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Abstract

This paper attempts to explain the acquisition of two languages, namely English and Arabic, by a three-year-old child. It focuses on the same syntactic code-switching constructs dealt with earlier by Taweel and Btoosh (2012). In their study, they examined adult subjects. In our study, we will only focus on one child simultaneously acquiring English and Arabic. To collect the data, the child was observed by her parents and videotaped for the period of two weeks. We found several syntactic constructs produced by our informant where she code switched back and forth between Arabic and English. After that, we attempted to analyze the data and give explanation where it is appropriate. The scope of this article is descriptive as to states what might be going on with the child linguistically when she is acquiring English and Arabic at the same time. However, we are only focusing on the syntactic code switching part of it.
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Introduction

Bilingualism—more generally, multilingualism—is a major fact of life in the world today. To begin with, the world’s estimated 5,000 languages are spoken in the world’s 200 sovereign states (or 25 languages per state), so that communication among the citizens of many of the world’s countries clearly requires extensive bi-(if not multi-)lingualism. In fact, David Crystal (1997) estimates that two-thirds of the world’s children grow up in a bilingual environment. Considering only bilingualism involving English, the statistics that Crystal has gathered indicate that, of the approximately 570 million people world-wide who speak English, over 41 percent or 235 million are bilingual in English and some other language. Bhatia & Ritchie (2012, p.1)

One of the most interesting linguistic studies is that of language acquisition. Many scholars have tried to explain the mechanism of how language is acquired by human beings. The literature suggests lots of theories and explanations regarding this area; however, what has been found gives us only the “big picture,” generally pertaining to first language acquisition, leaving us with the conclusion that there is yet more to be discovered.

The study of first language acquisition is such a rich domain that linguists are often occupied in the area—but what if the acquisition is not just of one language, rather of two or more languages? In such case, our job as linguists would be more difficult as we try to give solid and theoretical explanations of what is going on during the acquisition period for speakers of more than one language.

This paper attempts to explain the acquisition of two languages, namely English and Arabic, by a three-year-old child. This is by no means an exhaustive research on all aspects of the language acquired by the child, but it will focus on the same syntactic code-switching constructs dealt with earlier by Taweel and Btoosh (2012). In their study, they examined adult subjects. In our study, we will only focus on one child simultaneously acquiring English and Arabic.

Literature Review

Chomsky (1965) puts forth the basis of language acquisition when he makes an important distinction between linguistic competencies: the speaker’s linguistic knowledge and performance and his or her actual linguistic productions. Hymes (1974) gives not only the insight that language affects the development of a child’s speech, but also that the child’s physical and social conditions must be looked at as supplementary elements in the process of language acquisition.

Many attempts have been made to define bilingualism, from very broad definitions to very specific ones. Eugene (1983, p.97) defines bilingualism as “the simultaneous acquisition
of more than two languages during the first five years of life.” The definition takes into consideration the early stages a child goes through linguistically. On the contrary, such is not given any attention in the following definitions of either Weinreich (1953, p.8) where he defines it as “the alternate use of two languages,” or as stated by Haugen (1953, p.7) as “to produce complete and meaningful utterances in the second language.” The latter two definitions do not accurately define what we are about to investigate. Rather, it can be understood from the last definition that second language learners are bilinguals, and they are, in the general sense of the word, perceived as such by many linguists (e.g., Hakuta, 1986; Macnamara, 1967; Mohanty & Perregaux, 1997) Yuko and Kenji (2004) mentioned by Bhatia & Ritchie (2012, p.115). However, this is not the intended meaning used here within our scope of research.

In this paper we embrace the definition put forth by De Houwer (2009, p.604) who states that “Bilingual First Language Acquisition (BFLA) is the development of language in young children who hear two languages spoken to them from birth.” De Houwer’s definition accurately takes into account what languages are being used around the child from the moment he or she is born, which is an integral part of first language bilingualism. Another important distinction she makes is between bilingualism and first-language bilingualism. This distinction is very important so that we can have better understanding between the two terms. The former can refer to any individual who can speak more than one language natively, regardless of the level of proficiency. The latter, however, does clarify what we mean by “bilinguals” in this study: They are those who are brought up in an environment where more than one language is spoken natively around them. However, the term BFLA was first developed by Swain (1976) in her dissertation De Houwer (2009, p.666) and now it is widely accepted and used by other linguists.

