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THE CANONICAL PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION IN ARABIC AND ENGLISH

By

Ghiath Eddeen El-Mrazouk

This is a detailed comparative study into the canonical passive construction (i.e. its verbal representation) in two genetically unrelated languages, namely, Arabic (its written variety in particular) and English. From a morphophonological perspective, an examination of the active-passive morphophonology of the main lexical verb in Arabic and its ‘typological’ counterpart in English will illustrate their essential crosslinguistic variations as necessary preliminaries to further discussion. By generalising across several lines of research, the study will arrive at the general pragmalinguistic definition of the construction in question within the conceptual limitations of the terms that have been used to describe several different types (viz. the ‘personal passive’, the ‘impersonal passive’, and the ‘pseudopassive’). Then, from a principle-based standpoint, the study will seek to reconsider the entire terminological apparatus in this respect, and to account for all natural instances of the construction under discussion in terms of the syntactic behaviour of the internal arguments that the main lexical verb has the potential to combine with. If at least one internal argument moves to subject position under canonical passivisation, then the resultant construction will be termed the ‘dynamic passive’. If, however, all the internal arguments remain in their base-positions under the same condition of canonical passivisation, then the nominal expletive is inserted in subject position and the resultant construction will be termed the ‘static passive’. This dichotomisation between ‘dynamicness’ and ‘staticness’ (a dichotomisation which indicates that there exist just these two types both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically) will therefore be established in order to give a reasonable account of the functional dimension of the canonical passive construction within a particular approach to the potential frequency differences and similarities between the two languages involved.
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# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>Accusative (Case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adjective/Adjectival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Arabic Dynamic Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adverb/Adverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff</td>
<td>Affix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr'</td>
<td>Single-bar projection of Agr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrP</td>
<td>Agreement Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Arabic Nonpassive Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-position</td>
<td>Argument-position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Arabic Static Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Complementiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'</td>
<td>Single-bar projection of C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-command</td>
<td>category-command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Computational System for Human Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Complementiser Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-select</td>
<td>category-select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Canonical Structural Realisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Dynamic Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Deep Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>empty element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>Empty Category Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP</td>
<td>English Dynamic Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENC</td>
<td>English Nonpassive Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>English Static Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-subject</td>
<td>External-subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Explicit Nominal Expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exp)</td>
<td>Implicit Nominal Expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Genitive (Case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'</td>
<td>Single-bar projection of I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr.</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Inflection Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Imperfective Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-subject</td>
<td>Internal-subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logical Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit.</td>
<td>Literal Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-command</td>
<td>maximally-command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morph</td>
<td>morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Modern Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-select</td>
<td>morphologically-select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N'</td>
<td>Single-bar projection of N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Nominative (Case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obi</td>
<td>Oblique (Case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'</td>
<td>Single-bar projection of P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Principles-and-Parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass'</td>
<td>Single-bar projection of Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PassP</td>
<td>Passive Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Phonetic Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Perfective Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ques</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-expression</td>
<td>Reference-expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>String/Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'</td>
<td>Single-bar projection of S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>Specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Surface Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s-select</td>
<td>semantically-select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGG</td>
<td>Transformational-Generative-Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tns</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tns'</td>
<td>Single-bar projection of Tns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TnsP</td>
<td>Tense Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr.</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V'</td>
<td>Single-bar projection of V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>first-person-singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>first-person-plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sm</td>
<td>second-person-singular-masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sf</td>
<td>second-person-singular-feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2du</td>
<td>second-person-dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2plm</td>
<td>second-person-plural-masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2plf</td>
<td>second-person-plural-feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sm</td>
<td>third-person-singular-masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sf</td>
<td>third-person-singular-feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3du</td>
<td>third-person-dual-masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3dum</td>
<td>third-person-dual-feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3plm</td>
<td>third-person-plural-masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3plf</td>
<td>third-person-plural-feminine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY TO TRANSLITERATION

Vowels

-a- Short front/back open neutral, e.g. a in about
-a:- Long front/back open neutral, e.g. a in hat
-i- Short front closed spread, e.g. i in sit
-i:- Long front closed spread, e.g. ee in see
-u- Short back closed rounded, e.g. u in put
-u:- Long back closed rounded, e.g. oo in food

Consonants

-?- Voiceless glottal stop, normally dropped in initial position
-?- Voiced pharyngeal fricative, the emphatic variant of -?--
-d- Voiced dental nonsulcal plosive, the emphatic variant of d in dark
-g- Voiced uvular fricative, the emphatic variant of gh in na ghael (Irish)
-h- Voiceless pharyngeal fricative, the emphatic variant of h in hat
-k- Voiceless uvular fricative, the emphatic variant of ch in loch (Scottish)
-q- Voiceless uvular plosive, the emphatic variant of q in queue
-s- Voiceless dento-alveolar sulcal fricative, the emphatic variant of s in saw
-š- Voiceless palato-alveolar fricative, the emphatic variant of sh in she
-l- Voiceless dento-alveolar plosive, the emphatic variant of l in task
-th- Voiceless dental nonsulcal fricative, the emphatic variant of th in thin
-th- Voiced dental nonsulcal fricative, the emphatic variant of th in then
-Th- Voiced dental sulcal fricative, the emphatic variant of -th-
INTRODUCTION

It is often argued that the canonical passive construction (i.e. its verbal representation) in any natural language instantiating this construction is essentially conditioned by pragmatic exigencies from the viewpoint of language use. These pragmatic exigencies include the speaker’s specific intention to forgo mention of the real Agent (i.e. the doer of the activity portrayed by the main lexical verb) for whatever reason. The logical consequence is, therefore, to generally define the passive form of the main lexical verb as a constituent which entails the syntactic deletion, and subsequently the anonymousness, of the real Agent in the unmarked situation, a definition that has been familiar in the history of linguistic thinking since the Middle Ages (see, for example, Al-Ghalaayiini, 1982; Owens, 1988; Owens, 1990). Even if the real Agent is syntactically inserted in the marked situation, on the other hand, its identity may also remain incognito for reasons which are to do with the lexical nature of the main lexical verb itself. Along with the distinction between unmarkedness and markedness in this sense, a corresponding distinction has thus been made between what is known as the ‘agentless’ or ‘short’ passive and the ‘agentive’ or ‘long’ passive.

But the pragmatic connotation of the canonical passive construction, be it agentless/short or agentive/long, also entails certain changes in the structural representation of the canonical active version. These changes comprise the subjectivisation of the object-NP (or any syntactic category standing proxy for it), the attachment of passive morphology to the main lexical verb, the necessary deletion or insertion of the Agent-PP, and the like. Structural changes such as these are assumed to emerge from the ‘mental’ interaction between a given set of general principles which have been designated within the framework of Universal Grammar (UG) (see, for example, Chomsky, 1981; Jaeggli, 1986; Chomsky, 1988a; Baker et al., 1989; Haegeman, 1993; Haegeman, 1994). The fundamental objective is to underline the typological convergence between even genetically unrelated languages in the application of
these general principles, and to explain the apparent typological divergence in terms of setting
different values of the same parameters involved such as the parameter that is responsible for
word order (e.g. VSO in Arabic, SVO in English, etc.) and the parameter associated with the
passive morpheme or complex of morphemes (see, for example, Fassi Fehri, 1987; Fassi
Fehri, 1988; Ouahalla, 1991). This is because the apparent typological divergence between
natural languages, which can only be observed at the two levels of morphology and
phonology, is said to be “illusory and epiphenomenal, the result of interaction of fixed
principles under slightly varying conditions” (Chomsky, 1994:4).

However, a ‘nonapparent’ typological divergence between natural languages, a matter that
does not seem to have received sufficient attention in the literature, is also discernible (given
the availability of the relevant evidence) but only at a third intervening level, viz. the
functional dimension of the canonical passive construction. In particular, this intervening
level addresses the manner in which natural instances of the construction in question function
crosslinguistically. Thus, as it is true that there exist certain canonical passives in language X
which do in fact function as corresponding canonical passives in language Y, it is equally true
that there exist further instances of the same construction in either language which do not
exhibit this functional convergence between the two. Furthermore, even in the case of
functional convergence (where there also exist structurally distinct types of the canonical
passive construction), not every type of this construction in language X functions as a
 corresponding type in language Y (or vice versa). In order to offer a reasonable account of
the functional dimension in the sense intended here, an investigation into the potential
crosslinguistic similarities and differences in the frequency of the same construction appears
to be necessary in this connection.

Apart from the functional dimension, the structural representation of the canonical passive
construction and its pragmatic connotation have in fact resulted in the treatment of this
construction within at least two ‘antagonistic’ enterprises, namely, the generativist and the
nongenerativist. While the generativist enterprise (i.e. Universal Grammar (UG)) attempts to explain the construction as a syntactic phenomenon arising from the workings of specified principles of the mind, the nongenerativist enterprise (including Relational and Functional Grammar) tends to view the same construction as a pragmatic phenomenon, whose sole function is societal, and thus examine it to the detriment of the principles that underlie its structural representation. What one would expect from this undesirable conflict is nothing but the coinage of a rather confusing terminology to describe several different types of the canonical passive construction. Within this terminology we find what is collectively known as the ‘personal passive’ and the ‘impersonal passive’, the latter being a less common type than the former. Generally speaking, the personal passive is assumed to involve the subjectivisation of a nonsubject category that has a semantic content as in (1) below, whereas the impersonal passive is said to subjectivise the semantically contentless nominal expletive (e.g. *huwa* ‘he’ in Arabic and *it* in English) for the strict reference to an unspecified human Agent as in (2) below.

   (Gloss: was done (3sm) the-work (Nom) in the-autumn (Obl))  
   b. The work was done in the autumn.

(2) a. *ʔurifa anna al-ʔamala munjazun.*  
   (Gloss: was known (he) that the-work (Acc) done (Nom))  
   b. It was known that the work was done.

We also find what is called the ‘pseudopassive’, which seems by far the most misleading term in the literature, since it still reflects the structural and lexical properties that are characteristic of the canonical passive construction in general but with ‘accidental’ output representations in the language-particular sense. This term has been coined to identify certain instantiations of the construction in question where peripheral NPs that are prepositionally marked are incorporated, viz. PPs other than the Agent-PP. In languages such as Arabic, for instance, no input representations would affect the base-position of the non-Agent-PP under canonical passivisation, thereby giving rise to the expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal *huwa* ‘he’, and therefore to a further instantiation of the ‘impersonal passive’ as in (3a) below. In languages such as English, on the other hand, the peripheral NP in the non-
Agent-PP (i.e. the object of P in this case) would establish a ‘new’ grammatical relationship with the main lexical verb under the same condition of canonical passivisation. As a result, the base-position of the non-Agent-PP is affected via the subjectivisation of the peripheral NP it contains, a property that is typical of the ‘personal passive’ as in (3b) below.

(3) a. niːma fiː al-bayti.
   (Gloss: was slept (he) in the-house (Obl))
   (Lit.: It was slept in the house.)
   b. The house was slept in.

How can, then, the term ‘pseudopassivisation’ be perceived if in either exemplification the main lexical verb exhibits its canonical passive morphology and presupposes the ‘existence’ of an active version? Looking at the English counterpart in (3b), the subjectivisation of a nonsubject category that has a semantic content does actually apply, whilst at the same time the strict reference to an unspecified human Agent is maintained, hence the subjectivisation of the semantically contentless nominal expletive in the Arabic counterpart in (3a). This means that neither the ‘personal passive’ nor the ‘impersonal passive’ nor any other term such as the ‘pseudopassive’ is adequately coined to account for these factual observations about the canonical passive construction among others. As the combining form pseudo- itself usually indicates, the term in fact can only be understood as an appropriate description of those instances which incorporate passive-like elements at a superficial level, but have nothing to do with passivisation, be it canonical or noncanonical, simply because such instances do not presuppose the ‘existence’ of active versions as in (4) below.

(4) a. fulija al-maliku.
   (Gloss: was paralysed (3sm) the-king (Nom))
   b. The King was paralysed.

So it can be seen that the problem with the description of the canonical passive construction is a fundamentally terminological one. The principal purpose of this study is simply to attempt to solve such a problem within a detailed comparative examination of the canonical passive construction in two genetically unrelated languages, viz. Arabic (its written form in particular) and English. By generalising across several lines of research, the study will arrive at the general linguistic and pragmatic properties of this construction (hence the term
'pragmalinguistic', as will be seen soon) within the conceptual limitations of the terms referred to above. Then, from a principle-based perspective, the discussion will seek to reconsider the whole terminological apparatus in this respect, and to account for all natural instances of the construction in question in terms of the syntactic behaviour of the internal arguments that the main lexical verb has the potential to combine with. If at least one internal argument moves to subject position under canonical passivisation, then the resultant construction will be termed the 'dynamic passive'. If, however, all the internal arguments remain in their base-positions under the same condition of canonical passivisation, then the nominal expletive is inserted in subject position and the resultant construction will be termed the 'static passive'. This polarity of 'dynamicness' and 'staticness', which indicates that there exist just these two types both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically, will therefore be established for a reasonable account of the functional dimension of the canonical passive construction within a particular approach to the potential frequency differences and similarities between the two languages involved.

The generalisation across the various lines of research referred to above will essentially be undertaken chronologically within the historical-conceptual significance of these lines of research. That is, discussion of the canonical passive construction in Arabic and English will begin with the descriptive treatment of this construction according to Arabic Linguistic Theory (which was enunciated and established in the Middle Ages) and end in how the same construction is viewed within the framework of the most recent version of the so-called Principles-and-Parameters (P&P) approach to language. This historical-conceptual account will also include some reference to what is known as Relational and Functional Grammar whose rationale in its present formulation can be traced back to the linguistic theorisation of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Instead of siding with one particular approach and obliterating its 'antagonism' or 'antagonisms', the study put forward in this work will seek to construct a new 'synthesis' out of conflicting ideas emanating from relevant parts of the generativist and nongenerativist enterprises mentioned above, since one of the persistent
goals in the history of human thought is to unify several different theories about the world (including human nature). Accordingly, such a ‘synthesis’ will attempt to unify the linguistic level of the canonical passive construction and its pragmatic level, an attempt which will require considerable reconsideration of either level.

To unify the linguistic level of the canonical passive construction and its pragmatic level is therefore to unify the rationale behind the generativist enterprise and the rationale behind the nongenerativist enterprise, respectively. Based on the truism that neither level can operate without the other, these two levels will be clearly articulated as formal representations of the native speaker’s internalised knowledge of the construction in question. Given that Arabic and English are the two main languages involved in this study, such formal representations will in principle underline the symmetrical balance in the linguistic and pragmatic knowledge that both the native speaker of Arabic and the native speaker of English possess of the canonical passive construction. The establishment of symmetrical balance in such a perspective is nothing to do with whether or not the two languages constantly exhibit functional convergence in the natural examples of the construction under consideration. For this reason, the functional dimension of the canonical passive construction will be examined within a particular approach to the potential frequency differences and similarities between Arabic and English in this construction.

**Main body structure**

The study falls into four principal chapters which may be summarised as follows. In the first chapter, where the discussion is restricted to the morphophonological level, section 1.1 offers some remarks on the morphophonological structure of the active verb in the written variety of Arabic and how the derivatives that are generated from the root are symbolised algebraically in terms of a finite set of morphophonological patterns. It also identifies the element that acts
as a morphophonological base and its ‘typological’ counterpart in English. Section 1.2 considers the active morphophonology of ten main verb-forms in Arabic with reference to their essential lexical properties (i.e. their grammaticisation), where each example is accompanied by its equivalent in English. Section 1.3, the final section, discusses the passive morphophonology of the ten main verb-forms in Arabic (i.e. their grammaticisation as well) and the ‘typological’ counterpart of this system in English, including the regularities and irregularities in either language. The section is concluded with some notes on the crosslinguistic variation between the two languages in the structural patterning of the canonical passive verb for representing both lexical and nonlexical information.

In the second chapter, where the discussion is confined to the pragmalinguistic level from the viewpoint of language use, section 2.1 gives a brief account of the traditional approach to canonical passivisation in Arabic and English, and underlines the logical flaws of this approach which held that transitivity was a decisive precondition for the natural occurrence of passivisation. Section 2.2 considers the relation between transitivity and passivisation with special reference to Medieval Arabic Linguistic Theory. This is to specify the categories that can be promoted to subject position under passivisation, and to illuminate the flaws of the traditional approach even further. Section 2.3 discusses the main pragmalinguistic properties of the so-called ‘personal passive’ in Arabic and English, and explains the promotional nature of the direct object in respect of other categories with some reference to Relational and Functional Grammar. It also touches on the diachronic overlap between the personal passive and the reflexive in order to shed light on further aspects of the former. Section 2.4 examines the salient pragmalinguistic properties of the so-called ‘impersonal passive’ in the two languages, and identifies two different subtypes of this type exhibiting the same expletive interpretation. It also introduces what will be called, the ‘personalised’ version of the impersonal passive for further analysis in the next chapter (chapter 3). The section is concluded with the general pragmalinguistic definition of the canonical passive construction
within the conceptual limitations of the terms referred to above. This definition will therefore be reconsidered a little further in the last chapter (chapter 4).

The third chapter focuses on the general principles which underlie canonical-passive formation in Arabic and English within the framework of Universal Grammar (UG). Section 3.1 gives a brief historical account of the paradigmatic shifts in the derivational system from the 1950s to the present decade insofar as they are related to this construction in the two languages. These are generally observable in three phases: the TGG model up to the 1970s, the early version of the P&P model in the 1980s, and the later version of the P&P model in the 1990s (the subject-matters of sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4, respectively). Section 3.2 considers the canonical passive according to the TGG model, where it results from the application of a transformational rule called Pass-transformation, and underlines the main criticisms levelled at the limitations of this rule. Section 3.3 discusses the canonical passive according to the early version of the P&P model, where it is identified with ‘theta-role absorption’ and ‘Case absorption’ (an identification that imposes an argument status on the Pass element), and highlights the conceptual defects of this analysis. Section 3.4 introduces an alternative analysis with some reference to the later version of the P&P model. Here, the Pass element is treated as a functional category in its own right, a treatment that is crucial for scrutinising virtually unnoticed aspects of the canonical passive and reconsidering all the misleading terms that have been used to describe several types of this construction. The section is concluded with the new syntactic definition which now indicates that there exist only two types, viz. the ‘dynamic passive’ and the ‘static passive’.

The fourth and final chapter draws on the potential frequency differences in the canonical passive between Arabic and English within a particular approach to functional convergence and divergence. Section 4.1 defines the two sorts of knowledge internalised by the native speaker in respect of this construction, and shows how this knowledge is related to the functional dimension. It also identifies the approach to the potential frequency differences by
using five paradigms (A, B, C, D, and E), with the last three being the topics of sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 respectively. Section 4.2 discusses the functional convergence in the canonical passive between Arabic and English in accord with paradigm C. Since the one-to-one correlation between instances of either type of this construction (the dynamic and the static) does not always hold in the two languages, paradigm C is considered in terms of four subparadigms (C1, C2, C3, and C4), with the first two referring to functional homogeneity and the last two to functional heterogeneity. Section 4.3 discusses the functional divergence between the two languages from the viewpoint of Arabic, the concern of paradigm D. Because this divergence exists in either type of the canonical passive, paradigm D is considered in terms of two subparadigms (D1 and D2), with the former addressing the dynamic passive type and the latter the static passive type. Section 4.4 discusses the functional divergence between the two languages from the viewpoint of English, the concern of paradigm E. Given that this divergence only exists in the dynamic passive type, paradigm E is considered in terms of only one subparadigm (E1), since no static passive in English does not function as a corresponding canonical passive in Arabic.

**Definition of terminology**

Each of the four chapters discusses the canonical passive construction from a distinctive angle where a number of crucial terms are employed in a general and/or particular sense. These terms may be defined in the following way. In chapter 1, the term 'morphophonology' will be used to simply indicate both the morphological and phonological aspects as integrated in the structure of a given lexical verb in 'inflectional' or 'fusional' languages such as Arabic. For such a structure, the algebraic three-variable notation \((X, Y, Z)\) will be designated as the symbolic representation of any three-radical root that is combined via the incorporation of a certain shape of vowel distribution. This is because the \(CV\) convention (where \(C\) stands for Consonant and \(V\) for Vowel) can only be designated to represent phonological patterns in
these languages, and therefore the important distinction between the active-passive contrast cannot be marked. Thus, both the active verb *kataba* ‘to write’ and its passive version *kutiba* ‘to be written’ in Arabic, for instance, have a single phonological pattern (viz. *CV*CVCV), whereas in fact they exhibit two distinctive morphophonological patterns (viz. *XaYaZa* versus *XuYiZa*, respectively). Accordingly, the ‘morphophonological’ dimension of the canonical passive verb in Semitic languages such as Arabic will be contrasted with the ‘morphosyntactic’ dimension of the same verb in Germanic languages such as English, the latter being classified as ‘agglutinative’ or ‘agglomerative’ languages. For the purposes of terminological simplification, the term ‘morphology’ will be used as an all-inclusive term to indicate either dimension in the upcoming chapters.

In chapter 2, the term ‘pragmalinguistic’ will be used to underline certain properties of the canonical passive construction that are not accounted for in the principle-based approach. At present, there seems to be no agreement as to what the term is, nor even as to what it is not. This is mainly because the so-called *pragmatic theory* normally covers a wide range of topics such as ‘aspects of deixis’, ‘conversational implicatures’, ‘presuppositions’, ‘speech acts’, ‘discourse structure’, and so forth. Therefore, any attempt to define the term implies imposing boundaries on its scope on the one hand, and determining such boundaries with particular linguistic domains on the other (cf. Mey, 1989; Mey, 1994). What is beyond question in this connection is the necessary relationship between pragmatics and its nearest linguistic neighbour, viz. semantics, a relationship that can be perceived from terms like *semanticism* (pragmatics inside semantics), *pragmaticism* (semantics inside pragmatics), and *complementarism* (both complement each other) (see, for example, Leech, 1983). To avoid possible confusion and misunderstanding in this chapter, the general ‘pragmalinguistic’ definition of the canonical passive construction will essentially be considered from the point of view of language use and the way certain participants interact for the natural occurrence of this construction (see, also, Levinson, 1983). As such, the term will comprise both the semantic nature of notions such as Agent, Patient, Location, etc. and the logical relationships
between these notions. Accordingly, the general ‘pragmalinguistic’ definition of the canonical passive construction will address the two major types of this construction (viz. the so-called ‘personal passive’ and the so-called ‘impersonal passive’) for the provisional introduction of what will be called, the ‘personalised’ version of the impersonal passive. This general definition will be clearly stated at the end of chapter 2 (cf. section 2.4) and restated at the outset of chapter 4 (cf. section 4.1).

In chapter 3, the term ‘principle-based’ will refer to any sort of linguistic analysis that is in line with the generativist enterprise within its three phases, viz. the TGG model, the early version of the P&P model, and the later version of the P&P model. Accordingly, the two major types of the canonical passive construction (viz. the ‘personal passive’ and the ‘impersonal passive’) as well as the intermediary type provisionally introduced in chapter 2 (viz. the ‘personalised’ version of the impersonal passive) will be reconsidered for the arrival at the ‘dynamic-static’ dichotomy and its formal representation in the universal sense. In particular, within the treatment of the Pass (Passive) element as a functional category in its own right by some reference to the later version of the P&P model, this dichotomy (which indicates that the ‘dynamic passive’ and the ‘static passive’ are the only primary types of the canonical passive construction that exist both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically) will therefore be established in terms of the syntactic behaviour of the internal arguments required by the main lexical verb. That is, movement of at least one internal argument to subject position will give rise to ‘dynamic passivisation’, whereas retention of all the internal arguments in their base-positions will result in ‘static passivisation’. Again, this linguistic description of the canonical passive construction will be clearly stated at the end of chapter 3 (cf. section 3.4) and restated at the outset of chapter 4 (cf. section 4.1).

In chapter 4, the final chapter, the ‘frequency-based’ approach will account for the manner in which natural instances of the canonical passive construction recur in a given text in Arabic (its written form in particular) as well as in its English version or versions. For this reason,
the term ‘functional’ in the use of ‘functional dimension’ will be used throughout the chapter to simply indicate how a particular example of this construction in the intended Arabic text ‘functions’ (i.e. ‘is rendered’) in the English version or versions, and vice versa. This term should not be confused with the same term ‘functional’ in the use of ‘functional categories’ within the framework of the principle-based approach discussed in chapter 3 specifically. As discussed, the functional dimension of the canonical passive construction refers to its natural occurrence in either language and the way either type of this construction (viz. the ‘dynamic passive’ and the ‘static passive’) ‘functions’ both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically (cf. chapter 4, section, 4.1), whereas functional categories, being used in contrast with lexical categories in a more technical sense, are almost purely grammatical units which are defective in their lexical properties such as Agr (Agreement), Tns (Tense), Pass (Passive), etc. (cf. chapter 3, section 3.4).

[N. B.: All the semantic notions that interact for the natural occurrence of the canonical passive construction will be capitalised throughout as in Agent, Patient, Location, etc. This is to differentiate these notions from grammatical categories such as subject, object, etc. Likewise, all types of grammatical Cases (which are morphologically realised at the end of bare nominals, adjecitvals, and adverbials in Arabic but not in English) will also be capitalised throughout as in Nominative, Accusative, Genitive and Oblique. Capitalisation, in this case, will also apply to all the derivative forms of each of these Cases (e.g. Nominative (Adj/N), Nominatively (Adv), Nominativeness (N), Nominativise (V), Nominativisation (N), Nominativised (V/Adj), etc.).]
Chapter One

A MORPHOPHONOLOGICAL APPROACH

The passive morpheme that is incorporated into a given active verb normally brings about certain changes in the structural representation of this verb whose ‘resultative’ meaning, in turn, implies certain changes in the structural representation of the sentence. This chapter will be concerned with the former changes in two genetically unrelated languages, viz. the written variety of Arabic (Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA)) and English, whereas the latter changes will be discussed in the upcoming chapters. But the structure of the canonical passive verb in Arabic in particular cannot be fully accounted for without considering the structure of the active version which also presupposes an understanding of how the linguistic levels of morphology and phonology interact for its formation. For this reason, discussion of the general system of morphophonology in Arabic will occupy most of the chapter.

Section 1.1 of this chapter will offer some introductory remarks on the morphophonological structure of the active verb in the written variety of Arabic such as the relationship between the root and the set of derived stems it has the potential to generate. It will also show how the derived stems which exhibit certain verb-forms are symbolised algebraically in terms of a finite set of morphophonological patterns. Thus, the element that acts as a morphophonological base in Arabic as well as its ‘typological’ counterpart in English will be identified with particular reference to ten main verb-forms in the former language. Section 1.2 will consider the active morphophonology of the ten main verb-forms (i.e. their grammaticisation) and how they operate within a highly precise system in Arabic, where each example is accompanied by its equivalent in English. Stress will be placed on the salient lexical properties (morphophonological and semantic) of these ten main verb-forms to give an initial idea about the specific verb-forms which may or may not have access to canonical passivisation. Section 1.3, the final section, will discuss the passive morphophonology of the ten main verb-forms (i.e. their grammaticisation as well) in Arabic and the ‘typological’ counterpart of this system in English. It will also illustrate how the regularities and irregularities of this system are reflected in either language. The section will conclude with some notes on the crosslinguistic (i.e. parametric) variation between Arabic and English in the structural patterning of the passive verb for representing both lexical and nonlexical information.
1.1 Preliminary remarks

The linguistic components of morphology and phonology have always been associated with one another as a unified generative system in Arabic Grammatical Theory (which was enunciated in the Middle Ages), hence the provisional use of the umbrella term 'morphophonology' in this chapter (see, for example, Owens, 1988: 89f). Accordingly, the morphophonological structure of the active form of the verb in the written variety of Arabic, be it Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), is essentially determined by an intricate chain of different processes of vocalic and/or consonantal alteration (i.e. annexation, substitution and/or permutation). These different processes occur within a basic linguistic unit traditionally known as al-ʔasl 'the root' (literally, 'the origin') to give rise to one or more representations of a less basic linguistic unit traditionally known as al-faṣla 'the derived stem' (literally, 'the branch').

As an abstract element constituting the underlying lexical form of a given verb, or any other lexical category derived from it, the root contains the least possible number of segments for that particular category, normally three or four radicals with full consonantal values.\(^1\) The natural combination of these radicals assigns the main lexical information before they undergo processes of vocalic and/or consonantal alteration, whereas the occurrence of any of such processes is responsible for other nonlexical information, as will be seen presently. Thus, out of every three-radical root or four-radical root in Arabic, the processes of vocalic and/or consonantal alteration construct a finite set of derived stems. These derived stems operate within defined limits, and permit access to a potentially infinite number of lexical verbs, given

\(^1\) In the unmarked situation lexical verbs in Arabic derive from three-radical roots as in kataba 'to write', samiʔa 'to hear', sahula 'to be easy', and so on. Whereas in the marked situation lexical verbs derive from four-radical roots as in tarjama 'to translate', dahlaja 'to roll', zalzala 'to shake/rock', and so on. Given the constant vowel distribution in the latter verbs, the morphophonological pattern that governs them is similar to Form II of verbs deriving from three-radical roots, as will be seen in section 1.2 of this chapter.
the indefinitely large set of all possible roots in the language (or any other Semitic language, for that matter).

In Arabic Grammatical Theory, the derived stems being talked about (henceforth, 'the derivatives') are reduced to a finite set of morphophonological patterns or 'templates' traditionally known as *awza:n* 'rhythmic modules' or *bina*: 'structural modules', which are essentially based on those poetic devices such as *taf?i:la:t* 'feet' used in metric measures. This indicates that, in respect of a given three-radical root (see note 1), the finite set of morphophonological patterns are designated to act as 'rhythmic' or 'structural' criteria for representing a finite set of different derivatives which assign distinctive meanings but revolve around a single semantic axis, viz. the main lexical information assigned by the same root. As such, the three-radical root refers to the basic meaning of an activity, a condition, a quality, or a state, whose semantic ramifications can be configured by the set of derivatives that incorporate the same root. Some of these derivatives mark verbalisation [+V], whereas other derivatives mark nominalisation [+N].

Clearly, therefore, the derivatives of a given three-radical root that mark verbalisation [+V] establish the set of all possible verb-forms incorporating this root. For instance, the three-radical root *k-t-b-* carries lexical information which has to do with the basic meaning of an activity rather than a condition, a quality or a state (relating to the basic meaning of 'writing'). The verb-form *kataba*, which instantiates one of the three variants of Form I in the hierarchy of verb derivation, as will be discussed in the next section (section 1.2), has undergone a certain process of vocalic alteration, viz. the annexation of the short vowel -a after each radical within the short-vowel distribution -a-a-a. Given the basic meaning of the three-radical root *k-t-b-*, vocalic alteration has, in this case, resulted in the derivation of the verb-form *kataba*, thereby assigning a distinctive, but related, meaning on the basis of the main lexical information assigned by the root, namely 'wrote (3sm)'. The abbreviation (3sm) indicates here that the verb-form in question is inflected in accordance with the third-person-singular-
masculine pronominal *huwa* ‘he’ in order to act as a morphophonological base for the derivation of other verb-forms, as will be seen presently.

From the above example of the verb-form *kataba* ‘wrote (3sm)’ it can be seen that the three radicals *k-, t-, and b-* are combined via the specific short vowel distribution *-a-a-a* in order to generate one of the three variants of Form I as just mentioned. In Arabic Grammatical Theory, all lexical verbs which exhibit the same verb-form are symbolised algebraically in terms of constants and variables, and are therefore classified under a single morphophonological pattern. In our example, the elements of the short vowel distribution *-a-a-a* represent the constants, whereas the segments of the three-radical root *k-t-b-* represents the variables. Accordingly, the verb-form in question would be an instantiation of a morphophonological pattern commonly referred to as *fa?ila*, where the constants are *-a-a-a* and the variables are *f-?-l-*, with each segment of the latter ranging over all radicals with full consonantal values. This, again, is to symbolise algebraically one of the three variants of Form I, the other two variants being referred to as *fa?ila* and *fa?ula*, as will be discussed in the next section (section 1.2). For ease of exposition, the variables *f-?-l-* will be referred to as *X-Y-Z-* respectively in the algebraic sense.

Algebraic symbolisation means therefore that the morphophonological pattern *fa?ala* (that is, *XaYaZa*), for instance, is the canonical abstraction of all lexical verbs exhibiting the same pattern such as *kasara* ‘broke (3sm)’, *daraba* ‘hit (3sm)’, *jalasa* ‘sat (3sm)’, etc., where the three radicals in each lexical verb are combined via the same short vowel distribution. On this account, any set of lexical verbs which are identified with a given morphophonological pattern would reflect isomorphic and isophonic properties. The elements of the short vowel distribution that bring about such properties (*-a-a-a* in this case) are considered a single morpheme, sometimes called a ‘formative morpheme’, since it adds more information such as Tense features (the perfective aspect in this case) and Agreement features (Number, Person, and Gender) to the basic meaning of the three-radical root. This indicates that, in any lexical
verb in the unmarked situation in Arabic (see note 1), at least two morphemes are incorporated to specify its 'surface' realisation: first, the three-radical root which carries the main lexical information referred to above; and second, the formative morpheme which is responsible for nonlexical information such as Tense and Agreement features.

In the hierarchy of verb derivation lexical verbs exhibiting any of the three variants of Form I (viz. *XaYaZa*, *XaYiZa*, and *XaYuZa*) are actually instances of what is termed *al-mujarrad* 'the bare (verb)' in the sense that the three-radical root in each of such verbs is not affected by processes of vocalic and/or consonantal alteration other than the infixation of one of the three formative morphemes (viz. *-a-a-a*, *-a-i-a*, and *-a-u-a*). In this case, the bare verb may act as a morphophonological base for the derivation of other verb-forms (i.e. verb-forms other than Form I) incorporating the same three-radical root but different formative morphemes. Thus, lexical verbs exhibiting any verb-form other than the three variants of Form I would, in contrast, be instantiations of what is termed *al-mazi:d* 'the derivative (verb)' in the sense that the bare version of each of such verbs (i.e. its Form I) is affected by processes of vocalic and/or consonantal alteration other than the infixation of one of the three formative morphemes just mentioned.

Referring back to the example cited above, the bare verb *kataba* 'wrote (3sm)', which, as we have seen, is governed by the morphophonological pattern *XaYaZa* as one of the three variants of Form I, may also undergo a process of consonantal alteration such as gemination, whereby the second radical (−*t*− in this case) is doubled. This process would, therefore, give rise to the derivative verb *kattaba*, which assigns a further distinctive, but related, meaning on the basis of the main lexical information, namely, 'caused someone to write (3sm)'. Similarly, the

---

2 The term 'surface' will be preserved in this chapter to make further elaboration in the upcoming chapters (see chapter 3 specifically). In the meantime, it can be used to indicate the superficial properties of a given linguistic structure (a word or a sentence), which are observable on at least two external levels: first, the phonemic level in the spoken mode of language; and second, the graphemic level in the written mode. These two levels can therefore reveal the 'surface' realisation of the linguistic structure, or structures, being talked about.
resultant verb-form would be an instantiation of a morphophonological pattern commonly known as \( fa\mathcal{a}lala \) (i.e. \( XaYYaZa \)), where the constants in this case are \(-a-a-a\) and the variables are \( f2l \) (i.e. \( X-Y-Y-Z \)), with the two segments \( \mathcal{a} \) (i.e. \( YY \)) in the latter indicating two identical radicals with full consonantal values. This, again, is to symbolise algebraically the morphophonological pattern of Form I as the canonical abstraction of all lexical verbs exhibiting the same pattern such as \( kassara \) ‘smashed (3sm)’, \( dammara \) ‘destroyed (3sm)’, \( saddaqa \) ‘believed (3sm)’, and so on.

Moreover, the bare verb \( kataba \) ‘wrote (3sm)’ of Form I may also pass through a process of vocalic alteration such as the lengthening of the first short vowel to generate the derivative verb \( kaitaba \), thereby assigning a further distinctive, but related, meaning, viz. ‘corresponded with someone (3sm)’. Likewise, the resultant verb-form would be an instantiation of a morphophonological pattern commonly known as \( fa\mathcal{a}lala \) (i.e. \( Xa:YaZa \)), where the constants are \(-a:-a-a\) and the variables are \( f2l \) (i.e. \( X-Y-Z \)), with the first element \(-a:-\) in the former indicating a long vowel. This, again, is to symbolise algebraically the morphophonological pattern of Form III as the canonical abstraction of all lexical verbs exhibiting the same pattern such as \( kasa:ra \) ‘challenged (3sm)’, \( qa:bala \) ‘interviewed (3sm)’, \( ja:baha \) ‘confronted (3sm)’, and so forth. In consequence, a particular bare verb of Form I in Arabic can in principle generate as many derivative verbs, and therefore morphophonological patterns, as it passes through different processes of vocalic and/or consonantal alteration. As will be seen throughout, the formative morphemes which result from these processes represent one, or more, of the three types of affixes, viz. infixes, prefixes, and suffixes.

In such a perspective, it can be seen how the morphological and phonological aspects of the active verb in Arabic operate within a unified generative system, a statement that was referred to at the outset of this section. Thus, from a given three-radical root such as \( k-t-b- \) (relating to the basic meaning of ‘writing’) the bare verb \( kataba \) ‘wrote (3sm)’ is generated as one of the
three variants of Form I. The bare verb, in turn, functions as a morphophonological base for the generation of further distinctive derivative verbs such as *kattaba* ‘made someone write (3sm)’ (Form II), *ka:taba* ‘corresponded with someone (3sm)’ (Form III), and so on. Given that this generative system is in principle applicable to every three-radical root that exists in the language (Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA)), the finite set of verb-forms (the bare verb and the derivative verbs) are symbolised algebraically in terms of morphophonological patterns such as *fa?ala* (i.e. *XaYaZa*, Form I), *fa??ala* (i.e. *XaYYaZa*, Form II), *fa?:ala* (i.e. *Xa:YaZa*, Form III), and so forth. This is to configure the semantic ramifications of the main lexical information assigned by each three-radical root, and to maintain the nonlexical information that has to do with Tense and Agreement features for each verb-form.

Clearly, therefore, in Semitic languages such as Arabic, unlike the case of Germanic languages such as English, there exists no infinitive representation of the lexical verb that may serve as a morphophonological base for the inflection of other Tense or Aspect representations of that verb. Instead, in the unmarked situation the three-radical root, which, as we have seen, is associated with the basic meaning of a given activity, condition or state, passes through certain processes of vocalic and/or consonantal alteration to generate a finite set of verb-forms (the bare verb and the derivative verbs), and subsequently any other lexical categories.

Nevertheless, the infinitive exists in Arabic in the form of what is known as *al-muda:nZ al-mansu:b* ‘the imperfective subjunctive’, an imperfective representation that is subjunctivised by a functional category known as *an al-masdariyya* ‘the particle *an* of infinitiveness’. Both categories (i.e. the imperfective and the particle *an* that subjunctivises it) are semantically equated with an Accusative cognate substantive known as *al-masdar* ‘the verbal nominal’ (literally, ‘the source’), a nominal that is derived from the same root incorporated into its verbal representation (e.g. *kataba* ‘wrote (3sm)’ vs. *kita:bata* ‘writing [+N]’). Thus, both structures in (i) and (ii) below can be interpreted in terms of the English counterpart [to + infinitive] (see also note 5 below).

(i) a. ara:da an yaktuba. (Imperfective Subjunctive) (Gloss: wanted (3sm) to write (3sm))
   b. He wanted to write.

(ii) a. ara:da al-kita:bata. (Verbal Nominal)
   (Gloss: wanted (3sm) writing (Acc))
   (Lit.: He wanted writing.)
   b. He wanted to write.
incorporating the same three-radical root. Furthermore, the initial incorporation of the formative morpheme (or the complex of formative morphemes) in each of such verb-forms is responsible for a Tense representation collectively referred to as al-ma:di: ‘the perfective’, sometimes called ‘the preterite’, a representation that is inflected in accordance with the third-person-singular-masculine pronominal huwa ‘he’, as seen. The purpose is to maintain the same Tense representation, whilst at the same time acting as an inflectional base for the incorporation of other Agreement features such as Number, Person, and Gender.4

This indicates that the perfective representation of the generated verb-form in Arabic, which is similar to, but not exactly congruent with, the simple past form of the equivalent verb in English, can in turn operate as a morphophonological base for the inflection of several distinctive representations such as the imperfective and the imperative, with the former including the indicative, the subjunctive and the jussive (a matter that is not to be dealt with in the current study). Thus, like the three-radical root which gives rise to a finite set of verb-forms (the bare verb and the derivative verbs), the perfective representation of each of such verb-forms passes through other processes of vocalic and/or consonantal alteration to yield the other representations just mentioned. For instance, within the generation of any verb-form in

\footnote{It is worth mentioning here that since Tense and Agreement features are incorporated into the ‘surface’ realisation of the verb along with the main lexical information assigned by the three-radical root, the verb-form in Arabic (perfective or imperfective) may act as an ‘autonomous predicate’ in the sense that it is syntactically independent of the subject. For this reason, Arabic is classified as one of the pro-drop languages. Thus, in each Arabic inflectional form in (i) below the subject is already implied in contrast to the English counterpart.}

(i)  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>katabtu ‘wrote (1s)’ vs. I wrote (first-person-singular)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>katabna ‘wrote (1pl)’ vs. We wrote (first-person-plural)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>katabta ‘wrote (2sm)’ vs. You wrote (second-person-singular-masculine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>katabti ‘wrote (2sf)’ vs. You wrote (second-person-singular-feminine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>katabtuna ‘wrote (2du)’ vs. You wrote (second-person-dual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>katabtum ‘wrote (2plm)’ vs. You wrote (second-person-plural-masculine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>katabtunna ‘wrote (2plf)’ vs. You wrote (second-person-plural-feminine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>kataba ‘wrote (3sm)’ vs. He wrote (third-person-singular-masculine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>katabat ‘wrote (3sf)’ vs. She wrote (third-person-singular-feminine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>kataba ‘wrote (3dum)’ vs. They wrote (third-person-dual-masculine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>katabata ‘wrote (3duf)’ vs. They wrote (third-person-dual-feminine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>katabtu ‘wrote (3plm)’ vs. They wrote (third-person-plural-masculine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>katabna ‘wrote (3plf)’ vs. They wrote (third-person-plural-feminine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arabic such as (1 a-c) below the perfective representation (PR) creates an inflectional basis for the imperfective representation (IR).

(1) a. Form I: *kataba* ‘wrote (3sm)’ (PR); *yaktuba* ‘write (3sm)’ (IR)
   b. Form II: *kattaba* ‘made write (3sm)’ (PR); *yukattibu* ‘make write (3sm)’ (IR)
   c. Form III: *ka:taba* ‘corresponded (3sm)’ (PR); *yuka:tibu* ‘correspond (3sm)’ (IR)

It now becomes evident that while in Arabic the perfective representation of a generated verb-form acts as a morphophonological base for the inflection of other representations, in English it is the infinitive representation that is taken as this base (e.g. *to write* (Infinitive); *he wrote* (Past); *he writes* (Present); etc.). Given that the bare verb of Form I in Arabic is directly derived from the three-radical root in the unmarked situation, and that the former in turn operates as a morphophonological base for the generation of other verb-forms, it appears that both the three-radical root in Arabic and the infinitive representation in English converge typologically in establishing the underlying lexical form of the lexical verb, a form that is taken as the derivational and inflectional base itself. This means that a three-radical root in Arabic such as *k-t-b-* would, in principle, be the typological counterpart of the infinitive representation *write* in English. For ease of exposition, the perfective representation of the Arabic verb-form in question, *kataba* in this case (cf. (1a)), will be taken as the ‘typological’ equivalent of the English counterpart when it incorporates the particle of infinitiveness *to* as in ‘to write’.  

As we have seen, all lexical verbs in the written variety of Arabic, Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), are reduced to a finite set of morphophonological patterns, which are identified in terms of constants (the formative morphemes) and variables (the three-radical

---

5 Notice that, in examples (i) and (ii) in note 3, either the imperfective subjunctive *an yaktaba* in (ia) or the verbal nominal *al-kita:bata* in (iia) may be the crosslinguistic equivalent of the English infinitive *to write* in (ib) and (iib). Yet, unlike the Arabic perfective *kataba* ‘wrote (3sm)’ and the English infinitive ‘to write’, the imperfective subjunctive *an yaktaba* does not operate as a morphophonological base for stem derivation, since the general order of this derivation in Arabic is as follows:

(i) a. The three- or four-radical root,
b. The verbal nominal (i.e. the source),
c. The perfective representation,
d. The imperfective representation,
e. The imperative representation, etc.
roots). This is to symbolise algebraically the possible distinctive verb-forms (the bare verb and the derivative verbs) that a given three-radical root generates by means of certain processes of vocalic and/or consonantal alteration. As a derivational and inflectional base, the ‘surface’ representation of each verb-form is considered to be the active perfective, whereby the lexical verb in question is inflected in accordance with the third-person-singular-masculine pronominal *huwa* ‘he’ (hence its ‘typological’ counterpart in English, viz. the infinitive representation). It follows that there exist in the written variety of Arabic at least fifteen main verb-forms, of which the three variants of Form I represent the bare verbs and the remaining fourteen (Form II to Form XV) represent the derivative verbs. These fifteen main verb-forms are illustrated in terms of the morphophonological patterns that govern them as in (2) below (see, for example, Bulos, 1965; Wright, 1967), where each pattern is followed by its algebraic representation.

(2)  
   a. Form I:  faʔala (XaYaZa)/faʔila (XaYiZa)/faʔula (XaYuZa)  
   b. Form II:  faʔaala (XaYYaZa)  
   c. Form III:  faʔala (Xa:YaZa)  
   d. Form IV:  afala (aXYaZa)  
   e. Form V:  taʔala (taXaYYaZa)  
   f. Form VI:  taʔala (taXa:YaZa)  
   g. Form VII:  infaʔala (inXaYaZa)  
   h. Form VIII:  iftaʔala (iXtaYaZa)  
   i. Form IX:  ifʔalla (iXYaZZa)  
   j. Form X:  istafʔala (istaXYaZa)  
   k. Form XI:  ifʔa:lla (iXYa:ZZa)  
   l. Form XII:  ifʔawʔala (iXYawYaZa)  
   m. Form XIII:  ifʔawwalala (iXYawwaZa)  
   n. Form XIV:  ifʔanlala (iXYanZaZa)  
   o. Form XV:  ifʔanla: (iXYanZa:)  

As is well known, however, the last five of the these fifteen main verb-forms (Form XI to Form XV in (2 k-o)) are extremely rare in the actual use of the written variety of Arabic, in even the most elevated style of the language such as the Koran (cf. chapter 4). For this reason, only the first ten of these fifteen main verb-forms (Form I to Form X in (2 a-j)) will be considered in the next section of this chapter (cf. section 1.2) as a preliminary to a detailed comparative study of the canonical passive construction in Arabic and English in the upcoming chapters. Since the present study deals exclusively with written Arabic as the
second' variety of the language (the 'first' variety being spoken Arabic), the canonical passive construction in the former variety will be restricted to its verbal instantiations that are essentially derived from the passivisable 'surface' representations of the ten main verb-forms in (2 a-j), as will be seen later in this chapter (cf. section 1.3).

One final point to be made here concerns the derivational relationship between the set of all possible three-radical roots in the unmarked situation in Arabic and the ten main verb-forms intended in the current study (cf. (2 a-j)). Although this relationship would, in principle, establish a recursive cycle (that is, each three-radical root would have direct access to each morphophonological pattern), not every derived verb-form is actually used in the written variety of Arabic. As Bulos points out: "Certain forms, though theoretically possible in respect of certain verbs, have either dropped out of use, or were never used at all" (Bulos, 1965:13). Thus, certain three-radical roots have access to only one morphophonological pattern (e.g. b-k-s- in bakasa 'to reduce/lessen' (Form I)); others have access to two morphophonological patterns (e.g. b-k-r- in bakkara 'to vaporise' (Form II) and tabakkara 'to evaporate' (Form V)); and so forth. Yet, no three-radical root would have direct access to each of the ten main verb-forms illustrated in (2 a-j), a fact that holds for even those three-radical roots which occur with considerable frequency such as k-t-b- in (3) below, where Form V and Form IX do not apply.

(3) a. Form I: kataba 'to write (down)/note down'
   b. Form II: kattaba 'to make someone write'
   c. Form III: kataba 'to correspond with someone'
   d. Form IV: aktaba 'to dictate to someone'
   e. Form V: takattaba
   f. Form VI: taka:taba 'to write to each other'
   g. Form VII: inkataba 'to subscribe to something'
   h. Form VIII: iktataba 'to copy/be registered'
   i. Form IX: *uktaba
   j. Form X: istaktaba 'to ask someone to write'

---

6 It has been argued that native speakers of Arabic are historically confronted with at least two distinctive, but 'diglossically' related, varieties of their mother tongue: first, the Colloquial variety which they have been exposed to during the language acquisition period; and second, the Classical variety whose modern extension, Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), is used as a standard written form all over the Arabic-speaking world (cf. El-Marzouk, 1993:30).
Having considered the salient morphophonological properties of the lexical verb in Arabic as well as its ‘typological’ counterpart in English in this section, the active morphophonology of each of the ten main verb-forms cited in (2 a-j) (i.e. its grammaticisation) will be discussed and exemplified in the next section (section 1.2). This account will later be taken as a preliminary to a detailed analysis of the system of passive morphophonology in Arabic (i.e. its grammaticisation) and its ‘typological’ counterpart in English, as will be seen in the final section (section 1.3). Notice that, for any example of the perfective representation in Arabic, the ‘typological’ counterpart in English will be taken as a corresponding example of the infinitive representation.

