiveness or proximity as in (30) and (31) without any qualifications, then (32) would disappoint us. But this conflict can easily be settled when we consider the semantics of the verb 'yimūt'. Any animate being that is referred to as 'dying' is still alive. Imagine a person, tortured in a prison several times, who is between life and death. So instead of claiming that (32) involves presupposition, we would better say that word order matches world order (cf. Gorgis 1999) and, hence, the justification of replica. The same is true of the 'give and take' example (1) interpreted at the outset tentatively. In real-life situations, the Arabs are supposed to listen attentively to their interlocutors first, i.e. take in more words, then get involved in the exchange and give back fewer or more or less words. Whether this use extends to other aspects of behaviour or not, requires empirical research different from ours. However, 'silence is gold', so to say. If justifications, like the ones above, are not given, semantic principles will not be able to account for many orderings. For instance:

33. /timman iw marag/ 'rice and stew' (IA; JA: /ruzz iw laħma/)

is in sharp contrast with its tokens, e.g.

34. /bāmya w timman/ 'okra and rice' (IA; JA: /bāmya w ruzz/; and

35. /yābsa w timman/ 'white beans and rice' (IA).

The most viable interpretation that one may propose is that (33) is a type of dish generally expressed without denoting any specific stew, i.e. a token. Rice is a given whereas each stew in (34) and (35) is a new. Put another way, we may alternatively say that rice is unmarked distributionally or is more basic than any stew embraced by /marag/. To support our argument, simply drop in by one of the Iraqi local restaurants; you will hear the waiter rehearsing rapidly to his customer a list of different stews that can be served. Once the customer has made his choice, the waiter shouts loudly, e.g. /wāhid bāmya/ 'one okra' without mentioning rice. As soon as an errand boy hears the order, he goes to the kitchen bar and asks the cook for 'one okra', but the outcome turns out to be (34). The principle of 'proximity' and/or 'positiveness' (cf. MFOP) have been given credit by almost all the researchers documented in this paper. Although we, too, find this appealing, yet they are not able to solve some seemingly ordering paradoxes such as:

36. /ʔil girīb w ilbiššīd/ 'the close and the distant' (IA, JA) as opposed to:  
37. /ʔil qāši wi ddāni/ 'the remote and the proximate' (Standard Arabic, but widely used in IA and JA).

These two are used in two different contexts to fulfill two distinct functions. While (36) can be used to mean something like 'charity begins at home', (37) is used rhetorically to mean the most remote person knows about it (some issue) even before anyone who is nearby does. Analogously, the following seem to be incompatible:

38. /ʔilhīlwa w ʔilmurra/ 'the sweet and the bitter' (IA, JA)  
39. /hāmīd hīlu/ 'sour and sweet (a candy)'.

Although 'sweetness' is positive, it is ordered second in (39). In terms of markedness, we will accept 'sweet' as the unmarked term because we often ask about how sweet, not how bitter, a thing (or a state of affairs) is. But how about 'sweet' in (39)? Where has markedness go? Rather than accounting for this ordering in semantic, or even syllabic structure, terms, we tend to believe that the very structure of the candy seems to have imposed such ordering in (39); for once you put the candy in your mouth, you first sense sourness. Sourness stimulates, then sweetness soothes. An interpretation like this may be rejected on grounds that it is a non-linguistic commitment which does not yield any generalization. Well, let us suggest, as we did earlier, that subjects are ordered first. The word /hāmīd/ is moulded after /fāšīl/ 'subject' in Arabic grammar, but it is not an agent. It is an adjective. Al-Hilfī (personal communication) suggests that order in (39) is governed by metrical structure. He may be correct because the chorus of one popular Iraqi song repeat the expression several times. As can be clearly seen from all the preceding examples and from the Appendix, IA and JA are very much similar. Except for differences in form as well as the availability of some culturally-based binomials in one colloquial but not in the other, the criteria we have proposed for the categorization of the collected data, which is by no means exhaustive, are valid. Below, however, are some representative expressions of each sub-culture:

40. /zēt iw zaštar/ '(olive) oil and thyme' (JA)  
41. /hummuš w fūl/ 'chick-peas and broad beans' (JA)  
42. /γurfā w manāfišha/ 'a room and its utilities' (JA)  
43. /lōz w šinōbar/ 'almond and pine' (JA)  
44. /šammak xālak/ '(paternal) uncle-(maternal) uncle' (IA)  
45. /našla w gaḥḥa/ 'flue and cough' (IA)

46. /ħaşba w ĵidri/ 'measles and small-pox' (IA)

47. /mislim masĥi/ 'Muslim-Christian' (IA)

The first term in each of the four JA examples is basic, whereas in (44) paternal uncle, i.e. father's brother, is given a higher status. A 'cough' in (45) naturally follows from cold. In (46), 'measles' are less threatening to life. And a Muslim in (47) is given preference because Muslims are the majority in Iraq. Interestingly, (45) and (46) are used metaphorically. While the former would be an appropriate response to: "How are you?", the latter can rhetorically describe the awkward situation in which the speaker has been put.