Arabic is Emphasized

The acquisition of two languages or more where Arabic is one of the languages being acquired is not abundant in the literature. According to Kattab (2014, p.3), this is due to the fact that studies on “Arabic acquisition of monolinguals are rare themselves,” and I do agree with her on this issue. She supports her claim with the studies of Amayreh and Dyson (1998) and Omar (1973).

The issue of language maintenance on the part of the parents of children who speak more than one language where Arabic is one them was investigated in a number of studies such as those of Rouchdy (1971) and Atawneh (1992). These studies are of the view that parental attitude toward the major language in the community and the heritage language alike could be important factors in influencing their children’s behavior toward the use of either one language or the other, or maybe the use of both. However, the outcomes of these studies show that peer pressure would impact the children’s use, behavior, and attitude of their
languages more than their parents would, especially when it comes to communicative needs. Khattab (2014, p.3) states that Shorrab (1986) argues: “In most cases, first-borns will be more proficient in the L1 than their siblings, partly due to the home communication between the offspring shifting towards the L2.” Through observation of the child in this study, the child does impact her little brother’s acquisition of the L2 more than her parents impacted her’s, which is in line with Shorrab’s findings but we are not going to look into this topic as it is not the main concern of this paper.

Parents usually are afraid that their children will lose their heritage language due to language attrition, especially when their heritage language is the minority language in the community. In an effort to prevent this, first, parents would choose the heritage language to be the one used at home. Second, clubs would be created to maintain the heritage language from going extinct through the implantation of extra-curricular activities where reading and writing is priority number one.

In the studies of bilingual literacy, most of the concerns focus on bilinguals’ abilities to learn two distinct languages, especially when the two have two different grapheme-phoneme systems because such thing could lead to interference issues (Benholz & Lipkowski, 1999). Recent studies show that bilinguals have better understandings of grapheme-phoneme correspondence when dealing with more than one system Kenner (2004). Eviatar and Rafiq (2000) suggest that being literate in Arabic does improve the awareness of both languages as a consequence.

According to Kattab (2014, p.4), “Work on aspects of the grammar of Arabic is heavily under-researched.” Shahin (1995) investigated the phonology of a child who was learning Arabic at home and English at his daycare from ages of 1–11 and 2–8.5, respectively, and evidence was found that the development of his phonology for both languages progressed independently, which suggests the existence of two separate phonological systems.

The lexicon acquired by bilinguals is often looked at as unequally developed when compared to that of monolinguals (Eviatar and Rafiq, 2000). Rouchdy (1971), however, explained this as a result of the unbalanced input of the lexicon acquired by bilinguals from each language. Khattab (2014, p.5) adds that:

It should also be borne in mind that bilinguals are not expected to have translation equivalents for every item in their L1 or L2. Bilinguals often acquire each of their languages in different contexts and use each for different communicative needs.

The syntactic system of bilinguals is often considered not to be a well-developed system when compared to that of their monolingual peers. Bos (2001) examined the
complexity of the syntax of Moroccan–Dutch bilinguals and their monolingual counterparts aged from 5 to 9 years old. Bos (2001) found that monolingual children used more sophisticated, complex, adult-like structures than did the bilinguals. In both of these categories, the older the child, the more sophisticated the structure. Through observation of the child in this study, her syntactic development in both Arabic and English was a bit behind when compared to the monolinguals of each language. Although this is true, it does not mean that the child fails to progress in the acquisition of both languages.

One of the most studied topics on bilinguals in the literature is code-switching (also called code-mixing); that is, when a bilingual uses both languages (called codes) in the same sentence (intra-sententially), or uses both languages between sentences (inter-sententially), this process leads to a new code consisting of both languages. Kattab (2014) observed that studies done on code-switching where Arabic is one of the languages resemble the outcomes found in the literature focused on the types of code-switched utterances where nouns are the most frequently switched items, followed by verbs, and then finally all other constituents.

Al-Enazi (2002) found that Arabic bilinguals violate most of the code-switching constraints that are available in the literature with regard to the morphological and syntactic systems. In such violations, bilinguals use both morphological patterns of each language interchangeably so that an English vocabulary in this case, would fit the Arabic morphological system, and at the same time, an Arabic word would be treated as if it is an English word when it comes to the use of affixes. Similarly, the word order of Arabic and English can be mixed, which leads to the violation of code-switching constraints as well.