1.2 Active morphophonology

Given the workings of the morphological and phonological components within a unified generative system in the written variety of Arabic (Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA)), the morphophonological structure of the canonical passive verb in this language cannot be fully understood without considering the morphophonological structure of the active version, as mentioned at the outset of this chapter. This is because the passive morpheme or morphemes in any language instantiating the canonical passive construction tend to be systematically attached to the active verb, not any other lexical category. As we proceed in this section, the morphophonological structure of the active verb in the written variety of Arabic will be discussed with reference to the ten main verb-forms cited in (2 a-j), where each example will be accompanied by its ‘typological’ counterpart in English. Emphasis will also be placed on the salient lexical properties (i.e. morphophonological and semantic) of these ten main verb-forms in order to give an initial picture about the specific verb-forms which may or may not have direct access to canonical passivisation. These ten main verb-forms may be classified in accordance with the morphophonological patterns that govern them in the
following way. From now on reference will be confined to the algebraic representations of these patterns.

**Form I: XaYaZa/XaYiZa/XaYuZa**

As mentioned in the preceding section, there exist in Arabic three variants of Form I, which are symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological patterns XaYaZa, XaYiZa, and XaYuZa. These three variants, therefore, establish the canonical abstractions of all bare verbs incorporating three-radical roots in the unmarked situation (see also note 1), whereas derivative verbs are instantiations of any other morphophonological patterns (i.e. Form II onward), as will be seen presently. This indicates that a given lexical verb of Form I is in fact a bare verb resulting from the infixation of any of the three formative morphemes (viz. -a-a-a, -a-i-a, and -a-u-a) into the three-radical root, where the difference lies in the second short vowel that governs the second radical.

Concerning the first variant of Form I, XaYaZa, lexical verbs of this variant are either transitive (i.e. requiring a single direct object) or ditransitive (i.e. requiring two objects) in the unmarked situation as in (4 a-b) and (4 c-d) below, respectively. Whereas, in the marked situation, a few verbs of the same variant are intransitive in nature (i.e. requiring no direct object) as in (5 a-d) below:

**(4)**

| a. | *kataba* 'to write (down)/note down' |
| b. | *kasara* 'to break/shatter/fracture' |
| c. | *sa?ala* 'to ask/demand/consult' |
| d. | *manaha* 'to grant/award/accord' |

**(5)**

| a. | *thahaba* 'to go/travel' |
| b. | *rakada* 'to run (away)' |
| c. | *ra?ada* 'to rest/sleep' |
| d. | *qa?ada* 'to sit (down)' |

In respect of the second variant of Form I, XaYiZa, lexical verbs of this variant are intransitive in the unmarked situation, since they normally express transient states, conditions, or qualities rather than processes towards activities as in (6 a-d) below. In the marked situation, on the
other hand, a few verbs of the same variant may be transitive and/or intransitive in nature as in
(7 a-d) below:

(6)  
   a.  **fariha** 'to become glad'
   b.  **hazina** 'to become sad'
   c.  **sa?ima** 'to be bored'
   d.  **kabira** 'to grow old'

(7)  
   a.  **$ariba** 'to drink'
   b.  **$ahida** 'to witness/be present'
   c.  **sami?a** 'to hear/be told'
   d.  **?alima** 'to know/be cognizant'

With regard to the third variant of Form I, **XaYuZa**, all lexical verbs of this variant are
intransitive in nature. Thus, like the unmarked case of the second variant as in (6) above,
lexical verbs of the third variant usually indicate permanent or temporary states, conditions, or
qualities rather than processes towards activities as in (8 a-d) below. Notice the coincidence
of the three-radical root \( k-b-r \) in (6d) and (8d).

(8)  
   a.  **yam w /a'to become beautiful’
   b.  **sahula** 'to become easy'
   c.  **sa?uba** 'to become difficult'
   d.  **kabura** 'to become big'

It should be noted, here, that the infixation of any of the three formative morphemes 
-\( a-a-a \),
-\( a-i-a \), and -\( a-u-a \) into the three-radical root would be an indication of the regular system of
active morphophonology in the written variety of Arabic, where each of the three radicals has
a full consonantal value. If, however, the second and third radicals of the bare verb are
identical, or if either the second or the third radical is phonetically realised as the long vowel
-\( a-:- \), then the structure of the formative morpheme (or the complex of formative morphemes)
would be affected, and therefore irregularities would be expected. By the same token,
regularities and irregularities also exhibit themselves in the system of passive
morphophonology in Arabic, as will be seen in the next section (section 1.3).

**Form II: XaYYaZa**

As mentioned in the previous section, Form II is derived from the bare representation of Form
I, **XaYaZa**, through the application of a process of gemination to the latter, whereby the second
radical is doubled. Thus, the derivative representation of Form II is symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological pattern $XaYYaZa$, a pattern that also governs bare verbs incorporating four-radical roots, but the second and third radicals are not identical (see note 1). Notice, here, that the second short vowel which governs the geminated radical in Form II is constantly realised as the short -a-, even though the same vowel differs in the three variants of Form I, viz. -a-, -i-, and -u-. Form II is characterised by four main properties, which may be summarised as follows:

The first property, which seems to be the most prominent one, is that the geminated radical in Form II marks the notion of causativisation (i.e. it increases the magnitude of transitivity). Thus, certain bare verbs which are intransitive in Form I become transitive in Form II as in (9) below, and other bare verbs which are transitive in Form I become ditransitive in Form II as in (10) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. fariha 'to be glad'</td>
<td>a’. farraha 'to gladden'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. hazina 'to be sad'</td>
<td>b’. hazzana ‘to saddened’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. jamula ‘to be beautiful’</td>
<td>c’. jammala ‘to beautify’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cf. (6) and (8) above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. kataba ‘to write’</td>
<td>a’. kattaba ‘to cause someone to write’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. samnia ‘to hear’</td>
<td>b’. samma?a ‘to make someone hear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ?alima ‘to know’</td>
<td>c’. ?allama ‘to teach’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cf. (4) and (7) above)

The second property of Form II is that, in relation to certain instances of kinetic verbs in particular, the geminated radical denotes the notion of intensification. That is, the derivative verb in Form II intensifies the process towards the activity portrayed by the bare kinetic verb in Form I as in (11) below. Notice that -th- in (11 c-c’) is considered a single radical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. kasara ‘to break’</td>
<td>a’. kassara ‘to smash’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. qaja‘a ‘to cut’</td>
<td>b’. qatta‘a ‘to cut up’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. thalama ‘to blunt’</td>
<td>c’. thallama ‘to overblunt’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cf. (4b) above)

The third property of Form II is that, in relation to certain instances of premeditative verbs in particular, the geminated radical denotes the notions of qualitative evaluation or assessment,
notions which are lacking in the bare counterparts of these verbs in Form I as in (12) below.

Notice that -th- in (12 b-b') is considered a single radical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. sadaqa ‘to tell the truth’</td>
<td>a’. sadaqa ‘to believe’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. kathaba ‘to tell lies’</td>
<td>b’. kathhaba ‘to disbelieve’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. qadara ‘to decide/ordain’</td>
<td>c’. qaddara ‘to estimate’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth and final property of Form II refers to an exceptional situation, where certain derivative verbs of Form II seem to derive directly from their cognate nominals as nominalisation markers [+N] rather than from any existing bare verbs of Form I as verbalisation markers [+V] as in (13) below. Notice that -y- in (13 a-a’) and -w- in (13 b-b’) are considered radicals with full consonantal values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognate [+N]</th>
<th>Form II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. kaymah ‘tent’</td>
<td>a’. kayyma ‘to camp’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. tawr ‘phase’</td>
<td>b’. tawwara ‘to develop’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. sila:h ‘weapon’</td>
<td>c’. salla:ha ‘to arm’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form III: Xa:Ya Za**

As mentioned in the preceding section, Form III is derived from the bare representation of Form I, XaYaZa, through the application of a process of vocalic alteration to the latter, whereby the first short vowel is lengthened. Thus, the derivative representation of Form III is symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological pattern Xa:YaZa, a pattern which incorporates a distinctive complex of formative morphemes as a result of short-vowel lengthening, viz. -a:-a-a. Notice, again, that the second vowel in Form III is always realised as the short -a-, even though it differs in the three variants of Form I, viz. -a-, -i-, and -u-. The principal properties of Form III may be explained as follows:

In the unmarked situation, the most prominent property of derivative verbs in Form III is that the lengthened short vowel denotes the notion of reciprocity between two participants, a notion that characterises the process towards the activity portrayed by the bare verb in Form I.

For example:
Form I
(14)  
| a. | kataba ‘to write’    |
| b. | qatala ‘to kill’    |
| c. | sabqa ‘to precede’  |
| d. | ?amila ‘to do’    |

Form III
(14)  
| a’. | ka:taba ‘to correspond’ |
| b’. | qa:tala ‘to fight’ |
| c’. | sa:baqa ‘to compete’ |
| d’. | ?a:mala ‘to deal’ |

Given the notion of reciprocity, the lengthened short vowel in Form III may also mark the notion of causativisation in respect of certain instances of stative verbs. Thus, like the case of Form II (cf. (9) above), the derivative representation in Form III transitivises the bare counterpart in Form I, which is intransitive in nature. For example:

Form I
(15)  
| a. | jamula ‘to be beautiful’ |
| b. | karuma ‘to be magnanimous’ |
| c. | ba?uda ‘to be far away’ |
| d. | garuba ‘to be near’ |

Form III
(15)  
| a’. | ja:mala ‘to compliment’ |
| b’. | ka:runa ‘to meet reverentially’ |
| c’. | ba:za:da ‘to separate’ |
| d’. | qa:rabu ‘to approximate’ |

In the marked situation, on the other hand, the notion of reciprocity referred to above cannot be perceived in certain derivative verbs of Form III as in (16) below. Notice that, in this situation, the lexical meaning of the derivative verb in Form III may diverge considerably from the basic meaning of the three-radical root which is incorporated into the bare verb of Form I. For example:

Form I
(16)  
| a. | balaga ‘to reach’ |
| b. | thabara ‘to destroy’ |
| c. | safara ‘to unveil’ |
| d. | marasa ‘to soak’ |

Form III
(16)  
| a’. | ba:la:ga ‘to exaggerate’ |
| b’. | tha:bara ‘to persevere’ |
| c’. | sa:fa:ra ‘to travel’ |
| d’. | ma:ra:sa ‘to exercise’ |

**Form IV: aXYaZa**

Form IV is derived from the bare representation of Form I, XaYaZa, via the prefixation of a radical with a full consonantal value known as *hamzah* ‘glottal stop’ (transliterated as ?-) to the latter, thereby absorbing the first short vowel due to its epenthetic nature. Thus, the derivative representation of Form IV is symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological pattern ?aXYaZa, which incorporates the complex of formative morphemes ?a--a-a, but whose prefixed radical ?- is usually dropped in initial position as in aXYaZa (cf. El-Marzouk, 1993:39f). Notice that, like the case of Form II and Form III discussed above, the second vowel in Form IV is constantly realised as the short -a- though it
differs in the three variants of Form I, viz. -a-, -i-, and -u-. The outstanding properties of Form IV may be characterised as follows:

In the unmarked situation, the most prominent property of derivative verbs in Form IV is that the prefixed radical marks the notion of causativisation. Thus, like the case of Form II (cf. (9-10)), the derivative representation in Form IV transitivises the intransitive bare counterpart in Form I as in (17) below (cf. also Form III, (15)), and ditransitivises the transitive bare counterpart in Form I as in (18) below. Notice that the derivative verb *aathaya* in (17c') is phonetically realised as *a:tha:*. Notice, also, that the derivative verb *a?lama* in (18c') can also be used tritransitively, a matter that is beyond the scope of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. jalasa ‘to sit’</td>
<td>a’. <em>aflasa</em> ‘to seat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. hasuna ‘to be nice’</td>
<td>b’. ahmana ‘to do well’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <em>athiya</em> ‘to be hurt’</td>
<td>c’. <em>aathaya</em> [a:tha:] ‘to hurt’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. kataba ‘to write’</td>
<td>a’. aktaba ‘to dictate to someone’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>samia</em> ‘to hear’</td>
<td>b’. asma?a ‘to let someone hear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <em>alima</em> ‘to know’</td>
<td>c’. a?lama ‘to inform’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the marked situation, on the other hand, certain derivative verbs of Form IV are more likely to be used as Accusativising their cognate nominals, which mark nominalisation [+N], than any existing bare verbs of Form I, which mark verbalisation [+V] (cf. Form II, (13)). In this marked situation, the notion of causativisation referred to above can hardly be perceived. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognate [+N]</th>
<th>Form IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <em>thamar</em> ‘fruit’</td>
<td>a’. athmara ‘to bear fruit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>waraq</em> ‘leaves’</td>
<td>b’. awraqa ‘to (be in) leaf’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. matar ‘rain’</td>
<td>c’. amtara ‘to rain’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form V: taXaYYaZa**

Form V is directly derived from the derivative representation of Form II, *XaYYaZa*, via the prefixation of an extra formative morpheme, *ta-*, to the latter. Thus, the derivative representation of Form V is symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological
pattern \( taXaYyaZa \), a pattern which incorporates the distinctive complex of formative morphemes \( ta-a-a-a \), with the prefixed morpheme \( ta- \) marking reflexivisation. For this reason, Form V is traditionally identified as \( al-fi?l al-muta:wi? \) 'the reflexive intransitiviser' in the sense that it generally nullifies the notion of causativisation marked by the geminated radical in Form II. The principal properties of Form V may be adumbrated as follows:

In the unmarked situation, derivative verbs in Form V normally reflexivise their transitive counterparts in Form II as in (20) below. Notice that the reflexive verbs in Arabic are usually rendered into passivised verbs in English due to the more restricted distribution of reflexive use in the latter (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3). Yet the reflexive marker \( ta- \) in (20 a’-c’) can be approximated more closely in languages such as French via the reflexive pronominal \( se \) (e.g. \( s'embr?lir \) ‘to embellish oneself’, \( s'etonner \) ‘to be astonished’, \( se \text{ casser en morceaux} \) ‘to be broken into pieces’, etc.).

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Form II} & \text{Form V} \\
(20) & \\
a. \text{ jam'ala} ‘\text{to beautify}’ & a'. \text{ tajammala} ‘\text{to be adorned}’ \\
b. \text{ 'ajjaba} ‘\text{to amaze}’ & b'. \text{ ta'ajjaba} ‘\text{to be amazed}’ \\
c. \text{ kassara} ‘\text{to smash}’ & c'. \text{ takassara} ‘\text{to be smashed}’
\end{array}
\]

In addition to the notion of reflexivisation, certain derivative verbs in Form V seem to exhibit the resultative versions of their derivative counterparts in Form II as in (21) below; whereas other derivative verbs in Form V may also indicate notions such as adoption of a creed, representation of a practice, and performance of a quality as in (22a’), (22b’), and (22c’) below, respectively.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Form II} & \text{Form V} \\
(21) & \\
a. \text{ addaba} ‘\text{to discipline}’ & a'. \text{ ta'addaba} ‘\text{to be polite}’ \\
b. \text{ 'allama} ‘\text{to teach}’ & b'. \text{ ta'allama} ‘\text{to learn}’ \\
c. \text{ maddana} ‘\text{to civilise}’ & c'. \text{ tamaddana} ‘\text{to be civilised}’
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Form II} & \text{Form V} \\
(22) & \\
a. \text{ nasara} ‘\text{to Christianise}’ & a'. \text{ tanasara} ‘\text{to become a Christian}’ \\
b. \text{ marrana} ‘\text{to train}’ & b'. \text{ tamarrana} ‘\text{to be trained}’ \\
c. \text{ kabbara} ‘\text{to make great(er)}’ & c'. \text{ takabbara} ‘\text{to be haughty}’
\end{array}
\]

In the marked situation, however, certain derivative verbs in Form V do not seem to denote the notion of reflexivisation, but rather continuation or succession of the processes towards the
activities portrayed by the bare verbs in Form I as in (23) below. Furthermore, other
derivative verbs in Form V appear to derive from cognate nominals as nominalisation markers
\([+N]\) through Form II rather than from any existing bare verbs in Form I as verbalisation
markers \([+V]\) as in (24) below (cf. Form II, (13); Form IV, (19)).

Form I

(23) a. jara?\(\_\)a ‘to drink’  
b. tabi?\(\_\)a ‘to follow’  
c. sami?\(\_\)a ‘to listen’

Form V

a’. tajarra?\(\_\)a ‘to drink in sips’  
b’. tatabba?\(\_\)a ‘to follow step by step’  
c’. tasamma?\(\_\)a ‘to listen attentively’

Cognate \([+N]\)

(24) a. bahr ‘sea/metre’  
b. hizb ‘group/party’  
c. wardah ‘rose/flower’

Form V

a’. tabahhara ‘to be well-versed’  
b’. tahazzaba ‘to take sides’  
c’. tawarrada ‘to be red/rosy’

Form VI: taXa:YaZa

Form VI is directly derived from the derivative representation of Form III, Xa:YaZa, via the
prefixation of an extra formative morpheme, ta-, to the latter. Accordingly, the derivative
representation of Form VI is symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological
pattern taXa:YaZa, which incorporates the complex of formative morphemes ta-a:-a-a, with
the prefixed morpheme ta- marking reflexivisation, as discussed above. Hence, like the case
of Form V with respect to Form II, Form VI is generally identified as the ‘reflexive
intransitiviser’ of Form III. The outstanding properties of Form VI may be summarised as
follows:

Similarly, in the unmarked situation, derivative verbs in Form VI normally reflexivise their
transitive counterparts in Form III as in (25) below. Notice, also, that the reflexivised verbs in
Arabic as in (25 a’-c’) are usually rendered into either passivised or intransitivised verbs in
English due to the more restricted distribution of reflexive use in the latter language as
mentioned above (cf. Form V, (20)).

Form III

(25) a. ba:raka ‘to bless’  
b. ma:zaja ‘to intermix’  
c. wa:zana ‘to balance’

Form VI

a’. taba:raka ‘to be blessed’  
b’. tama:zaja ‘to (be) intermix(ed)’  
c’. tawa:zana ‘to (be) balance(d)’
Furthermore, in addition to the notion of reflexivisation, certain derivative verbs in Form VI
may indicate positive or negative gradualness of the processes towards the activities portrayed
by their derivative counterparts in Form III as in (26) below; whereas other derivative verbs in
Form VI do not seem to imply this gradualness as in (27) below. Notice that the latter
examples do not have derivative counterparts in Form III. Notice, also, that -Th- in (27 a-a') is
considered a single radical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form III</th>
<th>Form VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. fa:gama ‘to aggravate’</td>
<td>a’. tafa:qama ‘to be aggravated’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. za:yada ‘to increase (tr.)’</td>
<td>b’. taza:yada ‘to increase gradually’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. na:qaqa ‘to decrease (tr.)’</td>
<td>c’. tana:qaqa ‘to decrease gradually’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form III</th>
<th>Form VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. *?a:Thama</td>
<td>a’. ta?a:Thama ‘to be great’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. *sa:gara</td>
<td>b’. tasa:gara ‘to be servile’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. *ha:mala</td>
<td>c’. taha:mala ‘to be prejudiced’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recall that, in the unmarked property, derivative verbs in Form III normally denote a
reciprocal activity between two participants (cf. Form III, (14-15)). In certain derivative verbs
in Form VI, the notion of reciprocity is even obligatory, for which reason these derivative
verbs are necessarily inflected in accordance with either the dual (du) or the plural (pl)
pronominal (see also note 4). For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. taka:taba: (3dum); taka:tabu: (3plm) ‘to exchange letters’</td>
<td>a’. taja:taba: ‘to affect ignorance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. taba:hatha: (3dum); taba:hathu: (3plm) ‘to discuss/confer’</td>
<td>b’. taja:hatha: ‘to affect ignorance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. taqa:tala: (3dum); taqa:talu: (3plm) ‘to fight/combat’</td>
<td>c’. taja:talu: ‘to affect ignorance’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the marked situation, however, certain derivative verbs in Form VI do not seem to denote
the notion of reflexivisation, but rather a pretence of the states or conditions portrayed by the
bare verbs in Form I as in (29) below. Furthermore, other derivative verbs in Form VI appear
to derive from cognate nominals as nominalisation markers [+N] through Form III rather than
from any existing bare verbs in Form I marking verbalisation [+V] as in (30) below (cf. Form
II, (13); Form IV, (19); Form V, (23)). Notice that the verb ma:ta ‘to die’ in (29c) is an
example of what is traditionally known as al-fi?l al-ajwaf ‘the hollow verb’, as will be
explained in the next section (cf. section 1.3, examples (49)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. jahila ‘to be ignorant’</td>
<td>a’. taja:hal ‘to affect ignorance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. marida ‘to be ill’</td>
<td>b’. tama:raga ‘to malingering’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form VII: inXaYaZa

Form VII is derived from the bare representation of Form I, XaYaZa, via the prefixation of an extra formative morpheme, in-, to the latter. Thus, the derivative representation of Form VII is symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological pattern inXaYaZa, which incorporates the complex of formative morphemes in-a-a-a, with the prefixed morpheme in- being a stronger reflexive marker than ta- in Form V and Form VI. For this reason, Form VII acts as a constant ‘reflexive intransitiviser’ of Form I in the sense discussed above. Notice that, unlike the epenthetic initial vowel a- in Form IV, the initial vowel i- in Form VII is usually assimilated to have a prothetic value; that is, the radical hamzah created by this vowel is not glottalised except for its occurrence in utterance initial position. The main properties of Form VII may be summarised as follows:

Given the strong reflexive marker in-, derivative verbs in Form VII would constantly reflexivise their transitive bare counterparts in Form I as in (31) below. For this reason, derivative verbs in Form VII can never be passivised in any context as there is a semantic relation between the notions of reflexivisation and passivisation, as will be seen later (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3).

7 In a traditional Arabic grammar, two types of the radical hamzah (transliterated as ?) are recognised. First, hamzat al-fasl/al-qatZ ‘hamza of glottalisation’ (literally, ‘disjunctive hamza’) which occurs in all utterance positions, and is therefore glottalised with a full consonantal value in these positions as in akala ‘to eat’, sa?ala ‘to ask’, bada?a ‘to begin’, and so on (see also Form IV aXYaZa where the initial vowel a- is epenthetic). Second, hamzat al-wasl ‘hamza of assimilation’ (literally, ‘conjunctive hamza’) which only occurs in utterance initial position, and is therefore assimilated whenever it is preceded by a vowel as in the case of the initial vowel i- in Form VII inXaYaZa or any other verb-form following it (i.e. Form VIII onward), where this vowel is prothetic in nature.
In a few exceptional cases, certain derivative verbs in Form VII seem to derive from their transitive derivative counterparts in Form IV rather than from any existing bare verbs in Form I. Still, however, a derivative verb of Form VII in such exceptional cases would strongly reflexivise its transitive derivative counterpart in Form IV (hence the nonpassivisability of the former). For example:

**Form VIII: \(iXtaYaZa\)**

Form VIII is derived from the bare representation of Form I, \(XaYaZa\), via both the prefixation of the formative morpheme \(i\)- to the latter and the infixation of the formative morpheme \(-t-\) between the first radical and the short vowel that follows it. Thus, the derivative representation of Form VIII is symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological pattern \(iXtaYaZa\), which incorporates the complex of formative morphemes \(i-ta-a-a\), with the infixed morpheme \(-t-\) marking some measure of reflexivisation (cf. the prefixed morpheme \(ta\)- in Form V and Form VI). Like the initial vowel \(i\)- in Form VII, the initial vowel \(i\)- in Form VIII is usually assimilated, and is therefore characterised by a prothetic nature (see note 7). The outstanding properties of Form VIII may be adumbrated as follows:

In some cases, derivative verbs in Form VIII tend to act as the ‘reflexive intransitivisers’ of their transitive bare counterparts in Form I as in (33) below. In other cases, there seems to be no difference in meaning between derivative verbs in Form VIII and the corresponding bare verbs in Form I as in (34) below.
Recall that derivative verbs in Form III normally indicate a reciprocal activity between two participants (cf. Form III, (14-15)). Like certain derivative verbs in Form VI which emphasise the process towards this activity (cf. Form VI, (28)), the notion of reciprocity is obligatory in certain derivative verbs in Form VIII. Hence, the latter are also necessarily inflected in accord with the dual (du) or plural (pl) pronominal. For example:

(35) a. istabaqa: (3dum); istabaqu: (3plm) 'to race/compete'
    b. iqtatala: (3dum); iqtatalu: (3plm) 'to fight/combat'
    c. iqtasama: (3dum); iqtasamu: (3plm) 'divide/share'

It is worth noting, here, that certain derivative verbs in Form VIII may undergo further processes of consonantal alteration, which are determined by the phonetic nature of the first radicals of the corresponding bare verbs in Form I. These processes may be summarised in the following four points:

Firstly, if either of the emphatic fricative ž- and the emphatic plosive d- occurs as the first radical of a bare verb in Form I, then the infixed -t- in the derivative verb in Form VIII is replaced by the emphatic plosive -t- for reasons which have to do with the process of pharyngealisation. For example:

(36) a. sahiba ‘to accompany’
    b. sabara ‘to be patient’
    c. daraba ‘to beat’

    a’. istalaba ‘to accompany’
    b’. istabara ‘to vie in patience’
    c’. idkaraba ‘to be agitated’

Secondly, if either of the dento-alveolar plosives t- and d- or the emphatic plosive t- occurs as the first radical of a bare verb in Form I, then the infixed -t- in the derivative verb in Form VIII parallels that radical in its phonetic features. As a consequence, a process of gemination with -tt-, -dd-, or -tt- applies. For example:
Thirdly, if the labio-velar semi-vowel w- occurs as the first radical of a bare verb in Form I, then this semi-vowel is assimilated into the infixed -t- in the derivative verb in Form VIII. As a result, a further dento-alveolar plosive, -t-, emerges, and therefore a process of gemination with -tt- also applies. For example:

Form I  Form VIII
(37)  a. tabiʔa ‘to follow’  a’. ʔittabaʔa ‘to follow/adopt’
b. ʔakahara ‘to keep/store’  b’. ʔiddakahara ‘to keep/store’
c. talaʔa ‘to come up/out’  c’. ʔitalaʔa ‘to view/be aware’

Fourthly, if the voiced dento-alveolar fricative z- occurs as the first radical of a bare verb in Form I, then the infixed -t- in the derivative verb in Form VIII, which is a voiceless dento-alveolar plosive, is articulated as the voiced dento-alveolar plosive -d- (cf. (37 b-b’) above). For example:

Form I  Form VIII
(38)  a. waʔala ‘to link/reach’  a’. ʔittagala ‘to be linked/contact’
b. waʔifiga ‘to be appropriate’  b’. ʔittafaqqa ‘to be in agreement’
c. waʔakala ‘to entrust/commission’  c’. ʔittakala ‘to rely/depend’

Form IX: iXYaZZa

Form IX is derived from the bare representation of Form I, XaYaZa, via both the prefixation of the formative morpheme i- to the latter and the gemination of the third radical -Z-, processes which result in the absorption of the first short vowel -a-. Accordingly, the derivative representation of Form IX is symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological pattern iXYaZZa, which incorporates the complex of formative morphemes i–a–a to strongly mark reflexivisation. For this reason, Form IX acts as a constant ‘reflexive intransitiviser’ of Form I (cf. Form VII). Notice that, like the initial vowel i- in Form VII and Form VIII, the initial vowel i- in Form IX is usually assimilated and is therefore characterised by a prothetic nature (see also note 7). The fundamental properties of Form IX may be summarised as follows:
Given the strong reflexive marker in the complex of formative morphemes "i--a--a", derivative verbs in Form IX would constantly reflexivise their intransitive bare counterparts in Form I. This indicates that neither derivative verbs in Form IX nor their intransitive bare counterparts in Form I can be passivised in any context as they normally indicate states of colours or qualities of defects as in (40) below. Notice that the bare verbs in Form I specifically are extremely rare in the actual use of written Arabic.

Form IX: istaXYaZa

Form X is directly derived from the derivative representation of Form IV, aXYaZa, via the prefixation of an extra formative morpheme, ist-, to the latter. Thus, the derivative representation of Form X is symbolised algebraically in terms of the morphophonological pattern istaXYaZa, which incorporates the complex of formative morphemes ista--a-a, with the prefixed morpheme ist- marking some measure of reflexivisation (see the infixed morpheme -t- in Form VIII for a similar marking). Notice that, like the initial vowel i- in Form VII, Form VIII and Form IX, the initial vowel i- in Form X is usually assimilated, and is therefore characterised by a prothetic nature (see also note 7). The outstanding properties of Form X may be adumbrated as follows:

Given the reflexive marker ist- in the complex of formative morphemes ista--a-a, certain derivative verbs in Form X tend to act as the ‘reflexive intransitivisers’ of their transitive derivative counterparts in Form IV as in (41) below. In most cases, the derivative verbs in Form X seem to semantically duplicate their intransitive bare counterparts in Form I. Compare, for instance, the bare verbs wasu2a ‘to be wide’ (Form I) and yaqliTha ‘to be awake’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form IX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. hamura ‘to redden (intr.)’</td>
<td>a’. imharra ‘to be red/blush’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. safura ‘to yellow (intr.)’</td>
<td>b’. ifarra ‘to be yellow/pale’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ?awija ‘to be crooked’</td>
<td>c’. i?wajja ‘to be crooked’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ?awira ‘to be one-eyed’</td>
<td>d’. i?warra ‘to be one-eyed’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Form I) with their derivative representations in Form X as in (41b’) and (41c’) respectively.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form IV</th>
<th>Form X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(41) a. <em>aslama</em> ‘to deliver (tr.)’</td>
<td>a’. <em>istaslama</em> ‘to surrender’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>awsa?a</em> ‘to widen (tr.)’</td>
<td>b’. <em>istawsa?a</em> ‘to widen (intr.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <em>ayqa?tha</em> ‘to awake (tr.)’</td>
<td>c’. <em>istayqa?tha</em> ‘to awake (intr.)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, certain derivative verbs in Form X may denote the notions of requesting, pleading, or obtaining, notions which identify the processes towards the activities portrayed by the bare counterparts in Form I. However, unlike the case of the reflexive intransitivisers in (41 a’-c’), derivative verbs in Form X such as these may take a direct object, and thus reflexivisation may not be implied. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(42) a. <em>kataba</em> ‘to write’</td>
<td>a’. <em>istiktaba</em> ‘to ask someone to write’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>athina</em> ‘to permit’</td>
<td>b’. <em>ista?thana</em> ‘to ask permission’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <em>kabura</em> ‘to know well’</td>
<td>c’. <em>istikbara</em> ‘to gather information’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, certain derivative verbs in Form X may indicate the notion of qualitative evaluation, a notion which identifies the states or conditions portrayed by the bare counterparts in Form I. In this case, the necessity of a direct object in transitivisation, as opposed to reflexivisation, is well perceivable. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(43) a. <em>jamula</em> ‘to be beautiful’</td>
<td>a’. <em>istajmala</em> ‘to regard as beautiful’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>sahula</em> ‘to be easy’</td>
<td>b’. <em>istashala</em> ‘to deem easy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <em>sa?uba</em> ‘to be difficult’</td>
<td>c’. <em>istas?aba</em> ‘to find difficult’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3 Passive morphophonology

Having discussed the salient morphophonological properties of each of the ten main verb-forms and its grammaticisation in the written variety of Arabic, Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), it can be seen how the three-radical root, which is responsible for the underlying lexical information, leads to the generation of its derived stems (the bare verb and the finite set of derivative verbs) within a highly precise system of active morphophonology.
Given the constants and variables that are represented in the morphophonological pattern of each verb-form, such a system is similar in spirit to that branch of mathematics which often conjures up apprehension in people, viz. algebra.

As an extremely ‘inflectional’ or ‘fusional’ language, Arabic requires that certain bound morphemes be incorporated into the three-radical root in the unmarked situation (see note 1) for the generation of bare verbs of Form I, as in the infixation of the formative morpheme -a-a-a into the three-radical root k-t-b- to yield kataba ‘to write’ (the first variant of Form I, XaYaZa). Furthermore, Arabic also requires that other bound morphemes (or complexes of bound morphemes) be affixed (i.e. prefixed, infixed and/or suffixed) to the resultant bare verb for the generation of derivative verbs of Form II onward, as in the duplication of the second radical -t- which results in its gemination -tt- to yield kattaba ‘to make someone write’ (Form II, XaYYaZa), the duplication of the first short vowel -a- which results in its lengthening -a:- to yield ka:taba ‘to correspond with someone’ (Form III, Xa:YaZa), and so forth.

Arabic, in such a perspective, stands in sharp contrast with ‘agglutinative’ or ‘agglomerative’ languages such as English which exhibits an entirely different distribution of verb-forms. In this latter language, the ‘typological’ counterpart of active morphophonology operates within a system where bound morphemes are affixed (i.e. prefixed and/or suffixed) to the inflectional base, the infinitive representation in this case, and are therefore maintained distinct from the root (the base itself). As a result, the root in the case of what is known as ‘weak verbs’ in the unmarked situation undergoes little or no change of shape in the process of combination (e.g. snare/ensnare (Present) vs. snared/ensnared (Past), permit (Present) vs. permitted (Past), etc.).

In the case of what is known as ‘strong verbs’ in the marked situation, on the other hand, the process of combination does not seem to reflect regular representations (e.g. write (Present) vs. wrote (Past), teach (Present) vs. taught (Past), hit (Present) vs. hit (Past), etc.), as will be seen presently.
Recall that the elements of the three-radical root in Arabic represent the variables and the elements which combine them represent the constants, the latter being the formative morpheme in the case of bare verbs or the complex of formative morphemes in the case of derivative verbs (cf. section 1.1). Since the elements of the three-radical root were traditionally designated as the three radicals $\text{-}f$, $\text{-}z$, and $\text{-}l$ in order to canonically abstract the morphophonological pattern of a given verb-form, and therefore all lexical verbs exhibiting this pattern, these elements can be identified with a set of three variables in the algebraic sense. For ease of exposition, the notation for this set will be taken as $(X,Y,Z)$ to stand for any three-radical root in the language, where $X$ stands for the first radical, $Y$ for the second radical, and $Z$ for the third radical. On this account, the morphophonological pattern $\text{fa?ala}$ will be symbolised as $XaYaZa$, the morphophonological pattern $\text{fa??ala}$ as $XaYYaZa$, and so on. Thus, the algebraic ‘modules’ of the ten main verb-forms are listed in (44).

(44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$XaYaZa/XaYiZa/XaYuZa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$XaYYaZa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$XaYaZa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$aXYaZa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$taXaYYaZa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>$taXa:YaZa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>$inXaYaZa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>$iXtaYaZa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>$iXYaZZa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>$istaXYaZa$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It follows from the above that, for the construction of the passive perfective verb in Arabic (i.e. its canonical passive representation), each of the ten main verb-forms cited in (44), which represent the active perfective verb (i.e. its canonical active representation), should pass through further processes of vocalic alteration to yield a different shape of its vowel distribution. Given the workings of the system of active morphophonology and its grammaticisation discussed above, these processes of vocalic alteration also operate within defined limits, and are therefore strictly instantiated by the system of passive morphophonology and its grammaticisation. Hence, unlike the case of Germanic languages such as English, where the ‘typological’ counterpart of this system requires in general that the past participle representation be preceded by an extra functional category (namely, the Aux
be) to act as a verbalisation marker [+V], the canonical passive representation in Semitic languages such as Arabic is governed by a finite set of morphophonological patterns which are, in principle, constructed out of the ten main verb-forms shown in (44), since these represent the canonical active versions.

This indicates that there exist in principle ten main verb-forms of the canonical passive representation in Arabic, notwithstanding the rarity of at least five other verb-forms of the canonical active representation and the theoretical possibility of their passivisation (cf. section 1.1, (2)). However, even in the case of the ten main verb-forms cited in (44) not every verb-form has direct access to canonical passivisation in the actual use of the language. As discussed in the preceding section, the semantic properties of verb-forms such as Form VII, inXaYaZa, and Form IX, iXYaZZa, inhibit them from canonical passivisation in any natural context, though the algebraic symbolisation of their passive counterparts is theoretically possible. This may be ascribed to the fact that the formative morphemes which these verb-forms incorporate strongly mark the notion of reflexivisation (given the semantic association of this notion with the notion of passivisation itself), meaning that whenever the notion of reflexivisation is strongly marked in a given verb-form it would be difficult for this form to passivise. The following list illustrates how the system of passive morphophonology in Arabic affects the shape of vowel distribution in each of the ten main verb-forms cited in (44). Notice that the asterisk (*) indicates that the verb-form in question is theoretically possible but never occurs in actual use.

(45)  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Form I:</td>
<td>XuYiZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Form II:</td>
<td>XuYYiZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Form III:</td>
<td>Xu:YiZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Form IV:</td>
<td>uXYiZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Form V:</td>
<td>tuXuYYiZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Form VI:</td>
<td>tuXu:YiZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Form VII:</td>
<td>* unXuYiZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Form VIII:</td>
<td>uXtuYiZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Form IX:</td>
<td>* uXYuZZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Form X:</td>
<td>ustuXYiZa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It now becomes evident that, like active morphophonology, passive morphophonology in the written variety of Arabic also operates within a highly generative system, given the canonical abstraction of each verb-form in terms of the morphophonological pattern that governs it. An indication of such a system is the fact that all passivisable verbs of a particular verb-form in the active are reduced to the corresponding verb-form in the passive. This truistic generalisation is not new in itself; it even dates back to the very early stages of 'Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory' (see, for example, Owens, 1988). Thus, passivisable active verbs of the first and second variants of Form I, XαYaΖα, and XαYiΖα, such as kataba ‘to write’ and samiʔa ‘to hear’ will exhibit their canonical passive versions of Form I, XuYiΖα, as in kutiba ‘to be written’ and sumiʔa ‘to be heard’ respectively; a passivisable active verb of Form II, XαYYaΖα, such as kassara ‘to smash’ will reflect its canonical passive version of Form II, XuYYiΖα, as in kussira ‘to be smashed’; and so forth. The following two lists illustrate further examples, where (46) are examples of the active and (47) their canonical passive versions. Notice also the nonpassivisability of Form VII and Form IX.

(46)  
a. Form I:     darasa ‘to study’  
b. Form II:    darrasa ‘to teach’  
c. Form III:   haʔaraba ‘to fight’  
d. Form IV:    afrasa ‘to seat’  
e. Form V:     taʔallama ‘to learn’  
f. Form VI:    tadaʔarasa ‘to discuss’  
g. Form VII:   inkasara ‘to break (intr.)’  
h. Form VIII:  ikṭatafa ‘to kidnap’  
i. Form IX:    iswadda ‘to blacken (intr.)’  
j. Form X:     istakdama ‘to utilise/employ’

(47)  
a. Form I:    
b. Form II:   
c. Form III:  
d. Form IV:   
e. Form V:    
f. Form VI:   
g. Form VII:  
h. Form VIII: 
i. Form IX:   
j. Form X:    

8 Notice that active verbs of the third variant of Form I, XαY YaΖα, such as jamula ‘to be beautiful’ can never be passivised as they categorically designate states, conditions or qualities rather than processes towards activities (cf. Form I, (8)). The same prerequisite also applies to certain active verbs of the first and second variants of Form I, XαYαΖα and XαYιΖα, when they designate similar properties as in (i) below (see also Form I, (6)).

(i)  
a. fasada ‘to decay’ (the first variant)  
b. galaiʔa ‘to become better’ (the first variant)  
c. kabira ‘to grow old’ (the second variant)  
d. sogira ‘to become young’ (the second variant)

In this case, active verbs of the first variant of Form I, XαYαΖα, may also take the third variant, XαYυΖα. Thus, there is no difference in meaning between fasada in (ia) and fasada or between galaiʔa in (ib) and galaiʔa.
a. Form I: *dursa* 'to be studied'
b. Form II: *durrisa* 'to be taught'
c. Form III: *hiribaa* 'to be fought (against)'
d. Form IV: *uilsa* 'to be seated'
e. Form V: *tuzullima* 'to be learned'
f. Form VI: *tudursa* 'to be discussed'
g. Form VII: *unkasira*
h. Form VIII: *uktufa* 'to be kidnapped'
i. Form IX: *uswudda*
j. Form X: *ustukdima* 'to be utilised/employed'

As mentioned in the previous section, the regularities or irregularities of the system of active morphophonology in Arabic are determined by the phonetic nature of the three-radical root, which is symbolised algebraically in terms of the set of three variables \(X, Y, Z\). As for the regularities of this system, they would be reflected by the infixation of any of the three formative morphemes -a-a-a, -a-i-a, and -a-u-a into the three-radical root in the case of Form I (the bare verb), where each radical has a full consonantal value, as seen throughout. Given that the system of passive morphophonology is in general inflectionally dependent on the system of active morphophonology, the regularities of the former system are correlated with the regularities of the latter. Thus, the infixation of the single formative morpheme -u-i-a into the three-radical root in the case of Form I (the bare verb) would also be a reflection of the regular system of passive morphophonology, where each of the three radicals has a full consonantal value as well (cf. (45a) and (47a)).

With regard to the ‘irregular’ system of active/passive morphophonology, on the other hand, the instantiations of this system in Arabic cannot be easily captured in a uniform fashion. This is attributable to the possible instantiation of three-radical roots in which the second and the third radicals are identical, or even to the possible instantiation of three-radical roots where at least one radical does not have a full consonantal value. In either case, the resultant bare verb of Form I (be it an active representation or its canonical passive counterpart) would incorporate a formative morpheme which differs in vowel distribution from the formative morphemes incorporated into the bare verbs of Form I in the case of regularities, as discussed above. In fact, a complete and comprehensive description of irregularities in Arabic is beyond
the range of the present study (see, for example, Wright, 1967; Al Ghalayini, 1982). The discussion will therefore be confined to exemplifying the most prominent irregularities. These may emerge from certain bare verbs of Form I, which may be classified under the following three categories:

(i) *al-fīḍ al-mudaʔaf* ‘the geminated verb’, a bare verb of Form I which incorporates a three-radical root \((X, Y, Z)\) where the second and third radicals (i.e. \(Y\) and \(Z\)) are identical, thereby resulting in the gemination of the former as in \((X, Y, Y)\). Consequently, the formative morphemes would be \(-\textit{a}–\textit{a}\) in the active and \(-\textit{u}–\textit{a}\) in the passive. For example:

\[(48)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \textit{jarra} \text{ ‘to pull’ vs. } \textit{juʃra} \text{ ‘to be pulled’} \\
\text{b. } & \textit{sanna} \text{ ‘to sharpen’ vs. } \textit{sunna} \text{ ‘to be sharpened’} \\
\text{c. } & \textit{madda} \text{ ‘to extend’ vs. } \textit{mudda} \text{ ‘to be extended’}
\end{align*}\]

(ii) *al-fīḍ al-ajwaʃ* ‘the hollow verb’, a bare verb of Form I which incorporates a three-radical root \((X, Y, Z)\) where the second radical (i.e. \(Y\)) is phonetically realised as the long vowel \(-\textit{a}–\) as in \((X, a:, Z)\). Thus, the formative morphemes would be \(-\textit{a}–\textit{a}\) in the active and \(-\textit{i}–\textit{a}\) in the passive. Form example:

\[(49)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \textit{baʃa} \text{ ‘to kiss’ vs. } \textit{biʃa} \text{ ‘to be kissed’} \\
\text{b. } & \textit{zaʃa} \text{ ‘to visit’ vs. } \textit{ziʃa} \text{ ‘to be visited’} \\
\text{c. } & \textit{qaʃa} \text{ ‘to say’ vs. } \textit{qiʃa} \text{ ‘to be said’}
\end{align*}\]

(iii) *al-fīḍ al-muʔall* ‘the weak verb’, a bare verb of Form I which incorporates a three-radical root \((X, Y, Z)\) where the third radical (i.e. \(Z\)) is phonetically realised as the long vowel \(-\textit{a}–\) as in \((X, Y, a:)\). Thus, the formative morphemes would be \(-\textit{a}–\textit{a}\) in the active and \(-\textit{u}–\textit{i}–\textit{a}\) in the passive, with the final vowel in the latter governing the semi-vowel \(-\textit{y}–\). For example:

\[(50)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \textit{daʔa} \text{ ‘to invite’ vs. } \textit{duʔiya} \text{ ‘to be invited’} \\
\text{b. } & \textit{rama} \text{ ‘to throw’ vs. } \textit{rumiya} \text{ ‘to be thrown’} \\
\text{c. } & \textit{nawa} \text{ ‘to intend’ vs. } \textit{nuwiya} \text{ ‘to be intended’}
\end{align*}\]

In languages such as English, which offers a different distribution in the ‘typological’ counterparts of the systems of active/passive morphophonology, the regularities and irregularities of these systems are in general determined by what is known as ‘weak verbs’ and ‘strong verbs’ respectively (see above). In the case of ‘weak verbs’ in the unmarked situation,
the regularities exhibit themselves in the suffixation of the bound morpheme -ed or just -d to the basic form of the verb (the infinitive representation in this case) where either suffix is conditioned by the phonetic nature of the final consonant or phoneme. As a result, the basic form undergoes little or no change of shape in the process of suffixation. While the sole suffixation of this bound morpheme would still reflect the active representation, its association with the free morpheme be (the functional category Aux) as a verbalisation marker [+V] would be indicative of the canonical passive counterpart. For example:

(51) a. ask: asked (Active) vs. was asked (Passive)
    b. bake: baked (Active) vs. was baked (Passive)
    c. permit: permitted (Active) vs. was permitted (Passive)
    d. study: studied (Active) vs. was studied (Passive)

In the case of ‘strong verbs’ in the marked situation, on the other hand, the irregularities of the ‘typologically’ equivalent systems of active/passive morphophonology in English are, like the case of irregularities in Arabic, also difficult to handle in a uniform fashion. This is because such irregularities, which are nothing more than historical accidents exhibiting certain ‘deviations’ from the linguistic norm, may emerge from the incorporation of a variety of bound morphemes or even zero-morphemes into the basic form of the verb (the infinitive representation). In either case, the basic form may or may not undergo alteration of vocalic and/or consonantal distribution in the process of incorporation. Again, while the sole incorporation of bound morphemes or zero-morphemes would still indicate the active representation, its association with the free morpheme be (the functional category Aux) as a verbalisation marker [+V] would be a reflection of the canonical passive version. For example:

(52) a. beat: beat (Active) vs. was beaten (Passive)
    b. bring: brought (Active) vs. was brought (Passive)
    c. dig: dug (Active) vs. was dug (Passive)
    d. hit: hit (Active) vs. was hit (Passive)

From the above discussion of the system of passive morphophonology in Arabic and its ‘typological’ counterpart in English, it can be seen how this system operates in either language for the structural representation of the passive verb (i.e. its canonical representation). Thus, the fundamental crosslinguistic (or parametric) variation between the two languages is
readily discernible at a structural level. On the one hand, the canonical passive verb in Arabic is marked both morphologically and phonologically through the incorporation of certain formative morphemes (or complexes of formative morphemes), which exhibit specific shapes of vowel distribution, into the three-radical root in the unmarked situation (see note 1), for which reason the term ‘morphophonology’ has been used throughout. On the other, the canonical passive verb in English is marked both morphologically and syntactically via the incorporation of the past-participle morpheme or zero-morpheme into the infinitive representation and its association with an extra functional category (viz. the Aux be) as a verbalisation marker [+V], for which reason the term ‘morphosyntax’ is often used in this context. 

Given the typological contrast between morphophonological markedness in Arabic and morphosyntactic markedness in English, the structural representation of the canonical passive verb is usually described as ‘synthetic’ in the former language versus ‘analytic’ in the latter language. While the synthetic identification in Arabic establishes a ‘synthesis’ of at least a three-radical root and a formative morpheme (or a complex of formative morphemes) in the unmarked situation, the analytic identification in English constitutes something like a ‘periphrasis’ of at least two separate categories: the past-participle marker which may or may not be morphologically realised and the Aux be which is used as a functional element to verbalise the past-participle representation. It is therefore the canonical representation of the passive construction in the two languages that is the principal concern of the current study; ‘canonical’ in the sense that the passive marker in either language is attached to the underlying lexical form of the active verb (not any other lexical category) in order to represent what is collectively referred to as the ‘verbal passive’. Hence, several approaches will be employed to

---

9 It has been argued that, in a multitude of human languages, the structure of the passive verb is ‘morphologically and/or syntactically marked’ without really paying attention to phonological markedness (cf. Siewierska, 1984: 30). However, as mentioned at the outset of section 1.1, morphology and phonology have always been linked with one another as a unified generative system in Arabic linguistic theory, hence the use of the umbrella term ‘morphophonology’ for languages such as Arabic in this chapter.
the analysis of this construction and its possible types, as will be seen in the upcoming
chapters.

Although an analysis of what is known as the noncanonical passive construction in Arabic and
English is beyond the scope of the current study, some remarks on its major types are worthy
of mentioning here. At least three types of this construction are recognisable in the literature.
These may be adumbrated in the following way:

(i) The nominal passive, a noncanonical type which incorporates the derived nominal (i.e.
the verbal nominal) in Arabic as in (53a) below, and either the derived nominal or the
derived gerundive in English as in (53 b-c) below.