## Conclusion

This paper has shown that 'binomials', or better-termed 'contrastive lexical couple', in both IA and JA display the same grammatical patterns, a finding which confirms previous researchers' results. The most frequent pattern is N + N (75.33%), and the least Q + Q or D + D (one instance each). Reversibility (possible in two instances) is termed 'marked order' because it is constrained by a less common context of situation. Without any exception, all of the couples collected show a clear contrast between item A and item B. As such, we may characterize all of our binomials as belonging to an umbrella category of 'Contrasts'. The other four (see Table 2) are, in fact, extensions or identities of contrasts (a type and token relationship, as it were) which have been shown to conspire, i.e. two or more categories confirm a given order preference.

Contrary to the claim made by Bakir (1999), formal ordering principles (in terms of syllabic structure) do not override semantic/pragmatic ones. The majority of our binomials demonstrate Searle's (1979) 'a word-to-world direction of fit', i.e. there is a one-to-one correspondence between word order and world order (cf. Gorgis 1999). To draw a down-to-earth picture, we have utilized the concept of 'replica' which, in addition to accounting for natural sequences, including spatio-temporality, could resolve some ordering paradoxes. By so doing, it has been possible for us to dispense with semantic criteria such as proximity, positiveness, oppositeness, etc. The only useful semantic principle that could fruitfully account for ordering item A before

item B is 'unmarked vs. marked' in especially cases whereby a scale is more evident in one term rather than another.

Differences between IA and JA are mostly formal. Cultural harmony is quite evident. The only difference is exhibited by the availability of a limited number of expressions peculiar to each sub-culture. And this finding does not lend support to Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Equally, MFOP cannot be generalized to all of our data. Even if it were the case that it does, the position of item A should not be taken for granted, i.e. that we are conceptually grounded in it (cf. 'up and down' in English). Rather, the relationship between A and B can be explored in terms of beliefs and practices of language users (cf. 'give and take' in both IA and JA).

## About the Authors

The authors teach at the Hashemite University, Jordan.

Email: gorgis\_3@yahoo.co.uk

## Acknowledgements

The two authors wish to express their gratitude to their colleagues, viz. Dr. Nazmi Al-Shalabi, Dr. Ibrahim Al-Mumayiz, Mr. Gatie Al-Hilfy, and Mr. George Hijazeen for their lively discussions with us. Thanks are extended to our students who have partly provided us with data. These include: Miss Amal Sawalmeh, Miss Nisreen Al-Basha, Miss Suha Rabba, Miss Mervat Al-Omari, Miss Haya Al-Darienk. Special thanks go to Mrs. Hana Shatat and Mrs Eman Al-Jundi.

## References

- Bakir, Murtadah J. (1999). "*Ordering principles in conjoined lexical pairs*". *Linguistic Research* 4: 1-2, 9-33.
- Bolinger, D. L. (1962). "*Binomials and pitch accent*". *Lingua* 11, 34-44.

- Cooper, W. E. and J. R. Ross (1975). "World order". In: R. E. Grossman, L. J. San, and J. J. Vance (eds). *Papers from the Parasession on Functionalism*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society; 63-111.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gil, David (1988). "Freezes, prosodic theory, and the Modularity of grammar". *Wiener Linguistische Gazette*. Supplement Beiheft 4, 31.
- Gorgis, D. T. (1999). "World order and word order in Iraqi Arabic with special reference to English". *Adab Al-Rafidayn*. 31, 1-15. Mosul Univ.
- Gustafsson, Maria (1984). "The syntactic features of binomial expressions in legal English". *Text*. 4: 1-3, 123-141.
- Kadi, Samar (1988). "English and Arabic binomials". *Al-Abhath*. 36, 43-53.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lehrer, A. (1985). "Markedness and antonymy". *Journal of Linguistics*. 21, 397-429.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Malkiel, Y. (1959). "Studies in irreversible binomials". *Lingua*. 8, 113-160.
- Oden, G. and L. Lopes (1981). "Preference for order in freezes". *Linguistic Inquiry*. 12, 673-679.
- Potter, S. (1960). *Language in the Modern World*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Sa'ied, I. Sa'ied (1979). *Binomials in Iraqi Arabic with Reference to English*. Mosul University: Unpublished M.A. Thesis.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge: CUP.