The Child’s Environment

This female child was born in Saudi Arabia where the primary language is Arabic, and both of her parents speak Arabic natively. The first language that this child was exposed to was Arabic. The exposure extended for eight months before her parents moved to the United States for educational purposes. Prior to her exposure to English, she spoke a few words in Arabic, and this was a hint of a successful Arabic language development. The exposure of Arabic is an ongoing process, as it is the language spoken at the child’s home.

She started going to a daycare when she was ten months old and from that moment on—she was been surrounded by English for almost two and a half years during weekdays. However, the use of Arabic at home continued as well. It must be noted that the child visits Saudi Arabia every year during the summer for roughly two months where Arabic is the only language of communication as we mentioned above. As a result of the aforementioned information, we can see that the child has encountered two languages—namely Arabic and English—simultaneously since she was ten months old.
Methodology

The child was video recorded by her parents at home and while in the car, where she is conversing with the whole family, which consists of her parents and little brother. She was video-recorded for three hours total where she can code-switch in this environment. Similarly, the child was video-recorded for the duration of two hours while at her daycare having a conversation with one of the teachers working there. In this environment, however, the child does not have access to code switching in order to test whether her linguistic behavior would differ or not.

The video recording of the child was not structured, nor was it invoked by certain questions as to make her speak so that natural conversational interactions can be spotted. The video recordings were taken in a two-week period. Therefore, the purpose of the video recordings was to offer a snapshot of some of the current linguistic aspects that we are investigating in this paper. The diary of the child was also taken when it is hard to video record her or when the camera is not available at that particular moment.

Discussion and Analysis

Switching Between the Noun and Predicate: Arabic Pronoun into English Predicate.

(1) ana go park
1st per.s.pro. v. n.
‘I go park’

In this example, the child uses Arabic as her beginning language theme, and therefore, the English words utilized serve as predicate to the subject in Arabic, which is in this case a pronoun. Looking into the child’s corpus, it seems that the child has not acquired any other Arabic pronouns yet. The incomplete acquisition of such pronouns will subsequently stand in the way of the child’s ability to produce numerous structures of similar components. The child in the above sentence is experiencing structural influence from English because in Arabic, the subject doesn’t normally appear since the verb that follow it carries an affix that refers to the subject. To the contrary, such structure is the default layout of a sentence in English.

Switching Between the Noun and Predicate: English Pronoun into Arabic Predicate.

(2) I rooh gasili
I s.m.impert.v. s.f.impert.v.
‘I go wash’

In this sentence, we can see that the English noun ‘I’ is followed by the Arabic predicate rooh:

(3) You (her Mother) wasikeen
2nd per.pro. s.f.v.
‘you made a mess’
The same observation is made in this sentence where the predicate is in Arabic while the noun is in English. It is worth mentioning that the verbs in Arabic are not correctly formed by the child, and this is dominant throughout the whole batch of data collected. Most of the verbs used by the child are in the imperative mood of the verb, which makes sense, since most of the verb forms used to address the child are particularly in this mode. While in Example (2), the first verb is an imperative verb in the present form used to address males, and the following verb is also in the present form and it is in the imperative mode as well; however, it is used to address females. From this example, we can see that the concept of genders is not realized yet by the child, and we will discuss this issue later.

In Example (3), the form of the verb is not formed properly as well. However, in this case, the verb was formulated by the child based on a phrase in Arabic laa tuwasikin. The phrase is in the imperative mode and is used to address females, which translates to ‘don’t make a mess.’ The child was only capable of catching the last part of the phrase wasikin. Moreover, the child uses this phrase to tell her mother that she is the one who made a mess. Now, we can see that the child probably knows what laa ‘do not’ means, which is why she omits it from the phrase as to render it in the affirmative.

(4) Battal (the child’s brother) wasikeen

3rd per.s.m.sub. s.f.v

‘you made a mess’

In Example (4), the child uses this phrase even when addressing her little brother as if he were a female, which again confirms that gender distinction is not yet developed.

**Double Pronouns**

In the process of code-switching between Arabic and English in adult speech, we can observe that the double pronoun is not uncommon at all (Taweel & Btoosh, 2012). The double pronouns that Taweel and Btoosh (2012) found were in the subject position. To test this, they created some sentences where double pronouns were used. One of the sentences is the following.