(53) a. tarjamatu al-kita:bi:....
     (Gloss: translation (Nom) the-book (Gen))
     b. The translation of the book....
     c. Translating the book....

(ii) The adjectival passive, a noncanonical type which incorporates the nomen patientis in
Arabic as in (54a), and the passive participle in English as in (54b). Notice that the
predicative use of the latter is ambiguous between a verbal and an adjectival reading unless
the attributive use is applied as in (54c).

(54) a. al-kita:bu mutarjamun.
     (Gloss: the-book (Nom) translated (Nom))
     b. The book is translated.
     c. The translated book ....

(iii) The periphrastic passive, a noncanonical type which involves the subjectivisation of
the derived nominal by delexicalised verbs such as tamma ‘to happen’ and jara: ‘to occur’ in
Arabic as in (55a) below, and the association of the past participle with the delexicalised verb
get in English as in (55b) below. Notice, also, that these delexicalised verbs function in the
same way as the Aux be in the canonical passive construction in English.
a. tamma-t tarjamatu al-kita:bi.
   (Gloss: happened (3sf) translation (Nom) the-book (Gen))
   (Lit.: The translation of the book happened.)


It now becomes clear that, in any instance of the canonical passive construction in the written variety of Arabic and its 'typological' counterpart in English, the passive verb in the former language is governed by a certain morphophonological pattern (Form I to Form X with the exception of Form VII and Form IX, as discussed), whereas the corresponding passive verb in the latter language is governed by a single morphosyntactic pattern [Aux be + Past Participle].

In spite of this crosslinguistic (or parametric) variation, however, the formal distinction between the two patterns exhibits nothing more than two different values of the same parameter that is associated with the passive category itself, as will be explained later in this study (cf. chapter 3, section 3.4 specifically). The fact that crosslinguistic (or parametric) variations do exist between natural languages (be they genetically related or unrelated) can only be accounted for in terms of certain linguistic domains, whilst at the same time such languages converge in others. Thus, in Arabic and English as two samples of genetically unrelated languages (Semitic versus Germanic, respectively), essentially the same information is formally represented in the canonical patterning of the passive verb, whether it is morphophonologically marked in the former language or morphosyntactically marked in the latter. This information are usually divided into two types (viz. 'lexical information' and 'nonlexical information') which may be explained as follows:

(i) **Lexical information**

This type of information determines the basic lexical meaning of a particular verb (be it a canonical passive or its active version), a meaning that is contrasted with all sorts of grammatical or structural meaning. As we have seen throughout, the categorical element which assigns the main lexical information is the underlying lexical form of that verb. While in the written variety of Arabic this underlying lexical form is designated by the three-radical root in the unmarked situation (or the four-radical root in the marked situation (see note 1)), its
'typological' counterpart in English is designated by the infinitive representation. For instance, in canonical passive verbs such as *durisa* 'to be studied' (Form I, *XuYiZa*) in Arabic and *was studied* in English both the three-radical root *d-r-s-* in the former and the infinitive representation *study* in the latter converge in the assignment of the main lexical information being talked about (i.e. the basic lexical meaning of 'studying'), even though the two categorical elements are crosslinguistically divergent. The same three-radical root in Arabic may also assign further lexical meanings if it takes verb-forms other than Form I, thereby establishing further contrasts with the 'typological' counterparts in English as in *durrisa* 'to be taught' (Form II, *XuYYiZa*) versus *was taught*, etc. (cf. (47 a-b) and (47f)).

(ii) Nonlexical information

In contrast with the main lexical information discussed above, nonlexical information determines all sorts of grammatical or structural meaning that are incorporated into the canonical passive verb in question. In the case of active verbs, as seen earlier, nonlexical information includes inflectional features such as Agreement (Agr) features and Tense (Tns) features (cf. section 1.1). In the case of canonical passive verbs, on the other hand, nonlexical information also includes voice features such as Passive (Pass) features in addition to Agr features and Tns features. The categorical element or elements which assign(s) this nonlexical information is (are) the formative morpheme or the complex of formative morphemes (i.e. morphemes other than those which assign the underlying lexical form). While in Arabic all the nonlexical information being talked about (Agr, Tns, and Pass) are designated by the formative morpheme or the complex of formative morphemes, in English Agr and Tns are designated by the Aux *be* and Pass is designated by the past-participle marker. Thus, with reference to the example cited above, nonlexical information as well as lexical information is shown in the canonical passive verb in Arabic as in (56) and its 'typological' counterpart in English as in (57).

(56)

a. *durisa*

b. [*d-r-s-*] + [-u-i-a]

c. *[studying] + [Agr Tns Pass]*
As these examples illustrate, in the Arabic passive verb *durisa* in (56a) two categorical elements are incorporated as in (56b) to specify the two types of information under discussion: first, the three-radical root *d-r-s-* which assigns the main lexical information (the basic meaning of 'studying'—see above); and second, the formative morpheme *-u-i-a* which is responsible for all the markers of nonlexical information (viz. Agr, Tns, and Pass). Whereas the English passive verb *was studied* in (57a) consists of three categorical elements as in (57b) to specify the same two types of information: first, the Aux *be* which designates part of the nonlexical information (viz. Agr, and Tns); second, the underlying lexical form *study* which is comparable with the three-radical root *d-r-s-* in (56b); and third, the past-participle marker *-ed* which designates the residue of nonlexical information (viz. Pass). As will be seen later in the current study, the three elements of nonlexical information (viz. Agr, Tns, and Pass) will be treated as independent functional categories representing the inflectional features of the canonical passive verb in either language. One objective is to explain typologically the fixed position of the Pass element in relation to the Agr element and the Tns element (cf. chapter 3, section 3.4).

Finally, the system of passive morphophonology in the written variety of Arabic and its 'typological' counterpart in English are crosslinguistically (or parametrically) at variance with each other, as we have seen throughout. What is in common between the two languages is the fact that the Pass element in particular is attached (i.e. infixed in Arabic and suffixed in English) to the underlying lexical form of the active verb, not any other lexical category. For this reason, the canonical passive construction in both languages (i.e. its verbal representation) will be the principal concern of the current study, and must therefore be distinguished from other representations of the noncanonical passive construction (cf. examples (53-55)). Several terms have been used in the literature in order to describe different types (or subtypes) of the canonical passive construction. Among them are: the so-called 'personal passive' and the so-
called 'impersonal passive', including the misleading term 'pseudopassive'. In chapter 2 these
types (or subtypes) will be considered from a pragmalinguistic perspective as a preliminary to
further discussion, and in chapter 3 they will be reconsidered from a principle-based
perspective. The main objective is to arrive at a far more appropriate and clear-cut
terminology that may capture all possible types (or subtypes) of the canonical passive
construction, and to investigate the potential for frequency differences and similarities
between Arabic and English in this construction (cf. chapter 4). For ease of exposition, the
term 'morphology' will be used to indicate both 'morphophonology' in the former language
and 'morphosyntax' in the latter.

1.4 Summary

In section 1.1, a brief account of the morphophonological structure of the active verb in the
written variety of Arabic (Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA)) illustrated its
salient morphophonological properties, hence the close connection between morphology and
phonology in Arabic linguistic theory. Such properties include the relationship between the
three-radical root (the underlying lexical form) and the set of derived stems (the bare verb and
the derivative verbs) which this root has the potential to generate via the incorporation of
certain formative morphemes or complexes of formative morphemes. The discussion also
illustrated how the set of derived stems are symbolised algebraically in terms of a finite set of
morphophonological patterns in order to canonically abstract all possible forms of lexical
verbs in the language, given the variables (the three or four radicals of the root) and the
constants (the formative morpheme or the complex of formative morphemes). Thus, the
'typological' equivalence between Arabic and English was explained with reference to the
categorical element that proceeds as a derivational and inflectional base (the perfective
representation versus the infinitive representation, respectively) for the construction of other
verbal forms and representations. The section was concluded with identifying the ten main
verb-forms in terms of their morphophonological patterns in Arabic as a preliminary to further analysis in section 1.2.

In section 1.2, the ten main verb-forms in Arabic which were identified at the end of section 1.1 were, in turn, the focus of discussion as another preliminary to further discussion in the final section (section 1.3). Thus, the system of active morphophonology of the ten main verb-forms (i.e. their grammaticisation) was explained and exemplified in a fairly detailed manner, where each example in Arabic is accompanied by its 'typological' counterpart in English. Special emphasis was placed on the essential lexical properties of each of the ten main verb-forms, and on how these properties are expressed within a highly precise system of active morphophonology. These properties include the morphophonological and semantic properties as in the morphophonological realisation of contrasting semantic notions such as causativisation and reflexivisation by means of certain formative morphemes, since the former notion increases the magnitude of transitivity and the latter notion nullifies it. The fundamental reason for an account of such contrasting notions, among others, is to offer an initial picture about the specific forms of lexical verbs which may or may not have the potential for canonical passivisation as is generally the case with causativised verbs and reflexivised verbs respectively.

Section 1.3, the final section, was taken up by a consideration of the system of passive morphophonology in Arabic and its 'typological' counterpart in English. Since the grammaticisation of the former system is in general inflectionally determined by the grammaticisation of the system of active morphophonology, the ten main verb-forms discussed in section 1.2 were also symbolised algebraically in terms of the specific morphophonological patterns of their canonical passive versions, including the theoretical possibility of symbolising reflexive intransitivisers such as Form VII and Form IX, which do not have direct access to canonical passivisation. Likewise, this is to canonically abstract all possible forms of lexical verbs within a generative system of passive morphophonology, given
the variables and the constants as well. Then, the discussion moved on to the regularities and irregularities of this system in Arabic as well as those of the "typological" counterpart in English: while the regularities and irregularities in the former language are conditioned by the phonetic features of the three-radical root, in the latter language they emerge from "weak verbs" and "strong verbs" respectively. The section was concluded with some remarks on the crosslinguistic variation between Arabic and English in the structural representation of the passive verb (i.e. morphophonological markedness versus morphosyntactic markedness, respectively), and on the manner in which both lexical and nonlexical information is formally incorporated into this verb in either language. These remarks were, therefore, put forward for further discussion in the upcoming chapters.
Chapter Two

A PRAGMALINGUISTIC APPROACH

Having examined the salient morphological features of the passive verb (i.e. its grammaticisation) in Arabic and English in the preceding chapter, this chapter will be concerned with the linguistic and pragmatic properties of the canonical passive construction in the two languages. Given that the syntactic representation of this construction is essentially determined by pragmatic exigencies, the chapter will therefore concentrate on the logical and semantic preconditions for the natural occurrence of canonical passivisation from the viewpoint of language use. Accordingly, the fundamental pragmalinguistic properties of the two major types of this construction, viz. the personal and impersonal, will be explained and exemplified both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically.

Section 2.1 of this chapter will give a brief account of the traditional approach to canonical passivisation in Arabic and English, given their typological unrelatedness. The section will also underline the logical flaws of this approach which held that transitivity was the sole determinant of passivisation. Section 2.2 will consider the relationship between transitivity and passivisation with particular reference to medieval Arabic theorisation about this relationship. This is to specify the categories that can be promoted to subject position under passivisation, and to illuminate the logical flaws of the traditional approach even further. Section 2.3 will discuss the essential pragmalinguistic properties of the so-called personal passive in Arabic and English, and will touch on the decisive precondition for passivisation to be developed later. The section will also explain the promotional nature of the direct object in relation to other categories with some reference to relational and functional grammar. Then, the diachronic overlap between the personal passive and the reflexive will be considered to shed light on further aspects of the former. Section 2.4, the final section, will examine the principal pragmalinguistic properties of the so-called impersonal passive in Arabic and English such as the strict nature of the ‘surface’ subject and the nonpromotional nature of the nonsubject. The section will also identify two syntactically different subtypes of this construction exhibiting the same expletive interpretation. Then, what we will call the ‘personalised’ version of the impersonal passive will be introduced for further analyses in the next chapter. Finally, the section will conclude with the general pragmalinguistic definition of the canonical passive.
2.1 Preliminary remarks

As discussed in the preceding chapter, lexical verbs of certain forms in Arabic such as Form VII, \textit{inXaYaZa}, and Form IX, \textit{iXYaZZa}, do not have morphological access to canonical passivisation, given the specific lexical properties (morphological and semantic) that these verbs are identified with (cf. chapter 1, sections 1.2 and 1.3). However, this does not imply that every lexical verb of each of the remaining forms may undergo the process of passivisation. For instance, certain intransitive verbs of Form I, within its three variants \textit{XaYaZa}, \textit{XaYiZa}, and \textit{XaYuZa}, can never be passivised, particularly when they designate states (temporary or permanent), qualities or conditions rather than processes towards actions, as evident in the following examples (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2; see also note 8):

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Form I
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item a. \textit{XaYaZa} e.g. \textit{salaha} ‘to become good (better)’
      \item b. \textit{XaYiZa} e.g. \textit{kabira} ‘to grow old(er)’
      \item c. \textit{XaYuZa} e.g. \textit{kabura} ‘to get big(ger)/large(r)’
    \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Even in the case of the English counterparts as illustrated in these examples, the impossibility of passivisation is readily perceivable in that the states (temporary or permanent), qualities or conditions being talked about are expressible through the use of stative adjectives as independent lexical categories (e.g. \textit{good, old, big}, etc.), provided that these categories are ‘governed’ by stative verbs which are obligatorily intransitive (e.g. \textit{become, grow, get}, etc.). In order to syntactically approximate the English counterparts even further, the Arabic verbs in (1a-c) can also be identified with stative verbs such as \textit{asbaha} ‘to become/be’ and \textit{sa:ra} ‘to get/grow’, functional categories, traditionally known as \textit{af'af al naqisah} ‘defective verbs’, which Accusativise the predicate of a nominal clause, where the predicate in this case stands for the stative adjective in question. For example:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Form I
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item a. \textit{asbaha} / \textit{sa:ra sa:lihan} ‘to become good’
      \item b. \textit{asbaha} / \textit{sa:ra kabi:ran} ‘to grow old’
      \item c. \textit{asbaha} / \textit{sa:ra kabi:ran} ‘to get big/large’
    \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Given the intransitive verbs in (1a-c), the corresponding predicates in (2a-c) appear to be their cognate stative adjectives which incorporate the same three-radical roots. Notice, here,
that the predicates in (2b-c) coincide in their morphological shapes \textit{kabi:ran} though they differ in the second vowel when they take Form I, viz. \textit{kabira} versus \textit{kabura} in (1b-c). From this analysis it can be seen that there is a direct correlation between nonpassivisability and certain semantic features by which certain intransitive verbs of Form I are characterised as in (1a-c), a correlation that is also maintained upon paraphrasing such verbs into stative verbs Accusativising the former’s cognate stative adjectives as in (2a-c) where the structure shows more syntactic approximation to the English counterparts. This indicates that genetically unrelated languages such as Arabic and English (Semitic versus Germanic, respectively) can nonetheless resemble one another in respect of some nonpassivisable elements, though crosslinguistic variations between the two are much more marked so far as the whole process of passivisation is concerned (i.e. morphophonological markedness in Arabic versus morphosyntactic markedness in English).

Generally speaking, the syntactic process of canonical passivisation has frequently been intertwined with the semantic notion of transitivity in the sense that it is extremely difficult to speak of one without considering the other. For this reason, particular emphasis was placed on the semantic properties which were thought to act as logical preconditions for the natural occurrence of passive sentences, and thus research was primarily concerned with identifying the types of active sentences that would, for that matter, have direct access to canonical passivisation. Traditionally, most grammarians and linguists believed that transitivity, and the structural properties it entails, played a decisive role in such a process (cf. Siewierska, 1984:8). From this point of view, an apparently rigorous formula was introduced to account for the relationship between transitivity and passivisation: \textit{transitive verbs require a direct object and are passivisable; intransitive verbs do not require a direct object and are not passivisable}. If such a formula were constantly verifiable, then one would come to the obvious conclusion that every passive construction presupposes the ‘existence’ of an underlying active construction, and thus traditional approaches to the analysis of the former would seem satisfactory. Consider the following examples:
Given the Arabic active sentence (3a) and its English counterpart (3b), it would suffice to say that, following the above formula, a transitive verb of the first variant of Form I such as kasara in Arabic as well as its equivalent verb broke in English takes a direct object (al-ba:ba in (3a) and the door in (3b)), and is therefore passivisable as in (4a-b). On this account, traditional approaches to canonical passivisation would explain the structural properties that this process necessitates in a seemingly straightforward fashion, since derivation of a passive sentence such as (4a-b) from a corresponding active one as in (3a-b) would involve the application of three indispensable principles:

(i) **Topicalisation of the object:**

In Arabic the direct object of the active sentence al-ba:ba in (3a), which is assigned the Accusative case ending -a, becomes the subject (i.e. the topic) of the passive one al-ba:bu in (4a) in the form of what is known as na:?ib al-fa:?il, roughly ‘the acting Agent’, and is therefore assigned the Nominative case ending -u. In English, too, the direct object of the active sentence the door in (3b) occupies the subject position in the passive one as in (4b). As a result, the subject of the passive sentence in both cases retains the logical status of the direct object of the active one, notwithstanding the ‘new’ grammatical function of the former.

1 Notice that, unlike the case of the English sentence (3b) whose word order is SVO, the word order of the Arabic counterpart (3a) is VSO. For the majority of linguists, VSO is considered the principal word order of the active verbal construction in Arabic; whereas other types of word order such as VOS and OVS are possible in the language but constitute nothing more than ‘secondary’ variants of the principal word order (cf. Saad, 1982:8f). It seems that, for pragmatic reasons, these ‘secondary’ variants are affected by syntactic processes traditionally known as taqdi:m wa ta?kti:r, roughly ‘fronting and backing’ (cf. Owens, 1988: 305, 311) or ‘antepositioning and postpositioning’ (cf. Bohas et al., 1990:36, 39, 57).

2 In medieval Arabic grammar, the subject in the active verbal construction is known as al-fa:?il ‘the Agent’ (i.e. the doer of the action identified by the verb), and the subject in the canonical passive version is known as na:?ib al-fa:?il ‘the acting Agent’ (i.e. it performs the syntactic function of the
(i) Passive morphology of the verb:

In Arabic the active verb *kasara* in (3a), which is an example of Form I, undergoes certain internal processes of vocalic alteration to yield the 'surface' representation of the passive verb *kusira* in (4a) with a specific shape of vowel distribution, viz. *-a-a-a* versus *-u-i-a*. Whereas in English the corresponding verb *broke* in (3b) undergoes the process of affixation whereby the bound morpheme *-en* is suffixed, *-n* in this case, to yield the 'surface' representation of the past participle *broken* in (4b) preceded by a particular functional category, viz. the Aux *be* (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3).

(ii) Degradation of the subject:

In Arabic the subject of the active sentence *al-waladu* in (3a) is normally deleted in the passive one (4a) for which reason the traditional term *al-majhu:liyyah*, the technical equivalent of *passivisation*, is literally rendered into 'unknownness', 'anonymousness', etc., states which the nature of the Agent (i.e. the doer of the action) is normally identified with. In English, on the other hand, the corresponding subject of the active sentence *the boy* in (3b) may be inserted in the passive one (4b) to act as the object of an optional PP *by the boy*, whilst at the same time its logical status is retained. The optionality of the agentive PP will be discussed in the next chapter (cf. chapter 3, section 3.2).

Although they appear at first glance to have provided a straightforward analysis for particular examples such as (3a-b) and (4a-b), traditional approaches to the process of canonical passivisation in Arabic and English are fraught with serious complications when it comes to dealing with all natural instances of the canonical passive (personal and impersonal) in the two languages. This is due to the fact that the logical foundation of this process was, and is still, not fully understood in the literature, and that a number of counter-indications seem to strongly undermine the validity of the one-to-one relationship between transitivity and

Agent, but logically it is not the doer of the action identified by the verb). The latter term is sometimes called 'a proxy of the Agent' (cf. Gruntfest, 1984: 228) or 'a deputy Agent' (cf. Owens, 1988: 181).
passivisation as expressed in the rigid formula mentioned above. These counter-indications will be considered in the light of the Arabic examples cited in (Saad, 1982:2f):

(i) In Arabic certain lexical verbs of Form I (cf. (5)), Form IV (cf. (6)), Form V (cf. (7)), and so on require a direct object (i.e. they are transitive), but they are not passivisable. For example:

(5)  
   a. waṣala al-maktu:bu zaydan.  
      (Gloss: reached (3sm) the-letter (Nom) Zaid (Acc))  
      a’. The letter reached Zaid.  
   b. * wusila zaydun.  
      (Gloss: was reached (3sm) Zaid (Nom))  
      b’. * Zaid was reached.  

(6)  
   a. asbaha al-tiflu al-aba.  
      (Gloss: resembled (3sm) the-child (Nom) the-father (Acc))  
      a’. The child resembled the father.  
   b. * uṣbiha al-abu.  
      (Gloss: was resembled (3sm) the-father (Nom))  
      b’. * The father was resembled.  

(7)  
      (Gloss: married (3sm) the-man (Nom) the-woman (Acc))  
      a’. The man married the woman.  
   b.* tuzuwwijat al-mar?atu.  
      (Gloss: was married (3sf) the-woman (Nom))  
      b’. The woman was married.  

Notice, however, that the English sentence (5b’) is considered to be perfectly acceptable as a canonical passive construction only when the Agent, be it overt or covert, is characterised by an animate nature, that is, when the meaning of reach is identified with the basic meaning of ‘contacting’ as in the following examples:

(i)  
   a. Amr reached Zaid.  
   b. Zaid was reached (by Amr).

(ii)  
   a. I haven’t reached Zaid for days.  
   b. Zaid hasn’t been reached for days (by me).

For this reason, the English sentence (5b’) cannot be taken as the canonical passive version of (5a’).

It is worth mentioning, here, that in the English active sentence The man married the woman it is clearly understood that the Agent is the man, since the action of marriage is reciprocal in this context. However, the canonical passive version The woman was married is considered to be perfectly acceptable in English only when the word married is a stative adjective, or the Agent is understood to be someone (e.g. a preacher, a civil official, etc.) who conducted the ceremony of marriage (cf. Saad, 1982: 12).
In English, too, certain lexical verbs require a direct object (i.e. they are transitive), but they are not passivisable. Most of these verbs are ‘stative verbs’ which designate states or conditions rather than processes towards actions. For example:

(8) a. He has a nice car.
    b.* A nice car is had (by him).

(9) a. These shoes don’t fit you.
    b.* You’re not fitted by these shoes.

(10) a. Her husband lacked tact.
    b.* Tact was lacked (by her husband).
    (cf. also (5-7) above)

(ii) In Arabic certain lexical verbs of Form I (cf. (11)), Form II (cf. (12)), Form III (cf.(13)), and so on do not require a direct object (i.e. they are intransitive), but they are nonetheless passivisable. The resultant construction in these cases would usually represent ‘the impersonal passive’ where the passive form of the verb is constantly inflected in accord with the third-person-singular-masculine (3sm) pronominal which corresponds to the nominal expletive it in English (cf. section 2.4 below). For example:

      (Gloss: went (3sm) Zaid (Nom) to the-market (Obl))
      a’. Zaid went to the market.

      b. thuhiba ila: al-su:qi.
      (Gloss: was gone (3sm) to the-market (Obl))
      (Lit.: It was gone to the market.)
      b’. The market was gone to.

(12) a. darrasa-t hindun fi: al-saffi.
      (Gloss: taught (3sf) Hind (Nom) in the-classroom (Obl))
      a’. Hind taught in the classroom.

      b. durrisa fi: al-saffi.
      (Gloss: was taught (3sm) in the-classroom (Obl))
      (Lit.: It was taught in the classroom.)
      b’. The classroom was taught in.

      (Gloss: contributed (3plm) to the-project (Obl))
      a’. They contributed to the project.

      (Gloss: was contributed (3sm) to the-project (Obl))
      (Lit.: It was contributed to the project.)
      b’. The project was contributed to.
In English, too, certain lexical verbs do not take a direct object (i.e., they are intransitive), but they are nonetheless passivisable. However, the resultant construction would usually be classified as 'the pseudopassive', a misleading term which seems to imply a midway representation between the impersonal passive with an expletive interpretation as in Arabic (cf. (11b-13b) above) and its personal version where the object of the preposition is 'personalised' as the 'surface' subject as in English (cf. (11b'-13b') above) (cf. also section 2.4 below). Further examples follow:

(14) a. Someone slept in the house.
    b. The house was slept in.

(15) a. Everyone had skated on the ice.
    b. The ice had been skated on.

(16) a. No one is to sit on that chair.
    b. That chair is not to be sat on.
    (cf. also (11-13) above)

(iii) In Arabic particular passive-like constructions do not seem to presuppose the 'existence' of underlying active counterparts where the active verb is theoretically assumed to be of Form 1. It may be the case that the 'passive' form of the verb in these constructions may reflect a special representation of the active for certain pragmatic reasons which will be clarified later (cf. sections 2.2 and 2.3). For example:

(17) a. duhiša al-rajulu.
    (Gloss: amazed (3sm, Pass) the-man (Nom))
    b. The man was amazed.

(18) a. fulija al-maliku.
    (Gloss: paralysed (3sm, Pass) the-king (Nom))
    b. The King was paralysed.

(19) a. zukima al-waladu
    (Gloss: caught a cold (3sm, Pass) the-boy (Nom))
    (Lit.: The boy was struck by a cold.)
    b. The boy caught a cold.

In English, too, certain passive-like constructions do not appear to presuppose the 'existence' of corresponding active constructions. Like the case in Arabic, the 'passive' form of the verb in these constructions may also reflect a special representation of the active for the same pragmatic reasons (cf. sections 2.2 and 2.3). For example:
a. Joseph Conrad was born in 1857.
b. The Idiot in Dostoevsky's novel is possessed.
c. The Castle in Kafka's novel is haunted by man's fear.
d. He is destined for a promising career on the stage.
e. These premises are licensed for the sale of tobacco.
f. Are whales doomed to extinction?
   (cf. also (17); (18) above)

From the counter-indications adumbrated above, it now becomes clear that traditional
approaches to the process of canonical passivisation do not satisfy the requirements of the
existing facts. That is, there is either something wrong with the traditional account of the
relationship between transitivity and passivisation or, contrary to the belief which was
predominant in the early part of this century, transitivity does not constitute a defining
precondition for passivisation to operate. In this respect, it is argued that crosslinguistic
variation is explicable in terms of the way the presence or absence of specific morphological
and/or syntactic properties influences the degree of transitivity (cf. Hopper and Thompson,
1980:257f). Such an argument entails the possibility that crosslinguistic variation is also
determined by the extent to which the overt syntax of passivisation is sensitive to transitivity,
given the nonpassivisability of certain transitive verbs on the one hand, and the
passivisability of certain intransitive verbs on the other. If this is indeed the case, then the
majority of linguists and grammarians appear to have been misled in regarding transitivity as
the crucial factor underlying the process of passivisation (cf. Siewierska, 1984:18f). The
following section will consider the notion of transitivity and its relationship to canonical
passivation from a deeper perspective.

2.2 Transitivity and passivisation

In modern linguistics one of the most thoroughgoing attempts to deal with the notion of
transitivity was made by Tesnière. For this notion he advocated the term 'diathesis' to refer
to the sort of relationship that a lexical verb constitutes with its dependants, or participants,
relative to an underlying force. He also introduced the term 'valency' to describe this
underlying force, that is, the number and type of dependants, or participants, with which a lexical verb has the potential to combine (Tesnière, 1959:238f).

The idea of valency later received much more attention, and thus it was established as a linguistic criterion to classify verbs in terms of the number of their participants, or satellite noun phrases, in certain languages: verbs which require only one participant are said to have a valency of one, to be ‘univalent’ (e.g. the intransitive verb *die*); verbs which require two participants are said to have a valency of two, to be ‘bivalent’ (e.g. the transitive verb *break*); verbs which take three participants are said to have a valency of three, to be ‘trivalent’ (e.g. the ditransitive verb *give*); and so forth (cf. also Klaiman, 1991:4). On this account, a transitive verb was defined as a verb having a valency of two (i.e. ‘bivalent’) and ‘governing’ a direct object (Lyons, 1977:486). Although such a linguistic criterion offers a more sophisticated account of certain verb classes, it does not seem to solve the problem with transitivity and the identification of the direct object.

In medieval Arabic linguistic theory the term *al-maf?u:l*, roughly ‘the object’, was used to refer to any Accusative nominal which is directly ‘dependent’ on the verb (cf. ‘dependant’ in Tesnière’s terminology). From this point of view, at least eight types of Accusative nominals were identified and examined in a fairly systematic fashion, and thus research into the notion of transitivity gained considerable momentum. These eight types of Accusative nominals may be classified as follows:

**i) al-maf?u:l bihi** ‘the direct object’ (literally, ‘the acted upon’), a nonderived Accusative nominal which the action of the verb is placed on or carried over as in *zaydan* ‘Zaid’ in (21a) below; ‘nonderived’ in the sense that it is not morphologically derived from the three-radical root incorporated into the verb, but may be derived from a different three-radical root. For example:
   (Gloss: saw (1s) Zaid (Acc) in the-field (Obl))
   b. I saw Zaid in the field.

(ii) al-maf?u:1 al-muṭlaq ‘the cognate object’ (literally, ‘the absolute object’) which takes the form of al-magdar ‘the verbal nominal’, an Accusative nominal that is morphologically derived from the three-radical root incorporated into the verb as in ġarban ‘hitting’ in (22a) below. Semantically, this derived nominal is used to increase the intensity of the action identified by the verb (cf. chapter 1; section 1.2; (11)). For example:

(22) a. daraba zaydan ġarban sadi:dan.
   (Gloss: hit (3sm) Zaid (Acc) hitting (Acc) hard (Acc))
   (Lit.: He hit Zaid hard hitting.)
   b. He hit Zaid with a hard blow.

(iii) al-maf?u:1 fi:hi ‘the adverbial object’, a nonderived Accusative nominal which can designate either Tharf zama:n ‘an adverb of time’ as in sa:?atan ‘hour’ in (23a) below or Tharf maka:n ‘an adverb of place’ as in ama:ma ‘before’ in (24a) below. For example:

(23) a. jalasa sa:?atan fi: al-maktabi.
   (Gloss: sat (3sm) hour (Acc) in the-office (Obl))
   (Lit.: He sat an hour in the office.)
   b. He has stayed in the office for an hour.

(24) a. waqafa ama:ma al-maḥkamati.
   (Gloss: stood up (3sm) before (Acc) the-court (Gen))
   b. He stood up before the court.

(iv) al-maf?u:1 ma?ahu ‘the concomitate object’, a nonderived Accusative nominal which is always preceded by the particle wa as in zaydan ‘Zaid’ in (25a) below. This particle, which can act as the conjunctive and in English, is traditionally known as wa:w al-ma?iyyah ‘wa of withness’ in the sense that it is semantically equivalent to the preposition ma?a ‘with’. For example:

(25) a. sir-tu wa zaydan.
   (Gloss: walked (1s) with Zaid (Acc))
   b. I walked with Zaid.

(v) al-maf?u:1 lahu ‘the causative object’, a derived Accusative nominal which has a ‘teleological’ value in the sense that the action of the verb is performed for a particular purpose as in iltima:san ‘seeking’ in (26a) below; ‘derived’ in the sense that it is derived
from the three-radical root incorporated into its cognate verb, iltamasa 'to seek' in this case.

For example:

(Gloss: went (3sm) seeking (Acc) for-the-peace (Obl))
 b. He went seeking peace.

(vi) al-ha:l 'the circumstantial nominal', an Accusative nominal which is normally derived from its cognate verb to take the form of a gerundive as in ra:kiban 'riding' in (27a) below, whose cognate verb is rakiba 'to ride'. This nominal is used to designate the condition or state of the Agent while performing the action of a given verb. For example:

(27)  a. ja:?a zaydun ra:kiban farasan.
(Gloss: came (3sm) Zaid (Nom) riding (Acc) mare (Acc))
 b. Zaid came riding a horse.

(vii) al-tam yi:z 'the specification nominal', an Accusative nominal (not necessarily derived) which is semantically restricted to describing a further nominal and syntactically adjacent to it via a characteristic predicate as in ?araqan 'sweat' in (28a) below. For example:

(Gloss: dripped (3sm) the-man (Nom) sweat (Acc))
 b. The man dripped sweat.

(viii) al-istithna:? 'the exception nominal', an Accusative nominal (not necessarily derived) which is always preceded by the exception particle illa: 'except' as in zaydan 'Zaid' in (29a) below. For example:

(Gloss: saw (Is) the-people (Acc) except Zaid (Acc))
 b. I saw the people, except Zaid.

Having identified the eight types of Accusative nominals, Arabic grammarians recognised the first five types as mafa:?i:l 'true objects' and the remaining three types as a?sha:h mafa:?i:l

* Some other Arabic grammarians added a further type to the five types of 'true objects', viz. al-ma:f?u:l minhu 'the selection object'. This object indicates a person or thing being selected by the Agent from a given group of persons or things as in al-na:sa 'the people' in the following examples:

(i)  a. iktar-tu-ka al-na:sa.
(Gloss: chose (Is)-you (2sm) the-people (Acc))
 b. I chose you (among) the people.

Characteristic of this object is that it can be paraphrased as the object of the preposition min 'from' (cf. Al-Bustani, 1983:696), and thus it is assigned the Oblique Case ending -i (cf. note 9 below) as in (iia):
'pseudo-objects' (cf. Owens, 1988:167f). Furthermore, they placed particular emphasis on the first type, viz. *al-mafūl bihi* 'the direct object'. This was syntactically defined as an Accusative nominal or pronominal or noun clause directly 'governed' by a transitive verb. It was stated that, depending on the valency of the verb discussed above, the sentence may contain one direct object for transitive verbs (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, Form I (4a-d); (7a-c); Form II (9a'-c'); Form III (14a'-d'); etc.), or two objects for ditransitive verbs (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, Form II (10a'-c'); Form IV (18 a'-c'); etc.), or, even, three objects for tritransitive verbs, which are not to be dealt with in the current study.

So far as transitivity is concerned, Arabic grammarians like Al-Mubarred defined transitive verbs as "those in which an action is placed on *awqa?a* or carried over to *awsala* an object". For instance, if one said *darabtu zaydan* 'I hit Zaid' or *kallamtu Tamran* 'I spoke to Amr', one would not "affect Zaid or Amr, but rather did an action of hitting or speaking, and placed the blow on Zaid or made the speech carry over to Amr. [Therefore] Zaid and Amr are direct objects" (cited in Owens, 1988:169). With the identification of direct objects in terms of ‘carrying over of actions’, there seems to be an isomorphism between an Accusative nominal which takes the role of a participant and a particular semantic value.

Other Arabic linguists such as Al-Sarra:j construed the semantic value of transitivity more clearly in terms of a ‘physical or mental process’. He stated that a movement of the body, if it 'physically' affects the object (as is the case with *hitting*) or 'mentally' encounters it (as is the case with *speaking*), then the verb which represents that physical or mental activity is

(ii) a. ḥqartu-ka min al-nasi.
   (Gloss: chose (1s)-you (2sm) from the-people (Obl))
   b. I chose you from (among) the people.

6 In this context, researchers like Hopper and Thompson have worked out a linguistic scheme known as 'scale of transitivity' within defined parameters. To them, a canonical transitive verb indicates an action ‘carried over’ or ‘transferred’ from an Agent to a Patient. They state that this scale accounts for the extent to which the action being talked about is ‘transferred’. For instance, ‘transfer’ occurs if the two participants are involved as in *John killed Mary*, not one as in *Mary died*, and if the verb denotes an action as in *John hugged Mary*, not a state as in *John likes Mary*, etc. (see Hopper and Thompson, 1980 for further details).
transitive. Al-Sarra:j, however, subscribed to the view that al-ta?thi:r ‘affecting’ does not seem to invariably act as a precondition for transitivity,\(^7\) albeit necessary for the unmarked verbs such as daraba ‘to hit’, kasara ‘to break’, and the like. For instance, verbs such as Thanna ‘to think’ constitute a marked case in that they are ditransitive, but the action they identify does not ‘affect’ either of the two objects (cf. Owens, 1988:170). Al-Mubarred and Al-Zamakšari added that ditransitives like Thanna ‘to think’ do not imply ‘affecting’ because the two objects these ditransitives take are semantically related to a nominal nonverbal sentence (i.e. a ‘topic’ and a ‘comment’). They contrasted these with ditransitives like a?la: ‘to give’, whose actions entail ‘affecting’. For example:

\[(30)\] a. a?tay-tu zaydan hadiyyatan.
   (Gloss: gave (Is) Zaid (Acc) present (Acc))
   b. I gave Zaid a present.

\[(31)\] a. Thanan-tu zaydan tabi:ban.
   (Gloss: thought (Is) Zaid (Acc) doctor (Acc))
   b. I thought that Zaid was a doctor.

In (30a) it is possible to delete one of the two objects since the action of giving inherently implies that something was given to Zaid as in (32a) below, or someone was given a present as in (32b) below. In (31a), on the other hand, it is impossible to mention one object without the other because the verb does not imply that Zaid was thought to be something as in (33a) below, or someone was thought to be a doctor as in (33b) below:

\[(32)\] a. a?tay-tu zaydan _____.
   b. a?tay-tu _____ hadiyyatan.

\[(33)\] a.* Thanan-tu zaydan _____.
   b.* Thanan-tu _____ tabi:ban.

These aspects of co-occurrence restriction were interpreted in terms of ‘optionality’ and ‘obligatoriness’ in that the two objects in (30a) are alternately optional, whereas the two objects in (31a) are both obligatory (cf. Owens, 1988:174f). For this reason, the latter objects

\(^7\) Notice, here, that Bolinger talks about the same point (i.e. the semantic value of transitivity), but does not recognise the illogicality of his assumption. He claims that an NP is looked upon as a direct object and a clause as transitive if the NP is genuinely ‘affected’ by the action of the verb (Bolinger, 1977: 68). In a counter-argument, Siewierska points out that “not all direct objects can be seen to be affected by the action portrayed, nor are all affected NPs direct objects” (Siewierska, 1984:89).
are semantically related to a nominal nonverbal sentence where they take the grammatical function of ‘topic’ and ‘comment’ respectively. Thus, they can occur either as a nominal nonverbal sentence Accusativised by the verb as in (34a) below (and in this case the embedded sentence is equivalent to the English that-argument in (34b)) or as a separate nominal nonverbal sentence Nominatively parsed as in (35):

(34)  a. Thanan-tu anna zaydan ṭabi:bun.
     (Gloss: thought (1s) that Zaid (Acc) a doctor (Nom))
     b. I thought that Zaid was a doctor.

(35)  a. zaydun ṭabi:bun.
     (Gloss: Zaid (Nom) doctor (Nom))
     b. Zaid is a doctor.

Furthermore, in the previous chapter mention was made of how certain different verb-forms having the same three-radical root are linked in a causative relation. For instance, from the three-radical root $k-t-b-$, whose lexical content refers to the basic meaning of ‘writing’, two different verb-forms, among others, can be derived: first, *kataba* ‘to write’ which is transitive in nature; and second, *kattaba* ‘to make someone write’ whose transitivity is increased via the gemination of the second radical -t- to become ditransitive (cf. chapter 1; section 1.2, Form II (10)).

This leads to the identification of transitivity with the morphological component in Arabic linguistic theory. In this context, a distinction was made between verbs which are *muta‘addiya bi nafsiha*: ‘potentially transitive’ and verbs which are *muta‘addiya sarfiyyan* ‘morphologically transitive’. In the former category are verbs whose three-radical root potentially permits one direct object (e.g. *kasara* ‘to break’, *kataba* ‘to write’, etc.), or two objects (e.g. *a‘ta*: ‘to give’, *Thanna* ‘to think’, etc.) depending on their valency as discussed above. In the latter category are verbs whose three-radical root may or may not potentially permit an object (i.e. they may be transitive or intransitive),

\[8\] In chapter 1 the discussion showed how certain verb-forms are characterised by a causative nature in that they increase the magnitude of transitivity. This can be generalised along three parameters:

(i) verbs which are intransitive in their bare form (i.e. Form I) become transitive in another form;
increased by means of either bound morphemes such as the infix \(-t-\) in *kattaba* ‘to make someone write’ in (36a) or ‘free’ morphemes such as the preposition *bi* in (37a):

(36) a. kattaba zaydan risa:latan.
   (Gloss: made write (3sm) Zaid (Acc) letter (Acc))
   b. He made Zaid write a letter.

(37) a. marar-tu bi-zaydin.
   (Gloss: passed (1s) by Zaid (Obl))
   b. I passed (by) Zaid.

To Arabic linguists like Ibn Jinni:, causativisation was looked upon as a ‘unitary process’ in that transitivisers such as those illustrated in (36a) and (37a) integrate into the morphological structure of the verb. Just as the infix \(-t-\) forms part of the whole structure of the verb *kattaba* ‘to make someone write’, the preposition *bi* is in complementary distribution with the morphological modifications of the verb *marra* ‘to pass’. This indicates that the object of the preposition (i.e. *zaydin* ‘Zaid’ in (37a)) has the same potential character of a direct object (e.g. *zaydan* ‘Zaid’ in (36a)), even though the former is assigned the Oblique Case ending \(-i^9\) since prepositions are regarded as ‘proper governors’ (cf. Owens, 1988:176). In other words, if the two active sentences (36a) and (37a) are passivised as in (38a) and (39a) below, then both *zaydan* and *zaydin* will take the role of the subject or the ‘acting Agent’ mentioned earlier in this chapter (cf. section 2.1, examples (3) and (4); see also note 2):

(38) a. kuttiba zaydun risa:latan.
   (Gloss: was made write (3sm) Zaid (Nom) letter (Acc))
   b. Zaid was made write a letter.

(39) a. murra bi-zaydin.
   (Gloss: was passed (3sm) by-Zaid (Obl))
   (Lit.: It was passed by Zaid.)
   b. Zaid was passed by.

(ii) verbs which are transitive in their bare form become ditransitive in another form; and
(iii) verbs which are ditransitive in some form become tritransitive in another form.

[see, for instance, chapter 1, section 1.2; Form II, examples (9-10); Form III, examples (15); and Form IV, examples (17-18).]

\(^9\) According to most linguists, only three ‘surface’ Case endings are assigned to nouns and adjectives in Arabic: the Nominative \(-u\), the Accusative \(-a\), and the Genitive \(-i\). In particular, the third Case ending refers vaguely to either a relation of possession/association or a relation of the object of a preposition. For analytical clarity in this study, the term ‘Genitive’ is reserved for the former relation, whereas the term ‘Oblique’ is used to indicate the latter (cf. Chomsky, 1981: 17f; Chomsky, 1986:186f).
Given the semantic and morphological identification of transitivity, whose magnitude is augmented by the process of causativisation as discussed above, it is necessary at this point to drive home the ‘dialectical’ relationship between the latter process and the process of passivisation. From a logical perspective, such a relationship was seen in terms of a polarity of maximisation and minimisation of transitivity. One Arabic grammarian, Al-Farisi, expounded this principle in the following way: “The formation of a causative verb is the opposite of the formation of a passive verb, because the form of the passive verb is associated with the reduction of an object... On the other hand, the formation of a causative verb in transitivity increases a direct object” (cited in Owens, 1988:183).

The generally accepted definition of this polarity resulted in two divergent accounts when research came to dealing with the structural nature of the passive verb. Firstly, to grammarians like Sibawayh and Al-Zajja:ji, passivisation is largely lexical, that is, the passive verb is considered a basic verb-form which is not derived from the corresponding active. Batalyusi: lent credence to this view by pointing to the fact that there exist passive verbs that do not have corresponding active ones (cf. examples (17-19)): if the passive form was derived, such examples would not exist in the language. The injunction was further bolstered by reference to pairs of active-passive sentences such as (36a) and (38a) above, where the active verb is ditransitive (cf. also (30a)). In (38a) the passive verb kuttiba objectivises the nominal risa:latan in the same way the active counterpart kattaba does in (36a), for which reason this nominal is assigned the Accusative Case ending -an in both

---

10 Al-Farisi’s principle can be generalised as follows: a change in the identity of the verb (i.e. from one morphological form to another by means of a causative marker, or from an active form to a passive one) correlates with a change in its semantic potential and inherent valency. In this context, Tesnière is comparable, as Owens quotes: “Le causatif et le recessif (passive or reflexive) constituent des operations opposées, puisque l’une a pour but d’augmenter le nombre des actants et l’autre de le diminuer” (Tesnière, 1959:280). From the viewpoint of relational grammar, researchers like Postal state: “Passive is a detransitivising rule, since it allows an early direct object to be a late subject and thus sanctions clauses whose late strata do not contain direct objects” (Postal, 1977:275). Similar statements have later been made by other researchers (see, for example, Keenan, 1982:18; Perlmutter, 1983:91).
sentences. Therefore, with respect to ‘objectivisation’ properties, passivisation creates a new verb *kuttiba*, just as causativisation yields *kattaba* which has a valency of its own.

Secondly, to grammarians like Ibn ʿūṣfur and Ibn Jinni:, passivisation is largely **morphological** in the sense that the passive verb is determined by a finite set of morphophonological patterns which are derived from the basic forms of the active verb (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3). On this view, Bata'lyusiː’s mention of the fact that there are verbs which only occur in the passive form (cf. examples (17-19)) does not seem to endorse its lexical specification. It could well be argued that verbs such as these are actually special representations of the active verb, and not the passive one, as will be discussed in the next section (section 2.3). Moreover, referring back to the active-passive sentences cited above, in (38a) the Nominative nominal *zaydun* is ‘governed’ by the inflectional features of the passive verb *kuttiba*, but, contrary to the first account, the Accusative nominal *risalatan* is still ‘governed’ by the semantic potential of the active verb *kattaba* in (36a). That is, a change of verb-form [Active (36a) → Passive (38a)] correlates with a change in the Case assignment of the ‘affected’ person [zaydan (Acc) → zaydun (Nom)], but the ‘affected’ thing *risalatan* is assigned the Accusative Case ending -an in both sentences. On this reasoning, the category ‘governing’ *risalatan* should in principle be the same, since no change in Case assignment entails no change in ‘governor’ (cf. Chomsky, 1981:170f; Chomsky, 1986: 186f; Owens, 1988:185).

It seems, therefore, neither account on its own is adequate to give a complete picture of the passive, though the highly sophisticated examination of transitivity is beyond dispute. It is perfectly acceptable to suggest that a relative combination of the two accounts is capable of providing a full picture, since both accounts yield indispensable insights into the structural nature of the passive. That is, passivisation is both **lexical** for the marked cases discussed above (where the ‘new’ combination of the three-radical root is handled as a ‘new’ lexical
idiosyncrasy) and morphological for the unmarked cases which represent the third major step in the hierarchy of verb derivation: (i) the three-radical root, (ii) the active form, and (iii) the passive form. In addition, passivisation is also syntactic because, so far as structure-dependency goes, it necessitates considerable changes in the structural properties of the sentence as seen above.

From the above discussion of transitivity and causativisation, it now becomes clear that the traditional approach, which considers transitivity a decisive factor in the process of passivisation in Arabic (cf. section 2.1), is insufficient for the analysis of all possible mutations that this process brings about. Given the eight types of Accusative nominals introduced at the outset of this section, it appears that the traditional approach deals only with the first type, viz. al-mafzu:bihi ‘the direct object’. Although it offers a somewhat reasonable account of passive sentences such as (4a), whose active counterpart (3a) expresses an overt direct object, the traditional approach overlooks other types of Accusative nominals that can be promoted to subject position (i.e. na:ib al-fa:il ‘the acting Agent’) through passivisation, particularly when the active sentence incorporates an intransitive verb.

In this case, in general, two types of Accusative nominals seem to have the potential for subject promotion: the second type, al-mafzu:laq ‘the cognate object’, as in julu:san ‘sitting’ in (40a); and the third type, al-mafzu:lihi ‘the adverbial object’, which occurs in the form of either an adverb of time as in zaman ‘time’ in (42a), or an adverb of place as in fawqa ‘over’ in (44a) below. Such Accusative nominals can therefore act as the ‘surface’ subjects of the corresponding passive sentences, for which reason they are assigned the

---

11 Notice, here, that the imperative is excluded from the hierarchy of verb derivation, since, unlike the case of the active and the passive, it has neither perfective nor imperfective forms. Rather, the imperative is only used to denote a certain mood (e.g. orders, commands, requests, etc.) which is semantically comparable to, but not equatable with, such moods as indicative, subjunctive, and so on.

12 See also other examples where the object (direct or indirect) occurs overtly: zaydan ‘Zaid’ in (21a); zaydan ‘Zaid’ in (22a); al-na:sa ‘the people’ in (29a); zaydan ‘Zaid’ in (30a); the two Accusative nominals: zaydan ‘Zaid’ and tabi ban ‘a doctor’ in (31a); the two Accusative nominals: zaydan ‘Zaid’ and risa:latan ‘a letter’ in (36a); and the Oblique nominal zaydin ‘Zaid’ in (37a).
Nominative Case (i.e. structural Case—see chapter 3, section 3.3) as in julusun in (41a), zamanun in (43a), and fawqu in (45a). Notice that, like the direct object, each of these latter elements retains its logical status:

(40) a. jalasa julusun hasanan.
   (Gloss: sat (3sm) sitting (Acc) nice (Acc))
   (Lit.: He sat nice sitting.)
   b. He sat (down) in a nice way (of sitting).
   (cf. examples (22))

(41) a. julisa julusun hasanun.
   (Gloss: was sat (3sm) sitting (Nom) nice (Nom))
   b. (Lit.: A nice sitting was sat.)