## Appendix

Notations: C(ontrasts), B(asics), P(resuppositions), G(ender), A(gent)-P(atient); (iw; wi;w)= optional

No.	Literal Translation	C	B	P	G	A-P	Transcription
1.	lightning & thunder			X			barq iw raṣṣad
2.	the world & hereafter			X			?iddinya w ilāxra
3.	(he) injures & heals			X			yijrah w yidāwi
4.	(he) grows & harvests			X			yizraṣṣw yihṣid
5.	the deaf & dumb			X			ṣumm iw bukm
6.	murderer & murdered			X			qātil (iw) maqtūl
7.	beater & beaten			X			ḍārib (iw) maḍrūb
8.	oppressor & oppressed			X			ḍālim (iw) maḍlūm

9.	night & day			X			lēl (wi) nhār
10.	ascending-descending			X			tāliṣ nāzil, ṣāṣid nāzil
11.	going & coming			X			rāyih iw jāy
12.	coming in-going out			X			xāš tāliṣ
13.	rising-sitting			X			gāyim gāṣid
14.	full (food) & quenched		X				mākil (iw) šarib
15.	drumming & playing the flute		X				yitabbil wı yizammir
16.	drumming & dancing			X			dagg iw rigiṣ
17.	(he) complains & cries			X			biški iw bibki
18.	soaking & kneading			X			bilitt iw biṣḡin
19.	paper & pencil		X				waraqa iw qalam
20.	table & chair		X				tāwla iw kursi
21.	beginning & end			X			bidāya w nihāya
22.	seller & buyer			X			bāyṣ (iw) šari
23.	taking & giving		X				?axΔ iw Ṣata
24.	headcloth & iqal			X			ḡutra wi Ṣgāl
25.	tea & sugar		X				šāy iw sukkar
26.	A man & a women				X		zalame w mara
27.	men & women				X		zilim iw niswān
28.	(he) dies & lives			X			yimūt iw yiḡtiyi
29.	boys & girls				X		?awlād iw banāt
30.	cock & hen				X		dič iw diḡaja
31.	close-open (eyes)			X			ḡammid fattih
32.	old & young		X				ikbār wi zyār
33.	summer & winter	X	X	X			ṣēf iw šita
34.	rice & stew		X				timman iw marag
35.	sun & moon		X				šams iw gumar
36.	fasting & praying		X	X			ṣāyim (wi) mṣalli
37.	voice & picture		X				ṣōt iw ṣūra
38.	bread & onion		X				xubz iw baṣal
39.	word & deed			X			ḡōl iw fiṣil
40.	sky & earth		X				?issama w il?ard
41.	ease & difficulty		X				yusr iwṢusr
42.	better & worse	X	X				?issarrā? wi ḡdarrā?
43.	sweet & bitter	X	X				?ilhilwa wilmurra
44.	problem & solution			X			muškila w ḡall
45.	question & answer			X			su?āl iw ḡawāb
46.	Qais & Layla				X		qays (iw) layla
47.	Antar & Abla				X		Ṣantar iw Ṣabla
48.	black & white	X	X				?aswad w abyad
49.	Paradise & hell		X	X			ḡanna w nār
50.	Jjnn & humans		X				?iḡḡin wi l?ins
51.	the close & far		X				?ilḡarīb w ilbaṢid
52.	the rich & poor		X				?ilyani w ilfaqir
53.	gold & silver		X				Δahab iw fiddah
54.	pearl & corals		X				lūlu iw marḡan
55.	the outer & inner		X				wiḡh iw gufa