(5) inta You are coming tonight?

2nd per.m.s.pro. ‘you’

We can see from the above-mentioned example that ‘you’ has been introduced twice — once by each language—in order to test the subjects’ attitudes toward such a form. Most of the subjects, who were all adults, in their study had negative attitudes toward such a form. Having said that, the child in our study surprisingly employs this phenomenon in the object position. Examine the following example:
(6) I found it saiiarah
    s.f.obj.
    ‘car’

(7) I got it mandeel
    s.f.obj.
    ‘tissue’

Here ‘it’ is used by the child to refer to the car but for some reason, she uses the word ‘car’ right after ‘it,’ which is considered to be the doubling of the same object stated in the sentence. Based on the data, it seems that the child prefers chunking as a tool of language acquisition. ‘I found it’ is a very common phrase in English that is used to tell that something was found by the subject. Therefore, the child employs this phrase exactly to serve this particular purpose. However, in her mind, this phrase seems incomplete, and it might have been used to mean ‘found’ only or else the object, saiiarah, will not be stated. Example (7) is another instance that shows the same mechanism is employed by the child, where the use of object pronouns is redundant when encountered with such common phrases, and in this case, it is ‘I got it.’

**Code-switching within the Verb Phrase**

**Switching after the verb ‘to be.’**

Looking at the data of the child, we found that she produces sentences within the verb phrase. Here we are going to examine some of the sentences that the child uses after the auxiliary ‘to be’:

(8) this is hilwah
    f.s.adj
    ‘nice’

(9) I’m shatrah
    f.s.adj.
    ‘well-behaved’

In a study conducted by Taweel & Btoosh, (2012), they found that constructions like these might not always be acceptable to the Arabic-English speaker. Some of the students in the study found these sentences strange and some other students simply did not acceptable them at all. However, some of them liked such sentences and thought that may occur in their speech. Our study distinguishes itself in that the child speaks both languages natively and yet uses such sentences. Therefore, we are inclined to speculate that such constructions can occur naturally by natives and should be viewed as normal code-switching based on Chomsky
(1965), who states that native competence and performance are to be viewed as perfect—unlike language learners as those in Taweel & Btoosh, (2012).

**Switching after the auxiliary ‘have.’**

The construction of have—have+participle—is considered to be a somewhat sophisticated structure and one that an adult is expected to produce. Therefore, this type of sentence makeup has not yet been developed by the child where she uses verbs to indicate finished actions. Having said that, the child does employ ‘have’ in order to indicate ownership. Examine the following example:

(10) I have *mushiti*
    impert.s.f.v.
    ‘comb’

As we can see from the above example, the child is capable of using ‘have’ to indicate things that belong to her or to others. However, as mentioned earlier, the child sometimes perceives verbs as nouns and uses them as such. Example (10) is no different when the verb *mushiti* ‘comb’ is used as noun. Although the child can indicate ownership, she only uses ‘have’ in its basic form. Refer to Example (11):

(11) Battal have my story. (speaking to her parents)

**Negation**

Now we are going to examine the child’s strategy regarding how she can construct sentences where negation is involved.

(12) Battal (the child’s brother) *mo shater*
    neg.part. m.s.adj.
    ‘not’ ‘well-behaved’

(13) Battal not *shater*

(14) Battal no *shatter*

It seems the child can produce sentences using negation words. Her perception of such words seems to be interchangeably employed from both languages. As is obvious from the above, all sentences in Examples (12), (13), and (14) have the same structure except for the use of negation words. The sentence in Example (12) is in Arabic, and is formed correctly by the child, but Examples (13) and (14) are in English and are ungrammatically formed. This is not because the child in not yet capable of forming such structures—see example (18). Rather, it is due to the influence of the Arabic structure on English sentences, where forms of ‘to be,’ such as ‘is’ and ‘are,’ do not exist in Arabic. Therefore, the child overgeneralizes the Arabic
structure found in Example (12) and makes it the default structure for the sentences in Examples (13) and (14) where negation is utilized.

In the following sentences, we will look at some of the sentences in which the child utilizes the verb ‘to be’ correctly without being influenced by the Arabic structure.