(42) a. jalasa zamanun tawi:lan.
   (Gloss: sat (3sm) time (Acc) long (Acc))
   b. He sat (down) (for) a long time.
   (cf. examples (23))

(43) a. julisa zamanun tawi:lun.
   (Gloss: was sat (3sm) time (Nom) long (Nom))
   b. (Lit.: A long time was sat.)

(44) a. jalasa fawqa al-?ardi.
   (Gloss: sat (3sm) over (Acc) the-floor (Obi))
   b. He sat (down) over/on the floor.
   (cf. examples (24))

(45) a. julisa fawqu al-?ardi.
   (Gloss: was sat (3sm) over (Nom) the-floor (Obi))
   b. (Lit.: Over the floor was sat.)

With the identification of all possible substantival categories that have the potential for subject promotion in Arabic, there seems to be an inherent hierarchy among them when canonical passivisation operates: the direct object (or, for that matter, the indirect object), otherwise either the cognate object or the adverbial object. Notice that the direct object also includes Oblique nominals such as zaydin ‘Zaid’ in the active sentence (37a) where the ‘intransitive’ verb marra ‘to pass’ is causativised by the preposition bi ‘by’ as discussed above. For both linguistic and pragmatic reasons, such an hierarchy is determined by the degree of importance or ‘basicness’ of these substantival categories, as illustrated in the following way:
(i) If a direct object exists overtly in the case of potentially or morphologically transitive verbs, then this category should be syntactically promoted to subject position, even if one, or more, of the other categories coexist (cf. (3); (21); (22); (29)).

(ii) If both a direct object and an indirect object exist overtly in the case of potentially or morphologically ditransitive verbs, then, depending on Case assignment, either category should be syntactically promoted to subject position, even if one, or more, of the other categories coexist (cf. (30); (31); (36); (38)).

(iii) If a direct object exists covertly within a PP in the case of potentially or morphologically ‘intransitive’ verbs (but causativised by certain prepositions), then this category should be semantically promoted to subject position, even if one, or more, of the other categories coexist (cf. (37); (39)).

(iv) If neither a direct object nor an indirect object exists overtly or covertly in the case of potentially or morphologically intransitive verbs, then, under certain conditions, either the cognate object (cf. (40); (41)) or the adverbial object (time or place) (cf. (23); (24); (42-45)) should be syntactically promoted to subject position.

Correspondingly, the traditional account of the relationship between transitivity and canonical passivisation in English (cf. section 2.1) suffers from more or less the same flaws, as can be implicitly seen in the English equivalents of most of the Arabic examples cited in this section. That is, the traditional account addresses particular passive sentences such as (4b), whose active counterpart (3b) expresses an overt direct object, but ignores other

---

13 At one end, there are verbs of a bare form (i.e. Form I) which are potentially intransitive such as *thahaba* ‘to go’, *jalasa* ‘to sit’, etc. (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (5-6); (8)). At another, there are other verbs of a bare form (i.e. Form I) which are potentially transitive such as *mahaha* ‘to efface (tr.)’, *kasara* ‘to break (tr.)’, etc. (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (4)). If, for instance, the latter verbs are governed by the derivative representation of Form VII, then they become morphologically
linguistic and nonlinguistic aspects which may act as necessary preconditions for the occurrence of canonical passivisation. It also ignores categories, other than the direct object, which may become the 'surface' subject of the passive construction. In the upcoming sections these aspects and categories will be explained in a fairly detailed and elaborated configuration throughout the discussion of the two main types of the canonical passive construction in Arabic and English; namely, what is known as the personal passive and the impersonal passive. The next section will consider the essential pragmalinguistic properties of the former type in the two languages.

2.3 Personal passivisation

It is often argued that the canonical representation of the verbal passive construction in most human languages is primarily associated with what is collectively referred to as the 'personal passive construction', and that what is known as the 'impersonal passive construction' appears to constitute a less common type, as will be discussed in the next section (section 2.4). For this reason, research in comparative linguistics has been much more concerned with the former type than it has been with the latter.

Numerous attempts have been made to probe the entity of the 'surface' subject in the personal passive construction both on a syntactic and a semantic level, given the pragmatic significance of its thematic role. As a consequence, the general definition of this construction, a definition that is accepted by most linguists and grammarians, seems to underline two fundamental prerequisites, which may be adumbrated in the following way:

(46) a. A construction can be classified as a personal passive if it contains an overt subject with semantic content, provided that this subject maintains the logical status of the object (direct or indirect depending on Case assignment—see above) in the corresponding active construction.

intransitive as in *inmaḥaqa ‘to efface (intr.)’* and *inkasara ‘to break (intr.)’* respectively (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (31)).
b. If the first generalised prerequisite is constantly verifiable, and if a construction can indeed be taken as a reflection of the personal passive, then it follows that every instance of this construction presupposes the 'existence' of an underlying active counterpart.

According to these two generalised prerequisites, the propositional contents of both the personal passive construction and the corresponding active one are in principle expressible in a similar configuration, notwithstanding the possibility that the former construction may be agentive or agentless in nature. However, concerning the logical and semantic implications of the structural mutations that either construction necessitates, this propositional content cannot always be synonymous, especially when categories such as quantifiers, pronominals, modals and the like are incorporated. This seems to be true of even certain instances of the personal passive construction which is agentive in nature, where the logical status of the Agent in the corresponding active construction is explicitly retained in the form of an object of the preposition by. For example, in either of the following active-passive pairs in English the propositional contents of (a) and (b) are not synonymous (see, for instance, Siewierska, 1984:257):

(47) a. Everyone pleased his wife.
    b. His wife was pleased by everyone.

(48) a. John could not do this job.
    b. This job could not be done by John.

As these examples illustrate, the active sentence in (47a) is ambiguous due to the potential coreferentiality (or coindexation) of everyone and his, whereas the passive sentence in (47b) is apparently unambiguous as the same potential coreferentiality is not perceivable. Analogously, while the modal could in the active sentence in (48a) may indicate the notion of 'ability', the same modal in the passive sentence in (48b) may also express the notion of 'possibility'. Although examples of active-passive pairs in English such as (47a-b) and (48a-b) could well be taken up as counter-evidence to the general definition of the personal passive construction stated in (46), for many linguists and grammarians such examples are said to constitute nothing more than an exceptional (or marked) situation relative to the majority of the instances of this construction in real-life discourse. This point also holds for
Arabic examples of active-passive pairs incorporating the same categories in even more explicit configurations, since the general rule of canonical passivisation in Arabic normally requires that the real Agent (i.e. the doer of the action portrayed by the verb) be suppressed by whatever means as discussed earlier (cf. section 2.1). For example:

(49) a. qabbala-t kullu imra?atin zawja-ha:.
    (Gloss: kissed (3sf) every (Nom) woman (Gen) husband-her (Acc))
    b. Every woman kissed her husband.

(50) a. qubbila zawju-ha:.
    (Gloss: was kissed (3sm) husband-her (Nom))
    b. Her husband was kissed.

(51) a. ma:-ista?a an-yunj iza al-muhimmata.
    (Gloss: not-could (3sm) to-carry out (3sm) the-mission (Acc))
    b. He could not carry out the mission.

(52) a. ma:-istuti:?a inja:zu al-muhimmati.
    (Gloss: not-could (3sm, Pass) carrying out (Nom) the-mission (Gen))
    (Lit.: Carrying out of the mission could not be done.)
    b. The mission could not be carried out.

So far as the suppression of the Agent is concerned, there seems to be widespread agreement that, in languages such as English, the vast majority of instances of the personal passive construction that are reported in the literature are agentless in nature, approximately 85% (see, for example, Siewierska, 1984:38; Thompson, 1987:498). This indicates that most of the instances of this construction in English are employed in naturalistic settings (be they formal or informal) when there are indeed sufficient pragmatic reasons to forego mention of the real Agent (i.e. the doer of the action), for which reason the resultant construction is sometimes called the ‘short passive construction’. However, although such an existing fact can be taken as a plausible criterion for illustrating the fundamental parallelism in the personal passive construction between Arabic and English, the extremely predominant agentless nature of this construction in Arabic (approximately 95%) tends to minimise the functional divergence across certain Arabic ‘patientive’ actives and certain English agentive passives, since the agentless nature of the latter construction is less predominant as just seen (for a detailed analysis of frequency variability, see chapter 4, section 4.4).
As mentioned at the end of the preceding section (section 2.2), certain types of Accusative nominals in Arabic can act as the 'surface' subject in the canonical passive construction. These substantival categories seem to function within a specified hierarchy: the direct or indirect object, otherwise either the cognate or adverbial object, a hierarchy which delineates the degree of semantic significance of the thematic role (if any) that is assigned to each of these categories. If, however, an intransitive verb necessitates a PP-argument to act as its phrasal complement, or if a potentially ditransitive verb involves the semantic equation of its two objects with a *that*-argument to act as its sentential complement, then the resultant construction would, generally speaking, be a reflection of what is collectively referred to as the 'impersonal passive construction'. This means that a canonical passive construction which incorporates as its 'surface' subject any of the four substantival categories just mentioned would, on the other hand, be a reflection of the personal passive construction, an assertion whose validity should be reconsidered through discussion of the impersonal passive construction, as will be seen in the next section (section 2.4).

Given the degree of semantic significance of the thematic role referred to above, it appears that what determines the passivisability of a particular construction is not the degree of transitivity as has been misleadingly believed, but the *thematic arguments* that the main lexical verb has to discharge as its 'place-holders' in order to flesh out *who-did-what-to-whom*. An active construction with the transitive verb *kasara* in Arabic or *break* in English, for instance, should obligatorily mention both *al-ka:sir* 'the-breaker' and *al-maksu:r* ‘the-thing-broken’, for which reason passivisation may operate. Furthermore, an active construction with the transitive verb *wadaʔa* in Arabic or *put* in English should, in addition to *al-wa:diʔ* 'the-putter' and *al-mawduʔ* ‘the-thing-put’, obligatorily mention *al-mawduʔ: fi:hi* ‘the-place-where-the-thing-is-put’, otherwise passivisation may not operate. Thus, in either

---

14. Within the early version of the Principles-and-Parameters (P&P) model, the thematic (or theta) arguments of the main lexical verb are said to be regulated by a general principle termed the theta-Criterion (see, for example, Chomsky, 1981:34f, 101f; Chomsky, 1986a:184f). This general principle will be explained in detail in the next chapter (cf. chapter 3; sections 3.1 and 3.3).
language the active sentence (53) and the canonical passive version (54) below are ungrammatical, even though the direct object is overtly expressed in the former. For example:

\[(53)\]  
a.* wada?a zaydun al-kita:ba.  
(Gloss: put (3sm) Zaid (Nom) the-book (Acc))  
b.* Zaid put the book.

\[(54)\]  
(Gloss: was put (3sm) the-book (Nom))  
b.* The book was put.

This explains why the missing PP, whose thematic role is to define the place where *al-kita:bu* 'the book' is put in examples such as these, is an integral constituent of the whole construction, leading one to suggest that, for the verb *wada?a* 'to put', the Location-PP is potentially more important than the Agent-NP within the hierarchy of the thematic arguments that this verb has to discharge. While the former is still required when passivisation comes into operation (hence the ungrammaticality of (54) above), the latter is syntactically demoted, or rather dispensed with, in most of the instances of the personal passive construction seen earlier, due to the presence of a certain category that has the potential for subject-promotion (the direct object in this case). As a result, the Agent-NP is considered an entity which is syntactically functionless, sometimes termed 'chômeur' within the framework of relational grammar (cf. Perlmutter, 1983:9f), but whose logical status is inferable either from the interrelationship between the 'new' thematic arguments emitted by the passive verb or from the pragmatic clues available in the context.

For the proponents of relational grammar, the direct object, which is assigned the thematic role of the Patient, or Theme to some scholars, is the only category that can be immediately promoted to subject-position in the personal passive construction. On this view, categories other than the Patient, viz. the Recipient, or Goal to some scholars, pass through two distinct rules of promotion, which correlate with two distinct rules of demotion: first, the Recipient is promoted to object-position, whilst at the same time the original Patient is demoted to a 'chômeur'; and second, passivisation, then, promotes the already promoted object to subject-
position and demotes the original Agent to a ‘chômeur’. According to these two rules, the
passive sentences (57) in Arabic and English appear to derive from (55) through (56) (cf.
Siewierska, 1984:46).

(Gloss: gave (3sm) Zaid (Nom) the-book (Acc) to-Amr (Obl))
b. Zaid gave the book to Amr.

(Gloss: gave (3sm) Zaid (Nom) Amr (Acc) the-book (Acc))
b. Zaid gave Amr the book.

(Gloss: was given (3sm) Amr (Nom) the-book (Acc))
b. Amr was given the book.

Researchers like Saad argue that in active sentences such as (56), which represent the first
rule of promotion/demotion, it is the NP ?amran ‘Amr’, rather than the NP al-kita:ba ‘the
book’, which is assigned the thematic role of a Patient (cf. Saad, 1982:22). Relational
grammarians explain this role assignment in terms of what is known as ‘indirect-object
advancement’, a syntactic process which matches the thematic role of the ‘passive’ subject-
NP ?amrun ‘Amr’ in (57), not with that of the Recipient-NP ?amrin ‘Amr’ in (55), but with
that of the promoted object-NP ?amran ‘Amr’ in (56). They support their caveat by reference
to a further set of examples where the thematic role of the ‘passive’ subject-NP ?amrun
‘Amr’ in (60) below mismatches that of the Benefactive-NP ?amrin ‘Amr’ in (58) more
explicitly, and thus the lexical verb kašafa ‘to reveal’ in Arabic and English permits access
neither to indirect-object advancement as in (59) nor to passivisation as in (60) (see, for
example, Siewierska, 1984:48):

(58) a. kašafa zaydun al-sirra li-?amrin.
(Gloss: revealed (3sm) Zaid (Nom) the-secret (Acc) to-Amr (Obl))
b. Zaid revealed the secret to Amr.

(59) a.* kašafa zaydun ?amran al-sirra.
(Gloss: revealed (3sm) Zaid (Nom) Amr (Acc) the-secret (Acc))
b.* Zaid revealed Amr the secret.

(60) a.* kušifa ?amrun al-sirra.
(Gloss: was revealed (3sm) Amr (Nom) the-secret (Acc))
b.* Amr was revealed the secret.
Such an account, however, obfuscates the obvious fact that the promoted object-NP in (56) does not have the same syntactic, and therefore semantic, potential of the ‘basic’ Patient-NP in Arabic and English. It could be well argued that, following Ziv and Sheintuch (1979; 1981), the thematic role of an NP like ?amran ‘Amr’ in (56) is not a Patient, but a Recipient occupying the syntactic position of a ‘surface’ direct object. Thus, so far as Case-assignment is concerned, this NP does not behave syntactically in the same way as an NP like al-kita:ba ‘the book’ does. While the former NP is assigned the Oblique Case (i.e. it is a prepositional object) in (55)\(^\text{15}\) and the Accusative Case (i.e it is a nonprepositional object) in (56), the latter NP is assigned the Accusative Case, and is therefore nonprepositional in both instances. This distinction is made here to show that the prepositional NP in (55) is not an indirect object, but an Oblique NP (an object of a preposition) simply because, under ‘ungrammatical passivisation’, it behaves syntactically in the same way as other Oblique NPs do. For example:

(61)  
- b. Zaid gave the book to Amr.
- d.* Amr was given the book to.

(62)  
- a. kataba-t hindun risa:latan li-zaydin.
- b. Hind wrote a letter for Zaid.
- c.* kutiba zaydun risa:latan li.
- d.* Zaid was written a letter for.

(63)  
- b. He played the tune on the guitar.
- c.* ?uzifa al-qaytha:ru al-lahna ?ala:.
- d.* The guitar was played the tune on.

(64)  
- b. She opened the door with the key.
- c.* futih a al-mifta:hu al-ba:ba bi.
- d.* The key was opened the door with.

This analysis is in principle congruent with the analysis introduced by the proponents of functional grammar who hold that direct-object identification (or, for that matter, subject-identification) is relevant only for languages like Arabic and English where the syntactic

\[^{15}\] In some other languages which also express grammatical relations by means of inflection or inflections the ‘Dative Case’ is used as an alternative term to express this indirect-object relation.
properties of either category act as ‘formal indicators’ of its semantic and pragmatic properties. Examples such as (55) and (56) can be seen as alternative representations of the same state of affairs: primarily, the Agent-NP zaydun ‘Zaid’ is taken up for representing this state of affairs in both instances; and secondarily, either the Recipient-NP ?amran ‘Amr’ or the Patient-NP al-kita:ba ‘the book’ is selected for ‘completing’ the task of representation.

Although traditional grammarians often employ the term ‘indirect object’ for an NP like ?amrin ‘Amr’ in (55) (see also note 15) and the term ‘direct object’ for an NP like ?amran ‘Amr’ in (56), a matter that does not seem to constitute a conceptual deviation, functional grammarians underline the obvious fact that the two categories coincide in relation to thematic-role assignment, viz. the Recipient. Yet, the inherent idiosyncrasies of either category are difficult to explain in terms of this one-sided account, given the peculiar nature of its syntactic behaviour. Functional grammarians add that if the two categories differ, as they clearly do, then their differences have to do with whether or not either category is identified with a direct object. Therefore, in the unmarked case, the direct object precedes a ‘potential object’, and is nonprepositional; whereas the Recipient-NP which is not identified with the direct object is prepositional. The Patient-NP in both cases (i.e. whether or not it is identified with the direct object) is nonprepositional (see, for example, Dik, 1991:263).

Having discussed the most significant properties of the personal passive construction, its seems that the only property that can be generalised across all natural instances of such a construction is the nonagentive nature of the ‘surface’ subject. However, this generalisation does not seem to be sufficient to offer a comprehensive definition since there exist in Arabic and English (or any other human language) certain natural instances of the active construction where the subject is also characterised by a nonagentive nature (cf. examples (5-

---

16 The term ‘potential object’ refers here to either the prepositional Recipient-NP ?amrin ‘Amr’ in (55) or the nonprepositional Patient-NP al-kita:ba ‘the book’ in (56). In Arabic linguistic theory the former is referred to as ism majru:r ‘an Oblique nominal’ (cf. the Oblique NPs in (61-64)), whereas
10) in section 2.1). Given this existing fact, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to fully define the personal passive construction except in conjunction with a consideration of the corresponding active. Thus, in reference to the two generalised prerequisites stated in (46) above, a comparison of the two constructions will bring to light two distinctive properties as stated in (65):

(65) a. The ‘surface’ subject in the personal passive construction is semantically equivalent to a nonsubject in the active version.

b. The overt or covert Agent-NP in the personal passive construction is semantically equivalent to a possible subject in the active version.

These two properties can therefore be said to unite all natural instances of the personal passive in Arabic and English. The only exceptions are those passive-like sentences which do not seem to presuppose the ‘existence’ of underlying active versions (cf. examples (17-20)). Examples such as these can be seen as specific representations of the active construction rather than the passive one, as will be seen presently. But first let us consider the pragmalinguistic overlap between the personal passive and what is known as the reflexive in Arabic and English in order to illuminate further aspects of the former construction.

As seen earlier, there exist in Arabic certain bound morphemes such as ta- and in- which mark reflexivisation within the structure of the active verb. The morpheme ta- is prefixed to morphologically transitive verbs of Form II and the morpheme in- to potentially transitive verbs of Form I to yield their ‘reflexive intransitivisers’ in Form V and Form VII respectively (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2). Generally, reflexives are intransitive verbs which do not permit a core relationship with an Accusative nominal in the form of a direct object. This means that the NP which the inflectional representation of the reflexive immediately ‘governs’ acts as its ‘surface’ subject, for which reason it is assigned the Nominative Case, with the ending being morphologically realised in Arabic, but not in English. For example:

(66) a. takassara al-ka?su.  (Form V)
    (Gloss: smashed (3sm, Ref) the-glass (Nom))

the latter is known as maʃʔw.l bihi thawi:n: ‘the second object’ since it follows the nonprepositional Recipient-NP påmrân ‘Amr’ in (56) which is known as maʃʔw.l bihi awwal ‘the first object’.
b. The glass smashed.

(67)  a. inkasara al-ka?su.  (Form VII)  
(Gloss: broke (3sm, Ref) the-glass (Nom))

b. The glass broke.

Here, the subject of the reflexive verb in (66) and (67) is depicted as if it were responsible for bringing about the main event, although in reality glasses do not smash or break of their own accord.17 But the absence of reified causation, an important precondition for passivisation, may well explain the nonpassivisability of these verbs, given the active representation of their structure. In addition, there exists no ‘external’ Agent, a further important precondition for passivisation, to be suppressed or demoted as these verbs are univalent in nature (i.e. they assign only one thematic argument, viz. the Patient). This also applies to other reflexive constructions which employ transitive verbs as in (68) and (69) below, but whose reflexivisation is marked by anaphoric pronominals such as nafsahu ‘himself’. For example:

(68)  a. qatala zaydun nafsahu.  
(Gloss: killed (3sm) Zaid (Nom) himself (Acc))

b. Zaid killed himself.

(69)  a. jammala zaydun nafsahu.  
(Gloss: embellished (3sm) Zaid (Nom) himself (Acc))

b. Zaid embellished himself.

The distinction between the subject al-ka?su ‘the glass’ in (66-67) and the subject zaydun ‘Zaid’ in (68-69) can be readily made in terms of the distinction between the Patient and the Agent respectively. This leads one to believe that passivisation may apply to the latter sentences due to the existence of an Agent to be suppressed or demoted on the one hand, and a ‘Patient’ to be promoted to subject-position on the other. However, the fact that the two categories are coindexed with each other explains the nonpassivisability of the verbs that

---

17 There is a divergence of opinion about the description of English verbs such as break, open, move, etc. On the one hand, to linguists like Halliday (1970), these verbs are ergative in that they are basically intransitive verbs whose transitive use is derived. On the other, linguists like Comrie (1977a) refer to them as anticausative in that they are basically transitive verbs whose intransitive use is derived. It seems that the latter opinion is the one that holds crosslinguistically, since the Arabic counterparts are transitive verbs from which the intransitive versions are derived via certain morphological rules (see also note 13). For example:

(i)  a. kasara (tr.)  
    b. fataha (tr.)  
    c. harraka (tr.)

    inkasara (intr.) ‘to break’  
    infataha (intr.) ‘to open’  
    taguearra (intr.) ‘to move’


discharge them as these verbs can be looked upon as alternately bivalent (i.e. they assign two thematic roles, the Agent and the Patient, to one participant simultaneously). Thus, the ‘external’ Agent referred to above is still lacking, since coindexation imposes an ‘internal’ characteristic on the Agent, whether its causational value is reified in $zaydun$ ‘Zaid’ or in $nafsahu$ ‘himself’.

Now the distinction between the Patient $al-ka?su$ ‘the glass’ in (66-67) and the ‘Patient’ $nafsahu$ ‘himself’ in (68-69) is that the former does not imply agency whereas the latter does, albeit ‘internally’, via coindexation with the Agent $zaydun$ ‘Zaid’. Thus, the only denominator that can be said to unite morphological and anaphoric reflexives is the absence of ‘external’ agency (i.e. the nonattendance of at least two noncoindexed ‘univalent’ participants), for which reason canonical passivisation does not come into operation (cf. Saad, 1982:98). This means that if ‘external’ agency is already suppressed by a low-transitivity verb, then there must be some inherent similarities between reflexives and personal passives. It is argued that such similarities are historically inevitable; otherwise it would be difficult to account for the predominance of personal passives which derive diachronically from reflexives (cf. Givón, 1990:564). For example:

(70)  
a. inkasara al-ka?su.  
   (Gloss: broke (3sm, Ref) the-glass (Nom))
   b. The glass broke.

(71)  
a. kusira al-ka?su.  
   (Gloss: was broken (3sm) the-glass (Nom))
   b. The glass was broken.

In both constructions the subject is assigned the Nominative Case and the Patient, meaning that it is both promotional and anticausational. Moreover, in addition to the missing Agent the morphological reflexive in (70)\(^{18}\) tends to approximate the stativeness and resultativeness

\(^{18}\) Notice that both $inkasara$ in Arabic and $break$ in English also coincide in their transitive use, in which case the former takes its bare form, viz. $kasara$ in Form 1 (see also note 17). As such, neither $kasara$ nor $break$ can undergo anaphoric reflexivisation, unless the meaning and valency are figuratively extended away from the transitive prototype.
of the passive in (71). The only difference is that causation is not reified in the former (cf. (66-67) and note 17), whereas, in the latter, it is reified in an 'external' Agent that is responsible for bringing about the main event. This substantial overlap has led numerous researchers to describe the morphological reflexive as the middle voice, a matter that is beyond the scope of this study (cf. Saad, 1982:92; Keyser and Roeper, 1984:383; Givón, 1990:638). The crucial point here is that the morphological reflexive may well have acted as a pragmalinguistic interface within the diachronic rise of personal passives out of anaphoric reflexives, notwithstanding the considerable difference between the two types of reflexives, as seen above. This interface can therefore be understood, particularly when nonvolitional verbs, or verbs of adverse effect on the reflexive participant, are incorporated. For example:

(72) a. jaraha zaydun nafsahu.
   (Gloss: cut (3sm) Zaid (Nom) himself (Acc))
   b. Zaid cut himself.

(73) a. juriha zaydun.
   (Gloss: was cut (3sm) Zaid (Nom))
   b. Zaid was cut.

From the viewpoint of the personal passive (73), where the subject zaydun ‘Zaid’ is the real Patient, the same subject in the anaphoric reflexive (72) cannot be seen as the real Agent simply because it is not the entity that triggers volitionally the main event, but an entity that acts upon itself both reflexively and nonvolitionally. Likewise the object nafsahu ‘himself’ in (72) cannot be seen as the real Patient since it is coreferential (or coindexed) with a subject that is not the real Agent. Thus, the coreferentiality (or coindexation) of a ‘nonagent’ and a ‘nonpatient’ is logically equivalent to the conjunction of ‘no-cause’ and ‘no-effect’, a fact incapable, so it may seem, of clarifying the overlap between (72) and (73), even if both connectives are truth functional: they are true if the propositions joined by them are true. Yet, the exclusive and/or inclusive disjunction of either connective implies that in (72) volitional causation is abstracted from ‘Zaid’ or ‘himself’ or both participants. As a result, unlike (68-69) where volitional causation is reified ‘internally’ in both participants, to abstract volitional causation as such is in fact to reify it both nonvolitionally and ‘externally’ in the accident that caused ‘Zaid’ to cut ‘himself’ on the one hand, and to represent the subsequent effect
'alternately' in both participants on the other. These two facts appear to invariably neutralise the sharp distinction between (72) and (73).

On this reasoning, the pragmatic divergence across anaphoric reflexives such as (68-69) and the corresponding personal passives can also be minimised by abstracting volitional causation exclusively and/or inclusively in order to maintain its nonvolitional and ‘external’ reification. This is attainable when an adverbial phrase like kataʔan ‘accidentally’ is used to modify the volitional event. For example:

(74)  
   a. qatala zaydun nafsahu kataʔan.  
       (Gloss: killed (3sm) Zaid (Nom) himself (Acc) accidentally (Acc))  
   b. Zaid killed himself accidentally.

(75)  
   a. qutila zaydun kataʔan.  
       (Gloss: was killed (3sm) Zaid (Nom) accidentally (Acc))  
   b. Zaid was killed accidentally.

Here, it does not matter whether the accident caused ‘Zaid’ to kill ‘himself’ as in (74) or caused someone/something else to kill ‘Zaid’ as in (75). Nor does it matter whether the subsequent effect is represented alternately both in ‘Zaid’ and ‘himself’ as in (74) or exclusively in ‘Zaid’ as in (75), since the abstractive dissociation of the former is no longer sustained, and thus ‘alternate’ patiency is considered one entity. What matters is the fact that the subject in both instances is nonagentive and that causation is reified in the accident both nonvolitionally and ‘externally’. Therefore, the structural status of nonvolitional ‘external’ agency is syntactically demoted in the form of an adverbial phrase, a status that can be perceived more transparently in the following paraphrase:

19 If, however, an adverbial phrase such as qasdan ‘deliberately’ modifies the nonvolitional event in an anaphoric reflexive, then agency turns out to be both volitional and ‘internal’, and thus the sharp distinction between the resultant construction and the personal passive construction cannot be neutralised. For example:

(i)  
   a. jaraha zaydun nafsahu qasdan.  
       (Gloss: cut (3sm) Zaid (Nom) himself (Acc) deliberately (Acc))  
   b. Zaid cut himself deliberately.

(ii)  
   a. juriha zaydun qasdan.  
       (Gloss: was cut (3sm) Zaid (Nom) deliberately (Acc))  
   b. Zaid was cut deliberately.
From the above discussion of the pragmalinguistic overlap between the anaphoric reflexive and the personal passive and how this overlap is diachronically 'mediated' by the morphological reflexive, it can be seen that, besides the two properties stated in (65), two further aspects are indispensable for the natural occurrence of canonical passivisation: 'reification of causation' and 'externalisation of agency'. It is therefore the absence of these two aspects which brings to light the nonpassiveness of passive-like sentences such as those cited in section 2.1 (cf. examples (17-20)). This absence, which is above all a logical consequence of the nonpromotional nature of the 'surface' subject, can now be said to demonstrate the implication of activeness in these examples, even if on the surface the verbs they incorporate comply with the rules of passive morphology in Arabic and English. Given the significance of the two aspects being talked about, the pragmalinguistic definition of the canonical passive will be restated later, especially when we discuss the second type of this construction, viz. what is known as the impersonal passive. The next section will consider the essential pragmalinguistic properties of this second type in Arabic and English.

2.4 Impersonal passivisation

As mentioned at the outset of the previous section, the so-called impersonal passive construction constitutes a less common type than the personal passive construction discussed above. This is ascribable to the very restricted nature of the 'surface' subject in the former construction, a generalisable property that is most noticeable to the linguistic analyst. As it appears in languages instantiating the impersonal passive construction, the 'surface' subject in this construction takes the form of a nominal expletive: The implicit third-person-singular-masculine pronominal 

From a syntactic perspective, these two pronominals can be said to represent...
a ‘surface’ subject in both languages, a subject which has its grammatical function, but whose logical status is abstractively dissociated from the real Agent for linguistic and pragmatic reasons.

It is therefore the implicit existence of the pronominal \textit{huwa} ‘he’ in Arabic and the explicit existence of the pronominal \textit{it} in English which stand in contrast with the assumption that the ‘surface’ subject in the impersonal passive construction is syntactically deleted as a result of a process termed ‘spontaneous demotion’, an assumption that was made by researchers like Comrie (1977b). Even in reference to those alternative analyses proposed within the framework of relational grammar, it is difficult to regard the two pronominals in question as representatives of a ‘dummy’ which is promoted from a nonsubject relation-2 to a subject relation-1 (cf. Perlmutter, 1978; Perlmutter and Postal, 1984).

Rather, in languages such as Arabic and English, the expletive interpretation is syntactically represented as a ‘surface’ subject to simply impersonalise the identity of the real Agent. Thus, as the term ‘impersonal’ itself would indicate, the two pronominals being talked about are incorporated (implicitly in Arabic and explicitly in English) to refer specifically to a human Agent and to imply that this human Agent is characterised by a covert and indefinite nature. For this reason, the nominal expletive in the impersonal passive construction can semantically be equated with nonanaphoric pronominals such as \textit{ahaduhum} ‘someone’ and \textit{hum} ‘they’ which act arbitrarily as the ‘surface’ subject in certain impersonal active constructions in Arabic and English. For example:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{77} a. \textit{na:ma ahaduhum fi: al-da:ri}.  
\quad (Gloss: slept (3sm) someone (Nom) in the-house (Obl))
\item b. Someone slept in the house.
\item \textbf{78} a. \textit{qa:lu: anna zaydan nahawiyyun}.  
\quad (Gloss: said (3plm) that Zaid (Acc) syntactician (Nom))
\item b. They said that Zaid was a syntactician.
\end{itemize}

Therefore, the perceivable covertexness and indefiniteness of the subjectivised nonanaphoric pronominal in impersonal active constructions such as (77-78) would entail an abstractive
dissociation of this pronominal from the real human Agent, since there exists no syntactically represented nominal in a core relationship with the main lexical verb. This is the basic property of the nominal expletive that acts as the ‘surface’ subject in the impersonal passive construction (see, for example, Moreno, 1990:32; Klaiman, 1991:8f). As such, impersonal passivisation changes the mapping of a potential nominal to the subjectivised nonanaphoric pronominal (i.e. the nominal expletive itself) in a typically detransitivised construction, for which reason the nonsubject in the corresponding active construction is syntactically unpromoted (see also Givón, 1990:570f). In other words, if impersonal active constructions such as (77-78) are passivised, then the nonsubject being talked about, the Locative PP-argument in (77) and the embedded that-argument in (78), will remain in its base position, and will therefore retain its Case assignment (for further details, see chapter 3, sections 3.3 and 3.4). For example:

    (Gloss: was slept (he) in the-house (Obl))
    b. (Lit.: It was slept in the house.)

(80) a. qi:la anna zaydan nahawiyyun.
    (Gloss: was said (he) that Zaid (Acc) syntactician (Nom))
    b. It was said that Zaid was a syntactician.

Provisionally, this brings to light two syntactically different subtypes of the impersonal passive construction having the same expletive interpretation of the subjectivised nonanaphoric pronominal, an interpretation that is necessarily confined to a covert and indefinite human Agent. The first subtype generally incorporates an intransitive verb necessitating a PP-argument to act as its phrasal complement, a construction that occurs in languages such as Arabic, but not English, as in (79) above. The second subtype normally incorporates a verb which is potentially ditransitive, but whose two objects act as an embedded that-argument to be its sentential complement, a construction that is instantiated in languages such as Arabic and English as in (80) above. These two subtypes will be considered respectively.
Concerning the first subtype of the impersonal passive as in (79) above, the incorporation of an intransitive verb necessitating a PP-argument seems to act as an important precondition for the implicit subjectivisation of the nominal expletive *huwa* ‘he’ in Arabic. The apparent evidence for the real, though implicit, existence of such an expletive is the fact that the passive form of the intransitive verb in question is constantly inflected in accord with the third-person-singular-masculine pronominal, as seen. This is to strictly refer to a covert and indefinite human Agent within a typically detransitivised construction. Detransitivisation of an intransitive verb will therefore result in a nonvalent construction, a syntactic representation that seems to exist in languages such as Arabic, but not English for no obvious reason (cf. also chapter 3, section 3.3, examples (59-61), note 12). Further examples follow:

(81) a. si:ra ?ala: al-?ardi.
   (Gloss: was walked (he) on the-land (Obl))
   b. (Lit.: It was walked on the land.)

(82) a. ruq:iša fi: al-masrahi.
   (Gloss: was danced (he) in-theatre (Obl))
   b. (Lit.: It was danced in the theatre.)

In such a perspective, the strict reference to a covert and indefinite human Agent will still be maintained, even if the Locative PP-argument denotes a place of animals rather than humans as in *hadi:qati al-hayawa:nati* ‘the Zoo’ (literally, ‘the animal park’) in (83) below, or even if the intransitive verb itself specifically expresses an animal rather than human activity as in *nabaha* ‘to bark’ in (84) below. Thus, in both instances, the implicit subjectivisation of the nominal expletive *huwa* ‘he’ refers strictly to an unspecified person rather than to an unspecified animal as in (83) or to an unspecified dog as in (84), the latter being used with a derogatory meaning only (cf. Frajzyngier, 1982:280). For example:

(83) a. huriba min hadi:qati al-hayawa:nati.
   (Gloss: was run away (he) from park (Obl) the-animals (Gen))
   b. (Lit.: It was run away from the Zoo.)

(84) a. nubiha fi: al-mahkamati.
   (Gloss: was barked (he) in-the-court (Obl))
   b. (Lit.: It was barked in the court.)

Crosslinguistically, to render the implicit nominal expletive *huwa* ‘he’ as shown in Arabic examples such as (83-84) into English would require the explicit incorporation of a
nonanaphoric pronominal such as *someone*, a pronominal that stands for an unspecified human Agent to be responsible for bringing about the main event. The explicit incorporation of such a pronominal means, therefore, its syntactic representation within a typically impersonal active construction (e.g. *Someone ran away from the Zoo; Someone barked in the court*; etc.). This is due to the fact that the first subtype of the impersonal passive construction is not possible in languages such as English as mentioned above.

In Arabic linguistic theory, subjectivisation, as a syntactic process, entails Nominative-Case assignment to the NP that performs the grammatical function of the subject of the verb, whatever form of voice it may express (see, for example, Saad, 1982:104). If, however, there exists no other NP with a thematic role that can function as the 'surface' subject under canonical passivisation, then the verb, be it intransitive or potentially ditransitive, would be associated with the nominal expletive *huwa* 'he' for the impersonalisation of its subject as is evident in (79-84) above. This also applies to verbs which are potentially intransitive but causativised by certain prepositions like *bi* 'by' as discussed earlier (cf. section 2.2, examples (39)). These examples are repeated in (85) for convenience:

(85)  a. *murra bi-zaydin.*

   (Gloss: was passed (he) by-Zaid (Obl))

   b. (Lit.: It was passed by Zaid.)

Given the hierarchy of Accusative nominals in Arabic referred to in the preceding section (the direct or indirect object, otherwise either the cognate or adverbial object), a

---

20 Notice that in all examples of the first subtype of the impersonal passive construction, where the intransitive verb necessitates a PP-argument (cf. (79) and (81-85)), the object of the preposition is typically an NP. In Arabic it is also possible to find examples of this construction in which the object of the preposition is an embedded infinitival clause, a specific representation of a PP-argument required by intransitive verbs such as *ittafqa* 'to agree' of Form VIII (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, Form VIII). For example:


   (Gloss: was agreed (he) on to-be (3sm) the-peace (Nom) permanent (Acc))

   (Lit.: It was agreed on the Peace to be permanent.)

   b. *It was agreed that the Peace would be permanent.*

The interesting point here is that an impersonal passive of the first subtype in Arabic such as (ia) is usually rendered into an impersonal passive of the second subtype in English as in (ib). The second subtype will be discussed further in the text.
reconsideration of both the cognate object and the adverbial object may shed light on special representations of the canonical passive, representations which may constitute a pragmalinguistic interface between the two main types of this construction, viz. the personal passive and the impersonal passive. As discussed earlier, either the cognate or adverbial object can act as the ‘surface’ subject under canonical passivisation when neither the direct nor indirect object exists in a core relationship with the main lexical verb (cf. section 2.2). Thus, according to the rule of subjectivisation just mentioned, a passive sentence where either of the two former Accusative nominals acts as its ‘surface’ subject and is assigned the Nominative Case would count as an instance of the personal passive construction. Examples (41), (43) and (45) are repeated in (86), (87) and (88) respectively:

(86)  
a. julisajulu:sun hasanun. (Cognate)  
(Gloss: was sat (3sm) sitting (Nom) nice (Nom))  
b. (Lit.: A nice sitting was sat.)

(87)  
a. julisa zamanun tawi:lun. (Time)  
(Gloss: was sat (3sm) time (Nom) long (Nom))  
b. (Lit.: A long time was sat.)

(88)  
a. julisa fawqu al-?ardi. (Place)  
(Gloss: was sat (3sm) over (Nom) the-floor (Obl))  
b. (Lit.: Over the floor was sat.)

As these examples illustrate, the cognate object is exemplified by julusun ‘sitting’ in (86) and the adverbial object by zamanun ‘time’ in (87) as an adverb of time and by fawqu ‘over’ in (88) as an adverb of place. However, although these substantival categories exist in a core relationship with the main lexical verb, and are therefore assigned the Nominative Case in accordance with the rule of subjectivisation mentioned above, the abstractive dissociation of the implicit pronominal from the real human Agent is still perceivable within a typically detransitivised construction that is nonvalent in nature, even if such a pronominal may not take the (3sm) form. For this reason, Arabic passive sentences such as (86-88) can be said to

---

If, however, either the cognate object or the adverbial object denoting time is a feminine nominal as in qira:?atun ‘reading (f)’ in (i) and sa ?atun ‘hour (f)’ in (ii) respectively, then the main lexical verb may also be inflected accordingly. For example:

(i)  
a. quri:?a-t qira:?atun hasanatun. (Cognate)  
(Gloss: was read (3sf) reading (Nom) nice (Nom))
constitute a pragmalinguistic interface between the two main types of the canonical passive construction. That is, they are syntactically represented as instances of the personal passive, whilst at the same time the semantic representation of the impersonal passive is apparently maintained. To avoid possible confusion, we will refer to Arabic examples such as (86-88) as the ‘personalised’ versions of the impersonal passive for further analysis in the next chapter (cf. section 3.3, examples (62-64); section 3.4, examples (89)).

Crosslinguistically, to render Arabic examples of the first subtype of the impersonal passive construction such as those cited above into English would necessitate the subjectivisation of the object of the preposition incorporated by the intransitive verb, a construction that is misleadingly called ‘the pseudopassive’ (cf. section 2.1, examples (14-16)). But the abstractive dissociation of the subjectivised category (the object of the preposition) from the real human Agent is perceivable even more transparently than the case with the Arabic examples cited in (86-88), provided that this dissociation is also maintained within a detransitivised construction which is nonvalent in nature. For example:

(89)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The house was slept in.</td>
<td>(cf. (79))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The land was walked on.</td>
<td>(cf. (81))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The theatre was danced in.</td>
<td>(cf. (82))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Zaid was passed by.</td>
<td>(cf. (85))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To linguists like Dixon, whose approach to English grammar is semantically orientated, the subjectivisation of the object of a preposition under canonical passivisation as in (89) is generally conditioned by two syntactic restrictions. First, there must be no direct-object NP intervening between the verb and the preposition it incorporates, otherwise the peripheral NP that is prepositionally marked (i.e. the object of the preposition) cannot be subjectivised. This

b. (Lit.: A nice reading was read.)

(ii)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. julisa-t sa:?atun ka:milatun.</td>
<td>(Time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gloss: was sat (3sf) hour (Nom) whole (Nom))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. (Lit.: A whole hour was sat.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But the fact that the implicit pronominal (3sf) may also take the (3sm) form in examples such as these seems to invariably underline the abstractive dissociation referred to in the text.
would explain the relative grammaticality of *The spoon was eaten with and the ungrammaticality of *The spoon was eaten beans with, for instance. Second, the peripheral NP that is prepositionally marked must not be alternatively codable as a direct-object NP within the same semantic (or thematic) role. This, again, would account for the grammaticality of The box was kicked and the ungrammaticality of *The box was kicked at, for instance. Accordingly, for a peripheral NP to be subjectivised under canonical passivisation as in (89) above this NP must have many of the characteristics of a direct object in the sense discussed earlier (for further information, see Dixon, 1991:315f).

Given the abstractive dissociation of the subjectivised category from the real human Agent in English examples such as (89) and Arabic examples such as (86-88), the former examples can also be said to constitute a pragmalinguistic interface between the two main types of the canonical passive construction, the personal and the impersonal, in the sense referred to above. To avoid the same possible confusion, we will also refer to English examples such as these as the ‘personalised’ versions of the impersonal passive for further analysis in the next chapter (cf. section 3.3, examples (65); section 3.4, examples (90)). Yet, the structural relation between Arabic examples of the first subtype of the impersonal passive and their English ‘personalised’ versions as in (89) is still not fully understood, given that the mechanisms underlying the subjectivisation of the object of the preposition in the latter construction constitute one of the unsolved problems in current linguistic thinking (for an attempt to explain this relation typologically, see chapter 3, section 3.3, note 14).

With regard to the second subtype of the impersonal passive as in (80) above, the incorporation of a potentially ditransitive verb whose two objects represent an embedded that-argument seems to act as another important precondition for the subjectivisation of the nominal expletive in both languages: the implicit pronominalisation of huwa ‘he’ in Arabic and the explicit pronominalisation of it in English, as seen. This is also to refer strictly to a covert and indefinite human Agent within a typically detransitivised construction. Yet,
detransitivisation of a potentially ditransitive verb will, in this case, result in a univalent construction, a syntactic representation which seems to mark crosslinguistic similarity between the two languages far more conspicuously than the syntactic representation of the first subtype of the impersonal passive construction discussed above. But what is the idiosyncratic nature of ditransitive verbs that may render these verbs susceptible to impersonal passivisation of the second subtype?

In Arabic linguistic theory, a seemingly sophisticated taxonomy of ditransitive verbs in general (i.e. whether they are potentially or morphologically ditransitive) was introduced in the Middle Ages. Within this taxonomy we find two distinctive classes of ditransitive verbs so far as the syntactic behaviour of the two objects they necessitate is concerned. The first class, which includes both potentially and morphologically ditransitive verbs, dictates that the two objects these verbs take cannot stand independently as a nominal nonverbal sentence consisting of a ‘topic’ and a ‘comment’ as in the case of ditransitive verbs like *a?ta*: ‘to give’, *sa?ala*: ‘to ask’, *mana?a*: ‘to deny/prevent’, *albasa*: ‘to dress’, *?allama*: ‘to teach’, etc. The second class, where most of the verbs are potentially ditransitive, dictates that the two objects these verbs take can in fact stand independently as a nominal nonverbal sentence (i.e. a ‘topic’ and a ‘comment’). These verbs are further subclassified into what is traditionally known as *af?xa*:1 *al-yaq?in* ‘verbs of certainty’ such as *dara*: ‘to know’, *?alima*: ‘to know/realise’, *adraka*: ‘to perceive’, *i?tagada*: ‘to believe’, etc. and *af?xa*:1 *al-Thann* ‘verbs of uncertainty’ such as *Thanna*: ‘to assume/think’, *hasaba*: ‘to suppose/think’, *za?ama*: ‘to claim/allege’, *qa?la*: ‘to say/state’, etc. (see, for example, Al-Ghalaayiini, 1982).

Given the distinction between the two classes of ditransitive verbs in terms of the syntactic behaviour of the two objects they require, it appears that ditransitive verbs of the first class cannot undergo impersonal passivisation with an expletive interpretation, though they can undergo personal passivisation as discussed in the preceding section (section 2.3). Whereas it is the ditransitive verbs of the second class that are in fact susceptible to impersonal
passivisation with an expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal, thereby yielding the second subtype of this construction. Susceptibility to impersonal passivisation is therefore ascribable to the semantic association of the two objects these verbs necessitate with a nominal nonverbal sentence, an independent sentence that is Nominatively parsed, where both the 'topic' and the 'comment' are assigned the Nominative Case (cf. section 2.2, examples (30-35)). For this reason, the independent sentence in question can act as an embedded that-argument to be a sentential complement of the main lexical verb (the ditransitive verb itself) within an invariable position. Accordingly, the Case-assignment of the embedded that-argument would not be affected whether it is incorporated into impersonal active constructions such as (78) or into their impersonal passive versions as in (80). Further examples follow:

(90) a. ʔulima anna zaydan ka:tibun.  
   (Gloss: was known (he) that Zaid (Acc) writer (Nom))  
   b. It was known that Zaid was a writer.

(91) a. iʔuqida anna hindan jami:latun.  
   (Gloss: was believed (he) that Hind (Acc) beautiful (Nom))  
   b. It was believed that Hind was beautiful.

(92) a. Thunna anna al-falsafata tuʔallimu al-hikmata.  
   (Gloss: was assumed (he) that the-philosophy (Acc) teach (3sf) the-wisdom (Acc))  
   b. It was assumed that philosophy taught wisdom.

As these examples illustrate, the sentential complement being talked about, the anna-argument in Arabic and the that-argument in English, is in fact a declarative statement that can convey its message independently. It is something like a simple informative statement which is known, believed, assumed, etc. by an unspecified person, with the 'topic' and 'comment' of this statement standing for the two objects of the ditransitive verb itself. Thus, like the case of the first subtype of the impersonal passive, the strict reference to a covert and indefinite human Agent is invariably maintained via the subjectivisation of the nominal expletive, since the ditransitive verb in the second subtype is always associated with a mental activity which is typical of humans as is evident in (80) and (90-92).
It is worth noting here that, both in Arabic and English, the ‘topic’ of the sentential complement can be subjectivised to replace the nominal expletive itself in examples such as (90-92) for reasons which have to do with the pragmatic importance or ‘basicness’ of the subjectivised category. While in Arabic replacement leads to the Accusativisation of the ‘comment’ (the residue of the sentential complement), in English it leads to the infinitivisation of the predicate, be it a copular verb as in (90b-91b) or a lexical verb as in (92b). Thus, according to the rule of subjectivisation mentioned above, an impersonal passive sentence which permits a nominal (the ‘topic’ of the sentential complement) to act as its ‘surface’ subject, and therefore be assigned the Nominative Case, will result in an instance of the personal passive construction. For example:

(93)  a. ?ulima zaydun ka:tiban.
   (Gloss: was known (3sm) Zaid (Nom) writer (Acc))
   b. Zaid was known to be a writer.

(94)  a. i?tuqida-t hindun jami:latan.
   (Gloss: was believed (3sf) Hind (Nom) beautiful (Acc))
   b. Hind was believed to be beautiful.