56.	fat & flesh			X		šahim iw lahim
57.	chick-peas & (broad beans)		X			ħummuş iw fül
58.	life & death		X	X		ħaya w mōt
59.	(paternal) uncle & (maternal) uncle		X			ħammak xālak
60.	hunger & thirst		X			ǰūŝ iw ŝataš
61.	safe & sound		X			sālim ǰānim
62.	needle & thread		X			?ibreh iw xēt
63.	tide & ebb		X			madd iw ǰazir
64.	jacket & trousers		X			sutra iw pantalūn
65.	water & electricity		X			mayy iw kahraba
66.	Zayd & Obayd		X			zēd wi ŝbēd
67.	attack & retreat			X		karr iw farr
68.	Dijla & Euphrates		X			diǰla w furāt
69.	here & there		X			hnā (wi) hnāk
70.	today & tomorrow		X	X		?ilyōm (iw) bāčir
71.	now & later		X	X		hissa w baŝdēn
72.	this & that		X	X		hā Δa (w) haΔāk
73.	present-absent		X	X		ħādir ǰāyib
74.	conscious & drunk		X			šāhi (w) sakrān
75.	tall (long) & short		X			tawīl iw ǰašīr
76.	nuts and almond		X			ǰōz iw lōz
77.	the distant & near		X			?ilqāši wi ddāni
78.	skin & bone		X	X		ǰild iw ŝadum
79.	lunch & supper		X	X		ǰada w ŝaša
80.	profit & loss		X			ribh iw xasāra
81.	twisting & revolving		X			laff iw dawarān
82.	the green & dry	X	X	X		?ilaxdar wi lyābis
83.	wheat & barley		X			ħinta iw šaŝīr
84.	desirous and timid		X			mištihi iw mistihi
85.	plus-minus		X			zāqīd nāgiş
86.	much & little		X			kaθīr iw qalīl
87.	(its) protector while a thief		X			ħāmīha ħarāmīha
88.	okra & rice		X			bāmya w ruzz
89.	married or single	X	X			?aŝzab lō mitzawwiǰ
90.	science & arts	X	X			ŝilmi (w) ?adabi
91.	Moslem & Christian	X	X			mislīm masīhi
92.	out & in		X			šādīra (w) wārīda
93.	East & west		X			šarq iw ǰarb
94.	north & south		X			šamāl iw ǰanūb
95.	left & right	X	X			yasār (iw) yamīn
96.	doctor (M & F)				X	tabīb iw tabība
97.	morning & evening (shift)	X		X		šabāhi (iw) masā?i
98.	flue & cough	X				naşla iw ǰahha
99.	measles & small pox		X			ħaşba w ǰidri

100.	head & tail		X			tirra (iw) kitba
101.	bread & salt		X			xubz iw milh
102.	(he) reads & writes	X				yiqra (w) yiktib
103.	up & down (IA); up & inside (JA)		X			fōg iw jawwa
104.	before & after	X		X		gabl uw baʕad
105.	live & see	X				ʕiʕ iw ŕiʕ
106.	Brand new & second hand		X	X		ʕdīd iw mustaʕmal
107.	lawful & unlawful		X			ḥalāl iw ḥarām
108.	male & female				X	ʕakar w unḥa
109.	female (animal or spare part) & stallion				X	niḥya iw faḥal
110.	good & bless		X			xēr iw baraka
111.	good & evil	X	X			xēr iw šarr
112.	Virtue & vice	X	X			fadīla w raʕīla
113.	sleeping & getting up			X		nōm w gōm
114.	plus & minus (sign)		X			mūjab iw sālib
115.	pass & fail		X			nāʕih (iw) rāsib
116.	hungry or thirsty		X			ʕōʕan lō ʕatšān
117.	tired & bored		X			taʕbān (iw) zahgān
118.	(olive) oil & thyme			X		zēt iw zaʕtar
119.	room and utilities		X			ʕurfa w manāfiʕha
120.	teacher (M & F)		X			muʕallim wi mʕallima
121.	hot & cold	X	X			ḥār iw bārid
122.	sour-sweet	X				ḥāmiḍ ḥilu
123.	landlord & tenant			X		mālik iw mistaʕʕir
124.	ruler-ruled	X	X			ḥākim iw mahkūm
125.	doer & done- upon (SO)	X				fāʕil iw mafʕūl
126.	student (M & F)				X	tālib iw tāliba
127.	door & windows		X			bāb iw šabābīk
128.	Moon & stars		X			gamar wi nʕūm
129.	teacher & students		X			ʕustāʕ iw talāmīʕ
130.	cucumber & Armenian cucumber		X			xyār iw faggūs
131.	Pickle & olive		X			turši w zaytūn
132.	cucumber & tomato		X			xyār iw tamāta
133.	pickled munga & (French) bread		X			ʕamba w šammūn
134.	man & wife				X	mara iw riʕjāl
135.	rice & yoghurt		X			ruzz iw laban
136.	shirt & tie		X			qamīš iw rabta
137.	potatoes & tomatoes		X			baʕāta iw bandōra
138.	mother & daughter- in-law		X	X		ʕamā w kanne
139.	pilgrim (M & F)				X	ḥāʕi w ḥāʕiya

140.	truth & falsehood		X			ḥaqq iw bātil
141.	kneeling and prost- rating	X		X		rākiṣ sājid
142.	running & still (water)		X			ḡāri w rākid
143.	eating & drinking		X			?akl iw šurub
144.	sponge & soap		X			līfa w šābūn
145.	awake or sleeping		X			šahi lō nāyim
146.	pack (of cig.) & lighter		X			pākēt iw ḡiddāha
147.	rose & jasmine		X			ward iw yasmīn
148.	Adam & Eve				X	?ādam iw ḥawwa
149.	almond & pine		X			lōz wi šinōbar
150.	onion & garlic		X			bišal iw θūm