(15) I am Rywan.
(16) It’s cold outside.
(17) crocodile is hungry
(18) crocodile is not hungry

In the above examples, we can see that all of the sentences are grammatically formed showing the capability of the child to produce constructions where the verb ‘to be’ is used correctly. Therefore, we can speculate that what occurred in Examples (13) and (14) is most likely an influence from Arabic. In Examples (12) and (18), the child negates the two sentences correctly, each in its respective language. This shows that the child’s linguistic development is on the right track in both languages because linguistic milestones are being acquired. Having said that, we are now going to look at negation when verbs are involved, such as ‘do’:

(19) dadi! I do not have my story.
(20) Rywan mo eat it.  (speaking to her parents about her brother)
(21) Battal don’t hit me.  (speaking to her parents about her brother)

In Example (19), the child uses negation properly with ‘do’ to speak about herself. In Example (20), however, she mirrors what we have found earlier when she uses the Arabic negation without any helping verb ‘to be.’ Although the matrix language is English, now we know that such a construction is used across the board in her corpus whether to express an action or describe a situation or even an entity. Example (21) shows that marked structures are not yet developed by the child. We see that in Example (21), the child does not use the appropriate ‘do’ form when negating the singular entity ‘Battal.’ Instead, she overgeneralizes the ‘do’ form across the board.

Questions

Asking questions is part of the linguistic developmental milestones that a child will acquire along the way during her/his language acquisition. Here, we are going to look at how much the child in this study has accomplished regarding the asking of questions. First, we will list some of the questions that the child was able to construct correctly in English and Arabic.

(22) What do you say?
(23) What’s your name?
(24) What’s that?
(25) What are you doing?
(26) Where’s your cup?

In Arabic:

(27) Baba  rah  almasjid?
   n.  past.m.s.v.  n.
   ‘Dadi went to the mosque?’

(28) Mama!  ba’dain  rooheen  Chuck E. Cheese?
   n.  adv.  f.future.v.  n.
   ‘Mam! Will I go to Chuck E. Cheese later?’

In the previous examples in both English and Arabic, the child was able to construct adult-like questions, except for the section where some of the verbs are not formed properly in terms of following the correct morphological patterns in Arabic. Her syntax, however, has been developed rather well. Example (28) is syntactically correct but morphologically wrong. The verb rooheen should have been produced as aroh, and this form would be the correct one. However, the verb that was used by the child to refer to herself was the one used by her parents to address her; for example, her Mam would say something like this:

(29) Honey!  badain  t-rooheen  Chuck E. Cheese
    adv.  f.part-f.s.future.v  n
    ‘Honey! You will go to Chuck E. Cheese later.’

In Example (28), the child took this form and used it to address herself where the ‘t’ at the beginning of the verb was deleted. Similar strategies adopted by the child were discussed earlier in this paper where she takes the verb and uses it exactly as it is without making the necessary changes for the entities involved in her statements.

When the child does not use the adult version of forming questions, she relies on intonation. This method of asking questions can be found in adult speech when engaged in everyday language variety. Therefore, we do not know if the child uses this form because she is exposed to the adult version of everyday speech or simply comes up with her own alternative version of asking questions using intonation. Here are some examples where the child code-switches when asking questions using intonation:

(30) Monster  rah  far away?
n. past.m.s.v adv.
‘The monster went far away?’

(31) Sarah rahat ind um-aha?
   n past.f.s.v prep. n-f.poss.part.
‘Sarah went to her mam?’

More examples on intonation in English only:

(32) Dark is coming?
(33) Daddi! You’re tired?

In the examples above, the child has developed what seems to be an alternative version of asking questions without following the proper grammatical layout of forming such questions. However, as mentioned above, these questions are not uncommon in everyday speech in both English and Arabic. For this reason, they may have influenced the child’s linguistic development in forming questions.

Two systems?

By the nature of acquiring two languages or more, one might ask if the child has one or two systems for this matter. This question is legitimate in principle but hard to tackle in practice. Many linguists have tried to address this issue and have arrived at different conclusions. The question lies in the nature of dealing with two independent languages, as stated by Kattab (2014, p.2):

The main question that has occupied researchers since the 1970s is whether bilingual children start by mixing the grammatical systems of the two languages and later separate them during their development (known as Gradual Differentiation Theory) or separate the two linguistic systems from the beginning of their language development (the so-called Separate Development Theory.)