(95)  a. Thunna-t al-falsafatu tu?allimu al-hikmata.
   (Gloss: was assumed (3sf) the-philosophy (Nom) teach (3sf) the-wisdom (Acc))
   b. Philosophy was assumed to teach wisdom.

However, as in the case of Arabic examples such as (86-88) and English examples such as (89) above, the abstractive dissociation of the subjectivised category (the ‘topic’ of the sentential complement) from the real human Agent is still perceivable, provided that this dissociation is also maintained but within a detransitivised construction that is univalent in nature due to the potential ditransitivity of the main lexical verb. For this reason, passive sentences in Arabic and English such as (93-95) can, again, be said to establish a pragmalinguistic interface between the two main types of the canonical passive construction, viz. the personal and the impersonal. Given this analogy, we will also refer to Arabic and English examples such as these as the ‘personalised’ versions of the impersonal passive in order to facilitate further analysis in the next chapter (cf. chapter 3, section 3.3, examples (72-74); section 3.4, examples (93)).
From the above discussion of the outstanding pragmalinguistic properties of the impersonal passive construction with an expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal, a construction which instantiates a PP-argument (the first subtype) as in Arabic or a *that*-argument (the second subtype) as in both Arabic and English, it now becomes evident that the crucial differences between this construction and the personal passive construction discussed in the preceding section have to do mainly with three fundamental characteristics: (i) the semantic features of the ‘surface’ subject, (ii) the lexical features of the main lexical verb (i.e. its valency), and (iii) the referential nature of the real Agent, be it necessarily deleted in the unmarked situation or necessarily inserted in the marked situation. The necessity of deleting or inserting the agentive PP will be discussed in the next chapter (cf. chapter 3; section 3.2).

In the personal passive construction, as seen, the ‘surface’ subject is in general syntactically represented as a substantival category and is assigned a thematic role (a Patient or its syntactic equivalent); the main lexical verb is either transitive (bivalent) or ditransitive (trivalent), with the latter inhibiting its two objects from acting as an embedded *that*-argument; and the real Agent is not necessarily a covert and indefinite human Agent. In the impersonal passive construction, on the other hand, the ‘surface’ subject, in particular, is syntactically represented in the form of a nominal expletive which is not assigned a thematic role; the main lexical verb is either intransitive (univalent) or ditransitive (trivalent), with the former incorporating a PP-argument and the latter permitting its two objects to act as an embedded *that*-argument; and the real Agent is necessarily a covert and indefinite human Agent.

This indicates that, because of the lexical features of the main lexical verb (the passivisable verb itself), the crucial differences between the two types of the canonical passive construction (the personal passive and the impersonal passive) have to do mainly with the category that acts as the ‘surface’ subject at one extreme, and the category that does not act as
the ‘surface’ subject at the other. In the personal passive construction the ‘surface’ subject is promoted by being topicalised, and therefore Nominativised, a process which correlates with the demotion of the real Agent, as seen. Whereas in the impersonal passive construction the ‘surface’ subject is not promoted, but rather inserted as an instrumental unit in the form of a nominal expletive to impersonalise the identity of the real Agent, a process which correlates with the nonpromotion of the nonsubject, be it a PP-argument which is typically assigned the thematic role of a Location or a that-argument which plays the thematic role of a Patient in much the same way most direct objects do.

However, the crucial similarities between the two types of the canonical passive construction (the personal passive and the impersonal passive), on the other hand, can only be observed in the two further aspects put forward at the end of the preceding section, viz. ‘reification of causation’ and ‘externalisation of agency’ (cf. section 2.3). Throughout the discussion of the pragmalinguistic overlap between the personal passive and the anaphoric reflexive and how this overlap is diachronically ‘mediated’ by the morphological reflexive, these two aspects have been arrived at in order to demonstrate the nonpassive implications of certain passive-like sentences (cf. section 2.1, examples (17-20)). Finally, given the significance of these two aspects for the natural occurrence of canonical passivisation, the general pragmalinguistic definition of the two types of this construction can be restated as in (96) below. Still, however, this definition will be modified a little further in the final chapter (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1), especially when we arrive at the universal identification of the canonical passive construction in the next chapter (cf. chapter 3, section 3.4).

(96) a. Topicalisation of patiency (or its syntactic equivalent) in the personal passive and impersonalisation of agency in the impersonal passive.

b. Reification of causation in both constructions.

c. Externalisation of agency in both constructions.

d. Demotion of external agency in the personal passive and nonpromotion of internal patiency (or its syntactic equivalent) in the impersonal passive.
2.5 Summary

In section 2.1, some introductory remarks were made on particular typological similarities between Arabic and English in respect of particular nonpassivisable elements, even though these two languages are typologically unrelated (Semitic versus Germanic, respectively). Then, the discussion moved on to the traditional account of the canonical passive construction as well as a number of counter-indications in order to illustrate the logical inadequacy of this traditional account by citing numerous examples of this construction from Arabic and English. These counter-indications were, therefore, put forward as a wholesale refutation of the traditional belief that transitivity of the main lexical verb as well as the structural properties it necessitates constitutes a decisive precondition for the natural occurrence of canonical passivisation.

In section 2.2, the relationship between transitivity and canonical passivisation was dealt with in a fairly detailed configuration with particular reference to some of the medieval Arabic linguists and their seemingly sophisticated explanation of this relationship. Thus, the main types of Accusative nominals were classified and exemplified for the identification of the real nature of the direct and indirect objects on the one hand, and of the real nature of other Accusative nominals that have the potential for subject-promotion under canonical passivisation on the other. The semantic and morphological requirements of transitivity were also explained in terms of the ‘dialectical’ relationship between causativisation and passivisation, which is in fact a polarity of maximisation and minimisation of transitivity, respectively (that is, causativisation maximises transitivity and passivisation minimises it). This is to illustrate the two divergent accounts of the passive verb, viz. lexical and morphological, and their relative combination for a better understanding of the structural nature of this verb both in the marked and unmarked cases. The insights gained from some of the medieval Arabic linguists did in fact illuminate the major flaws of the traditional approach to canonical passivisation in Arabic and English even further. Hence, the categories
that have the potential for subject-promotion under canonical passivisation (syntactic or semantic promotion) were identified within a specified hierarchy for the Arabic passive in order to facilitate further analyses of the English counterpart.

Section 2.3 was taken up by a consideration of the first main type of the canonical passive construction in Arabic and English; namely, what is known as the personal passive. From a pragmalinguistic perspective, the discussion started with the general definition of this construction, which seems to underline the overtness as well as the semantic content of the ‘surface’ subject. Thus, the relationship between a given personal passive sentence and its active version was considered by citing various examples from Arabic and English. Then, the discussion moved on to the genuine determinant of the passivisability of a given lexical verb; that is, the thematic arguments that this verb has to discharge rather than its transitivity as erroneously believed. These thematic arguments were therefore considered rather sketchily to be further developed in the next chapter (chapter 3; section 3.1 and 3.3). Accordingly, the promotional nature of the direct object (i.e. the Patient) in relation to other categories (e.g. the Recipient) was explained with some reference to relational and functional grammar. This led to the characterisation of the two distinctive properties of the personal passive by comparison with the corresponding active. Following this, the pragmalinguistic overlap between the personal passive construction and what is known as the reflexive construction was also discussed in order to illuminate further aspects of the former construction, viz. ‘reification of causation’ and ‘externalisation of agency’, aspects which demonstrate the nonpassive implications of certain passive-like sentences in Arabic and English.

In section 2.4, the final section, the second main type of the canonical passive construction in Arabic and English, viz. the so-called impersonal passive, was examined in some detail by citing concrete examples from the two languages. From a pragmalinguistic standpoint as well, the discussion began with the identification of the ‘surface’ subject in this construction which takes the form of a nominal expletive, a semantically contentless category which is
syntactically represented (implicitly in Arabic and explicitly in English), but whose sole grammatical function is to refer strictly to a covert and indefinite human Agent. Hence, the semantic equation of the nominal expletive in a given impersonal passive sentence with the nonanaphoric pronominal in its active version resulted in identifying two distinctive subtypes of the impersonal passive with the same expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal: the first subtype employs an intransitive verb involving a PP-argument as in Arabic (but not English); and the second subtype employs a ditransitive verb whose two objects form an embedded *that*-argument as in both Arabic and English. These two subtypes were therefore examined and exemplified both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically. Furthermore, to avoid certain misleading terms used in the literature, the sentences which establish a pragmalinguistic interface between the personal and impersonal passive were provisionally referred to as the ‘personalised’ versions of the impersonal passive for further analyses in the next chapter. Finally, a quick comparison of the two main types of the canonical passive construction (the personal type and the impersonal type) illustrated their differences as well as their similarities, and therefore led to the reformulation of the general pragmalinguistic definition of this construction.
Chapter Three

A PRINCIPLE-BASED APPROACH

Having discussed the linguistic and pragmatic aspects of the canonical passive (personal and impersonal) in Arabic and English in the previous chapter, this chapter will focus attention on a set of general principles and the manner in which they interact for the formation of this construction in the two languages. Given the assumption that these principles reflect certain properties of the human mind, they are understood to yield the mental representations of the canonical passive as part of a genetically determined ordinance known as Universal Grammar (UG). This indicates that these principles are responsible for the typological convergence between unrelated languages, whereas typological divergence is reduced to different values of certain parameters.

Section 3.1 of this chapter will give a brief historical account of the paradigmatic shifts in the derivational system from the 1950s to the present decade insofar as they are relevant to passive-formation in Arabic and English. These are generally observable in three phases: First, in the TGG model, the selected units are strings of not necessarily ordered morphemes. Second, in the early version of the P&P model, the selected units are strings of uninflected lexical items. Third, in the later version of the P&P model, these units are selected as fully inflected lexical items. Section 3.2 will consider the canonical passive according to the TGG model, where it results from the application of a transformational rule called Pass-transformation. The section will also underline the main criticisms levelled at the limitations of this rule. Section 3.3 will discuss the canonical passive according to the early version of the P&P model, where it is identified with 'theta-role absorption' and 'Case absorption', an identification that imposes an argument status on the Pass element. The section will also highlight the conceptual defects of this analysis as well as the inherent contradictions between its premises. Section 3.4, the final section, will introduce an alternative analysis in the light of the later version of the P&P model. Here, the Pass element will be treated as a functional category in its own right, a treatment that is crucial for scrutinising virtually unnoticed aspects of the canonical passive. It should be noted, however, that our critical analysis does not intend to undermine this approach since we will be employing basically the same, but less complicated, dialectic that is typical of Chomsky's style. For the purposes of simplification and clarification, technical details will be kept to the bare minimum.
3.1 Preliminary remarks

Throughout the discussion so far the term 'surface' has been used to indicate the superficial properties of a given structure, which are observable on at least two levels: the phonemic and the graphemic (cf. chapter 1, note 2). Since natural language is, from a historical perspective, primarily a speech process whereby the physical representation of sound is the only observable medium of transmission, the graphemic level will be disregarded here for ease of exposition.

Within the traditional framework of Transformational-Generative-Grammar (TGG) (Chomsky, 1955, 1957), a set of transformations was designed to mediate between phrase structure (the input) and morphophonemic structure (the output). The grammar of the input has a general phrase-structure rule of the form ‘Rewrite X as Y’. This rule dictates that a given derivation begin with the initial string S and continue until it reaches its terminal string by applying a sequence of ‘Rewrite X as Y’. Examples (1-3) show how this mechanism works in Arabic and English:

(1)  
   a. S  
   b. NP + VP  
   c. Det + N + VP  
   d. Det + N + V + NP  
   e. Det + N + V + Det + N  

(2)  
   a. al + N + V + Det + N  
   b. al + walah + V + Det + N  
   c. al + walah + k-s-r + Det + N  
   d. al + walah + k-s-r + al + N  
   e. al + walah + k-s-r + al + ba:b  

(3)  
   a. the + N + V + Det + N  
   b. the + boy + V + Det + N  
   c. the + boy + break + Det + N  
   d. the + boy + break + the + N  
   e. the + boy + break + the + door  

The terminal string, (2e) in Arabic and (3e) in English, is a sequence of morphemes in a given order, not necessarily in the order given here (cf. chapter 2, note 1). This sequence then passes through a set of obligatory transformations for the derivation of a simple sentence,
which may also pass through optional transformations for the derivation of a more complex one. Thus, in (4) below Past is attached to V as a result of Aux-transformation, for example (cf. section 3.2 for further detail):

(4)  

(a) \( al + walad + k-s-r + \text{Past} + al + ba:b \)  
(b) \( \text{the} + \text{boy} + \text{break} + \text{Past} + \text{the} + \text{door} \)

Such transformations may ‘move’ certain strings or may ‘add’ or ‘delete’ certain morphemes in order to convert the sequence of morphemes as in (4) into a sequence of lexical items. The latter then enters into the output to be converted into a sequence of phonemes, which leads to the ‘surface’ realisation of its final shape. For example:

(5)  

(a) Kasara al-waladu al-ba:ba.
(b) The boy broke the door.

Furthermore, a simple active sentence as in (5) may also pass through a set of optional transformations for the derivation of a more complex one. These include unitary transformations, each of which applies to a single terminal string (e.g. passivisation, interrogativisation, etc.) and binary transformations, each of which applies to two terminal strings (e.g. conjunction, nominalisation, etc.). Thus, (5) will be converted into (6) in the course of Pass-transformation, for example:

(6)  

(a) Kusira al-ba:bu.
(b) The door was broken.

In the standard model of TGG (Chomsky, 1965) the derivational system incorporated two further syntactic levels: ‘surface structure’ which yields the output of the syntactic component and the input to the phonological component; and ‘deep structure’ which constitutes the output of the lexicon and the input to the semantic component. Accordingly, any pair of active-passive sentences such as (5) and (6) above would be treated as having different surface structures but sharing a common deep structure. However, this account is fraught with serious problems when it comes to the necessary deletion of certain constituents in the passive sentence, as will be seen in the next section (section 3.2).
In fact, since their initial introduction, the levels of deep structure and surface structure have been the subject-matter of acrimonious polemics among linguists and philosophers alike, a matter that is beyond the scope of this study. The important point is that, up to this stage, the morphological component was still regarded as independent from the syntactic component: phrase-structure rules as in (1-3) form terminal strings of not necessarily ordered morphemes; certain obligatory transformations in turn convert them into strings of lexical items as in (4-5), to which further optional transformations may apply as in (6).

In the extended standard model (Chomsky, 1970) X-bar theory was introduced to restrict the set of phrase markers that are permitted in the derivational system. This theory involves a set of principles which operate at deep structure (henceforth DS) to determine the assembly of lexical items into phrases, and to create a syntactic ordinance for surface structure (henceforth SS) to appear. Essentially, the emphasis shifted away from particular grammatical rules that describe syntactic phenomena to general principles which interact to explain such phenomena. As a result, the lexicalist hypothesis was enunciated with the purpose of constraining the capacity of the transformational apparatus for reasons which have to do with learnability, and thus confining the processes inherent in the morphological component to the lexicon. This means that the elements inserted into the set of phrase markers are no longer considered a string of morphemes as seen above, but rather a string of lexical items, each of which must have its own inflectional features to play a role in the syntactic component. It was necessary therefore to differentiate lexical rules governing word formation from transformational rules, leading to the preservation of an idiosyncratic identity of the lexicon alongside the level of DS.

\[1\] It is worth noting that the notions of 'surface structure' and 'deep structure' can never be looked upon as a unique innovative contribution to linguistic analysis due to the very long history that lies behind them. They even have roots in the Sanskrit grammarian Panini, some 500 BC, who used the terms vibhakti and karaka to refer to the outer morphological shape of a given category and its inner semantic function respectively. These notions were developed in medieval Arabic linguistic theory (see, for example, Gruntfæst, 1984), and were later employed by other linguists and philosophers within essentially the same paradigms (see, also, Chomsky, 1965:198f, fn 12).
The crucial consequences of this lexicalist conception of grammar culminated in the early version of the P&P model (Chomsky, 1981, 1982, 1986 a-b). Here, the two external levels ‘phonetic form’ (PF) and ‘logical form’ (LF) are maintained as a direct or indirect reflection of the interaction between DS and SS, these latter being the internal levels. This interaction is said to be regulated by the derivational system, which, in the later version of the P&P model, is taken as a computational system for human language (CHL). As such, the derivational system transforms a given string from one level into another in terms of mapping processes. These mapping processes are in turn regulated by a general principle known as Move-alpha, where alpha is a variable ranging over all types of categories, as will be seen presently.

Recall that the set of transformations postulated in the traditional model of TGG may ‘move’, ‘add’ or ‘delete’ certain elements. The restriction of the capacity of the transformational apparatus within the early version of the P&P model means therefore confining it to the principle Move-alpha and specifying ‘addition’ and ‘deletion’ as syntactic phenomena determined by other principles of Universal Grammar (UG). Certain principles of UG are said to apply at DS level (the Projection Principle and the theta-Criterion specifically) and

---

2 In logic the LF of a given argument \( A \) is the structure that is responsible for its inferential power, provided that this structure is shareable with other \( As \). Accordingly, LF determines the way \( A \) can validly be inferred from other \( As \), and the way the latter can validly be inferred from sets of premises which include the former. To cite two traditional syllogisms:

(i) a. all men are mortal  
   b. Socrates is a man  
   c. therefore, Socrates is mortal

(ii) a. all linguists beat about the bush  
   b. that ostrich is a linguist  
   c. therefore, that ostrich beats about the bush

The LF, here, can be symbolised algebraically, geometrically or whatever by abstracting away from the particular subject-matter, and considering either syllogism of the form (iii), valid for any possible world, including worldly experience:

(iii) a. all \( Xs \) are \( Y \)  
    b. \( a \) is \( X \)  
    c. \( \therefore a \) is \( Y \)

By analogy, the LF of a given linguistic expression \( S \) is its structure (say, the canonical passive structure) which is responsible for its inferential power and shareable with other \( Ss \), but whose formal aspects are associated with aspects of worldly experience.
others at SS level (e.g. the Empty Category Principle (ECP), the Case Filter, etc.). Thus, DS is the interface between the lexicon and the derivational system, whereas SS is the interface between the derivational system and its independent branching to PF and LF.

Bearing this picture in mind, it appears that all lexical properties of lexical categories are structurally encoded at DS, a level that is mapped onto SS by the principle Move-alpha. SS in turn surfaces at PF and LF by means of the same principle. This structural encoding, which seems to be algebraic in nature, is represented in terms of phrase markers in the X-bar format. As a result, DS reflects the lexical properties of lexical categories directly, while SS reflects them indirectly before it branches to PF and LF, as in the case of the selectional properties of Vs. Now before defining each of the principles that play a significant role in passive formation, let us first give a brief account of how categories are structurally encoded in the X-bar format.

**X-bar Theory**

The X-bar Theory is said to constrain the set of phrase markers that are permitted in a given derivation, where they are represented in the form of rule schemata following the general phrase-structure rule ‘Rewrite X as Y’ shown in (1-3) above. Yet the representation here concerns the overall categorical structure of these markers and posits them in terms of three distinct levels of projection (viz. X, X’ and X”) as illustrated in (7) (cf. Jackendoff, 1977):

(7)  
a. \( X'' \longrightarrow \{ \text{Spec, } X' \} \)  
b. \( X' \longrightarrow \{ X, Y'' \} \)

Here, the curly brackets indicate an unordered set where the order is determined by the head parameter, that is, whether the language type is head-first or head-last. Notice that the former holds for both Arabic and English (cf. chapter 2, note 1). The head X is the zero-bar projection of a given category; X’ is the single-bar projection of X; and X” is the double-bar or maximal projection of X. The specifier Spec stands for Det in the case of NPs, for example, and Y” which acts as the complement of X, is the maximal projection of another
head Y. The maximal projection of any head is defined in terms of its phrasal projection (i.e. X" and Y" are in fact XP and YP respectively). Thus, the maximal projection of the head V is V" (= VP); the maximal projection of the head N is N" (= NP); and so forth. For example:

(8)  a. [VP [V' [V kasara] [NP al-ba:ba]]]
    b. [VP[V' [V broke] [NP the door]]]

Furthermore, Chomsky (1986b) extended the X-bar format to include functional categories such as I (inflectional features) and C (complementisers). The former category acts as the head of S (the zero-bar projection of a given linguistic expression) and the latter as the head of S' (the single-bar projection of S). In other words, IP and CP stand for S and S' respectively. These functional categories undergo the projection cycle in the same way as any other lexical category does, as shown in the following abstract structure:

(9)  [CP Spec [C' C [IP Spec [I' I [VP Spec [V' V NP]]]]]]

Here, the I-node (the head of IP) is the position occupied by inflectional features like Tns and Agr, and the C-node (the head of CP) is the position occupied by complementisers. Thus, the Spec of IP specifies the position of the subject NP, whereas the Spec of CP specifies the position of WH-phrases, which are not to be dealt with in this study. Furthermore, the Spec of VP specifies the position of the object NP. For the generation of a given linguistic expression S, X-bar theory involves the application of various principles, some of which will be considered briefly insofar as they are directly relevant to canonical-passive formation in Arabic and English.

(i) The Projection Principle

The projection principle requires that representations at various levels be projected from the lexicon onto the syntax of a given derivation. This is to ensure that that derivation observes the subcategorisation properties of lexical categories, viz. their c(ategorical)-selectional properties (cf. Chomsky, 1981:29). In the case of Vs, for instance, the principle determines the number and type of complements, if any, that a given V has to c-select. That is, it captures part of the information about the valency of that V, as discussed earlier (cf. chapter
2, section 2.2). This information is structurally represented in the form of what is known as the subcategorisation grid of \( V \) as in (10) below, where the underlined gaps indicate the placement of the Arabic verbs and their English counterparts. Notice that the verbs in (10c) c-select one of two possible subcategorisation grids, viz. [NP PP] and [NP NP].

(10)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{inkasara/break (intr.)} & \underline{[\_ \_]} \\
\text{b. } & \text{kasara/break (tr.)} & \underline{[\_ \_NP]} \\
\text{c. } & \text{aʔta:/give} & \underline{[\_ \_NP/NP PP/NP]} \\
\text{d. } & \text{wadaʔa/put} & \underline{[\_ \_NP PP]}
\end{align*}\]

(ii) The theta-Criterion

The theta-Criterion constitutes the basic principle of theta-Theory and determines the thematic relations between constituents which are treated as arguments. In Chomsky’s words: "Each argument is assigned its theta-role in exactly one theta-position..., and each assignable theta-role must be assigned to an argument" (Chomsky, 1986a: 184). While the Projection Principle formally encodes the c-selectional properties of Vs in their subcategorisation grids as in (10), the theta-Criterion represents the s(emantic)-selectional properties of these Vs in their theta-grids as in (11) below. That is, the theta-Criterion regulates the distribution of the theta-arguments that a given V has to s(emantically)-select.

(11)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{inkasara/break (intr.)} & \text{[Patient]} \\
\text{b. } & \text{kasara/break (tr.)} & \text{[Agent Patient]} \\
\text{c. } & \text{aʔta:/give} & \text{[Agent Patient/Recipient Recipient/Patient]}^{3}
\end{align*}\]

\(^3\) It is worth noting here that verbs such as aʔta: in Arabic and give in English s-select one of two possible theta-grids as illustrated in (i a-b):

(i)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{[Agent Patient Recipient]} \\
\text{b. } & \text{[Agent Recipient Patient]}
\end{align*}\]

The s-selection of either theta-grid is therefore determined by the degree of pragmatic significance of Patient and Recipient as discussed earlier (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3, examples (55) and (56)). These examples are repeated here for convenience:

(ii)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{aʔta: zaydun al-kita:ba li-ʔamrin.} \\
\text{(Gloss: gave (3sm) Zaid (Nom) the-book (Acc) to-Amr (Obl))} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Zaid gave the book to Amr.}
\end{align*}\]

(iii)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{aʔta: zaydun ʔamran al-kita:ba.} \\
\text{(Gloss: gave (3sm) Zaid (Nom) Amr (Acc) the-book (Acc))} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Zaid gave Amr the book.}
\end{align*}\]

Clearly, therefore, the verbs aʔta: and give in (ii a-b) s-select the theta-grid in (ia), whereas the same verbs in (iii a-b) s-select the theta-grid in (ib).
Arguments which are assigned theta-roles such as these are said to have a referential function, whereas arguments which do not have this function are not assigned theta-roles such as the nominal expletive in the so-called impersonal passive (cf. section 3.3). Given the close connection between the Projection Principle and the theta-Criterion, the former can be extended to account for the subject NPs which do not appear in the subcategorisation grids as in (10) but feature as theta-arguments in the theta-grids as in (11). This is to maintain the inherent one-to-one relationship between subcategorisation and theta-marking (cf. Chomsky, 1981:39; 1982:10).

(iii) The Case Filter

The Case Filter forms the basic principle of Case Theory and regulates the possible distribution of the NPs that occupy Case-marked positions. That is, it completes the overall picture initiated by the two previous principles for such NPs, and ensures that each NP is assigned Case as long as it is phonetically realised. This means that if an NP is phonetically realised and assigned no Case, then this NP is ruled out: “*NP if NP has phonetic content and has no Case” (Chomsky, 1981:49). Thus, the Case grids for the Vs cited above are illustrated in (12) below. Notice, again, that there are two possible Case grids for the verbs in (12c), viz. [Nom Acc Obl] and [Nom Acc Acc] (see also note 3).

(12) a. inkasaralbreak (intr.) [Nom]
    b. kasaralbreak (tr.) [Nom Acc]
    c. a?ta:/give [Nom Acc/Acc Obl/Acc]
    d. wada?a/put [Nom Acc Obl]

The syntactic precondition for Case-assignment is ‘government’, since a given NP is assigned Case by the head that ‘governs’ this NP. Thus, returning to the abstract structure in (9), Nominative is assigned to the subject NP in [Spec, IP] position by Tns inside I, Accusative is

---

Notice that I am avoiding the use of the term ‘Government-and-Binding’ (GB) for the early version of the P&P model (Chomsky, 1981, 1982, 1986 a-b) though it is still used by numerous linguists. The term, in and of itself, is misleading from a conceptual standpoint (cf. Chomsky, 1988b). Perhaps this is
assigned to the object NP in [Spec, VP] position by V, Oblique is assigned to the NP that is
the object of P in [Spec, PP] position by P, and so forth. In the case of R(efERENCE)-
expressions, Case-assignment is morphologically realised in Arabic, but not in English, as is
evident in most of the glossed examples throughout (see also note 4).

(iv) The Empty Category Principle

The Empty Category Principle (ECP) concerns locality conditions on the distribution of
certain empty categories such as the NP-trace and the WH-trace in relation to their
antecedents. Move-alpha, therefore, acts as the immediate trigger for the operation of the
ECP, since the former is said to regulate NP-movement and WH-movement among other
types of movement. Of prime concern here is NP-movement and the trace t that this NP
leaves behind. This movement proceeds from one argument position (A-position) to another,
the former being theta-marked and the latter non-theta-marked in accordance with the theta-
Criterion discussed above. The result of NP-movement is therefore the theta-marked trace t
whose relationship to this NP is regulated by the ECP. Notice that there are other types of

because of its unnecessary conceptual centralisation of Government and Binding, which are above all
postulated as general principles of UG among others.

Government regulates the relationship between any two categories which c-command each other,
provided that one is a lexical category and a governor and the other is a maximal projection (i.e. XP)
and a governor (cf. Chomsky, 1986a:162). For example:

(i) a. [VP [V kasara] [NP1 al-waladu] [NP2 al-ba: bel]]
   (Gloss: broke (3sm) the-boy (Nom) the-door (Acc))
   b. [NP1 the boy] [VP [V broke] [NP2 the door]]

Where V governs NP2 because both categories c-command each other, and V is a lexical category and
NP2 is a maximal projection. Thus, the relevance of Case Theory is perceivable from this relationship.
That is, V governs NP2 also because V assigns Case to NP2 (i.e. Acc), assignment which is
morphologically realised in Arabic but not in English.

Binding determines the distribution of categories in relation to locality conditions on Government.
These conditions are: (i) an anaphor is bound in a local domain; (ii) a pronominal is free in a local
domain; and (iii) an R-expression is free. Here, ‘local domain’ is referred to as a ‘governing category’
which is a maximal projection containing the category in question and a subject, a matter that is beyond
the scope of this study.
empty categories such as pro and PRO, but these do not result from the application of Move-alpha (cf. section 3.4).

Essentially, the ECP requires that the resultant trace \( t \) be configurationally related to its antecedent (the moved NP) in a manner that satisfies 'proper government'. In Chomsky's words: “a nonpronominal empty category must be properly governed” (Chomsky, 1986b:17).

Proper government is thus defined in terms of antecedent-government (i.e. government by coindexation and m(aximal)-commanding): a moved NP is said to properly govern its trace \( t \) if the NP antecedent-governs \( t \); a moved NP is said to antecedent-govern its trace \( t \) if the NP is coindexed with \( t \) and m-commands it (cf. Rizzi, 1990:6f). To illustrate how this mechanism operates in the Arabic passive and its English counterpart, consider the following examples:

(13) a. \([\text{VP } kusira] \, \text{al-ba:bu}, \, [t] \)  
   (Gloss: was broken (3sm) the-door (Nom))
   b. The door, [VP was broken \( t \)]

In both examples the trace \( t \), the underlying position of the direct object, is theta-marked by the basic form of the verb, viz. kasara in Arabic and break in English. Due to Move-alpha, \( t \) is left by the NP that has moved to subject position where it is assigned Nominative Case. Case assignment is morphologically realised in Arabic as in \( \text{al-ba:bu} \) in (13a) but not in English as in the door in (13b). The index \( i \) indicates that \( t \) is coindexed with its antecedent (the moved NP) in an m-commanding relation. Therefore, the moved NP in both examples is said to antecedent-govern its \( t \) in accordance with the ECP. The only difference in NP-movement between the two is that in (13b) it involves crossing over the maximal projection VP which is a barrier, whereas in (13a) it does not. This is ascribable to the VSO-SVO variation between Arabic and English, respectively (cf. chapter 2, note 1).

Having illustrated the salient features of the principles directly apposite to canonical passive formation in Arabic and English, it appears that such principles do not function in isolation, but rather they interact with each other to meet the well-formedness conditions of a given
derivation. As mentioned above, some of these principles apply at DS level, viz. the Projection Principle and the theta-Criterion, and others at SS level, viz. the Case Filter, the ECP, etc. This was based on the assumption that CHL selects lexical items from the lexicon by means of a more general principle called Satisfy, an all-at-once operation which mediates between the lexicon and DS in order to present the selected lexical items in the X-bar format discussed above. Yet a linguistic expression S resulting from the free application of UG principles such as these was held to be evaluated separately in that it is well-formed if it does not violate any of such principles.

Within the later version of the P&P model (Chomsky, 1995b), where the derivational system is now identified as a computational system for human language (CHL), particular emphasis has been placed on well-formedness conditions at the external levels of PF and LF due to the absence of any concrete parallelism to such conditions at the internal levels of DS and SS. While PF-LF representations may pertain to the realistic side of language, DS-SS representations, being the abstract levels, may not. Thus, PF interfaces derivations with the linguistic aspects involved in the articulatory-perceptual mode and LF with the nonlinguistic aspects involved in the conceptual-intentional mode. It follows that if the well-formedness of a given derivation can be evaluated at PF and LF, then evaluation at DS and SS will certainly prove to be superfluous. In such a perspective, the grammar is said to be 'minimalised' through the elimination of DS and SS, and with them the all-at-once property of Satisfy (cf. Chomsky, 1994; Chomsky, 1995a-b; El-Marzouk, 1995b).

Minimalisation of the grammar means therefore confining it to economy of derivation where a set of transformations similar to that of the traditional model of TGG is proposed to mediate between the lexicon and the external levels of PF and LF. This set also comprises unitary and binary transformations as mentioned above but the elements inserted here are fully inflected lexical items whose features are checked off when Move-alpha applies. For lexical access,
then, the computational system (CHL) selects lexical items freely and converts them into phrase markers satisfying a format which is similar in spirit to that of the X-bar theory. This is to ensure grammatical comparison or 'competition' among derivations, rather than separate evaluation of a single derivation, since CHL may construct a set of distinct structures out of the same selected set of lexical items. At any point, CHL reaches a level termed Spell-Out, a level that determines which movements will affect the PF representation of the 'winning' derivation. After Spell-Out, CHL has no further access to the lexicon, but it may proceed further, applying Move-alpha, to ensure that that derivation converge at PF and LF, otherwise it crashes (cf. Chomsky, 1994; Chomsky, 1995a-b; El-Marzouk, 1995b).

The notion of feature checking has resulted in arguments for a number of functional categories in the later version of the P&P model. Recall that the I-node in the early version is the position occupied by inflectional features such as Tns and Agr (cf. the abstract structure in (9) above). In the later version, these features are treated as functional categories in their own rights, provided that Agr is split up into Agrs (subject agreement) and Agro (object agreement) (cf. Chomsky, 1995b:95). This is to eliminate the odd dual function of both I (as a holder of Tns and Agr) and Agr (as a holder of Agrs and Agro), and to maintain the generalised recursiveness of the projection cycle which now requires that every category, be it lexical or functional, should be maximally projected from the lexicon. Thus, the abstract structure in (9) is expanded in (14) below, where the order of the functional categories being talked about is [Agrs, Tns, Agro]:

\[
(14) \quad [CP \ Spec \ [C' \ C \ [AgrsP \ Spec \ [Agrs' \ Agrs \ [TnsP \ Spec \ [Tns' \ Tns \ [AgroP \ Spec \ [Agro' \ Agro \ [VP \ Spec \ [V' \ V \ NP]]]]]]]]
\]

This indicates that, apart from the complementiser phrase CP, the phrasal categories AgrsP, TnsP, and AgroP are all responsible for the inflectional features of V as sister of NP, for

---

[5] To avoid possible confusion, the term NP will be preserved as the maximal projection of any nominal though in recent publications the term DP is used instead. As is well known, the DP-analysis, first introduced in Abney (1987), accommodates Det as the head of DP and NP as the complement of this head, an analysis which plays no significant role in this study.
which reason such phrasal categories are referred to as the IP-group. Moreover, this IP-group has been expanded still further to include phrasal categories such as AspP (Aspect Phrase) and PassP (Passive Phrase) among others (cf. Ouhalla, 1991). For ease of exposition in this study, the terms AgrP, TnsP, and PassP will be used to represent the main inflectional features of the passive verb (cf. section 3.4).

One of the crucial distinctions between the early and later versions of the P&P model is therefore explicable in terms of the distinction between government and feature checking, and therefore between the sorts of structural mutation that either process entails. In the early version of the P&P model, Vs and Ns move to incorporate their IP-features and Case-features respectively, whereas in the later version of the P&P model such categories are said to move to check their features off, since they are drawn from the lexicon as fully inflected lexical items. If feature checking occurs in the appropriate position, then the generated structure will be licensed by Spell-Out to converge at PF and LF. If, however, feature checking does not occur in the appropriate position, then that structure will crash at PF.

The final point to be made here concerns the status of UG principles such as those discussed above. Given that the internal levels of DS and SS are dispensed with in the later version of the P&P model, one might believe that these principles are also dispensed with because some apply at DS and others at SS, as seen earlier. However, the notion of feature checking implies that these principles, which are above all largely responsible for the IP-features of Vs and the Case-features of Ns, apply at some point in the derivation before CHL proceeds. In order to maintain this line of research, we will assume that the workings of these principles synchronise with lexical insertion, given that the lexicon permits open access to fully inflected lexical items. The next section will consider the canonical passive construction in Arabic and English according to the TGG model and the problems that would arise from this model.
3.2 Passivisation in the TGG model

As discussed at the outset of the previous section, phrase-structure rules of the form ‘Rewrite X as Y’ are said to generate terminal strings of not necessarily ordered morphemes. Accordingly, these strings would reflect unnatural representations of linguistic expressions, given their tenseless and noncombinational nature, as illustrated in the following examples from Arabic and English (see also (1-3) above).

(15) a. Det + N + V + Det + N
b. *al + w alad + k-s-r + al + ba:b
   c. the + boy + break + the + door

This clearly indicates that phrase-structure grammar on its own is inadequate to account for certain syntactic phenomena, even though such a grammar was proved to be more powerful than the so-called finite-state grammar, a simple set of rules that generate linguistic expressions where each element is entirely determined by the nature of the preceding element. It was necessary therefore to supplement phrase-structure rules with a set of obligatory transformations for the ‘natural’ derivation of simple declarative sentences which can be complexified by a further set of optional transformations. One such obligatory transformation is known as Aux-transformation which, together with the basic form of V, is immediately dominated by VP in the phrase marker. This transformational rule specifies the Tense feature of V (say, Past) to be inserted in the terminal string as an abstract morpheme. Thus, Past is branched to the left of V in the phrase marker, thereby converting (15 b-c) into (16 a-b):

(16) a. Det + N + V + Det + N
b. *al + w alad + k-s-r + al + ba:b
   c. the + boy + break + the + door

6 As a simple generative device, finite-state grammar is said to operate through a given sentence from its ‘initial state’ to its ‘final state’. In our examples:

(i) a. kasara al-waladu al-ba:b a.
   b. The boy broke the door.

The grammar would begin by selecting one of the set of all possible elements which occur first in the output such as *kasara in Arabic and the in English. It would thus proceed from the initial state of this output to select one of the set of all possible elements which occur next, and continue until it reaches the final state. Yet this entails the possibility that finite-state grammar deals only with continuous constructions as in (i a-b) and leaves discontinuous constructions as in (ii a-b) below unexplained.

    b. The boy who is sitting there broke the door.
Another obligatory transformation is known as Affix-hopping which is said to regulate the morphological unit or units attached to V, for instance, for signalling the temporal location of the event. This is to capture the fact that such units do not occur side-by-side in the output of natural speech. As the term ‘hopping’ implies, the morphological unit in question is shifted from one node to another in the phrase marker to be ‘affixed’ into the basic form of V. Thus, Past would be immediately dominated by the V-node and attached to the right of the basic form of V, thereby converting (16 a-b) into (17 a-b):

(17) a. al-walad [VP [V k-s-r Past]] al-ba:b
    b. The boy [VP [V break Past]] the door

The functioning of Affix-hopping seems, therefore, to be crucial for the derivational history of a given linguistic expression. This is because phrase-structure grammar on its own not only yields unnatural representations of linguistic expressions as in (15) but also leaves entirely unexplained the significant relationship between a simple active sentence and its canonical passive version as in (18) below. For ease of exposition, let us put the Arabic examples aside for the moment and consider the manner in which such a grammar operates for the English counterparts.

(18) a. The boy broke the door.
    b. The door was broken by the boy.

Given the clear syntactic and semantic relationship between active-passive pairs of sentences such as (18), a grammar that handles the syntax of a given derivation exclusively by means of phrase-structure rules would generate either sentence independently on the basis of an autonomous phrase-structure rule as in (19) for the active sentence and (20) for its passive version. Derivational dependency in this sense was thus a significant condition in the TGG model, though other models such as Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) would view the relationship as lexical, a matter that is beyond the scope of this study.

(19) a. S
    b. NP + V + NP
However, autonomous phrase-structure rules such as (19-20) would certainly imply that the generation of a given sentence is nothing more than a lacklustre and mechanical operation whereby the purely structural relationships between the immediate constituents of that sentence act as the only precondition for the arrival at its final shape in the output. Because variables like NP and V are such immediate constituents, phrase-structure rules would also imply that the relationship between an active sentence and its passive version as in (18) is both arbitrary and fortuitous, and thus the only loosely common denominator between these two sentences is their structural status which shows that they are both sentences. Furthermore, such rules would not be in a position to guarantee ruling out sentences such as (21) below as ungrammatical, since the output represents nothing more than strings of not necessarily ordered morphemes (see, for example, Harris, 1993:44f).

(21) a. * The door broke the boy.
   b. * The boy was broken by the door.

Given that information about the grammaticality of (18) and the ungrammaticality of (21), for instance, is part of the native speaker’s internalised knowledge of language, there seems to be an obvious systematic relationship between an active sentence and its passive version. An adequate grammar should be able to account for this information by generating well-formed sentences like (18) and eliminating ill-formed sentences like (21). However, phrase-structure grammar would only be capable of doing so to the detriment of unintuitive redundancy. An adequate grammar should also be able to specify the set of all possible NPs that the transitive verb break in English, for instance, may take as its subject and object both in an active sentence and its passive version, notwithstanding the strict inversion of the two sentences. That is, on the one hand, the subject must be able to break things and the object must be breakable in the active sentence; and on the other, the subject must be breakable and the object of by must be able to break things in the passive version.
In order to give a much more reasonable account of these existing facts, it was found necessary to postulate an optional transformational rule known as Pass-transformation, an algebraic operation which has its potential scope and its potential limits. Within its potential scope, Pass-transformation is said to be far more powerful than the autonomous phrase-structure rules shown in (19) and (20). Within its potential limits, however, it also leaves completely unexpressed certain important facts about the canonical passive construction in Arabic and English, as will be seen presently. The algebraic formula of Pass-transformation is illustrated in (23) below, with the rule in (22) being its input. Notice that this formula is a simplified version of the one introduced in Chomsky (1957:73).

(22)  
   a. S  
   b. NP₁ V NP₂

(23)  
   a. NP₁ V NP₂  
   b. NP₂ be-en V by NP₁

This can be interpreted in the following way: First, the rule in (22) requires that the input (22b) generate only grammatical active sentences as its output, viz. active sentences such as (18a), to which the obligatory transformation Affix-hopping has already applied (cf. (17)). Second, the rule in (23) requires that the same input become the input for the optional transformation Pass-transformation as in (23a). Third, the rule in (23) also requires the application of the obligatory transformation Affix-hopping to shift the affix -en in (23b) to the right of V in the phrase marker for the generation of the passive version (18b) as its output.

In the light of these three requirements, the derivational history of either output is shown below, with (24) being the input for the active and (25) the input for the passive.

(24)  
   a. the + boy + break + the + door  
   b. The boy [VP [Past [V break]]] the door  
   c. The boy [VP [V break Past]] the door

(25)  
   a. The boy [VP [Past [V break]]] the door  
   b. The door [VP [Past be-en [V break]]] by the boy  
   c. The door [VP [be Past [V break-en]]] by the boy

This analysis was based on the assumption that the relationship between an active sentence like (18a) and its canonical passive version (18b) is neither arbitrary nor fortuitous, but rather
it is both structural and derivational. That is, both sentences are identical at some level of representation, viz. the representation in (24b) and (25a) which is generated by the obligatory transformation Aux-transformation as seen above (cf. also (16)). Accordingly, the conclusion that any pair of active-passive sentences are derived from a common source was generalised across all languages instantiating the canonical passive construction.

However, in the course of the continuous evaluation of the TGG model, several empirical problems with this conclusion were recognised. One such problem is posed by the agentive PP in the passive sentence. Recall that phrase-structure rules generate terminal strings of not necessarily ordered morphemes such as (24a) to be the output of the phrase-structure representation [S: NP + VP] (cf. also (1-3) and (15)). Recall, again, that this string undergoes a set of obligatory transformations such as Aux-transformation which yields the representation in (24b) on the one hand, and Affix-hopping which yields the representation in (24c) on the other. Recall, further, that the latter representation constitutes the input for a simple, declarative and active sentence such as (18a). Now if it is indeed the case that active-passive sentences start in the course of their derivational history from the same level of representation shown in (24b) and (25a), then the optional rule Pass-transformation, which yields the representation in (25b), can only be understood to have two functions, viz. movement and addition. First, it moves the object in the active to be the subject in the passive, and moves the subject in the active to be the object of by in the passive. Second, it adds the Aux be and the Aff-en to create a 'new' V-complex, and adds the P by to create a 'new' PP-complex.

But the preposition by in the case of the English passive is above all a free morpheme, an autonomous category which has its own lexical status, and should therefore be treated in the history of derivation as a single element occupying a single position (not to mention the case of the Arabic passive where the counterpart of this preposition may involve more than a
Keeping this proviso in mind, a free morpheme such as *by* should be generated by phrase-structure rules, not by transformational rules, and should accordingly be inserted in the string of not necessarily ordered morphemes at some level of representation. As I understand it, the consequences of the optional rule Pass-transformation, which adds the P *by* at a later level of representation, will be catastrophic to its output. That is, a free morpheme such as *by* should be ‘familiar’ to the string of not necessarily ordered morphemes from the very outset of derivational history, otherwise the whole derivational construction of this string will be in a state of ‘destruction’ if a ‘strange’ body called the P *by* is inserted by a rule called Pass-transformation at a later level represented in (25b). As a result of this ‘strangeness’, no definite phrasal category can be specified for the ‘new’ PP-complex, since Pass-transformation has no access to phrase-structure rules at this level. In a ‘revised’ version of the TGG model, the insertion of the PP-complex was accounted for in terms of what is known as ‘Chomsky-adjunction’ so as to underline its optionality. Yet, this may well entail the danger of confusing empirical statements with logical ones, as will be seen later in this section.

What is more, a more serious problem is posed by the deletion of the ‘new’ PP-complex itself. Pass-transformation, as it stands in (23), presupposes the insertion of this complex into the output, viz. the output of the representation in (25c). How could, then, such a transformation account for the extremely predominant agentless nature of the canonical passive construction? As mentioned in the preceding chapter, approximately 85% of the natural instances of this construction in English are agentless (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3). Actually, the problem will be far worse in the case of Arabic, since the percentage of agentless passives is much higher (approximately 95%) (cf. chapter 4, section 4.4). Suppose

7 Generally speaking, the agentive PP in the Arabic canonical passive does not surface in the output as discussed earlier (cf. chapter 2, section 2.1; see also note 2). In certain rare cases, however, this PP can be expressed overtly for reasons to be spelled out in the next chapter. The main point here is that, in such cases, P may take the form of a single element such as *min* ‘from’, *bi* ‘by/with, *2mdu* ‘at’, etc. It may also take the form of more than a single element as in *min ladun* ‘from’ and *2ala lisa:ni* ‘on the tongue of’ (cf. chapter 4, section 4.4, note 19).
that Pass-transformation in (23) is generalised across Arabic, and that its algebraic formula is shown in (27) below, with the rule in (26) being its input as well. Notice that the VSO-order is taken into consideration (cf. chapter 2, note 1).

(26)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & S \\
\text{b. } & V \text{ NP}_1 \text{ NP}_2
\end{align*}

(27)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & V \text{ NP}_1 \text{ NP}_2 \\
\text{b. } & \text{Pass } V \text{ NP}_2 \text{ P NP}_1
\end{align*}

(where Pass is the set of all affixes which mark the passive morphology of V (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3), and P is the set of all prepositions which may be used to denote agency (see note 7)). Here, the interpretation will entail the same three requirements adumbrated above in that (26) provides the input for a grammatical active sentence and (27) provides the same input for Pass-transformation which, in turn, provides the input for the passive version. That is, the rule in (27b) still requires the application of Affix-hopping to shift the Pass element to the right of V in the phrase marker. However, as we will see in the next chapter, there exist only a few exceptional cases of the Arabic passive in which the agentive PP may surface in the output (cf. chapter 4, note 19). Thus, to generalise a marked property of the passive construction over the unmarked property via a transformational rule such as (27) is in fact to identify the exceptional as the normal. On this account, Pass-transformation cannot be perceived as a rule which adds P, since the derivational history of the Arabic counterparts of English active-passive pairs such as (18) necessitates that this P as well as its object be deleted at some level. This history may be represented in something like (28) and (29) below, with their outputs being (30) and (31) respectively (cf. also (24) and (25) above).

(28)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & k-s-r + al + walad + al + ba:b \\
\text{b. } & [\text{VP } [\text{Past } [V k-s-r]]] \text{ al-walad al-ba:b} \\
\text{c. } & [\text{VP } [V k-s-r \text{ Past}]] \text{ al-walad al-ba:b}
\end{align*}

(29)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & [\text{VP } [\text{Past } [V k-s-r]]] \text{ al-walad al-ba:b} \\
\text{b. } & [\text{VP } [\text{Pass } [V k-s-r]]] \text{ al-ba:b} \\
\text{c. } & [\text{VP } [V k-s-r \text{ Pass Past}]] \text{ al-ba:b}
\end{align*}

(30)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{kasara al-waladu al-ba:ba.} \\
\text{ (Gloss: broke (3sm) the-boy (Nom) the-door (Acc))} \\
\text{b. } & \text{The boy broke the door.}
\end{align*}
(31)  
  a. kusira al-ba:bu.
      (Gloss: was broken (3sm) the-door (Nom))
  b. The door was broken.

More significantly, if Pass-transformation can be taken as a working operation at all, then it
seems to be limited to transitive verbs only, owing to the obligatory insertion of the object NP
into its input (i.e. NP₂ in (23) and (27) above). As such, it addresses only particular instances
of the so-called personal passive and leaves completely unexplained the so-called impersonal
passive, and in this case the TGG approach to passivisation would not be in better position
than the traditional approach discussed in the previous chapter (cf. chapter 2, sections 2.1 and
2.2). Because of the restriction of Pass-transformation to transitive verbs, it was necessary to
postulate an independent Pass-transformation whose input would permit the insertion of
intransitive verbs (cf. Chomsky, 1965:104). As a consequence, Pass-transformation cannot be
perceived as a unified transformational rule generating the canonical passive as a unified
syntactic phenomenon.

In the standard model of TGG the common source from which any pair of active-passive
sentences were assumed to derive was identified with the notion of deep structure (DS)

---

8 Chomsky claimed that restricting Pass-transformation to transitive verbs was motivated by the
elimination of the unpassivisable version of verbs like resemble, have, marry, fit, cost, weigh, etc. He
was therefore forced to treat canonical passivisation and what he called ‘pseudopassivisation’ by two
separate transformational rules. Notice that I am not using the misleading term ‘middle verbs’, a term
which Chomsky himself borrowed from Lees (1960:8) to describe these verbs (cf. Chomsky,
1965:103f). First of all, verbs such as these are always transitive, whether they are unpassivisable as in
(i) or passivisable as in (ii) or represented marginally in a marked situation as in (iii):

(i)  
  a. John married Mary.
  b. The suit fits me.
  c. The car weighed two tons.

(ii)  
  a. The preacher married John and Mary.
  b. The tailor fitted me.
  c. John weighed the letter.

(iii)  
  a. Recourse was had to a new plan.
  b. A good time was had by all.

How can, then, such verbs be eliminated if in each case they Accusativise an NP? Secondly, by
specifying V as a transitive verb in the input, Pass-transformation also implies that transitivity is a
decisive precondition for canonicalical passivisation (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2). Pass-transformation
could have been much more reasonable, and therefore generalisable, if this V was specified as
passivisable, so as to exclude examples such as (i) and to include examples such as (ii) and (iii).
referred to in the preceding section, and thus an alternative treatment of passivisation was in order. The injunction was to widen the scope of Pass-transformation a little further: primarily via the combination of the two transformational rules (so that both transitive and intransitive verbs would be captured), and secondarily via scanning the derived phrase marker of the passive sentence within this scope and therefore eliminating an *ad hoc* phrase-structure rule for the derived constituent structure. This injunction was motivated by the association of canonical passivisation with verbs that take Manner adverbials freely, an observation signifying that verbs which do not take Manner adverbials freely do not undergo Pass-transformation. Hence, English verbs such as *resemble, have, marry, fit, cost, weigh,* etc. were exemplified in empirical corroboration of this observation where (32) below would represent the former verb class and (33) the latter (cf. chapter 2, section 2.1, examples (5-10)) (cf. also Chomsky, 1965:103 for further examples).

(32)  
  a. Mary was married by John (the preacher).
  b. I was fitted by the tailor.
  c. The letter was weighed by John.

(33)  
  a. * Mary was married by John (the groom).
  b. * I am fitted by the suit.
  c. * Two tons are weighed by this car.

Recognition of these existing facts, among others, led research to eliminate the algebraic formula of Pass-transformation illustrated in (23) above for reasons which had to do mainly with presupposed generalisability, and thus a completely different direction was taken in respect of canonical passivisation as a unified syntactic process. Accordingly, an alternative algebraic formula was proposed with the sole purpose of restricting Pass-transformation to verbs that take Manner adverbials freely such as the passivisable versions of the English verbs just mentioned. In the case of English, this formula is shown in (34c) below, with (34b) being its direct input and (34a) its indirect one. Notice, again, that this formula is a modified version of the one introduced in Chomsky (1965:104):

(34)  
  a. Manner Adv  \rightarrow  by Pass
  b. NP, V X NP, Y by Pass Z
  c. NP, V X ___ Y by NP, Z
     (where X does not contain an NP)
This algebraic formula was based on the assumption that the Manner adverbial in question should necessitate an element to be associated with passivisation as one of its realisations, a 'dummy element' which signifies that Pass-transformation must obligatorily apply. Thus, the interpretation of the algebraic formula in (34) may run as follows: Firstly, the indirect input (34a) restricts passivisation to verbs that take Manner adverbials freely, be they transitive or intransitive. Secondly, the direct input (34b) requires that one such verb will appear under the V-node only if it is positively selected from the lexicon; X could be occupied by P (in the case of phrasal verbs) and Y and Z by PP and Manner Adv freely. Thirdly, Pass-transformation, then, substitutes NP₁ for the dummy element Pass and Places NP₂ in the position of NP₁ as in (34c).

Under this analysis, any pair of active-passive sentences are now said to derive from essentially the same underlying DS (cf. Chomsky, 1965:23), provided that Pass-transformation is an obligatory substitution rule. Furthermore, the agentive PP in the passive version can now be understood as an optional category, given the generalisation of this rule over transitive as well as intransitive verbs. This means that Pass-transformation cannot be understood as responsible for adding the P by, since the agentive PP can be deleted as in (35 a-b) below and inserted as in (35c), even though all sentences are generated by the same rule whereby the subject NP₁ is unspecified in the former as in (36 a-b) and specified in the latter as in (36c) (cf. Chomsky, 1965:104).

(35)  a. The proposal was vehemently argued against.
    b. The new course of action was agreed on.
    c. John is looked up to by everyone.

(36)  a. NP₁ vehemently argued against the proposal by Pass
    b. NP₁ agreed on the new course of action by Pass
    c. everyone looks up to John by Pass

Pass-transformation as shown in (34) is also said to capture the correlation between strictly local subcategorisation and strictly local transformations, the former specifying which categories are internal to VP (i.e. V-complements) and which are external to it (i.e. VP-
complements). Given that the dummy element Pass is one of the categories that are internal to VP, it follows that if a PP is locally subcategorised as a V-complement then V is subject to Pass-transformation. This would account for the grammaticality of (37a) where the PP at this Job is a V-complement and the ungrammaticality of (37b) where the PP at this office is a VP-complement. By the same token, the ambiguity of the active version of (37c) would also be solved, since the ‘PP’ on the boat is a V-complement (cf. Chomsky, 1965:105).

(37) a. This job is being worked at quite seriously.
   b. *The office is being worked at.
   c. The boat was decided on.  

Although Pass-transformation in the standard model in (34) seems to offer a much more satisfactory account of canonical passivisation than the previous one in (23), as is evident in the above quite comprehensive analysis, its presupposed generalisability is still fraught with serious complications. These can be summarised in two fundamental points as follows:

The first point concerns the optionality of the agentive PP in the passive sentence, a position which is still held by generative syntacticians of today (see, for example, Roberts, 1996, among others). The notion of optionality may have been motivated by the structural representation of the PP-complex in terms of what is known as ‘Chomsky-adjunction’ referred to earlier. That is, the P by is ‘Chomsky-adjoined’ to the left of the relevant NP simply because the insertion or deletion of the whole agentive PP does not affect the internal structure of the passive sentence, given the dependency of either process on the speaker’s intention (cf. Akmajian and Heny, 1975:149). But this is an empirical statement not a logical one. Empirical statements are contingent: they may be true or false. Whereas logical statements are necessary: they are necessarily true if true, and they are necessarily false if false. In English examples such as (38) below the agentive PP is neither optional nor

---

9 Notice that I am avoiding the misleading term ‘pseudopassive’, a term used by Chomsky himself to describe sentences such (35) and (37) (see also note 8). Sentences such as these are in fact examples of the canonical passive, namely the ‘personalised’ version of the impersonal passive since the Agent is characterised by a human and indefinite nature but the nominal expletive it is not used to refer to it (cf. chapter 2, section 2.4).
obligatory, but rather it is necessarily deleted when deleted as in (38a) and it is necessarily inserted when inserted as in (38b).

(38)  
  a. Trinity College was founded in 1592.  
  b. John Major was succeeded by Tony Blair.

Even in the case of the Arabic passive such a generalisation cannot be seen as a paradox, notwithstanding the far more predominant agentless nature of such a construction than the English counterpart as mentioned above. This means that in the unmarked situation the agentive PP is necessarily deleted, and in the marked situation it is necessarily inserted. From now on the discussion will be confined to the agentless passive (i.e. the so-called 'short passive') in both languages. The input for this construction will be taken as (39a) for the Arabic VSO-order and (39b) for the English SVO-order where V is simply restricted to passivisable verbs and NP is the subject position in either language.

(39)  
  a. Pass V NP  (VSO-order)  
  b. NP Pass V  (SVO-order)

The second point is that Pass-transformation in (34), like the previous one in (23), is incapable of providing the input for the so-called impersonal passive. This is because it cannot insert the nominal expletive that acts as the subject in this construction, be it the implicit pronominal *huwa* 'he' in Arabic or the explicit pronominal *it* in English as discussed earlier (cf. chapter 2, section 2.4). In fact, with this contrast, it would be extremely difficult to capture the fact that an impersonal passive with an expletive interpretation in Arabic such as (40a) below is usually rendered in English into the 'personalised' version of this construction as in (40b).

(40)  
     (Gloss: was slept (he) in the-house (Obl))  
     (Lit.: It was slept in the house.)  
  b. The house was slept in.

The intricate problem with Pass-transformation would, therefore, arise from its failure to provide the input for examples like (40a) on the one hand, and its claim to account for examples like (40b) on the other, since the latter belong to the class of such mistakenly christened examples as 'pseudopassives' as in (35) and (37) (see also note 9). To resolve this
apparent intricacy, examples such as (35), (37) and (40b) will be provisionally considered a subclass of the personal passive as they all meet the structural condition shown in (39), whereas any example subjectivising the nominal expletive such as (40a) will be an indication of the impersonal passive. The input for the latter type is illustrated in (41a) for Arabic and (41b) for English, where Exp is the nominal expletive and X is the V-complement which may be a PP-argument as in (42) or a that-argument as in (43).

(41) a. Pass V Exp X (VSO-order)
    b. Exp Pass V X (SVO-order)

    (Gloss: was walked (he) on this the-land (Obl))
    b. (Lit.: It was walked on this land.)

(43) a. qi:la anna zaydan nahaw iyyun.
    (Gloss: was said (he) that Zaid (Acc) syntactician (Nom))
    b. It was said that Zaid was a syntactician.

The structural conditions shown in (39) and (41) above are therefore put forward as simplified representations of the two types of the canonical passive construction in Arabic and English (viz. the so-called ‘personal passive’ and the so-called ‘impersonal passive’) in order to facilitate further analyses of this construction in the upcoming sections. The criticism levelled at the TGG model has led research to entirely dispense with the assumption that the construction in question results from an application of the transformational rule Pass-transformation, though some of the deep insights put forward within this model are beyond dispute. The next section will consider how the early version of the P&P model treats the canonical passive construction in both languages and the problems that may proceed from this model.

3.3 Passivisation in the P&P model (I)

As mentioned earlier, the lexicalist hypothesis was enunciated in the extended standard model to essentially constrain the capacity of the transformational apparatus, and therefore confine the processes inherent in the morphological component to the lexicon. This indicates that the
set of elements generated by phrase-structure rules is no longer regarded as a string of not necessarily ordered morphemes, but rather a string of ‘ready-for-work’ lexical items, each of which plays a role in the syntactic component. This paradigmatic shift has been taken for granted within the early version of the P&P model, where the emphasis is placed on the study of general principles and the way they interact for the formation of syntactic constructions (cf. section 3.1).

More specifically, according to this approach, there exist no such rules as Pass-transformation to yield such constructions as the canonical passive. Rather, formation of this construction simply results from the interaction between a set of general principles which are said to reflect certain properties of the human mind. This means that typologically unrelated languages such as Arabic and English resemble one another in the application of these principles, and that if they do differ, as they clearly do, they only differ in fixing certain values for the set of parameters involved. The main principles that interact for passive-formation are: Move-alpha, the Projection Principle, the theta-Criterion, the Case Filter, and the ECP (cf. section 3.1). Whereas the main parameters that mark crosslinguistic variation are: the word-order parameter and the Pass-parameter as represented in the structural conditions for the personal and impersonal passives in (39) and (41) respectively. The former type will be considered first and its structural condition is repeated here in (44).

(44) a. Pass V NP (VSO-order)  
    b. NP Pass V (SVO-order)

Recall that the abstract structure in (9) represents the subject position in the Spec of IP (i.e. [NP, IP]) and the object position in the Spec of VP (i.e. [NP, VP]). These two representations would hold for any output, be it an active sentence (where both representations would be the input) or its passive version (where the former representation would be the input). Given that the NP in (44) acts as the subject of the passive version in Arabic and English, it follows that this NP would occupy the [NP, IP] position in the abstract structure of (9). Accordingly, the structure of (44) is converted into (45) below, with (46) being concrete examples:
(45)  a. [VP Pass V [IP NP]]  (VSO-order)
   b. [IP NP [VP Pass V]]  (SVO-order)

(46)  a. [VP kusira [IP al-ba:bu]]
   b. [IP the door [VP was broken]]

Of the general principles just mentioned, Move-alpha is the only principle that is characterised by a transformational nature, since it is said to transform a given derivation from one level of representation, viz. DS, to another level or levels, viz. SS, PF and LF. It is assumed therefore that NP-movement, the principal movement in passive-formation, can take place only if such a movement is required in order to satisfy such principles. In fact, this assumption is no more than a conceptual outgrowth of the traditional TGG model, which specified movement as one of two functions of Pass-transformation, the other being addition, as we saw in the previous section. To illustrate how NP-movement takes place in (46), consider the mapping of Move-alpha from DS onto SS in (47) and (48) respectively:

(47)  a. [VP kusira [IP e [NP al-ba:b]]]
   b. [IP e [VP was broken [NP the door]]]

(48)  a. [VP kusira [IP al-ba:bu [NP t]]]
   b. [IP the door [VP was broken [NP t]]]

At the level of DS in (47), the empty element e is allocated in the [NP, IP] position (the subject) to be occupied by the NP in [NP, VP] position (the object) in the course of derivation. Allocation of e as such is said to be preconditioned by the extended Projection Principle to ensure that the output has a subject. Accordingly, e is non-theta-marked and the [NP, VP] position is theta-marked, for which reason the NP in the latter position (al-ba:b in (47a) and the door in (47b)) will move to the former, otherwise it will violate the theta-Criterion (cf. examples (11)). Then, at the level of SS in (48), Move-alpha regulates the movement of this NP, so as to get Case from I (the head of IP), whilst at the same time the trace t that it leaves behind is specified by the ECP. As a result, this NP is assigned Nominative Case which is morphologically realised in Arabic, but not in English (al-ba:bu in (48a) and the door in (48b)). Case-assignment is therefore licensed by the Case Filter because NP-movement proceeds from one argument position (A-position) to another (cf. also examples (12) and (13)).
The interaction between UG-principles in this way is taken as the standard analysis of the canonical passive in the early version of the P&P model which generally holds that the DS-object as in (47) moves to act as the SS-subject as in (48). According to this model (which will be referred to as the ‘standard analysis’ or the ‘standard assumption’ throughout), passive sentences such as the output of (48) is assumed to reflect two fundamental properties. These are stated in (49) below, where the NP in [NP, IP] position carries the same theta-role which the active verb assigns to the NP in [NP, VP] position (cf. Chomsky, 1981:124).

(49)  a. [NP, IP] does not receive a theta-role.
     b. [NP, VP] does not receive Case within VP,
        for some choice of NP in VP.

Given the logical coincidence of the DS-object in (47) and the SS-subject in (48), the two fundamental properties in (49) are identified with ‘theta-role absorption’ and ‘Case absorption’ respectively, and are therefore attributed to the Pass element shown in (45). That is, the Pass element, when attached to V as in (46), is said to ‘absorb’ the dual ability of this V to assign a theta-role to the external argument at one end, and to assign Case to the internal argument at another (cf. Jaeggli, 1986; Chomsky, 1988a:119f; Baker et al., 1989; Haegeman, 1993: 169f). In order to see what either property would follow from, let us first consider the relationship between the subcategorisation grid and the theta-grid of V.

As discussed earlier, the subcategorisation grid of a given V is regulated by the the Projection Principle and the theta-grid of this V by the theta-Criterion. In the former grid, the number and type of complements that the V c-selects is determined and, in the latter grid, each of these complements as well as the subject is assigned its appropriate theta-role (cf. section 3.1). The complements that figure in the subcategorisation grid are known as ‘internal arguments’ and their theta-roles ‘internal theta-roles’, whereas the subject of the V (being the predicate) is known as the ‘external argument’ and its theta-role the ‘external theta-role’, since it does not figure in that grid (cf. Williams, 1980, 1981). Both the internal argument(s) and the external argument that a given predicate necessitates designate what is traditionally known as the ‘argument structure’ of the predicate, which is synonymous with the ‘valency’
of the verb in Tesnière's (1959) terminology (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2). Thus, the transitive verbs *kasara* in Arabic and *break* in English select the subcategorisation grid and the theta-grid illustrated in (50a) and (50b) respectively, the latter being the argument structure itself:

(50)  
\[ \begin{align*}  
\texta. & \quad \text{kasara}/\text{break} \ (\text{tr.}) \ [\_\_\_ \ NP] \\
\textb. & \quad \text{kasara}/\text{break} \ (\text{tr.}) \ [\text{Agent} \ \text{Patient}] 
\end{align*} \]

In fact, extending the Projection Principle seems to have resulted from this very notion of 'argument structure' to account for the subject of a predicate on the one hand, and to maintain the one-to-one relationship between subcategorisation and theta-marking on the other. That is, the insertion or deletion of a given argument correlates with the presence or absence of the theta-role that is assigned to that argument, otherwise the theta-Criterion will be violated. Because Case is assigned to a given argument in accordance with visibility conditions on NPs (cf. Chomsky, 1981: 170f), Case-assignment must also be correlated with theta-marking, otherwise the Case Filter will also be violated. These seemingly logical consequences of the theta-Criterion and the Case Filter have led Chomsky and his followers to identify 'theta-role absorption' and 'Case absorption' as the two fundamental properties of the canonical passive stated in (49) above. Given that these two properties are ascribed to the Pass element specifically, the distinction between a transitive active verb as in (50) and its passive form would be explained in terms of the distinction between their theta-grids and between the corresponding Case grids as shown in (51) and (52) respectively:

(51)  
\[ \begin{align*}  
\texta. & \quad \text{kasara}/\text{break} \ (\text{tr.}) \ [\text{Agent} \ \text{Patient}] \\
\textb. & \quad \text{kasara}/\text{break} \ (\text{tr.}) \ [\text{Nom} \ \text{Acc}] 
\end{align*} \]

(52)  
\[ \begin{align*}  
\texta. & \quad \text{kusira}/\text{was broken} \ [\text{Patient}] \\
\textb. & \quad \text{kusira}/\text{was broken} \ [\text{Nom}] 
\end{align*} \]

Concerning the first fundamental property in (49a), theta-role absorption is assumed to be a crucial function of the Pass element in that it 'absorbs' the external theta-role (i.e. the Agent in (51a), for instance) by being assigned this role, hence the theta-grid in (52a), and therefore the non-theta-marked *e* in the [NP, IP] configuration in (47). This assumption is motivated by the nonassignment of the external theta-role to an argument in the subcategorisation grid of V, since only internal arguments figure in this grid as in (50a), meaning that the external theta-
role is the only role that can be 'absorbed' by (i.e. assigned to) the Pass element. Accordingly, the distinction between the external theta-role and the internal theta-role(s) is said to correlate with the distinction between 'absorbability' and 'nonabsorbability', a correlation that would explain why active sentences where the implicit pronominal *huwa* 'he' in Arabic or the explicit pronominal *it* in English is incorporated as a nonhuman Agent as in (53) can never be interpreted as a paraphrase of (54) with expletive representations:

(53) a. kasara al-ba:ba.
   (Gloss: broke (3sm) the-door (Acc))
   b. It broke the door.

(54) a. kusira al-ba:bu.
   (Gloss: was broken (3sm) the-door (Nom))
   b. The door was broken.

The impossibility of interpretation would therefore be accounted for by assuming that the external theta-role in (54) is assigned to the Pass element, whereas the same role in (53) is assigned to the [NP, IP] position since the Pass element is absent. Pursuing the matter a little further, an important question would arise: How can a theta-role be assigned to the Pass element? At one end, the Pass element above all involves a bound morpheme as in Arabic or a complex of a bound and free morphemes as in English (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3); and at another, theta-role assignability is typical of NPs (or arguments standing proxy for them) and of some PPs. Given these two existing facts, to answer the question just posed would not be an easy task.

According to the standard analysis, theta-role absorption is simply defined as 'theta-role assignment to a bound morpheme', an obligatory process which is said to impose a lexical specification on the Pass element. As such, it must be stated in the lexicon as an idiosyncratic property of the canonical passive in general, and must therefore be projected as part of the mapping form DS as in (47) onto SS as in (48), so as to escape violation of the Projection Principle. On this basis, the Pass element can only be understood as an argument, perhaps an external argument, to also escape violation of the theta-Criterion (cf. section 3.1).
This analysis is claimed to be compatible with the factual observation that external theta-role assignment is a decisive precondition for passivisation: *Verbs which assign an external theta-role are passivisable; verbs which do not assign an external theta-role are not passivisable.* Accordingly, both transitive and intransitive verbs can be captured so far as the whole process of canonical passivisation is concerned (cf. Jaeggli, 1986:593). However, although it offers a much more reasonable account than all the rigid formulas discussed throughout, such a factual observation is in fact incompatible with the standard assumption that the external theta-role in the canonical passive is assigned to the Pass element. In order to demonstrate such incompatibility, it is necessary therefore to discuss the second fundamental property of this construction in greater detail, given the correlation between theta-marking and Case assignment as seen.

With respect to the second fundamental property in (49b), Case absorption is also assumed to be a crucial function of the Pass element, a function which is analogous to theta-role absorption. That is, the Pass element ‘absorbs’ the objective Case (i.e. Accusative in (51b), for instance) by being assigned this Case, hence the Case grid in (52b), and therefore the non-Case-marked NP in the [NP, VP] configuration in (47). In fact the statement “[NP, VP] does not receive Case within VP” as stated in (49b) holds only for languages such as English, while it is not the case with languages such as Italian and Spanish where the NP in [NP, VP]
can be assigned Nominative Case (cf. Jaeggli, 1986:593f, for further detail). The statement 
"[NP, VP] does not receive Accusative Case within VP" has therefore been implied, so as to 
maintain its generalisability across languages such as Arabic, if this turns out to be the case.
For this reason, the correlation between Case absorption and theta-role absorption would 
simply mean that the Pass element absorbs Accusative Case because it also absorbs the 
external theta-role at DS. The DS-representation in (47) is repeated here in (55).

(55) a. [VP kusira [IP e [NP al-ba:b]]]
   b. [IP e [VP was broken [NP the door]]]

Given this generalised correlation, the NP in [NP, IP] (i.e. the empty element e itself) is 
assigned no external theta-role, and the NP in [NP, VP] (al-ba:b in (55a) and the door in 
(55b)) is assigned no Accusative Case. It follows that, because the passive verb (kusira in 
(55a) and was broken in (55b)) is not an Accusative-Case assigner, the NP in the latter 
position must move to the former where it can be assigned Nominative Case, an exclusively 
legitimate type of movement which would render (55) grammatical at SS. The SS-
representation in (48) is repeated here in (56).

(56) a. [VP kusira [IP al-ba:bu [HY' t]]]
   b. [IP the door [VP was broken [NP t]]]

As discussed above, this movement is legitimate because it proceeds from one A-position to 
another, the former being theta-marked and the latter non-theta-marked. Thus, the moved NP 
(al-ba:bu in (56a) and the door in (56b)) receives both Nominative Case from 1 (the head of 
IP) and the internal theta-role through the medium of its trace t, which is theta-marked. Both 
the moved NP and the trace t it leaves behind form a chain, [al-ba:bu, t] and [the door, t], 
where the head (al-ba:bu/the door) receives one Case and the foot (the trace t) receives one 
theta-role. Under this analysis, NP-movement is mainly triggered by Case Theory in that 
Nominative-Case assignment must occur, and therefore be licensed by the Case Filter in order 
to satisfy this Filter. As a precondition for SS, this NP-movement is in general obligatory in
languages such as Arabic and English as is evident in (55) and (56), whereas the same NP-
movement is optional in languages such as Italian and Spanish.\(^{11}\)

It seems the case that Case absorption is simply interpreted as the exhaustion of the sole
occurrence of Accusative-Case assignment: once the Accusative Case is absorbed by the Pass
element, it is no longer assignable to an NP in [NP, VP]. But this interpretation will certainly
entail the following rigorous generalisation: **Verbs which assign Accusative Case are
passivisable; verbs which do not assign Accusative Case are not passivisable.** Here, again,
we are facing the same problem raised earlier within the traditional approach, and thus
"identification of passivisation with Accusative-Case assignment" would be no more than an
'elegant' locution for re-expressing the misguided belief that transitivity is a decisive
precondition for passivisation (cf. chapter 2, section 2.1). Suppose, for the moment, that this
generalisation is true in languages such as English, as Chomsky and his followers claim, it is
certainly false in languages such as Arabic, which permit instantiation of the so-called
impersonal passive with intransitive verbs. Let us now reintroduce the structural condition
for this construction stated in (41) above, and simplify its notations accordingly, as in (57)
and (58) respectively.

(57)  
  a. Pass V Exp X (VSO-order)  
  b. Exp Pass V X (SVO-order)

\(^{11}\) A concrete example from Spanish may be useful here to illustrate this optionality of NP-movement. Consider the following SS-representation where the NP *la oveja* ‘the sheep’ occupies the [NP, VP] position (cf. Chomsky, 1988a:119).

(i)  
  a. [IP *pro* [VP *ha sido devorada* [NP *la oveja*]]]  
     [IP *it* [VP *has been devoured* [NP *the sheep*]]]  
  b. The sheep has been devoured.

Due to a specific value of the pro-drop parameter in Spanish (or Italian), the NP *la oveja* ‘the sheep’
may move to the null-subject position *pro*, a value that is also fixed in Arabic but whose optionality is
permitted under certain conditions, which are not to be discussed here. As a result, the moved NP and
its trace form the chain [*la oveja, it*] where the head receives Nominative Case and the foot the internal
theta-role, thus yielding the other option in (ii):

(ii)  
  a. [IP *la oveja* [VP *ha sido devorada* [NP *it*]]]  
     [IP *the sheep* [VP *has been devoured* [NP *it*]]]  
  b. The sheep has been devoured.
(58)  
  a. [VP Pass V [IP (Exp) [X]]]
  b. [IP Exp [VP Pass V [X]]]

(where (Exp) in (58a) stands for the implicit expletive huwa ‘he’ in Arabic, and Exp in (58b) for the explicit expletive *it* in English. X in both cases stands for the V-complement, which may be a PP-argument or a that-argument as in Arabic, or just a that-argument as in English).

The PP-argument and the that-argument will be discussed in turn.

As for the PP-argument, certain intransitive verbs in Arabic can be ‘impersonally’ passivised, thereby allowing an expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal, an interpretation that cannot be instantiated in English for no apparent reason.\(^{12}\) Consider the following examples of the impersonal passive in (59a-61a) below, with (59b-61b) being their SS-representations in accord with the structure in (58a). Notice that the invariant pronominal huwa ‘he’ in the b-group is the implicit expletive (Exp).

(59)  
  b. [VP si:ra [IP (huwa) [PP ?ala: ha:thihi al-ardi]]]
  c. [VP was walked [IP (he) [PP on this the-land]]]
  d. (Lit.: It was walked on this land.)

(60)  
  b. [VP ni:ma [IP (huwa) [PP fi: ha:tha al-bayti]]]
  c. [VP was slept [IP (he) [PP in this the-huse]]]
  d. (Lit.: It was slept in this house.)

(61)  
  b. [VP ruqisa [IP (huwa) [PP fi: ha:tha al-masrahi]]]
  c. [VP was danced [IP (he) [PP in this the-theatre]]]
  d. (Lit.: It was danced in this theatre.)

Now if one accepts the standard assumption that intransitive verbs are not Accusative-Case

\(^{12}\) However, this expletive interpretation is well permissible in languages such as Dutch, Finnish, German, Hindi, etc. within exactly the same configuration (cf. Perlmutter, 1978:168f; Siewierska, 1984:101f). To clarify the point, a concrete example from Dutch as in (i) and from German as in (ii) will suffice:

(i)  
  a. Er wordt in deze kamer vaak geslapen.
      (Gloss: it was in this room often slept)
  b. (Lit.: It was often slept in this room.)

(ii)  
  a. Es wurde in der Vorstadt getanzt.
      (Gloss: it was in the suburbs danced)
  b. (Lit.: It was danced in the suburbs.)
assigners, then the rigorous generalisation mentioned above would predict that intransitive verbs such as *sara* ‘to walk’, *nama* ‘to sleep’, *raqasa* ‘to dance’, etc. in Arabic would systematically fail to passivise, which is absurd as the examples in (59-61) demonstrate. Plainly, there is no Accusative Case in the active versions of these examples to be absorbed by the Pass element, if one takes Case absorption for granted at all. Paradoxically, Chomsky and his followers would claim that, in languages which permit an expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal as in (59-61) above (see also note 12), the passivisability of these intransitive verbs is attributed to their ability to assign ‘structural’ Case indirectly to the object of P, though still inhibited from taking an internal theta-role.

If this contention were true of these languages only, then crosslinguistic variation between Arabic and English in these verbs would be explicable in terms of the polarity of structural-Case versus non-structural-Case assignment, meaning that the English counterparts would never passivise. However, as discussed in the preceding chapter, structural-Case assignment in Arabic is restricted exclusively to two types of substantive when neither the direct nor indirect object exists in a core relation with the verb, viz. the cognate object and the adverbial object (time/place) (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2, examples (40-45)). Accordingly, these two substantives can move to [NP, IP] position under passivisation as in (62-64) below, thereby barring an expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal, viz. the implicit pronominal (3sm).

(62)  a. *si:ra* [IP sayrun *ta:wi:lu*n] (Cognate)  
      (Gloss: was walked (3sm) walk (Nom) long (Nom))  
      b. (Lit.: A long walk was walked.)

(63)  a. *ni:m a* [IP yawmun *ka:mi:lu*n] (Time)  
      (Gloss: was slept (3sm) day (Nom) whole (Nom))  
      b. (Lit.: A whole day was slept.)

13 Chomsky makes a distinction between ‘structural’ Cases and ‘inherent’ Cases. The former include Nominative and Accusative which are assigned by I and V respectively at SS, whereas the latter comprise Genitive and Oblique which are assigned by N/A and P respectively at DS. In accordance with uniformity conditions on Case assignment, inherent Cases are said to be associated with theta-marking in that the head assigns inherent Case to the NP it theta-marks (cf. Chomsky, 1986a:193).
(64)  a. *ruqisa [IP fawqu al-minassati] (Place)
     (Gloss: was danced (3sm) over (Nom) the-platform (Gen))
   b. (Lit.: Over the platform was danced.)

Clearly, therefore, the 'personalised' version of the impersonal passive will be the result, since the abstractive dissociation of the the implicit pronominal (3sm) from the external theta-role (the Agent) is still perceivable (cf. also chapter 2, section 2.4). Now if the passivisability of intransitive verbs is determined by strictly local subcategorisation, where the PP is subcategorised internally to VP as seen earlier (cf. section 3.2, examples (35-37)), then nothing would in principle prevent English intransitive verbs such as walk, sleep, dance, etc. from impersonal passivisation with an expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal as in (59-61). In other words, if these English verbs were not able to assign structural Case under similar conditions, then they would never be able to instantiate the movement of the object of P to [NP, IP] position under passivisation, which is absurd as the following examples demonstrate.  

(65)  a. [IP this land] was walked on
   b. [IP this house] was slept in
   c. [IP this theatre] was danced in

14 However, the mechanisms underlying this movement in English constitute one of the unsolved problems in current linguistic thinking. Ian Roberts (p.c.) has pointed out that the presence of P, in this case, somehow imposes a transitive nature on the intransitive V, for which reason it is susceptible to canonical passivisation. This means that V and P are linked in a causative relation, a point that was already expressed in medieval Arabic linguistic theory (see chapter 2, section 2.2, examples (37); section 2.4, examples (89)). Yet, it does not explain the relation between (i) and (ii), given the acceptability of the latter in Arabic.

(i)  a. This land was walked on.
    b. * It was walked on this land.

It may be that the causative relation being talked about reduces both the intransitive V walk and the P on to an inseparable transitive entity walk-on, which selects an argument structure in the same way transitive Vs like break do. If this is correct, then the difference between walk-on and walk would be explained in terms of the difference between their argument structures, viz. [Agent Patient] vs. [Agent Location], respectively. Accordingly, the relation between (i) and (ii) would only be detected in the SS-representations of their active versions as in (ii), where the NP in [NP, IP] is an unspecified subject, the NP this land in (iia) acts as the object, and the PP on this land in (iib) as the V-complement.

(ii)  a. [IP NP [VP walked-on [NP this land]]]
     b. [IP NP [VP walked [PP on this land]]]

Consequently, (iia) would be passivisable in English as in (i), whereas (iib) would not be passivisable in English as in (ib) but passivisable in languages such as Arabic, Dutch, Finnish, German, Hindi, etc. (see also note 12).
Correspondingly, this NP-movement results in the ‘personalised’ version of impersonal passivisation rather than what is misleadingly called ‘pseudopassivisation’ (see also notes 8 and 9). Therefore, the rigorous generalisation which simply identifies passivisation with Accusative-Case assignment should be either abandoned or radically modified in the light of these existing facts, since it was already spelled out within the traditional approach as seen above. This is because an analysis of the PP-argument, which X in the structure of (58a) stands for, illustrates that certain intransitive verbs in Arabic can nonetheless passivise ‘impersonally’ with or without an expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal as in (59-61) and (62-64). Even in the case of the English counterparts, passivisation is also possible, particularly when the PP-argument is locally subcategorised as a V-complement as in (65).

With regard to the that-argument, another alternative for X in the structure of (58), certain ditransitive verbs in Arabic can also be ‘impersonally’ passivised, thereby permitting an expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal, an interpretation that can also be instantiated in English as will be seen presently. As discussed earlier, these verbs comprise what is traditionally known as ‘verbs of certainty’ such as  jclass='highlighter'\textit{\textipa{\textbackslash t}\textipa{\textbackslash t}arafa} ‘to know’, \textit{\textipa{i\textbackslash t}\textipa{\textbackslash t}aqada} ‘to believe’, etc. and ‘verbs of uncertainty’ such as \textit{\textipa{\textbackslash t}hanna} ‘to assume’, \textit{\textipa{\textbackslash q}\textipa{\textbackslash a}\textipa{\textbackslash l}a} ‘to say’, etc. Typical of these verbs is the semantic association of the two objects they take with a nominal sentence, viz. the embedded that-argument itself (see chapter 2, sections 2.2 and 2.4 for further detail). Consider the following impersonal passives from Arabic as in (66a-68a) below, with the b-group being their SS-representations in accord with the structure of (58a), and the d-group being the SS-representations of the English counterparts in accord with the structure of (58b). Notice, again, that the invariant pronominal \textit{\textipa{\textbackslash h}\textipa{\textbackslash u}\textipa{\textbackslash w}a} ‘he’ in the b-group is the implicit expletive (Exp).

(66) a. \textit{\textipa{\textbackslash 2}\textipa{\textbackslash u}\textipa{\textbackslash r}\textipa{\textbackslash i\textbackslash f\textbackslash a} anna zaydan ka:tibun.}
b. [VP \textit{\textipa{\textbackslash 2}\textipa{\textbackslash u}\textipa{\textbackslash r}\textipa{\textbackslash i\textbackslash f\textbackslash a} [IP (huwa) [CP anna zaydan ka:tibun]]] c. [VP was known [IP (ho) [CP that Zaid writer]]] d. [IP it [VP was known [CP that Zaid was a writer]]]
Here, the *that*-argument, whose Arabic equivalent is the *anna*-argument, is represented as the complementiser phrase CP, a single-bar projection of the embedded sentence S (cf. the abstract structure in (9)). In both languages, the whole *that*-argument branches under [NP, VP] to act as the object of V. Accordingly, it should be treated as an NP assigned Accusative Case though not realised morphologically as in the case of bare nominals in Arabic. Given that this *that*-argument does not require movement to [NP, IP] position under passivisation (except perhaps the case with some English verbs),\(^\text{15}\) it should in principle retain the potential for Accusativeness, and therefore its abstractive dissociation from being ‘absorbed’ by the Pass element (if ‘absorption’ were true). This is in fact ascribable to the potential Nominativeness of the expletive itself. Hence, the *that*-argument represents its structural status within a configuration independent of the bare verb, whether it is passivised as in (66-68) above or activised with an unspecified NP-subject as in (69-71) below (cf. chapter 2, section 2.4).

\(^\text{15}\)Researchers like Williams (1979) observe that some verbs in English permit the movement of *that*-argument to [NP, IP] position as in (ia), whereas other verbs do not as in (ib) (cf. Chomsky, 1981:149, note 121) (see also the medieval notions of ‘fronting’ and ‘antepositioning’ in chapter 2, note 1, and the cited references).
that the Pass element absorbs Accusative Case or, for that matter, the external theta-role. It is worth noting here that impersonal passives with *that*-arguments such as (66-68) exhibit more syntactic flexibility than impersonal passives with PP-arguments. This can be attributed to the ditransitivity of V in the former type, where the subject of the *that*-argument, the direct object of V, may move to [NP, IP] position, thereby replacing the expletive itself. Even if this movement occurs in Arabic and English, it would not affect the potential Accusativeness of CP, since the empty pronominal PRO, which presupposes the existence of an implicit argument, is still controlled by this subject (cf. section 3.4 for further detail). Thus, the Accusativeness of PRO is ‘transferred’ onto the second internal argument (the residue of CP). While in Arabic this ‘transfer’ is realised morphologically as in (72a-74a) below, in English it is realised via the infinitivisation of the predicate of CP as in (72b-74b).

(72) a. [VP ṭarifa [IP zaydun [PRO ka:ti:ban]]]
b. [IP Zaid [VP was known [PRO to be a writer]]]

(73) a. [VP ṭugidat [IP hindun [PRO jami:latan]]]
b. [IP Hind [VP was believed [PRO to be beautiful]]]

(74) a. [VP Thummot [IP al-falsafatu [PRO tu?allimu al-hikmata]]]
b. [IP philosophy [VP was assumed [PRO to teach wisdom]]]

For virtually the same structural reasons, we are therefore forced to consider (72-74) the ‘personalised’ versions of the impersonal passives in (69-71), given that the potential Accusativeness of CP is still maintained.16 Returning to the Arabic impersonal passives with PP-arguments in (59-61), the intransitive verbs in the SS-representations (the b-group) are said to assign structural Case to the object of P, assignment which would account for their susceptibility to passivisation. If this is indeed the case, then, like the *that*-argument in (66-

16 Notice that the Case structure of CP in (72-74) cannot be equated with one selected by transitive Vs such as *qarrara* in Arabic and *decide* in English. This is because such Vs are not ditransitive, and thus the ‘transferred’ Case from PRO to the residue of CP is Nominative, which is morphologically realised in Arabic as in (ia), but still infinitivised in English due the expletive interpretation as in (ib).

(i) a. [VP qurrira [PRO al-thaha bu]]
   (Lit.: Going was decided.)
b. [IP if [VP was decided [PRO to go]]]

The interesting point here is that the Arabic passive in (ia) would be the ‘personalised’ version of the English impersonal passive in (ib), notwithstanding the idiosyncratic behaviour of the latter within an exceptionally marginal situation (cf. Chomsky, 1986a:124, 211, note 63).
the PP-argument also represents its structural status within a configuration independent of the bare verb, since neither type of argument requires movement to [NP, IP] position due to the potential Nominativeness of the expletive. It follows that the potential for structural Case would not be affected either whether the bare verb is passivised as in (59-61) or activised with an unspecified NP-subject as in (75-77).

(75) a. [VP sa:ra [IP NP [PP ?ala: ha:thi al-ardi]]]
   b. [IP NP [VP walked [PP on this land]]]

(76) a. [VP na:ma [IP NP [PP fi: ha:thi al-bayti]]]
   b. [IP NP [VP slept [PP in this house]]]

(77) a. [VP raqasa [IP NP [PP fi: ha:thi al-masrahi]]]
   b. [IP NP [VP danced [PP in this theatre]]]

From the above analysis it can be seen that the Pass element is not an ‘absorber’ of Accusative Case at the DS-level of the canonical passive in general (cf. (55)), given the conservation of Case-assignment at the SS-level of the impersonal passive at least. Concerning the PP-argument, if it is true that the Case assigned to the object of P is structural, then this Case is still retained in the Arabic impersonal passives (59-61) due to the independent structural status of PP in these passives as well as their corresponding actives (75-77). Hence, the relation between the Arabic impersonal passives (59-61) and their English ‘personalised’ versions can be explained by reference to the ‘personalised’ versions of the former in (62-64), or even by reference to the SS-representations of the active counterparts of both (see note 14). As for the that-argument, the analysis has shown how the potential Accusativeness of this argument is retained more transparently both in the impersonal passives (66-68) and their ‘personalised’ versions (72-74) in the two languages by recourse to the active counterparts of both types as in (69-71).

Now if the Pass element is not an ‘absorber’ of Accusative Case as demonstrated, and if ‘Case absorption’ is correlated with ‘theta-role absorption’, then it follows that the Pass element is not an ‘absorber’ of the external theta-role either. The notion of absorption is based on the standard assumption that the Pass element is an argument which is base-generated under I
(the head of IP) and outside the domain of VP, for which reason it is said to absorb (i.e. be assigned) the external theta-role to satisfy the theta-Criterion. Yet, the status of the Pass element as an argument conflicts with its status as base-generated under I, and thus the standard assumption is incompatible with the factual observation that external-theta-role assignment is a defining factor in canonical passivisation. Conceptual defects such as these suggest that radical modifications of the standard assumption should be in order. In the next section an alternative analysis of the canonical passive construction in Arabic and English will be introduced with some reference to the later version of the P&P model.

3.4 Passivisation in the P&P model (II)

As mentioned earlier, the internal levels of DS and SS have been eliminated in the later version of the P&P model due to the redundancy of well-formedness evaluation at these levels on the one hand, and the greater viability of well-formedness evaluation at the external levels of PF and LF on the other. However, this does not mean that the principles which essentially apply at DS and SS are altogether dispensed with. Rather, the interaction between such principles for the formation of a given construction will be reflected in one form or another at PF and LF through the workings of a set of transformations (unitary and binary) similar in spirit to those of the traditional model of TGG. Given that Move-alpha is a subcase of unitary transformations, this general principle is said to be the direct mediator between the lexicon and the external levels of PF and LF (cf. section 3.1).

It follows from the above that the essential difference between the early and later versions of the P&P model can be detected in the manner in which units are selected from the lexicon. In the early version, such units are inserted in the phrase marker as lexical items without inflectional features (NPs with no Case, for example), whereas, in the later version, they are inserted as fully inflected lexical items whose features must be checked off in order to be
spelled out by Spell-Out at PF. More specifically, the essential difference between the two versions is discernible in the sort of trigger for the operation of Move-alpha: NPs without inflectional features, for instance, move to get inflectional features (i.e. Case features) as seen in the preceding section, while fully inflected NPs are now said to move to check off such features. For this reason, we have assumed that the principles which interact for passive-formation synchronise their functioning with lexical insertion.

The notion of feature checking was in fact motivated by the factual observation that it is the morphological component which, together with the phonological component, characteristically exhibits parametric variations between languages. This was resulted in the categorial expansion of inflectional features, which IP is responsible for (cf. the abstract structure in (9)), by splitting up the I-node into a number of functional categories such as Agrs, Tns, Agro, etc. (cf. the abstract structure in (14)). Because the Pass element is one such inflectional feature (which involves a bound morpheme as in Arabic or a complex of a bound and free morphemes as in English), it must therefore be categorially projected in a format similar to that of the X-bar theory. This indicates that the Pass element cannot be inserted as an argument to which Case and a theta-role are assigned as seen in the preceding section, but rather projected as a functional category having its independent categorial status and passing through the projection cycle in the same way as any member of the IP-group does, a seemingly tenable breakthrough which originated with Fassi Fehri (1987, 1988).

The idea of inserting the Pass element as an argument led a number of generative syntacticians to consider this element a nominal category which is base-generated under I (the head of IP) along with inflectional features such as Tns and Agr. Thus, incorporation of the Pass element into V (the head of VP) is said to proceed from one of two types of covert movement, viz. V-movement to I, or I-movement to V (cf. Baker et al., 1989). Accordingly, the three inflectional features (Agr, Tns, and Pass) would be incorporated into V
'simultaneously', since they are all base-generated under the head I, as illustrated in the following abstract structure:

(78)  [IP Spec [I' I-Agr-Tns-Pass [VP V NP]]]

However, this representation will clearly violate the principled difference between arguments and heads so far as the level of projection is concerned. At one extreme, to impose an argument status on the Pass element will certainly put this element on a par with maximal or phrasal projections (i.e. double-bar projections). At the other, to consider the Pass element a nominal category that is base-generated under I (which is after all the head of IP) will give this element a head status, and therefore a status of zero-bar projections. In both extremes, the distinction between zero-bar projections and double-bar projections will result in a seemingly unsolvable paradox.

What is more, the representation in (78) is in fact, empirically speaking, incapable of deriving the fixed position of the Pass element in relation to Agr and Tns. In languages such as Arabic the Pass element requires a bound morpheme which is systematically infixed into the underlying lexical form of V, a property which differentiates this language typologically from languages such as English. For example:

(79)  a. kusira
     b. [k-s-r-] + [-u-i-a]
     c. [breaking] + [Agr Tns Pass]

Here, the passive verb *kusira* in (79a) consists of two bound morphemes as in (79b): first, the three-radical root *k-s-r-* which carries the main lexical information (the basic meaning of 'breaking'); and second, the formative morpheme *-u-i-a* which is responsible for all the inflectional features being talked about, viz. Agr, Tns, and Pass (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3). Given that the formative morpheme is systematically infixed into the three-radical root, incorporation will therefore establish an **internal** position for the Pass element in relation to Agr and Tns, even though the whole IP is located outside the domain of VP as in (78). In languages such as English, on the other hand, the Pass element necessitates a complex of a
bound and free morphemes, the former being systematically suffixed to the underlying lexical form of V, as illustrated in (80) below, the English counterpart of (79).

(80) a. was broken
   b. [be] + [break] + [-en]
   c. [Agr Tns] + [breaking] + [Pass]

Here, the passive verb was broken in (80a) consists of three morphemes as in (80b): first, the free morpheme be which is responsible for Agr and Tns; second, the underlying lexical form of V break which can be equated with k-s-r- in (79b); and third, the bound morpheme -en which is the Pass element itself. Since the Pass element is systematically suffixed to the underlying lexical form of V, incorporation will in this case establish more conspicuously an external position for the Pass element in relation to Agr and Tns, notwithstanding the location of the whole IP outside the domain of VP.

Now if the abstract structure represented in (78) above is incapable of deriving the fixed position of the Pass element in relation to Agr and Tns, as demonstrated, then it is equally incapable of accounting for the typological divergence between languages in the morphological structure of the Pass element itself. This also indicates that an alternative analysis of the canonical passive is inevitable. To avoid possible confusion, let us call the Pass element which requires a single bound morpheme as in Arabic ‘1-morph Pass’, and the Pass element which involves a complex of a bound and free morphemes as in English ‘2-morph Pass’. This terminology will therefore help explain the typological divergence being talked about in terms of parametric variation, as will be seen soon.

In a quite comprehensive analysis, researchers like Ouhalla attempt to explain the major properties of the canonical passive in general, an explanation that seems to have resulted from the particular focus of attention on the morphological component within the later version of the P&P model. Drawing on Fassi Fehri’s (1987, 1988) original observation referred to above, Ouhalla’s analysis attributes to the Pass element the status of an independent
functional category, a category which heads its own maximal or phrasal projection (call it PassP) and intervenes between VP and the other elements of IP, viz. Agr and Tns (cf. Ouhalla, 1991:94). Because Agr and Tns are elements of the inflectional system of V like the Pass element itself, they must also be considered independent functional categories which head their own maximal or phrasal projections (call them AgrP and TnsP) in order to be at the same level of projection as PassP, thus steering clear of the unsolvable paradox that would arise from the abstract structure in (78).

Under this analysis, an apparently simple formula of the form ‘Pass c-selects VP’ has initially been introduced to capture the most prominent property of the canonical passive that is generalisable across languages, whether they employ the 1-morph Pass as in Arabic or the 2-morph Pass as in English. This formula clearly states that the c-selection of VP constitutes such a generalisable property, since the Pass element in any language instantiating the canonical passive (i.e. its verbal representation) tends to be systematically attached to V, not any other lexical category. Accordingly, the general order of the three main functional categories (Agr, Tns, and Pass) will essentially be the same (though not necessarily invariant) when each category heads its own maximal projection, as illustrated in the abstract structure in (81) below. Notice that the single-bar projection of each category is disregarded here for the purposes of technical simplification.

\[(81) \quad [\text{AgrP Agr} [\text{TnsP Tns} [\text{PassP Pass} [\text{VP V NP}]]]]\]

17 This indicates that noncanonical passives such as the so-called nominal or gerundive passive are to be treated by a formula different from ‘Pass c-selects VP’ since the Pass element itself is invisible in these constructions though the same pragmatic properties of the canonical passive are perceivable. A concrete example of the nominal passive from Arabic and English will suffice.

(i) a. Tarjamatu al-kitab....
   (Gloss: translation (Nom) the-book (Gen)....)
   b. The translation of the book....