The child in our study was spotted in very few occasions using some Arabic words or phrases while speaking with a native English speaker. Now these strategies of hers have some implications that we should address. We notice from this that the child implements a trial and error methodology. Although she knows that her teacher only speaks English, she used some Arabic words anyway. This is unusual, and a logical explanation for this might be that the child wants to find out which language the other person speaks so that she can continue successfully communicating. Another explanation is that some of the lexical items acquired by the child are realized in only one language but not the other (Khattab, 2014), which makes mixing lexical items unavoidable. Therefore, we are more inclined to say that the child in our study might follow the gradual differentiation theory.
On the contrary, although the child knows that her parents understand English and Arabic, she sometimes says a sentence in English and immediately follows it with a translation of the same sentence in Arabic—see example (36) below. Here, it is not clear why the child uses such a strategy. However, we can speculate that she does so because: (1) She might not enjoy gaining access to Arabic otherwise; and 2) She maybe wants to identify herself as being part of the group in order to establish solidarity with her family language. The reason might not be a linguistic reason per se but rather a sociolinguistic one, as mentioned above.

(34) We are going home?
The child’s translation: (bin)-rooh albait?

Observations

First, an odd structure was found in this study in which the structure does not follow either the Arabic syntax or that of English as well:

(35) I want غسلي فمك
n-m.poss.part. f.impert.v.
intended: ‘I want to wash my mouth.’
literally: ‘I want your mouth wash.’

Similar to English, the Arabic structure of such a sentence would be constructed like this:

(36) I want غسلي فمك
f.impert.v. n-m.poss.part.

This sentence in Arabic mirrors the intended sentence in English above. However, we notice that neither of these structures are being adopted by the child which makes us ask where did such odd structure come from?

Second, most of the code-switches performed by the child involved many verbs. Therefore, it goes against most code-switched lexical items, which are nouns Kattab (2014).

Taweel & Btoosh, (2012, p.9) states that: “Jake (1994) argues that an English double of an Arabic ‘topic’ pronoun is possible, but the opposite is not. If the speaker starts with an Arabic pronoun, followed by an English sentence, English being the matrix language here, then doubling is possible.”
In our study however, the Arabic object occurs last in both of the sentences (6) and (7) immediately before the object in English as to render it double objects, which disagrees with the findings of Jake in this matter. As for the matrix language, part of our study mirrors his findings.

Jake: (37) \textit{inta} You are coming tonight?
double pro.

text
‘you’

Child: (38) I found it \textit{saiiarah}.
double obj.

text
‘car’

Child: (39) I got it \textit{mandeel}.
double objects.

text
‘tissue’

Conclusion

In this paper, we tackled different linguistic intra-sentential structures and some other linguistic phenomena as well. In the literature review, we took a look at some of the literature concerning bilingualism in general and specifically where Arabic is one of the languages involved. Subsequently, the child’s environment was discussed with an emphasis on age, time, and language. In Methodology, we attempted to give a clear picture of how data was collected and used to reach our current results. After that, we discussed intra-sentential code-switching regarding some syntactic constructs in discussion and analysis. Negation structures and question formations were then discussed. We addressed, consequently, the subject matter of whether or not the child has one or two systems when linguistic acquisition takes place. Finally, three observations are pointed out.

The acquisition of Arabic-English by bilinguals is still under-researched in all the components of linguistics such as syntax, phonology, morphology, and semantics. However, our study attempted to explain some syntactic constructs with relation to code-switching between English and Arabic. In the process of doing that, we found ourselves confronted by several questions that were intriguing. The first question: What is it that makes the child do doubling with objects and not with pronouns (subjects), as found by Taweel and Btoosh (2012)? The child in our study has a tendency to use verb forms identically to how they are
addressed to her without making the necessary changes therein, such as using the imperative form, to express herself. This raises a question that needs to be tackled based on theoretical grounds. On some occasions, the child says a sentence in English and then immediately follows it with a translation in Arabic. Although we attempted to explain such a strategy, we still need to look deeper into this behavior to understand better the reason behind it.
**List of abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st per.</td>
<td>First Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd per.</td>
<td>Second Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd per.</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro.</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impert.</td>
<td>Imperative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj.</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past.</td>
<td>Past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future.</td>
<td>Future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss.</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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