Here, the derived nominal tarjamatu ‘translation’ in both examples would select the same argument structure of the passive verb turjima ‘was translated’, viz. [Patient], a matter that is beyond the scope of this study. Yet, the invisibility of the Pass element in nominal passives like (i) as well as the incorporation of the same pragmatic properties of the canonical passive is another empirical evidence that the Pass element is assigned neither Case nor a theta-role. This also holds for the gerundive passive with the derived gerundive translating, which is possible in English but not Arabic.
Proceeding from right to left, the configuration where VP is immediately dominated by PassP would account for the generalisable property of the canonical passive that the Pass morpheme is attached to V. Thus, as an initial step in the derivation of this construction, both Arabic (1-morph Pass) and English (2-morph Pass) will converge in the application of V-movement to Pass (rather than V-movement to I or I-movement to V as has been misleadingly believed (cf. (78)). As a result of V-movement to Pass, a new complex will be derived (call it the [V + Pass] complex) which simply indicates that the Pass morpheme is attached to V. At this point, before any other type of movement is applied in the course of derivation, the derived [V + Pass] complex alone would mark the beginning of typological divergence between Arabic and English in that the 1-morph Pass element is incorporated in the former (e.g. u-i-a-in (79b)) but only one part of the 2-morph Pass element is incorporated in the latter (e.g. -en in (80b)). This leads to the identification of the derived [V + Pass ] complex in terms of an independent parameter (call it the [V + Pass] parameter) which has two different values as shown in (82).

(82) a. [V + Pass] marks verbalisation [+V].
    b. [V + Pass] marks nominalisation [+N].

Clearly, therefore, in the initial step of derivation, the value of the [V + Pass] parameter in (82a) will be fixed in languages such as Arabic, whereas the value of the same parameter in (82b) will be set in languages such as English. These two values can also account for further typological divergence between Arabic and English in the next step of derivation. Returning to the abstract structure in (81), it is the derived [V + Pass] complex of the value (82a) rather than (82b) which can move to Tns in order to satisfy the morphological-selectional properties of Tns, which dictate that Tns m-selects verbal categories in general. Then, the resultant complex can move further to Agr in (81) since the incorporation of Tns in languages such as Arabic means the ‘bi-incorporation’ of Tns and Agr as in (79) or even perhaps the ‘multi-incorporation’ of Tns, Agr, and other inflectional features. Consequently, the resultant
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It is argued that in languages such as Arabic Tns is also associated with Asp(ect) in the sense that the distinction between Past and Present would essentially be the distinction between Perfective and Imperfective (cf. Fassi Fehri, 1988, for example). Thus, languages such as Greek, Polish, Russian, etc.
complex can now be spelled out by Spell-Out at the PF-level, given that all the inflectional requirements of the 1-morph passive verb are satisfied at this level.

Concerning the derived \([V + \text{Pass}]\) complex of the value (82b), on the other hand, this complex cannot move further to Tns in (81) because of its nominal nature, otherwise the m-selectional properties of Tns will be violated. Instead, the Aux \textit{be} as in (80) will be selected from the lexicon to act as an instrumental unit, and will therefore be inserted under Tns due to its verbal nature. The insertion of the Aux \textit{be} will, then, give rise to a new derived complex \([\textit{be} + V + \text{Pass}]\) which marks verbalisation in the same way the derived \([V + \text{Pass}]\) complex of the value (82a) does. Given that the new derived complex \([\textit{be} + V + \text{Pass}]\) satisfies the m-selectional properties of Tns, it can move further to Agr in (81) but the incorporation of Tns in languages such as English does not necessarily mean the ‘bi-incorporation’ of Tns and Agr as in (80). In consequence, the resultant complex can now surface at the PF-level through Spell-Out because all the inflectional requirements of the 2-morph passive verb are satisfied at this level.

In such a perspective, the typological divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive can be reduced to the two different values of the \([V + \text{Pass}]\) parameter in (82 a-b). If the derived \([V + \text{Pass}]\) complex is verbal as in Arabic (value (82a)), then this complex moves to Tns and further to Agr in order to surface at PF under well-formedness conditions. If, however, the derived \([V + \text{Pass}]\) complex is nominal as in English (value (82b)), then this complex remains in Pass and the Aux \textit{be} is inserted under Tns, thereby creating a new derived complex \([\textit{be} + V + \text{Pass}]\) which subsequently moves to Agr, so as to surface at PF under the same conditions. In both cases, the purpose of movement to Agr is to match the form of the derived passive verb, be it 1-morph or 2-morph, with the NP-subject. Recall that the NP-

would instantiate basically the same parameter. In languages such as English, on the other hand, Asp is marked by a different morphological complex \([\textit{have} + -en]\), and therefore a different parameter is involved, which may extend to French, Italian, Spanish, etc.
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subject occupies the Spec of IP (i.e. the [NP, IP] position) before splitting up the I-node into AgrP, TnsP, and PassP. This indicates that the NP-subject after splitting up the I-node will occupy the Spec of AgrP (i.e. the [NP, AgrP] position) as illustrated in (83) below, which is an extended version of (81). Notice that (83) is still a simplified version of (14), where AgrP is split up into AgrsP and AgroP, which are irrelevant here.

(83)  

Proceeding from right to left, again, NP is the object of V, which is an Accusative-Case position; the Spec of VP is the non-Case position of the subject that is assigned the external theta-role (call it the E-subject); and the Spec of AgrP is the Nominative-Case position of the subject that may be assigned an internal theta-role (call it the I-subject). Given the typological divergence between Arabic and English in the inflectional features of the canonical passive, it appears that the distinction between the E-subject and the I-subject is crucial for scrutinising the typological convergence in the structural aspects of this construction. As an alternative to the two properties of the Pass category discussed in the preceding section (cf. (49)), let us assume that the presence of this category in the abstract structure in (83) brings about two essential properties as illustrated in (84). These two properties will be discussed respectively.

(84)  
a. The E-subject does not move to [Spec, AgrP] position to become the I-subject.  
b. The NP-object may or may not move to [Spec, AgrP] position to become the I-subject.  

Concerning the first essential property in (84a), it is absolutely imperative that the E-subject be realised as an empty category in order to meet the well-formedness conditions referred to above. This is due to the fact that if the E-subject is realised as a lexical category, then these conditions will not be met at PF. As such, the lexicalised E-subject will remain in its base-position, the Spec of VP in (83), which is a non-Case position, as just seen, meaning that Case

---

19 Notice that the distinction between the E-subject and the I-subject is similar to Ouhalla's distinction between thematic and structural subjects respectively (cf. Ouhalla, 1991:96). Yet, the two essential properties stated in (84) presuppose the necessary synchronisation of the workings of the general principles that underlie passive-formation (cf. section 3.3) with lexical selection in order to meet well-formedness conditions at PF through Spell-Out.
requirement will be violated. On this account, the occurrence of a lexicalised E-subject, and therefore Case-requirement violation, will invariably result in ill-formed passives as shown in (85) below, where \( al-walad \) in (85a) and \( the \, boy \) in (85b) are the E-subjects themselves.

Notice that the symbol (\( \emptyset \)) in the gloss indicates that the NP in question is deprived of Case.

\[(85)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad *[\text{VP } kusira [\text{AgrP } al-ba:bu [al-walad]]] \\
& \quad \text{(Gloss: was broken (3sm) the-door (Nom) the-boy (\( \emptyset \)))}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad *[\text{AgrP the door} [\text{VP was broken [the boy]}]]
\end{align*}\]

Lexicalisation of the E-subject in such a configuration follows from the fact that the underlying lexical form of \( V \) (\( k-s-r- \) and \( break \)) moves to Pass (\( -u-i-a \) and \( -en \)) in order to generate the derived \([V + \text{Pass}]\) complex (\( kusira \) in (85a) and \( broken \) in (85b)) in the initial step of derivation, prior to the functioning of Tns and Agr, as seen above. The only way to evade the ill-formedness of passives such as (85) is the application of an instrumental process which necessarily deletes the E-subjects \( al-walad \) in (85a) and \( the \, boy \) in (85b) altogether, or necessarily inserts the \( P \) by as an adjunct to the latter, so as to get Oblique Case for the feature-checking process. As a consequence, the ill-formedness of (85) is explicable in terms of the more reasonable assumption that Pass simply inhibits the movement of the E-subject to \([\text{Spec, AgrP}]\) position as stated in (84a) than the standard assumption which attributes theta-role absorption and Case absorption to Pass, as seen in the preceding section.

From this standpoint, the ill-formedness that results from realising the E-subject as a lexical category makes it absolutely imperative to consider this E-subject an empty category simply because the inhibition of its movement to \([\text{Spec, AgrP}]\) position will not affect the internal structure of the canonical passive. The only empty categories that do not proceed from the application of Move-alpha are \( pro \) and PRO, the former being marked in a Case position \([-\text{anaphor, } +\text{pronominal}]\) and the latter in a non-Case position \([+\text{anaphor, } +\text{pronominal}]\).\(^{20}\)

Given that \([\text{Spec, VP}]\) in (83) is marked in a non-Case position, it follows that the E-subject,

\(^{20}\) Notice that traces such as NP-traces and WH-traces are also empty categories, but are coindexed with their antecedents as a result of Move-alpha applications, namely, the movement of the NP-object in the canonical passive (cf. section 3.1, examples (13); section 3.3, examples (47-48)) and the movement of WH-phrases which are not to be dealt with in the present study.
which originates in this position, must be realised as the empty category PRO rather than pro. Accordingly, PRO is perceived to be the implicit argument itself in that if the P by is necessarily inserted as an adjunct to the E-subject the boy in (85b) above, this E-subject can no longer be considered the external argument of V. Rather, both PRO and the derived PP complex will share the external theta-role of this V. This leads to the identification of PRO with the implicit controller when the PP complex is necessarily deleted and an infinitival clause is inserted instead. For example:

(86) a. [VP hudima [AgrP al-jisru [PRO li-bina:?i al-saddi]]]
   (Gloss: was destroyed (3sm) the-bridge (Nom) for-building (Obl) the-dam (Gen))
   b. [AgrP the bridge [VP was destroyed [PRO to build the dam]]]

Here, the implicit argument can be interpreted arbitrarily as a nonanaphoric pronoun such as al-?aduhum ‘someone’, hum ‘they’, etc. The fact that it refers to both al-?a:dim ‘the destroyer’ and al-ba:ni: ‘the builder’ in examples such as (86) may impose a syntactically ‘active’ nature on its implicitness, which enters into some sort of grammatical relation, even though it is not structurally represented in an A-position (an argument-position). The question arises as to which structurally represented category is to control PRO in examples such as (86). According to the standard assumption, it is the Pass morpheme which would be the legitimate controller of PRO, since this morpheme, being structurally represented, is said to absorb (i.e. be assigned) the external theta-role of V. However, this will certainly violate control relations between A-positions simply because Pass cannot act as an argument, as seen in the pervious section. Given that the E-subject is structurally represented in an A-position as [Spec, VP] in (83), it must therefore be the only legitimate controller of PRO to escape violation of control relations.

In such a perspective, identification of the E-subject with the implicit controller of PRO will naturally account for the arbitrary interpretation of the implicit argument, even if the infinitival clause in (86) in not embedded in the matrix clause. In this case, the agentless passive, the principal concern of the current study, will be the resultant construction, where the implicit argument being talked about refers exclusively to al-?a:dim ‘the destroyer’ as
illustrated in (87) below. Therefore, the arbitrary interpretation of the implicit argument follows from the absence of the referential controller of PRO (being the implicit argument itself) in the traditional sense of arbitrary control relations as shown in (88) below.

(87) a. [VP hudima [AgrP al-jisru [PRO]]]  
    (Gloss: was destroyed (3sm) the-bridge (Nom)))
    b. [AgrP the bridge [VP was destroyed [PRO]]]

(88) a. sahlun [PRO hadmu al-jisri]  
    (Gloss: easy (Nom) destroying (Nom) the-bridge (Gen))
    b. It is easy [PRO to destroy the bridge]

With regard to the second essential property stated in (84b) above, the question arises as to whether or not the NP-object may move to [Spec, AgrP] position in order to act as the I-subject. In fact, the second essential property eliminates the possibility of misunderstanding the logical consequences of the first essential property stated in (84a). That is, the assumption that the Pass morpheme inhibits the movement of the E-subject to [Spec, AgrP] position does not necessarily mean that the NP-object should obligatorily move to the same position. For this reason, two possible syntactic configurations are clearly articulated in the second essential property: first, where the NP-object may move to [Spec, AgrP] position; and second, where the NP-object may not move to the same position. These two syntactic configurations will be considered in turn.

As for the first possible syntactic configuration, it plainly permits the actual movement of the NP-object to [Spec, AgrP] position, in which case all natural examples of the personal passive will be generated, as cited throughout. Yet the notion of ‘NP-object’ (direct or indirect) needs to be reconsidered a little further and extended to those substantives that stand proxy for it in the case of its absence (i.e. the Accusative nominals that have the potential for I-subject promotion under canonical passivisation). These include the cognate object and the adverbial object (time/place) in Arabic, and the object of the P which is causatively linked to V in English (see note 14). The movement of these substantives to [Spec, AgrP] position results in deriving the ‘personalised’ version of the impersonal passive within the same syntactic
configuration, as seen in the preceding section. The Arabic examples (62-64) and the English examples (65) are repeated in (89) and (90) respectively:

(89) a. \[VP si:\text{ra} \ [AgrP \text{sayrun} \text{tawilun}] \quad \text{(Cognate)}
\quad \text{(Lit.: A long walk was walked.)}

b. \[VP ni:\text{ma} \ [AgrP \text{yawmun} \text{ka} : \text{milun}] \quad \text{(Time)}
\quad \text{(Lit.: A whole day was slept.)}

c. \[VP \text{ruqisa} \ [AgrP \text{fawq} \text{u} \text{al}-\text{minassati}] \quad \text{(Place)}
\quad \text{(Lit.: Over the platform was danced.)}

(90) a. \[AgrP \text{this land} \ [VP \text{was walked on}]

b. \[AgrP \text{this house} \ [VP \text{was slept in}]

c. \[AgrP \text{this theatre} \ [VP \text{was danced in}]

This clearly indicates that all natural examples of the canonical passive which involve NP-movement to [Spec, AgrP] position in Arabic and English can be classified under the first syntactic configuration of the second essential property in (84b). The moved NP may be an object (direct or indirect) or a substantive which stands proxy for it as in (89) and (90), a configuration that can also be generalised over marginally exceptional cases where English verbs such as believe may instantiate the movement of the embedded that-argument (CP-movement) to the same position (see note 15). In order to generalise the first syntactic configuration even further, let us call the categories that do in fact move to [Spec, AgrP] position ‘dynamic categories’ and contrast them with ‘static categories’, categories which do not move to this position, as will be seen soon.

The mechanism underlying movement in the case of ‘dynamic categories’ may be explained in terms of coindexation of a functional representation with a lexical one in the sense that the Pass category is coindexed with the dynamic category (cf. Borer, 1986; Kayne, 1987; Tsimpli, 1989; Ouhalla, 1991:100). Thus, for the derivation of any canonical passive construction which involves movement, the coindexation mechanism implies that the dynamic category moves to [Spec, AgrP] position through the [Spec, PassP] position, but not any other position in the abstract structure in (83). To illustrate the coindexation mechanism in structural terms, this abstract structure is repeated in (91) below, with the NP-object in (83)
being replaced by the dynamic category (DC), which has the same index $i$ as the [Spec, Pass] category itself.

(91)  
[VP Spec [V' V [DC,]]]]]]]]]]

As for the second possible syntactic configuration, on the other hand, it does not permit the actual movement of the NP-object from its base-position to [Spec, AgrP] position, in which case all natural examples of the impersonal passive construction incorporating transitive verbs specifically will be generated. However, this syntactic configuration only applies to languages such as Irish, Ukrainian, Welsh, and the like, where the direct object under impersonal passivisation remains in its base-position and the nominal expletive is inserted in [Spec, AgrP] position. Accordingly, the term ‘NP-object’ in these languages should be subclassified under what we have called ‘static categories’, categories which behave syntactically within the same configuration, where the inhibition of their movement to [Spec, AgrP] position is the immediate trigger for the insertion of the nominal expletive in this position. These categories include the PP-argument which acts as the V-complement in Arabic (see also note 12), and the embedded that-argument in Arabic and English, notwithstanding the marginally exceptional case of English verbs such as believe (see note 15).

Examples (59-61) and (66) are repeated in (92) and (93) respectively:

(92) a. [VP si:ra [AgrP (Exp) [PP ?ala: ha:thihi al-ardi]]]  
(Lit.: It was walked on this land.)  
b. [VP ni:ma [AgrP (Exp) [PP fi: ha:tha: al-bayti]]]  
(Lit.: It was slept in this house.)  
c. [VP ruqiسا [AgrP (Exp) [ PP fi: ha:tha al-masrahi]]]  
(Lit.: It was danced in this theatre.)

21 In these languages, certain transitive Vs may undergo ‘impersonal’ passivisation with the result that the direct object is still assigned Accusative Case and the inserted nominal expletive is assigned Nominative Case. A concrete example from Ukrainian as in (i) and from Welsh as in (ii) will suffice (cited in Baker, 1988; Baker et al., 1989; Ouhalla, 1991:97).

(i)  
a. Cerkv-u bulo zbudova-n-o V 1640 roc’i.  
(Gloss: church (Acc) was (Exp) was built in 1640)  
(Lit.: The church it was built in 1640.)  
b. The church was built in 1640.

(ii)  
a. Lladdwyd dyn.  
(Gloss: was killed (Exp) man (Acc))  
(Lit.: It was killed a man.)  
b. A man was killed.
likewise, the inhibition of movement to [Spec, AgrP] position indicates that all natural examples of the canonical passive incorporating static categories are classifiable under the second syntactic configuration of the second essential property in (84b). The static category may be an NP-object (see note 21), a PP-argument as in (92), or a CP-argument as in (93), a configuration that can also be generalised over the embedded infinitival clause which idiosyncratic verbs such as decide in English instantiate with an expletive interpretation (see note 16). Thus, unlike the case with the dynamic category, the static category cannot be coindexed with the [Spec, Pass] category simply because movement to [Spec, AgrP] position is inhibited. To illustrate movement inhibition in structural terms, the abstract structure in (91) is repeated in (94) below, with DC- and [Spec, AgrP] positions being occupied by the static category (SC) and the expletive (Exp) respectively.

Finally, within the alternative analysis put forward in this section, the Pass element is not an argument absorbing Case and a theta-role, but a functional category having its own categorial status along with other inflectional elements such as Agr and Tns. Hence, the typological divergence between 1-morph Pass as in Arabic and 2-morph Pass as in English can be reduced to the two different values (verbal and nominal) of the \([V + \text{Pass}]\) parameter in (82). The typological convergence, on the other hand, can also be detected in the general structure in (83), a structure that reflects the distinction between the E-subject and the I-subject. From the two essential properties of the canonical passive stated in (84), it can be seen that what all natural examples of this construction have in common, both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically, is in fact the first essential property (84a) that the presence of the Pass element prevents the E-subject from moving to [Spec, AgrP] position. This means that the I-subject can never be the E-subject, for which reason the latter must be realised as the empty
category PRO in its base-position, the [Spec, VP] position. A closely related conclusion was in fact arrived at in the previous chapter, but from a different perspective.

Given the conceptual compatibility between this conclusion and the factual observation that external-theta-role assignment is a decisive factor in passivisation, the question arises as to whether or not passivisable verbs permit the movement of the NP-object to [Spec, AgrP] position to become the I-subject as stated in the second essential property (84b). This question has led us to reconsider and extend the notion of ‘NP-object’ to include all categories which may move (hence the term ‘dynamic categories’) and all categories which may not move (hence the term ‘static categories’), a seemingly reasonable rectification of the mistaken belief that Accusative-Case assignment is a decisive factor in passivisation. Indeed, with this distinction mind, we can dispense with all the misleading terms that have been used in the literature to describe different types of the canonical passive. We can now safely say that there exist just two types, not only in Arabic and English, but also in any languages instantiating this construction: dynamic passives and static passives. These are defined in (95) below, which is a reformulation of the two properties stated in (84).

(95) a. In both the dynamic and static passives, the E-subject does not move to [Spec, AgrP] position to become the I-subject.

b. In the dynamic passive, DC is coindexed with [Spec, Pass], and therefore moves to [Spec, AgrP] position to become the I-subject (cf. the structure in (91)).

c. In the static passive, SC is not coindexed with [Spec, Pass], and therefore does not move to [Spec, AgrP] position to become the I-subject (cf. the structure in (94)).

3.5 Summary

In section 3.1, the major conceptual developments in the derivational system were outlined insofar as they are related to passive-formation in Arabic and English. These developments were chronologically scanned from the TGG model in the 1950s, with its standard version in
the 1960s and extended standard version in the 1970s, to the P&P model, with its early version in the 1980s and later version in the present decade. Yet, the paradigmatic shifts in the directions of linguistic theory could be observed in three of these frameworks. First, in the TGG model in general, the morphological component is separate from the syntactic component: phrase-structure rules form strings of not necessarily ordered morphemes, to which transformations (obligatory and optional) apply. Second, in the early version of the P&P model, the two components are closely linked: the derivational system selects from the lexicon strings of uninflected lexical items, to which certain UG-principles apply at DS and SS. Third, in the later version of the P&P model, DS and SS do not appear, but the computational system (CHL) selects from the lexicon fully inflected lexical items whose features must be checked off to surface at PF through Spell-Out. For this reason, the three frameworks were the subject-matters of sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4, respectively.

In section 3.2, the canonical passive in Arabic and English was dealt with in accordance with the TGG model, where the generation of this construction is said to result from the application of an optional rule called ‘Pass-transformation’. This was based on the generalised assumption that both the passive sentence and its active version derive from a common source. Hence, the serious problems with this assumption were explained, particularly in relation to the status of the agentive PP. Given the postulation of DS and SS in the standard version, the discussion moved on to the identification of this common source with the former, and therefore the reconsideration of the capacity of Pass-transformation for a better account of the canonical passive. Furthermore, the discussion also showed that even this better account is still fraught with a number of serious complications. These can be detected in the persistent imposition of optionality on the agentive PP and the apparent incapacity of this transformation to provide the input for the impersonal passive. Then, the structural conditions for both personal and impersonal passives were introduced for further analysis.
In section 3.3, the canonical passive in Arabic and English was treated according to the early version of the P&P model, given the criticism levelled at the TGG analysis. As a result of the lexicalist hypothesis, a set of general principles of UG are said to interact for passive-formation in any language, since they are said to reflect certain properties of the human mind. Thus, 'theta-role absorption' and 'Case absorption' were discussed as the two fundamental properties of the canonical passive, whose correlation (i.e. Pass absorbs both the external theta-role and Accusative Case) is based on the standard assumption that Pass acts as an argument base-generated under the head I along with Agr and Tns. Hence, 'absorption' is identified with 'assignment to Pass' as theta-roles and Cases are typically assigned to arguments. Yet, the discussion demonstrated the paradoxical nature of this correlation: at one end, theta-role absorption is claimed to be compatible with the true observation that external-theta-role assignment is a decisive factor in passivisation; and at another, Case absorption entails the false observation that Accusative-Case assignment is also a decisive factor in passivisation. This is due to the fact that certain categories such as the PP-argument and the that-argument still retain the potential for Case-assignment under impersonal passivisation. Therefore, Pass is neither a theta-role absorber nor a Case absorber, since its status as an argument conflicts with its status as base-generated under I.

In section 3.4, the final section, an alternative analysis of the canonical passive in Arabic and English was introduced with reference to some of the major insights put forward within the later version of the P&P model. As a reaction against the conceptual defects of the early version, the discussion illustrated the fact that Pass is not an argument base-generated under I, but a functional category heading its own maximal projection (i.e. PassP), meaning that Agr and Tns should also head their own maximal projections (i.e. AgrP and TnsP) in order to be at the same level of projection. Thus, the typological divergence between Arabic and English was explained in terms of the two different values of the Pass parameter, viz. verbalisation and nominalisation, respectively. This was to demonstrate the divergence in the covert movement of Pass itself: while verbal Pass can move to Tns and Agr, nominal Pass remains in
its base-position and Aux is inserted under Tns for further movement to Agr. The typological convergence, on the other hand, was explained in terms of two essential properties to define the canonical passive: first, the E-subject does not move to [Spec, AgrP] and must be realised as PRO; and second, the NP-object may or may not move to [Spec, AgrP]. Further, the NP-object was extended to all categories that may or may not move, hence the distinction between dynamic and static categories, the former (but not the latter) being coindexed with [Spec, Pass]. Finally, this led to the generalisable conclusion that there are just two types of the canonical passive, viz. dynamic and static passives.
Chapter Four

A FREQUENCY-BASED APPROACH

Having discussed the main principles and parameters which underlie canonical-passive formation in Arabic and English in the previous chapter, this chapter will draw on the potential frequency differences between the two languages in the same construction. Given the universal distinction between the dynamic and static passive types, the frequency differences will thus be examined within a particular approach to the functional convergence and divergence between the two languages from all possible angles. Essentially, this is to arrive at generalisable statements about the manner in which either type in Arabic functions in English and vice versa. As a standard corpus of data for this approach, the first nineteen chapters (or suras) of the Koran and their English counterparts in Dawood's version (1956/90) will be the central frame of reference throughout.

Section 4.1 of this chapter will offer some introductory remarks to define the two sorts of knowledge internalised by the native speaker in respect of the canonical passive construction, and to show how such knowledge has bearing on the functional aspects of this construction in Arabic and English. Hence, the approach to the potential frequency differences will be identified using five paradigms (A, B, C, D, and E), with the last three being the topics of sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 respectively. Section 4.2 will discuss the functional convergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive in accord with paradigm C. Since the one-to-one correlation between instances of either type of this construction does not always hold in the two languages, paradigm C will be considered in terms of four subparadigms (C1, C2, C3, and C4), with the first two referring to functional homogeneity and the last two to functional heterogeneity. Section 4.3 will discuss the functional divergence between the two languages from the viewpoint of Arabic, the concern of paradigm D. Because this functional divergence exists in either type of the canonical passive, paradigm D will be considered in terms of two subparadigms (D1 and D2), with the former addressing the dynamic type and the latter the static type. Section 4.4, the final section, will discuss the functional divergence between the two languages from the viewpoint of English, the concern of paradigm E. Given that this functional divergence only exists in the dynamic passive type, paradigm D will be considered in terms of only one subparadigm (E1). To avoid all sorts of confusion and misunderstanding, we will sometimes be forced to repeat the same statement on more than one occasion.
4.1 Preliminary remarks

In chapter 1, the salient morphological properties of the passive verb in Arabic and English were discussed and exemplified in detail. These properties constitute the system of passive morphology and its grammaticisation, a system which affects the internal structure of the active verb in the two languages (i.e. morphophonological markedness in Arabic versus morphosyntactic markedness in English). In chapter 2, the fundamental pragmalinguistic properties of the canonical passive construction (personal and impersonal) in the two languages were explained in greater detail. From the viewpoint of language use, these properties shed light on the semantic and logical connotations of this construction as well as its generalisability across unrelated languages such as Arabic and English.

Essentially, this indicates that, apart from the word-order variation between Arabic and English (VSO versus SVO, respectively), the morphological properties of the passive verb in particular mark the typological divergence between these two languages, whereas the pragmalinguistic properties are responsible for the typological convergence in general. In chapter 3, this typological convergence was re-examined in terms of a set of universal principles and the manner in which they interact for passive-formation, provided that the typological divergence was reduced to the two different values of the [V + Pass] parameter, viz. verbalisation in Arabic versus nominalisation in English. Furthermore, the interaction of this set of universal principles, whose functioning is assumed to synchronise with lexical selection, was taken to reflect two essential properties of the canonical passive, which in turn led to the identification of just two types of this construction, as stated at the end of the preceding chapter (cf. chapter 3, section 3.4, item (95)). Both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically, these two types may be restated in general terms as follows:

(1) a. The dynamic passive requires that the dynamic category (i.e. the direct object or any category standing proxy for it) move to subject position.
   b. The static passive requires that the static category (i.e. the direct object or any category standing proxy for it) remain in its base position, and that the subject position be occupied by the nominal expletive.
This illustrates the fact that, along with the morphological properties of the passive verb, the identification in (1a-b) represents one of the two parts of the native speaker's internalised **linguistic knowledge** of the canonical passive construction, viz. the *structural*. Whereas the categorial and subcategorial features of the elements incorporated in this construction would represent the other part of this knowledge, viz. the *lexical*. Specifically, the latter part concerns knowledge of the sorts of categories necessitated (i.e. lexical and functional categories) as well as the selectional properties of these categories such as the subcategorisation grid and the theta-grid of V, or any other lexical category for that matter. Given that the one-to-one relation between subcategorisation and theta-marking is reflected in the argument structure of V, the native speaker would know that, in the case of the dynamic passive, at least one internal argument in this structure must be a dynamic category in order to move to subject position such as the NP-arguments *al-nahwu* in Arabic in (2a) and *syntax* in English in (2b):

   (Gloss: was taught (3sm) the-syntax (Nom) in this the-class (Obl))
   b. Syntax was taught in this class.

In the case of the static passive, on the other hand, the native speaker would also know that, with regard to the one-to-one relation being talked about, all the internal arguments in the argument structure of V must be static categories in order to remain in their base positions, and therefore to leave scope for the nominal expletive to surface in the subject position, such as the PP-argument *fi: ha:tha: al-saffi* 'in this class' in Arabic only as in (3), and the *anna*-argument in Arabic as in (4a) and the *that*-argument in English as in (4b):

   (Gloss: was taught (he) in this the-class (Obl))
   b. (Lit.: It was taught in this class.)

(4) a. qa:la anna zaydan nahawiyyun.
   (Gloss: was said (he) that Zaid (Acc) syntactician (Nom))
   b. It was said that Zaid was a syntactician.

Clearly, therefore, in respect of the native speaker's linguistic knowledge, both Arabic and English necessitate basically the same mechanisms underlying dynamic passives such as (2) and static passives with *that*-arguments such as (4). Apart from the language-specific
variation referred to above, the only difference between the two languages in internalised
linguistic knowledge of the canonical passive construction can be detected in the mechanisms
underlying static passives with PP-arguments such as (3), which are grammatical in Arabic,
but not in English. This is due to the fact that, in the active versions of these passives, English
permits the movement of the object of P to subject position (e.g. This class was taught in), a
movement which is ascribable to the causative link between V and the P it requires (cf. chapter
3, note 14), meaning that the PP-argument fi: ha:tha: al-saffi ‘in this class’ in Arabic is a static
category, whereas the NP-argument this class in English is a dynamic category.

Recall that the native speaker’s linguistic knowledge of the canonical passive construction
comprises both the structural component and the lexical component. The inferential power of
this construction, whose LF is shareable with other linguistic expressions Ss, must also exhibit
the native speaker’s pragmatic knowledge of the same construction, otherwise its formal
aspects cannot be associated with aspects of worldly experience, and therefore linguistic
knowledge on its own cannot be put to actual use (cf. chapter 3, note 2). As discussed earlier,
the pragmatic properties of the canonical passive construction are to do mainly with the
semantic status of the Agent and the Patient (or the syntactic equivalent of the latter) (cf.
chapter 2, section 2.4, item 96). In the light of the new terminology arrived at, these properties
may be restated in (5) below to constitute the native speaker’s pragmatic knowledge being
talked about.

(5)  
a. Topicalisation of patiency (or its syntactic equivalent) in the dynamic
passive and impersonalisation of agency in the static passive.
b. Reification of causation in both constructions.
c. Externalisation of agency in both constructions.
d. Demotion of external agency in the dynamic passive and nonpromotion of
internal patiency (or its syntactic equivalent) in the static passive.

Thus, like the case of internalised linguistic knowledge as stated in (1a-b) above, the
identification in (5a-d) also represents two distinct, but related, parts of the native speaker’s
internalised pragmatic knowledge of the canonical passive construction, viz. the semantic
and the logical. While the former part refers to the thematic (i.e. semantic) roles of the lexical
categories incorporated in this construction, the latter part concerns the logical relationships between these categories or between linguistic expressions Ss sharing the same LF in general such as 'focus', 'presupposition', and the like. This is to construct a meaningful, and therefore communicable, message out of a given linguistic expression S in real-life discourse.

It appears that the necessary association of the formal aspects of a given canonical passive construction with aspects of worldly experience, is in fact the necessary association of the linguistic knowledge which constitutes the formal encoding of this construction with the pragmatic knowledge which is exhibited by the native speaker's specific intention to put this formal encoding to actual use. Thus, in addition to his/her linguistic knowledge discussed above, the native speaker would know that, in the case of the dynamic passive such as (2), the constituents *durrisa* in Arabic in (2a) and *was taught* in English in (2b) are passive verbs portraying a certain activity; that the constituents *al-nahwu* in Arabic in (2a) and *syntax* in English in (2b) represent the entity which undergoes the activity expressed by the passive verb (i.e. the Patient); that the constituents *ha:tha: al-saffi* in Arabic in (2a) and *this class* in English in (2b) represent the place where the activity expressed by the passive verb is situated (i.e. the Location); and so forth.

In the case of the static passive such as (4), on the other hand, the native speaker would also know that the constituents *qi:la* in Arabic in (4a) and *was said* in English in (4b) are also passive verbs but portraying a mental activity which is typical of humans; that the implicit pronominal *huwa* ‘he’ in Arabic in (4a) and the explicit pronominal *it* in English in (4b) are subjectivised in the form of a nominal expletive to refer specifically to a covert and indefinite human Agent; that the *anna*-argument in Arabic in (4a) and the *that*-argument in English in (4b) represent a declarative statement which undergoes the mental activity expressed by the passive verb to act as the Patient; and so forth. On this account, the inferential power of the canonical passive construction, which exhibits the native speaker's pragmatic knowledge of this construction, is indispensable for the association of its formal aspects with aspects of
worldly experience, and therefore for the utilisation of his/her linguistic knowledge of the same construction in real-life discourse.

It follows that, like the case of linguistic knowledge, aspects of pragmatic knowledge of the canonical passive both in Arabic and English would be reflected within basically the same functional paradigms via the production of any natural instance of this construction, which represents the dynamic passive as in (2) or the static passive with that-arguments as in (4). The only difference between the two languages in internalised pragmatic knowledge of the canonical passive can, again, be detected in the functional paradigms of the static passive with PP-arguments such as (3), which, as we have seen, is grammatical in Arabic, but not in English. This is also ascribable to the difference in internalised linguistic knowledge of this construction discussed above. That is, the fact that the PP-argument fi: ha:tha: al-saffi 'in this class' in Arabic is a static category and the NP-argument this class in English is a dynamic category suggests that, in the former language, the covert and indefinite human Agent is pragmatically more significant than the Location (hence the expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal), whereas the reverse would hold in the latter. Given the necessary association of formal aspects with aspects of worldly experience, the native speaker would therefore have internalised knowledge of all the general principles which underlie canonical-passive formation and its pragmatic import, together with the particular values of the parameters fixed.

It now becomes evident that any natural instance of the canonical passive (be it dynamic or static) would reflect the two sorts of the native speaker's knowledge of this construction, viz. linguistic and pragmatic, with the former consisting of the structural and lexical components and the latter the semantic and logical components. As a statement that can be generalised across genetically unrelated languages, it indicates that the knowledge that both the native speaker of Arabic and the native speaker of English would possess of this construction is in principle symmetrically balanced, since both languages necessitate basically the same set of
universal principles discussed in the preceding chapter. Such a generalisable statement also indicates that if the two languages differ, as they clearly do in the PF-representation of this construction, they only differ in setting the particular values of the parameters involved, viz. the word-order parameter and the [V+Pass] parameter.\footnote{Notice that, in the case of the native speaker of Arabic, there is a further symmetrical balance between internalised knowledge of the canonical passive in the written variety of Arabic, Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), and internalised knowledge of the same construction in the spoken variety, where passivisation is normally expressed by the morphologically marked reflexive. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Spoken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. durisa</td>
<td>a’. n’daras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. qila</td>
<td>b’. n’qa:la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. durrisa</td>
<td>c’. t’darras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. hu:riba</td>
<td>d’. t’ha:rab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, there would be no fundamental difference between the two varieties of Arabic in the word-order parameter and the [V+Pass] parameter, even though the SVO-value of the former parameter tends to be fixed as the principal word order in the spoken variety, with the other types of word order being secondary variants (cf. chapter 2, note 1). Since the variety of Arabic intended in the present study is the written one, we assume that the native speaker of Arabic (typically a university student) possesses knowledge of the canonical passive construction in this variety in exactly the same way the native speaker of English (also typically a university student) does of the English counterpart.}

However, the symmetrical balance in internalised knowledge in such a perspective cannot be perceived as an \textit{a priori} statement about the functional correlation between the notions of \textit{al-majhu:liyyah} in Arabic and \textit{passivisation} in English, a correlation which seems to signify that every canonical passive in the former language functions as a corresponding canonical passive in the latter language, and vice versa. If this statement were constantly verifiable, then the structural conditions for both \textit{al-majhu:liyyah} in Arabic and \textit{passivisation} in English would provide the formal input to what Chomsky terms \textquote{canonical structural realisation} (CSR), a process whereby the argument structure of V, for instance, is to be semantically selected and canonically realised as a specific set of syntactic categories such as NPs, PPs, or CPs (cf. Chomsky, 1986a:87). For example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(6)] a. turjima al-kita:bu. (\textit{Gloss: was translated (3sm) the-book (Nom)})
  \item b. The book was translated.
\end{itemize}
In these examples, the functioning of CSR would require something like the following representations so far as the argument structure of V is concerned: In example (6), the Patient-argument, al-kita:bu in Arabic and the book in English, is to be s-selected and c-realised as an NP, a syntactic category which represents this argument as a phrasal constituent within the subcategorisation grid of the passive verb turjima ‘to be translated’. In example (7), the Locative-argument, ?ala: al-raffi in Arabic and on the shelf in English, is to be s-selected and c-realised as a PP, a syntactic category which also represents this argument as a phrasal constituent within the subcategorisation grid of the passive verb wudi?a ‘to be put’ (cf. chapter 3, section 3.3). In example (8), the anna-argument in Arabic and the that-argument in English are to be s-selected and c-realised as a CP, a syntactic category which represents these arguments as a sentential constituent within the subcategorisation grid of the passive verb qi:la ‘to be said’ (cf. also chapter 2, section 2.4).

In such a perspective, to represent a certain argument via the functioning of CSR both in Arabic and English means to structurally encode this argument within the appropriate subcategorisation grid that is selected by a certain passive verb, and therefore to create a syntactic precondition for the functioning of Spell-Out at PF. Accordingly, the syntactic precondition would in principle be the process of feature checking itself, since the argument in question is assumed to be selected from the lexicon as a fully inflected lexical item (cf. chapter 3, section 3.1). The correlative functioning of CSR, however, may well be relevant but only to the canonical passives in Arabic that do in fact function as corresponding canonical passives in English, given the native speaker’s linguistic and pragmatic knowledge. But what about those canonical passives in Arabic that do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English on the one hand, and those canonical passives in English that do not function as
corresponding canonical passives in Arabic on the other? The answer to this question would be far from satisfactory without considering the potential frequency differences between the two languages in this construction.

As discussed throughout, the variety of Arabic intended in the present study is the written one, be it Classical Arabic or its modern extension, Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), since the canonical passive verb that occurs in this variety is normally replaced by the morphologically marked reflexive in the spoken variety (see note 1). This intention is motivated by the fact that the morphological structure of the canonical passive verb in the written variety has not undergone any vocalic or consonantal alteration, even though certain verb-forms (Form XI to Form XV) are extremely rare in the actual use of the language (cf. chapter 1, section 1.1). Thus, in order to investigate the frequency differences in the canonical passive construction between Classical Arabic and English (Classical and Contemporary), a simple, but time-consuming, method was conducted in an earlier work (cf. El-Marzouk, 1998). As a standard example of Classical Arabic, the Koran was chosen in this work, where all the canonical passives that recur in the first nineteen chapters (or suras) were counted. (Notice that there are no examples of Form XI to Form XV in this corpus.) Then, the same nineteen chapters of each of three respected English versions (Ali, 1934/46; Dawood, 1956/90; Arberry, 1964/90) were examined in the same way. Following this, the results of both the Arabic text and the three English versions were illustrated along the following frequency paradigms.²

(9)  

a. **Paradigm A**: The total number of canonical passives in Arabic.  
b. **Paradigm B**: The total number of canonical passives in English.  
c. **Paradigm C**: The number of canonical passives in Arabic which function as corresponding canonical passives in English.  
d. **Paradigm D**: The number of canonical passives in Arabic which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English.  
e. **Paradigm E**: The number of canonical passives in English which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic.

² To consider the potential frequency differences between Arabic and English by reference to the written form of either language seems to be the only plausible procedure in this context, even though language is, historically speaking, primarily a speech process within a particular speech community (cf. chapter 3, section 3.1). This is due to the fact that it is impossible to find a 'standard' example of spoken Arabic which is rendered into a corresponding 'standard' example of spoken English, or vice versa.
In our work just cited, the language of the three English versions covers two distinct diachronic dimensions of English so far as the Classical Arabic of the Koran is concerned: Both Ali (1934/46) and Arberry (1964/90) use Classical English (mainly the English of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), whereas Dawood (1956/90) employs Contemporary English (mainly present-day literary English). The principal reason for this method was to demonstrate that the underproduction trials made by the Arabic-speaking learners of English at the canonical passive construction could not be attributed to what is erroneously known as ‘avoidance phenomena’, but rather to the much less frequent use of this construction in L1-Arabic than it is in L2-English.3

In the current study, however, discussion of the frequency paradigms shown in (9) above will be confined to the Arabic text and its English equivalent in Dawood’s (1956/90) version simply because it is the only version that employs Contemporary English (though some reference will be made to the other two versions where appropriate). On these grounds, the frequency counts of the canonical passive were recorded in accordance with the same frequency paradigms as in (10) below. Notice that, apart from the typological divergence between Arabic and English, the canonical passives of paradigms A and B are only those which reflect the native speaker’s linguistic and pragmatic knowledge restated in (1) and (5) respectively.

(10)  
   a. **Paradigm A:** 531 examples  
   b. **Paradigm B:** 911 examples  
   c. **Paradigm C:** 414 examples  
   d. **Paradigm D:** 117 examples  
   e. **Paradigm E:** 497 examples

3 Among the large number of misunderstandings in L2-acquisition research, the phenomenon ‘explored’ by Schachter (1974) and subsequently by Kleinmann (1977; 1978) is thought to be an indication of ‘avoidance’, a term borrowed from behaviourist psychology whose precise definition (i.e. prevention or delay of an absent aversive stimulus) has nothing to do with the ‘explored’ phenomenon. The false premise that these researchers have started from is the hypothetical correlation between avoidance and the learning difficulty predicted on the basis of a contrastive analysis of L1 and L2 (the learner’s L1 and the L2 he/she is learning). Such a premise has led them to conclude that the learner avoids a given structure whenever he/she perceives crosslinguistic variation between L1 and L2, meaning that, for every avoidance trial, there is always a pair of L1-L2 structures to be perceived as radically different! If this were true then the false premise, which implies that every example of a given structure in the L1 functions as a corresponding example of the same structure in the L2, and vice versa, would also be true! (for a detailed analysis, see El-Marzouk, 1995a and El-Marzouk, 1998).
As the frequency counts recorded in (10) illustrate, the striking difference between paradigms A and B (531 canonical passives in Arabic versus 911 canonical passives in English, respectively) has in fact given rise to three empirical observations. The first observation refers to the actual frequency level of functional convergence between Arabic and English in canonical passivisation as recorded in paradigm C, where the convergence exists in 414 examples (approximately 78% of the 531 canonical passives in Arabic and approximately 45.5% of the 911 canonical passives in English). The second and third observations, on the other hand, refer to the residual frequency levels of functional divergence between Arabic and English in the same construction as recorded in paradigms D and E from the viewpoint of either language respectively: while paradigm D indicates that 117 out of the 531 canonical passives in Arabic (approximately 22%) do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English, paradigm E suggests that 497 out of the 911 canonical passives in English (approximately 54.5%) do not function as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic. For this reason, paradigms C, D, and E will be the subject-matters of sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 respectively.

Therefore, the striking difference between paradigms A and B as shown in (10) above is clear evidence that the canonical passive construction in English is far more important than it is in Arabic at the functional level, even though the Koran, with its typical embodiment of impersonal style, employs a comparatively high percentage of instances of this construction, as will be seen presently. Accordingly, the choice of the Koran and its English version in the current study can be justified for a number of reasons.

Firstly, the Classical Arabic of the Koran, whose codification began in the eighth century, is considered an extremely indispensable source of Arabic Linguistics in general (cf. Holes, 1994). This means that an examination of any other text in MSA with an English translation would not satisfy generalisations about paradigms C, D, and E. Secondly, to all scholars of Arabic Linguistics, the written variety of Arabic is Classical Arabic or MSA, the variety that
extends from pre-Islamic poetry to modern books and journals, and is used as a standard written form all over the Arabic-speaking world (cf. Ferguson, 1972). Thirdly, due to numerous factors which are beyond the scope of this study, the written variety exhibits essentially the same sound system and morphology but with certain variations in lexis and forms of discourse, which seem to have no bearing on the morphophonological distribution of the canonical passive. It is thus the spoken variety that offers tremendous variations at all linguistic levels (cf. Ferguson, 1970).

What is more, Jeff Kallen (p. c.) pointed to the important observation that “the translator of the Koran into English is faced with normative considerations which may cause a translation to be ‘faithful’ to the original in ways which other texts may not need to be”. The point we would therefore want to make is that, in spite of such normative considerations of ‘faithfulness’, there exist certain canonical passives in Arabic which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English (paradigm D) on the one hand, and certain canonical passives in English which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic (paradigm E) on the other. This means that if genetically unrelated languages such as these converge in the instantiation of the dynamic and static passive types as the sole universal dichotomisation, then other ways of distinguishing them can be recast with reference to the functional dimension of this construction in the sense intended here.

So it can be seen that the frequency counts recorded in (10) above are typical indications of the potential for the functional convergence and divergence between Arabic and English in canonical passivisation. Thus, paradigms C, D, and E were arrived at via an empirically inductive method that is characterised by a dual-purpose nature: primarily, to put forward a comparative analysis into particular examples of the canonical passive from both languages, examples that will be specified for each of these paradigms; and secondarily, to draw reasonable conclusions that can be generalised across genetically unrelated languages such as Arabic and English. On this account, we believe that the first nineteen chapters of the Koran
chosen as a standard example of Classical Arabic (or any form of written Arabic, for that matter) will, in addition to their English counterparts in Dawood's (1956/90) version, serve as a typical corpus of linguistic data for the arrival at these conclusions. For ease of reference to either text, all the verbs that are used in the canonical passive construction in accordance with paradigms C, D, and E are listed in appendices A, B, and C respectively, where the Roman and Arabic numerals to the right of each verb refer to the numbers of the chapters and verses respectively (cf. the appendices).

One final point to be made here concerns the proportional relationship between Arabic and English in respect of exemplifying canonical passivisation as recorded in paradigms A and B. Empirically speaking, the frequency counts shown in (10a-b) in terms of these two paradigms (531 examples in Arabic versus 911 examples in English) demonstrate that Classical Arabic makes far less use of the canonical passive than English does, even though the Koran, with its typical embodiment of abstractions and generalisations in a typically impersonal style, incorporates a comparatively high percentage of instances of this construction. This indicates that if the same method were to be conducted on any other text written in Classical Arabic or MSA and translated into English (or vice versa), then the frequency counts of canonical passives would bring to light a far more striking functional divergence between the two languages than what is recorded in paradigms A and B as in (10a-b).

However, a proportional relationship between the two languages in such a perspective does not necessarily imply that the Arabic passive construction, in general, constitutes a subset of the English counterpart. In Arabic, in particular, the logical foundation of passivisation, as a concept that is essentially conditioned by pragmatic exigencies, can be symbolised in several different ways, and therefore expressed through the implementation of several structurally different devices, which are beyond the range of this study, though some will be referred to throughout the analysis of functional divergence in terms of paradigm E (cf. section 4.4). As we proceed in the upcoming sections, the discussion will be focused on paradigms C, D, and E...
stated in (9c-d) which refer to the three empirical observations arrived at on the basis of the frequency counts recorded in (10c-d) respectively. Again, the principal corpus of data for these paradigms will be the first nineteen chapters of the Koran and their English equivalents in Dawood’s (1956/90) version, with Ali’s (1934/46) and Arberry’s (1964/90) versions being secondary. The next section will consider the functional convergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction, the concern of paradigm C stated in (9c) and the first empirical observation recorded in (10c).

4.2 Passives in Arabic and English

As discussed earlier, apart from the typological divergence between Arabic and English in canonical passivisation, the canonical passives recorded in paradigms A and B as in (10a-b) above are only those which exhibit the native speaker’s linguistic and pragmatic knowledge restated in (1a-b) and (5a-d) respectively. In respect of the native speaker’s linguistic knowledge, in particular, a distinction has been made between what we have called ‘dynamic’ and ‘static’ passives in terms of the distinction between ‘dynamic’ and ‘static’ categories. While the former categories are permitted to move to subject position, the latter are not, so as to leave scope for the insertion of the nominal expletive in this position (i.e. the implicit insertion of huwa ‘he’ in Arabic and the explicit insertion of it in English). The purpose of the ‘dynamic-static’ distinction is, therefore, to eliminate all the misleading terms that are used in the literature to describe several types of the canonical passive construction (cf. chapter 3, section 3.4).

Given the conclusion that there exist only such dynamic and static passives both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically, the distinction, however, does not necessarily imply a one-to-one correlation between instances of either type in a given pair of languages
instantiating a corpus of data in accordance with paradigm C stated in (9c) above. As we saw in the preceding chapter, certain syntactic categories in Arabic prove to be potentially dynamic, whereas their counterparts in English are constantly static, and vice versa (cf. chapter 3, section 3.4, examples (89-90); (92-93)), meaning that certain instances of the dynamic passive type in the former language function as corresponding instances of the static passive type in the latter language, and vice versa (see also section 4.1, examples (2-4)). This is precisely the case with the number of canonical passives in Arabic that do in fact function as corresponding canonical passives in English, as recorded in paradigm C in (10c) above. To avoid possible confusion, we are, therefore, forced to consider the functional convergence between the two languages in the canonical passive construction in terms of four subparadigms as stated in (11) below. Notice that these are simply four subparadigms of paradigm C.

(11) a. **Subparadigm C1**: The number of dynamic passives in Arabic which function as corresponding dynamic passives in English.

b. **Subparadigm C2**: The number of static passives in Arabic which function as corresponding static passives in English.

c. **Subparadigm C3**: The number of dynamic passives in Arabic which function as corresponding static passives in English.

d. **Subparadigm C4**: The number of static passives in Arabic which function as corresponding dynamic passives in English.

Given the first empirical observation recorded in paradigm C as in (10c), the 414 canonical passives in Arabic that actually function as corresponding canonical passives in English indicate a low level of frequency overlap between the two languages, even though this figure forms a comparatively high percentage of the total number of canonical passives in Arabic as recorded in paradigm A (approximately 78% out of 531 examples). This is due to the empirical fact that the same figure forms a lower percentage of the total number of canonical passives in English as recorded in paradigm B (approximately 45.5% out of 911 examples). However, despite this low level of frequency overlap, the empirical observation under discussion is proof enough that there exist in Arabic certain canonical passives which constantly function as corresponding canonical passives in English and vice versa. The fact that such canonical passives do not necessarily exhibit a one-to-one correlation between
instances of dynamic and static passives is ascribable to the idiosyncratic behaviour of certain syntactic categories in either language, as will be seen presently. But, first, let us introduce the frequency counts in accordance with the four subparadigms stated in (11) above as in (12) below.

(12)  a. Subparadigm C1: 375 examples  
b. Subparadigm C2: 15 examples  
c. Subparadigm C3: 1 example  
d. Subparadigm C4: 23 examples

As the frequency counts recorded in (12) illustrate, the figure of 414 examples recorded in paradigm C as in (10c) has given rise to four further empirical observations. The first and second observations refer to the actual frequency levels of functional homogeneity among instances of either type of the canonical passive in Arabic and English as recorded in subparadigms C1 and C2: the former shows that 375 out of the 414 examples (approximately 90.6%) actually function as corresponding dynamic passives in Arabic and English; and the latter illustrates that 15 out of the 414 examples (approximately 3.6%) actually function as corresponding static passives in both languages. The third and fourth observations, on the other hand, refer to the residual frequency levels of functional heterogeneity among instances of either type as recorded in subparadigms C3 and C4 from the viewpoint of either language: while subparadigm C3 indicates that only 1 out of the 414 examples (approximately 0.2%) marks a dynamic passive in Arabic which functions as a corresponding static passive in English, subparadigm C4 suggests that 23 out of the 414 examples (approximately 5.5%) mark static passives in Arabic which function as corresponding dynamic passives in English. These four subparadigms will be discussed and exemplified respectively, with the first two relating to functional homogeneity and the second two to functional heterogeneity.

**Functional homogeneity**

So far as subparadigm C1 is concerned, the empirical observation recorded in (12a) demonstrates that the vast majority of the canonical passives in Arabic which function as
corresponding canonical passives in English are actually instances of the dynamic passive type (approximately 90.5%). This is attributable to the fact that each lexical verb used in these canonical passives in Arabic as well as its counterpart in English s-selects basically the same pair of argument structures, provided that each pair of corresponding arguments in one such pair of argument structures is assigned an identical theta-role. Thus, the syntactic categories which render these canonical passives dynamic behave within exactly the same configuration in both languages, since these categories are characterised by the same syntactic nature. That is, they have the potential for movement to subject position under canonical passivisation because they are dynamic categories occupying internal positions in the argument structures being talked about.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the categories that have the potential for movement to subject position under canonical passivisation are in general the direct object or any syntactic category standing proxy for it, a statement that can be taken as a generalisation across all the natural languages instantiating this construction (cf. chapter 3, section 3.4). However, it is the syntactic categories standing proxy for the direct object which may vary from one such language to another for reasons which have to do with either the idiosyncratic behaviour of these categories or with certain phenomena which are yet to be fully understood in linguistic thinking (see also chapter 2, sections 2.2 and 2.3). For ease of exposition, the syntactic categories that can stand proxy for the direct object under canonical passivisation in Arabic and English are illustrated in (13) and (14) respectively:

(13) a. The indirect object.
    b. The cognate object (or the absolute object).
    c. The adverbial object (time and place).

(14) a. The indirect object.
    b. The object of a preposition.
    c. The embedded that-argument (cf. believe).

To maintain the generalisation just mentioned across Arabic and English, all these categories can, in addition to the direct object, move to subject position under specified conditions, thereby generating the dynamic passive. In the case of Arabic, as seen, the categories shown
in (13a-c) operate within an inherent hierarchy among them: If the direct object is lexically or syntactically absent, then the indirect object would be the candidate for subject position; if, however, both the direct and indirect objects are lexically or syntactically absent, then either the cognate or the adverbial object would be the candidate for the same position. In the case of the English categories illustrated in (14a-c), the same inherent hierarchy would hold for the first two categories as well as the direct object (that is, either the direct or indirect object, otherwise the object of a preposition would be the candidate), whereas the embedded *that*-argument would also be the candidate but only with verbs such as `believe` within a marginally exceptional situation (cf. chapter 3, note 15).

From the generalisation under discussion, it appears that what Arabic and English have in common is simply the instantiation of the dynamic passive type through the incorporation of the categories cited in (13a-c) and (14a-c) respectively. Recall that some of these categories can move to subject position under specified conditions, conditions that are peculiar to either language. The functional homogeneity among instances of this type can only be maintained through the incorporation of the direct and indirect objects. This is because Arabic and English converge in the potential dynamicness of these two categories only, but they in fact diverge in that of the other categories: At one extreme, both the cognate and adverbial objects are potentially dynamic categories in Arabic, whereas their counterparts in English are constantly static categories; and at the other, both the object of a preposition and the embedded

---

4 By 'syntactically absent' we mean that the direct object in question is lexically present but is not syntactically available for movement to subject position under canonical passivisation. That is, it behaves in such a syntactic configuration which inhibits its movement to the same position, a configuration that is typical of ditransitive verbs such as *a?ta*: ‘to give’, etc. For instance, the ‘direct’ object *?amrin ‘Amr*’ in (i) below acts as the object of the preposition *li-* ‘to’ to be an indirect one, for which reason it cannot move to subject position under canonical passivisation as in (ii) below (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3, examples (55-57)).

   (Gloss: gave (3sm) Zaid (Nom) the-book (Acc) to-Amr (Obl))  
   b. Zaid gave the book to Amr.

(ii) a. *u?tiya al-kita;bu li-?amrin.*  
    (Gloss: was given (3sm) the-book (nom) to-Amr (Obl))  
    b. The book was given to Amr.
that-argument are potentially dynamic categories in English, whereas their counterparts in Arabic are constantly static categories.

Given these existing facts, the only instances of the dynamic passive type in Arabic that do in fact function as corresponding instances of this type in English (or vice versa) are those which incorporate either passivisable transitive verbs or ditransitive verbs, since the former require a single object (a direct one) and the latter two objects (a direct and an indirect ones). This is precisely what the empirical observation recorded in subparadigm Cl as in (12a) has demonstrated in conformity with the functional homogeneity being talked about, meaning that the vast majority of the canonical passives in Arabic that function as corresponding canonical passives in English are actually dynamic passives incorporating either passivisable transitive verbs or ditransitive verbs (approximately 90.6%).

In the case of passivisable transitive verbs, the examples of the dynamic passive type are straightforward in that the single direct object required by each of these verbs always exhibits its movement to subject position in Arabic and English due to its potentially dynamic nature in both languages. Thus, all the examples of this types, the examples that recur in the first nineteen chapters of the Koran and their English counterparts in Dawood’s version (1956/90), represent this movement systematically as in the examples cited in (15-17) below. Notice that the Roman and Arabic numerals to the right of each example refer to the numbers of the chapter and verse of the Koran respectively.

(15)  a. duriba-t ?alay-him al-thillatu.... (11:61)
     (Gloss: was stamped (3sf) upon-them the-shame (Nom))
     b. Shame...[was] stamped upon them.

Notice that I am using the term ‘passivisable’ for transitive verbs in accordance with the proposed structural condition for the so-called ‘personal passive’, which was introduced and reconsidered in detail in the preceding chapter (cf. chapter 3, section 3.2, item (39); section 3.3, item (44)). This is because there exist in Arabic and English certain transitive verbs that are not passivisable, but I know of no ditransitive verb that is not passivisable (see also chapter 2, section 2.1, examples (5-10)).
In the case of ditransitive verbs, on the other hand, the examples of the dynamic passive type are less straightforward in that the moved object (direct or indirect) in Arabic does not always coincide with the moved object in English, though both reflect their movement to subject position due to their potentially dynamic nature in both languages. Yet, this does not stand in contrast with the generalisation about the dynamic passives that establish functional homogeneity, as mentioned above, since the presence or absence of coincidence is mainly conditioned by pragmatic as well as stylistic requirements in either language. Thus, the moved object may coincide in Arabic and English as in (18-19) below, or it may not as in (20).

Notice that the former examples is typical of ditransitive verbs such as anazala ‘reveal/send’, awha: ‘reveal’, etc., and the latter is typical of ditransitive verbs such as a:ta: ‘give’, etc.

6 An interesting example of the dynamic passive type in Arabic shows how the transitive verb qat_a:a ‘cut (off)’, which collocates with da:bir ‘root’ within the idiomatic expression qat_a:a da:bira ‘to annihilate/root out’, can nonetheless passivise, but within the syntactic limits of this expression. That is, the moved category would be the NP da:bir itself since it acts as the direct object of the verb qat_a:a (to mean: ‘the root of someone/something was cut off’), while in the English version the moved category would be the NP someone or something since it acts as the direct object of the whole expression (to mean: ‘someone/something was rooted out’). For example:

(i) a. fa-qua?ra da:biru....allathi:na Thalamu:. (VI:45)  
   (Gloss: thus was cut off (3sm) root (Nom) those (Gen) wronged (3plm))  
   (Lit.: Thus the root of those who wronged was cut off.)
   b. Thus were the evil-doers annihilated.

The passivisability of idiomatic expressions such as (i) is therefore explicable in terms of external-theta-role assignment, whereas the nonpassivisability of other idiomatic expressions such as (ii) below is simply ascribable to the absence of external-theta-role assignment, even though the lexical verbs incorporated in these latter expressions are transitive verbs (cf. chapter 3, section 3.3, note 10).

(ii) a. lafaTha al-nafasa al-aki:ra.  
    (Lit.: He uttered the last breath.)
   b. He breathed his last.
   c. He kicked the bucket.
(18) a. ....ma: unzila ila: iebra:hi:ma. (II:136)
    (Gloss: what was revealed (3sm) to Abraham (Obl))
    b. ....what was revealed to Abraham.

(19) a. ....lam yu:ha ilay-hi say?un. (VI:93)
    (Gloss: not was revealed (3sm) to-him thing (Nom))
    (Lit.: A thing was not revealed to him.)
    b. ....nothing was revealed to him.

(20) a. allathi:na u:tu: al-kita:ba.... (IV:131; V:5)
    (Gloss: those was given (3plm) the-Book (Acc))
    (Lit.: Those who were given the Book.)
    b. Those to whom the Book was given....

As for subparadigm C2, another subparadigm relating to functional homogeneity but among static passives in Arabic and English this time, the empirical observation recorded in (12b) demonstrates that approximately 3.6% of the canonical passives in Arabic which function as corresponding canonical passives in English are actually static passives (a far lower percentage than the case with subparadigm C1 discussed above). Typologically speaking, this comparatively very low percentage is ascribable to the fact that what is known as the ‘impersonal passive’ in any language instantiating canonical passivisation constitutes a far less common type than the so-called ‘personal passive’ (cf. chapter 2, section 2.4). In addition, the empirical observations recorded in (12c-d) also indicate that not all static passives in Arabic function as corresponding static passives in English (or vice versa), observations which are the concern of subparadigms C3 and C4, as will be seen throughout the discussion of functional heterogeneity.

However, apart from this comparatively very low percentage, functional homogeneity among static passives in Arabic and English suggests that each lexical verb used in these passives in the former language as well as its counterpart in the latter s-selects basically the same pair of argument structures, where all the internal arguments are static categories. Accordingly, such internal arguments remain in their base-positions, so as to leave scope for the insertion of the nominal expletive in subject position. As discussed in the preceding chapter, the internal arguments that act as static categories under canonical passivisation are in general the direct object or any internal argument standing proxy for it, a statement that, like the case with
dynamic categories, can also be taken as a generalisation across all languages instantiating this construction. Such a generalisation was introduced to capture the fact that, in languages such as Ukrainian and Welsh, there exist certain examples of the canonical passive where the direct object remains in its base-position and the nominal expletive is inserted in subject position (cf. chapter 3, section 3.4, note 21).

Yet, unlike the case with dynamic categories (where the generalisation specifies at least the direct object as a common denominator), all the static categories captured by the same generalisation may vary from one language to another. In other words, the generalisation about the dynamic categories is in fact ‘univerally stronger’ than the generalisation about static categories, since the former takes at least another denominator, albeit a less common one, to stand proxy for the direct object, viz. the indirect object (cf. (13-14)). Thus, as we have seen above, neither in Arabic nor in English are the direct and indirect objects static categories, meaning that if there exists a common denominator between static categories in both languages, there may not exist a less common one to stand proxy for it. To avoid possible confusion, all the internal arguments that act as static categories under canonical passivisation in Arabic and English are illustrated in (21) and (22) respectively.

(21)  a. The PP-argument (V-complement).
     b. The embedded that-argument.

(22)  a. The embedded that-argument.
     b. The embedded infinitival argument (cf. decide).

From the generalisation in question, it seems that what Arabic and English have in common is, again, simply the instantiation of the static passive type via the incorporation of the static categories cited in (21) and (22) respectively. However, the functional homogeneity among instances of this type can only be maintained via the incorporation of the embedded that-argument as in (21b) and (22a), notwithstanding the marginally exceptional case with English verbs such as believe (cf. (14c)). This is because Arabic and English only converge in the staticness of this category, but they in fact diverge in that of the other categories as in (21a) and (22b): At one end, the PP-argument is constantly static in Arabic, whereas the object of
the preposition in the English counterpart is potentially dynamic (cf. (14b)); and at the other, the embedded infinitival argument with idiosyncratic verbs such as *decide* in English is constantly static, whereas its counterpart in Arabic is potentially dynamic (cf. chapter 3, note 16).

Given these existing facts, the only instances of the static passive type in Arabic that do in fact function as corresponding instances of this type in English (or vice versa) are those which incorporate certain ditransitive verbs. As seen earlier, these verbs include what is traditionally known as ‘verbs of certainty’ such as *?arafa* ‘to know’, *adraka* ‘to perceive’, *i?taqada* ‘to believe’, etc. and ‘verbs of uncertainty’ such as *Thanna* ‘to assume’, *za?ama* ‘to claim’, *qa:la* ‘to say’, etc. Characteristic of these verbs is the semantic association of the two objects they require with a nominal nonverbal sentence, an association which identifies this sentence with the embedded *that*-argument itself in Arabic and English (cf. chapter 2, sections 2.2 and 2.4). Thus, in conformity with functional homogeneity among static passives in the two languages, the empirical observation recorded in subparadigm C2 as in (12b) has demonstrated that all such passives incorporate ditransitive verbs of the type just mentioned as shown in (23-25) below.

(23) a. wa-i?tha: qi:la la-hum [annahu]…. (II:11)  
   (Gloss: and-when was said (he) to-them [that])
   b. When it is said to them [that]….  

   (Gloss: was decreed (he) on-you [that] when approached (3sm) the-death (Nom))
   b. It is decreed that when death approaches….7

(25) a. ma: tuqubbila min-hum [annahu]…. (V:36)  
   (Gloss: not was accepted (he) from-them [that])
   b. It shall not be accepted from them [that]….  

7 Notice that the verb *kataba* ‘to decree/write’ in (24) is rendered as ‘to prescribe’ in Ali’s (1934/46) and Arberry’s (1964/90) versions as in (ia) and (ib)) below respectively, but is used within basically the same configuration. Only in the latter version, however, is the nominal expletive syntactically deleted for stylistic reasons.

(i) a. It is prescribed [that] when death approaches…. (II:180)
   b. Prescribed for you, when any of you is visited by death…. (II:180)
**Functional heterogeneity**

Under this rubric come subparadigms C3 and C4 which also establish functional convergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction but, unlike the case with subparadigms C1 and C2 discussed above, the one-to-one correlation between instances of either type of this construction in the two languages does not exist. While subparadigm C3 addresses the dynamic passives in Arabic that function as corresponding static passives in English, subparadigm C4 is concerned with the other way round, that is, it addresses the static passives in Arabic which function as corresponding dynamic passives in English. These two subparadigms will be explained and exemplified respectively.

In respect of subparadigm C3, the empirical observation recorded in (12c) demonstrates that only one example of the dynamic passive type in Arabic actually functions as a corresponding example of the static passive type in English, an idiosyncratic representation which constitutes an almost nonexistent percentage of the canonical passives in the two languages compared with the other subparadigms (approximately 0.2%). Thus, it can safely be said to mark nothing more than a marginally exceptional situation to the vast majority of instances of the canonical passive construction that do in fact establish functional homogeneity in Arabic and English. As it so appears, this example incorporates a ditransitive verb in a configuration where the indirect object is structurally represented as an embedded *that*-argument in Arabic as in (26a) below, a configuration which may lead one to believe that it is an instance of the static passive type cited in (23-25).

(Gloss: is revealed (3sm) to-me that God-your God (Nom) one (Nom))  
(Lit.: That your God is one God is revealed to me.)  
b. It is revealed to me that your God is one God.

But the ‘real’ direct object -\(\mu\) ‘me’ in (26a) acts as the object of the preposition *ilay*- ‘to’ to be an indirect one, thereby ‘transferring’ grammatical directness to the *that*-argument in question, and therefore the potential for movement to subject position under canonical passivisation as illustrated in the literal translation. In this configuration, the ‘real’ direct object is
'syntactically absent', albeit still lexically present, a configuration which is typical of ditransitive verbs such as *a?ta*: ‘to give’ and the like (see note 4). Thus, the configuration is in principle no different from that which is exhibited by instances of the dynamic passive type as in (18-20), except that the subject position is occupied by a *that*-argument. In the English counterpart (26b), on the other hand, it is the idiosyncratic occurrence of the *that*-argument in Arabic examples such as (26a) which makes it somewhat necessary to locate the English equivalent of this argument in a stylistically more appropriate position from the viewpoint of English. As such, the *that*-argument in question is maintained in its base-position, the immediate trigger for the insertion of the nominal expletive in subject position, thereby giving rise to an instance of the static passive type cited in (23-24).\(^8\)

Clearly, therefore, an example of the canonical passive construction in Arabic such as (26a) proves to be a reflection of the dynamic passive type, whereas its counterpart in English, if it is to be another example of this construction, appears to exhibit the characteristics of the static passive type as in (26b), a stylistically more appropriate representation from the viewpoint of English. Although such an example is extremely rare, its sole occurrence is sufficient, however, to establish an independent subparadigm such as C3, and thus to capture all possible canonical passives in Arabic and English in terms of this subparadigm. This is because there also exists in English a certain instance of the static passive type where an idiosyncratic verb like *decide* necessitates the embedding of a static category (an infinitival argument, as seen), so as to leave scope for the nominal expletive to appear in subject position. Such an exceptional representation as well as its counterpart in Arabic also marks the same examples

---

\(^8\) It is worth noting, here, that both Dawood’s (1956/90) and Arberry’s (1964/90) versions coincide in rendering the Arabic dynamic passive cited in (26a) into the English static passive as in (ia) below, whereas Ali’s (1934/46) version appears to introduce a semantic paraphrase of the potential dynamicness of the former within a declarative active construction as in (ib).

(i)  

a. It is revealed to me that your God is one God. (XVIII:100)

b. The inspiration has come to me that your God is one God. (XVIII:100)
in terms of the same subparadigm. The examples cited in (chapter 3, note 16) are repeated in (27) below for convenience.

(27)  
  a. quurrira al-thaha:bu.  
      (Gloss: was decided (3sm) the-going (Nom))  
      (Lit.: Going was decided.)  
  b. It was decided to go.

With regard to subparadigm C4, another subparadigm relating to functional heterogeneity among canonical passives in Arabic and English but in the opposite direction this time, the empirical observation recorded in (12d) demonstrates that approximately 5.5% of these canonical passives are actually examples of the static passive in Arabic which function as corresponding examples of the dynamic passive in English (a higher percentage than the case with subparadigm C3). This can be reduced to the syntactic behaviour of the PP-argument which occupies the position of a V-complement, a category that marks syntactic divergence between the two languages, as seen. While this PP-argument is constantly static in Arabic, the object of the preposition in the English equivalent is potentially dynamic (cf. (14b) and (21a)). Thus, in most of the Arabic canonical passives recorded in subparadigm C4, the lexical verb requires a given preposition to act as a phrasal verb in the language-particular sense. For example:

(28)  
  a. wa-qudiya bayna-hum bi-l-qisti. (X:47; X:54)  
      (Gloss: and-was judged (he) among-them (Obl) with-justice (Obl))  
      (Lit.: And it was judged among them with justice.)  
  b. Justice is done among them. (X:47)  
  c. But judgement shall be fairly passed upon them. (X:54)

(29)  
  a. wa-laqad istuzhi?a bi-rusulin min qabli-ka. (Vl:10; XII:32)  
      (Gloss: and-surely was mocked (he) at-apostles (Obl) before-you (Obl))  
      (Lit.: And surely it was mocked at apostles before you.)  
  b. Other apostles have been laughed to scorn before you. (VI:10)  
  c. Other apostles were mocked before you. (XIII:32)

Here, the verbs qada: ‘to judge’ in (28a) and istahza?a ‘to mock’ in (29a) require the prepositions bayna- ‘among’ and bi- ‘at’ respectively to act as phrasal verbs in Arabic. These prepositions, in turn, incorporate the NPs -hum ‘them’ in (28a) and -rusulin ‘apostles’ in (29a) to derive the PP-arguments bayna-hum ‘among them’ and bi-rusulin ‘at apostles’, arguments which are constantly static, for which reason the nominal expletive is inserted in subject
position as shown in the literal translations. In English, on the other hand, the equivalent verbs would in principle require the same prepositions which are linked to them in a causative relation, a link that would construct an inseparable transitive entity out of one such verb and the preposition it requires, thereby imposing a dynamic nature on the ‘object’ of this preposition (cf. chapter 3, note 14). Consequently, the resultant canonical passive construction would be an indication of the dynamic passive type as in (28b-c) and (29b-c).  

Furthermore, instances of the static passive type with PP-arguments in Arabic would also establish the same configurations when rendered into English (or vice versa), even if the lexical verb in the former language marks an idiomatic expression in combination with the preposition it requires. This would hold for either idiomatic expressions where the object of the preposition acts as a variable referent as in (30) below, or expressions where the object of the preposition collocates with the lexical verb as a constant referent as in (31) below. Thus, in (30) the verb *aha.ta* ‘to encompass’ combines with the preposition *bi- ‘with’* (to mean: ‘to destroy someone or something’); whereas in (31) the verb *nafaka* ‘to blow’ combines with the preposition *fi: ‘in’* and collocates with the referent *su:ri* ‘trumpet’ (to mean: ‘to sound the Trumpet’ as a sign of the Last Judgement).

(30)  
a. *wa-uhi:ta bi-thamari-hi.* (XVIII:42)  
(Gloss: and-was encompassed (he) with-fruits (Obl)-his (Gen))  
(Lit.: And it was encompassed with his fruits.)  
b. His fruits were destroyed.

(31)  
(Gloss: and-was blown (he) in the-trumpet (Obl))  
(Lit.: And it was blown in the Trumpet.)  
b. The Trumpet shall be sounded.

9 Notice the stylistic difference between (b) and (c) in (28-29) though both are English renderings of the same Arabic source as in (a) in Dawood’s (1956/90) version, a matter that is irrelevant in this context. What matters is the fact that instances of the static passive type with a PP-argument in Arabic such as (28a-29a) always function as corresponding instances of the dynamic passive type in English due to the potential dynamicness of the object of the preposition in the latter, a configuration that is more transparent in the English renderings in Arberry’s (1964/90) version as in (ia-b) below.

(i)  
a. (And) justly the issue is decided between them. (X:47; X:54)  
b. Messengers indeed were mocked/scoffed at before thee. (VI:10; XIII:32)
One final point to be made here concerns ditransitive verbs which necessitate a *that*-argument in Arabic and English. As discussed in subparadigm C2, in both languages these verbs in general exhibit the static passive type under canonical passivisation due to the static nature of *that*-argument in question (cf. (23-25)). An interesting exceptional case can be seen with the verb *qa:*la ‘to say’ in particular, where it may assign a different lexical meaning depending on the modality or type of the statement that immediately follows it (i.e. *maqu:*l al-*qawl* ‘the object of saying’). Thus, if this verb is immediately followed by an imperative statement, then it may assign the lexical meaning of ‘bidding/commanding’ as in (32) below. If, however, the same verb is immediately followed by an interrogative statement, then it may assign the lexical meaning of ‘asking’ as in (33) below. Consequently, the resultant construction under canonical passivisation in Arabic would still reflect the static passive type, whereas the corresponding construction in English would be an instance of the dynamic passive type, an example that is the concern of subparadigm C4. For example:

    (Gloss: and-was said (he) sit down (Imp) with the-sitters (Obl))
    (Lit.: And it was said: ‘Sit down with the sitters.’)
    b. They were bidden to stay with those who stayed behind.

(33)  a. ....*qi:*la la-*hum ma:*[^ia:*anzala rabbu-*kum*. (XVI:24; XVI:30)
    (Gloss: was said (he) to-them (Obl) what revealed (3sm) Lord (Nom)-your)
    (Lit.: It was said to them: ‘What did your Lord reveal?’)
    b. ....they were asked: ‘What has your Lord revealed?’

In this section, the functional convergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive has been discussed and exemplified in accordance with paradigm C stated in (9c) and the first empirical observation recorded in (10c). The discussion has also shown that the one-to-one correlation between instances of either type of this construction (dynamic and static)

---

10 In the case of (32), Ali’s (1934/46) version, like Dawood’s (1956/90) version, renders the different lexical meaning that the verb *qa:*la ‘to say’ assigns into English as in (ia) below, whereas Arberry’s (1964/90) version maintains the literal translation of this verb as in (ib) below. But, unlike Dawood’s version in the case of (33), both Ali’s and Arberry’s versions tend to maintain the literal translation of the same verb as in (iia-b) respectively.

(i)  a. And they were told, ‘Sit ye among those who sit (inactive)’. (IX:46)
    b. And it was said to them, ‘Tarry you with the tarriers.’ (IX:46)

(ii) a. ....it is said to them, ‘What is it that your Lord has revealed?’ (XVI:24; XVI:30)
    b. ....it is said to them, ‘What has your Lord sent down?’ (XVI:24; XVI:30)
does not always exist in the two languages. For this reason, paradigm C has been considered in terms of four subparadigms C1, C2, C3, and C4, with the first two relating to functional homogeneity and the second two to functional heterogeneity. While functional homogeneity refers to the actual one-to-one correlation between instances of either type in Arabic and English, functional heterogeneity relates to the contrast between instances of either type in either language and instances of the other type in the other language. For ease of reference to the examples recorded in paradigm C, all the verbs used in these examples are listed in appendix A (cf. the appendices). The next section will consider the functional divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction from the viewpoint of the former language, the concern of paradigm D stated in (9d) and the second empirical observation recorded in (10d).

4.3 Passives in Arabic not English

As mentioned earlier, the instantiation of the canonical passive construction (or any other construction, for that matter) in any two languages does not necessarily turn out to be such that every instance of this construction in either of these two languages functions as a corresponding instance in the other. It is true that there exist a certain percentage of instances which do function as corresponding canonical passives in the two languages as seen in the preceding section, but it is equally true that there exist another percentage of canonical passives in either language which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in the other. Thus, on the one hand, there are canonical passives in Arabic that do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English (paradigm D); and on the other, there are canonical passives in English that do not function as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic (paradigm E). Paradigm D will be discussed in this section and paradigm E will be considered in the next section (section 4.4).
So far as paradigm D is concerned, the second empirical observation recorded in (10d) demonstrates that approximately 22% of the total number of canonical passives in Arabic (117 out of 531 examples) do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English. This, however, cannot always be explained in terms of the syntactic behaviour of the categories involved under specified conditions as is the case with paradigm C discussed in the previous section. Rather, it may be explicable in terms of the lexical properties of the lexical verbs themselves, so that certain pragmatic and stylistic considerations may render certain examples more appropriate in either language than they are in the other. Accordingly, the figure of 117 examples does not necessarily imply that each of these examples would constantly mark a functional divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive from the standpoint of the former language. For ease of exposition, the distinction between the two types of this construction (dynamic and static) also suggests that paradigm D be considered in terms of two further subparadigms as stated in (34).

(34)  
a. **Subparadigm D1**: The number of canonical passives of the dynamic type in Arabic which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English.

b. **Subparadigm D2**: The number of canonical passives of the static type in Arabic which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English.

Given the second empirical observation recorded in paradigm D as in (10d), the figure of 117 examples indicates in fact the residual level of the potential frequency difference between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction from the perspective of the former language. Thus, the percentage recorded in this level (approximately 22%) is clear evidence that there exist certain canonical passives in Arabic which, when rendered into corresponding canonical passives in English, would reflect either linguistic unacceptability or pragmatic and stylistic inappropriateness, even though some may not mark ungrammaticality from the viewpoint of the standard norm of English, as will be seen presently. But, first, let us introduce the frequency counts of these canonical passives in accordance with the two subparadigms stated in (34) above as in (35) below.

(35)  
a. **Subparadigm D1**: 106 examples

b. **Subparadigm D2**: 11 examples
As the frequency counts recorded in (35) illustrate, the figure of 117 examples recorded in paradigm D as in (10d) has shed light on two further empirical observations. The first empirical observation refers to the actual frequency level of functional divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction as recorded in subparadigm D1, where the frequency level shows that 106 out of the 117 examples (approximately 90.6%) are in fact instances of the dynamic passive type in Arabic which do not function as corresponding instances of either type in English. The second empirical observation relates to the residual frequency level of functional divergence between the two languages in the same construction as recorded in subparadigm D2, where the frequency level illustrates that 11 out of the 117 examples (approximately 9.4%) are in fact instances of the static passive type in Arabic which do not function as corresponding instances of either type in English. These two subparadigms will be discussed and exemplified under the two rubrics: ‘functional divergence in dynamic passivisation’ and ‘functional divergence in static passivisation’, respectively.

**Functional divergence in dynamic passivisation**

With respect to subparadigm D1, the empirical observation recorded in (35a) above demonstrates that the vast majority of the canonical passives in Arabic which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English are actually instances of the dynamic passive type in the former language (approximately 90.6%). In most cases, this is reducible to the lexical properties of the lexical verbs incorporated in these canonical passives in Arabic alone, since their counterparts in English would not reflect the same properties. Thus, unlike the case of subparadigm C1 discussed in the preceding section (where the vast majority of the canonical passives in Arabic that function as corresponding canonical passives in English are actually dynamic passives), the one-to-one correlation between the argument structures s-selected by these verbs, and therefore between the theta-roles assigned to the arguments in these argument structures, does not always hold for the examples in accordance with subparadigm D1.
Recall that the canonical passives in Arabic and English as recorded in subparadigm C1 are specifically dynamic passives incorporating either passivisable transitive verbs or ditransitive verbs (see also note 5). Surprisingly, all the canonical passives in Arabic that do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English as recorded in subparadigm D1 are also dynamic passives incorporating either passivisable transitive verbs or ditransitive verbs. However, this does not necessarily mean that none of these verbs in the former language will passivise in any possible rendering in the latter, though some may prove to be pragmatically and/or stylistically inappropriate under the same conditions of functional homogeneity. Nor does it mean that the direct and indirect objects are the only syntactic categories which may lead to examples from the two languages in accordance with subparadigm D1, since there exist in Arabic other categories such as the cognate and adverbial objects cited in (13b-c) which, together with their counterparts in English, also result in examples in accordance with the same subparadigm, as will be seen later.

In the case of passivisable transitive verbs, the examples in question employ a variety of lexical verbs of this type, some of which will be cited and explained in terms of their lexical properties. For instance, certain verbs of Form I in Arabic incorporate three-radical roots, the underlying lexical forms, that have to do with the basic meaning of a state, quality or condition such as *r-h-m- (relating to the basic meaning of ‘mercy’). Due to the verbal nature of the formative morpheme *a-i-a (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (7)), its affixation into the three-radical root in question will require that such a kind of forgiving attitude be shown towards a human entity (the direct object). The resultant verb-form *rahima will, therefore, be responsible for all this verbal and lexical information when used in a given construction such as the canonical passive of the dynamic type as in (36a) below.

(36) a. laʔalla-kum turhamu:n. (III:132; VI:155)
   (Gloss: may-you (plm) *be mercied (2plm))
   (Lit.: *You may be mercied.)

b. (So) that you may find mercy.
To include all the information being talked about in the English counterpart, on the other hand, the NP mercy must be verbalised via the attachment of instrumental units such as have and be which are characterised by a verbal nature. As a result, this attachment gives rise to two possible verbalised expressions, 'to have mercy on someone' and 'to be merciful to(wards) someone', neither of which is passivisable as in (37a-b) below. It is, therefore, necessary to paraphrase canonical passives of the dynamic type in Arabic such as (36a) into a syntactically different construction in English which does not exhibit the same type as in (36b) or (37c-d) below. Notice, here, that (36b) is cited from Dawood's (1956/90) version, our principal reference, whereas (37c-d) are cited from Arberry's (1964/90) and Ali's (1934/46) versions respectively.

(37) a. *(So) that you may be had mercy on.
   b. *(So) that you may be been merciful to/towards.
   c. Haply so you will find mercy.
   d. ....that ye may obtain/receive mercy.

Other transitive verbs of Form I in Arabic incorporate three-radical roots which refer to the basic meaning of an activity such as w-r-th- (relating to the basic meaning of ‘inheritance’). Likewise, due to the verbal nature of the formative morpheme -a-i-a, its affixation into this root as in waritha will suggest that a human entity (the subject) be heir to another human entity (the direct object) as illustrated in the canonical passive of the dynamic type in (38a) below. The only way to represent all this verbal and lexical information in the English counterpart is via the verbalisation of the NP heir as in ‘to be heir to someone’ or ‘to be someone's heir’, a verbalised expression that is not passivisable as shown in the literal translation. This is because the verb inherit in English (whose Arabic equivalent is the same verb-form waritha but only when phrasalised via prepositions like ?an and min ‘from’) indicates nothing more than a nonhuman entity (the indirect object) to be inherited from a human entity (the ‘syntactically absent’ direct object (see note 4)). Hence, the Arabic dynamic passive in (38a) is rendered into a syntactically different construction in English as in (38b).

(38) a. wa-in ka:na rajulun yu:rathu kala:latan.... (IV:12)
   (Gloss: and-if was man (Nom) *be heired (3sm) kala:latan (Acc))
   (Lit.: *And if a man was heired kala:latan.)
b. If a man...leave[s] neither children nor parents.\footnote{11}

Certain verbs of Form II in Arabic do not seem to derive directly from any existing verbs of Form I, but rather from cognate nominals where the three-radical root relates to a given referent such as \textit{t-w-q-} (referring to ‘necklace’, ‘fetters’, ‘chains’, etc.) (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (13)). Due to the verbal nature of the formative morpheme \textit{-a--a-} as well as its causative nature that results from geminating the second radical of the three-radical root, the resultant verb-form \textit{tawwaqa} will denote that the referent in question be put around the neck of a human entity (the direct object). This denotation will also be maintained even if the referent is used figuratively as shown in (39a) below, where the same verb-form is phrasalised via the syntactically (but not semantically) deleted preposition \textit{[bi-]} ‘with’. Again, to include all this information in the English counterpart, the verb \textit{put} must be phrasalised even further via the preposition \textit{around} and in terms of the internal arguments that this verb s-selects as in ‘to put something around someone’s neck’, where ‘something’ denotes the referent in question. As a consequence, the Arabic dynamic passive in (39a) is rendered into a syntactically different construction in English as in (39b) below. Notice that the blank \textit{[....]} in the gloss and the literal translation stands for the whole residual of the phrasal verb \textit{put} just mentioned.

(39)
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. sa-\textit{tawwaqu}na \textit{[bi-]} \textit{ma: bakilu: bi-hi. (III:180)}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item \textit{(Gloss: will-be put [....] (3plm) [with] what be mean (3plm) with-it)}
      \item \textit{(Lit.: They will be put [....] with what they were mean with.)}
    \end{itemize}
  \item b. The riches they have hoarded shall become their fetters.\footnote{12}
\end{itemize}

\footnote{11} Notice that the word \textit{kala:latan} in Arabic is a legal term usually construed to refer to someone who has neither children nor parents regarding inheritance matters. More specifically, it is used to refer to “a person who has left no descendant or ascendant (however distant), but only collaterals, with or without a widow or widower” (Ali, 1934/46: 182, fn 520). Thus, the literal translation of the Arabic example (3ia) will be rephrased into (ia) below, where the blank in \textit{[who...]} stands for the whole construal of the term \textit{kala:latan} just quoted. Furthermore, the examples shown in (ib-c) below are also possible English renderings of the same Arabic source as cited from Ali’s (1934/46) and Arberry’s (1964/90) versions respectively.

(i)
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \textit{*And if a man [who....] was heired.}
  \item b. If the man....whose inheritance is in question, has left neither ascendants nor descendants,... (IV:12)
  \item c. If a man....[has] no heir direct,.... (IV:12)
\end{itemize}

\footnote{12} Note that the English rendering (39b) which is cited from Dawood’s (1956/90) version, can also be dynamically passivised via the verbal representation of the NP \textit{fetters} as in (ia) below, thus marking functional convergence in this type in accord with subparadigm C1 (cf. (11a) and (12a)). But the figurative use of the English verb \textit{fetter} in this case does not precisely convey the same denotation of the Arabic verb \textit{tawwaqa}, since the metaphor refers to the parsimonious and implies that all the riches they hoarded will cling around their necks like a massive collar, the symbol of slavery, a similar
Certain verbs of Form IV in Arabic incorporate three-radical roots that have to do with the basic meaning of a nonvolitional activity such as *a-th-y-* (relating to the basic meaning of 'harming', 'hurting', etc.). Due to the verbal and causative nature of the formative morpheme *a--a-a*, its affixation into this root as in *aatha:ya* (phonetically realised as *a:th:ya*) will suggest that this activity be inflicted on a human entity (the direct object) within a volitional rather than nonvolitional implication (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (17)). To represent all this information in the English counterpart, verbs such as *harm* and *hurt* or their nominal representations must also be phrasalised within this implication as in 'to harm/hurt someone volitionally' or 'to cause someone volitionally to suffer harm/hurt'. Due to the stylistically inappropriate representation of either verbalised expression under canonical passivisation, the Arabic dynamic passive in (40a) below is rendered into a syntactically different construction as in (40b). Notice, again, that the blank [*...*] in the gloss and the literal translation stands for the whole residual of either verbalised expression.

   (Gloss: and-was harmed/caused [*...*] (3pltm) for sake-My)  
   (Lit.: And they were harmed/caused [*...*] for My sake.)  

b. And those that suffered persecution for My sake.  

metaphor can be seen in the New Testament (cf. Matt. XVIII:6; Mark IX:42; Luke XVII:2). With this figurative use in mind, passivisation of an English rendering is not impossible, however, as illustrated in (ib) below, which is cited from Ali's (1934/46) version, (ic) being a further English rendering cited from Arberry's (1964/90) version.

(i) a. They shall be fettered with/by the riches they have hoarded.  
   b. Soon shall the things which they covetously withheld be tied to their necks like a twisted collar. (III:180)  
   c. That they were niggardly with shall have hung about their necks. (III:180)  

Although the NP *persecution* or its verbal representation *persecute* in English may imply infliction of mental or moral pain on someone for his/her belief (belief in God in this case), it may not imply infliction of physical injury as is the case with the verb-form *a:th:ya* in Arabic. Thus, to dynamically passivise the English rendering (40b) via the verbal representation of the NP in question as in (ia) below does not really mark functional convergence in accord with subparadigm C1, since the resultant construction employs a lexically different verb (see also note 12). Examples (ib-c) below are two further English renderings of the same Arabic source cited from Ali's (1934/46) and Arberry's (1964/90) versions respectively.

(i) a. And those that were persecuted for My sake.  
   b. Or [those who have] suffered harm in My cause. (III:195)  
   c. Those who suffered hurt in My way. (III:195)  

\[13\]
Other verbs of Form IV in Arabic incorporate three-radical roots which are associated with the basic meaning of a state, quality or condition such as h-s-n- (relating to the basic meaning of ‘chastity’). Again, due to the verbal and causative nature of the formative morpheme a-a-a, its affixation into this root as in ahsana will necessitate that a feminine human entity specifically (the direct object) be identified with this state through wedlock. The only way to represent all this information in the English counterpart is via the causativised verbalisation of the state being talked about as in ‘to make a woman chaste through wedlock’. Thus, like the case of (40) above, the stylistically inappropriate representation of this verbalised expression under canonical passivisation results in rendering the Arabic dynamic passive in (41a) below into a syntactically different English construction as in (41b). Notice, also, that the blank [....] in the gloss and the literal translation stands for the whole residual of the same expression.

(41)  

a. fa-itha: uhsinna.... (IV:25)  
   (Gloss: but-if was made chaste [....] (3plf))  
   (Lit.: But if they (women) were made chaste [....])

b. If after marriage [the chaste women]....

In the case of ditransitive verbs, a less frequent type than the transitive verbs discussed above, the examples in question appear to employ a few verbs of this type, two of which will also be cited and explained in terms of their lexical properties. For example, certain verbs of Form III incorporate three-radical roots that are to do with the basic meaning of a human activity such as n-d-w- (relating to the basic meaning of ‘calling’, ‘crying out’, etc.). Because of the verbal nature of the formative morpheme -a:-a-a (cf. Form IV in (40) above), its affixation into this root as in na:dawa (phonetically realised as na:da:) will require that this human activity be carried over to a human entity (the direct object) with some measure of intensity. If, however, the direct object is immediately followed by an embedded sentence, then this sentence will act

14 Notice that Arberry’s (1964/90) version introduces another English rendering of the same Arabic source as in (i) below, whereas Ali’s (1934/90) version tends to dynamically passivise a further verbalised expression, viz. ‘to take a woman in wedlock’ as in (ib) below. Yet, like the case of (ia) cited in note 13, passivisation here would not mark functional convergence in accord with subparadigm C1, since the causativised verbalisation of the state in question (i.e. ‘chastity’) is not perceivable.

(i)  

a. But when they are in wedlock,... (IV:25)

b. When they are taken in wedlock,... (IV:25)
as the indirect object of the same verb-form, thereby identifying it with a further human activity such as ‘saying’, ‘announcing’, etc. in addition to the verbal and lexical information just mentioned.

Now, to include all this information in the English counterpart, verbs such as call and cry should be phrasalised via the preposition out, so as to denote some measure of intensity of the human activity in question. Furthermore, the direct object to which this activity is carried over (the object of the preposition to in this case) should also be immediately followed by another human activity to act as a ‘sayer’, ‘announcer’, etc. of the embedded sentence referred to above as in ‘to call out to someone saying that’, where ‘that’ is the embedded that-argument itself (cf. (23-25)). Thus, the implication of two semantically distinct activities within the Arabic verb-form na:da: results in a lexically dual verbalisation of the English counterpart, for which reason the Arabic dynamic passive in (42a) below tends to be rendered into a syntactically different construction in English as in (42b). Notice that the blank [....] in the gloss and the literal translation stands for the whole residual of the same expression.

   (Gloss: and was called [....] (3plm) this-you (plm) the-paradise (Nom))
   (Lit.: And they were called [....] ‘this is the Paradise for you.’)
   b. And a voice will cry out to them, saying: This is the Paradise [for you].

One further example of ditransitive verbs in Arabic refers to a verb of Form IV, where the three-radical root it incorporates is associated with the basic meaning of a state, quality or condition as in h-l-l (relating to the basic meaning of ‘lawfulness’). Likewise, due to the verbal and causative nature of the formative morpheme a--a-a (cf. Form IV in (41) above), its affixation into the root as in ahlala (phonetically realised as ahalla) will suggest that a human or nonhuman entity (the direct object) be identified with the state in question for another

---

15 While Ali’s (1934/46) version introduces a further English rendering of the same Arabic source as in (ia) below, Arberry’s (1964/90) version appears to statically passivise the verb proclaim as in (ib) below. Although the latter may seem to mark functional convergence in terms of subparadigm C3, only one of the two activities implied in the Arabic counterpart is perceivable, viz. ‘saying’, etc.

(i) a. And they shall hear the cry: ‘Behold! The Garden before you!’ (VII:43)
   b. And it will be proclaimed: ‘This is your Paradise; (VII:43)
human entity (the indirect object). The human entity here (the direct or indirect object) refers to an experiencer of a social activity as in wedlock specifically, whereas the nonhuman entity (the direct object) relates to an experienced daily activity such as eating (hence the borrowing halal in expressions like halal meat).

Again, to represent all this information in the English counterpart, the state in question should be causatively verbalised via causative verbs such as make and declare as in ‘to make/declare someone or something lawful for someone’. This verbalised expression seems, therefore, to be the nearest semantic approximation to the Arabic verb-form ahalla when ‘someone’ and ‘something’ refer to the experiencer and the experienced mentioned above respectively. Consequently, like the case of (40) and (41), the stylistically inappropriate representation of this causatively verbalised expression under canonical passivisation results in rendering the Arabic dynamic passive in (43a) below into a syntactically different construction in English as in (43b). Notice that the blank [....] in the gloss and the literal translation stands for the whole residual of the expression being talked about.

(43) a. wa-uhilla la-kum ma wara?a tha:likum. (IV:24)
   (Gloss: and-was made [....] (3sm) for-you (plm) what beyond that)
   (Lit.: and [women] beyond that were made [....] for you.)
   b. All women other than these (mentioned) are lawful to you.

Having discussed some of the examples that mark functional divergence between Arabic and English in the dynamic passive type, the empirical observation recorded in subparadigm D1, however, does not necessarily imply that only the examples which employ passivisable transitive verbs or ditransitive verbs may mark this functional divergence. As mentioned earlier, there exist in Arabic the cognate object and the adverbial object (time/place) which are potentially dynamic categories, and therefore lead to instances of the dynamic passive type within a specific hierarchy, even if the lexical verbs involved are characterised by a low-transitivity nature (cf. (13)). Given that the English counterparts of these categories are constantly static under canonical passivisation, we also expect Arabic dynamic passives such as these and their English renderings to mark functional divergence in accordance with the
same subparadigm. Yet, the resultant examples seem to establish an exceptional situation since none of the dynamic passives in question occurs in the first nineteen chapters of the Koran, albeit existent in the language. The examples cited in (62-64) in section 3.3 of chapter 3 are repeated in (44-46) for convenience.

(44) a. si:ra sayrun tawi:lun. (Cognate)
    (Lit.: A long walk was walked.)
    b. Someone walked long.

(45) a. ni:ma yawmun ka:milun. (Time)
    (Lit.: A whole day was slept.)
    b. Someone slept (for) a whole day.

(46) a. ruq;sa fawqu al-minassati. (Place)
    (Lit.: Over the platform was danced.)
    b. Someone danced over the platform.

Functional divergence in static passivisation

With regard to subparadigm D2 stated in (34b), the empirical observation recorded in (35b) demonstrates that approximately 9.4% of the canonical passives in Arabic which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English are actually instances of the static passive type in the former language, a far less percentage than that recorded in subparadigm D1. This can also be reduced to the lexical properties of the lexical verbs incorporated in these canonical passives as well as some other properties which render them static in Arabic specifically. That is, most of such verbs are phrasalised via prepositions which establish with them a causative relation, a fact that would exhibit a contrast between instances of the static passive type in Arabic and corresponding instances of the dynamic passive type in English if the same conditions of canonical passivisation are met as seen throughout the discussion of subparadigm C4 in the previous section. Thus, unlike the case of subparadigm C2 (where some of the canonical passives in Arabic that function as corresponding canonical passives in English are actually static passives) the one-to-one correlation between the staticness of the internal arguments s-selected by the verbs in question does not hold for the examples in accord with subparadigm D2.
Recall that the canonical passives in Arabic and English as recorded in subparadigm C2 are in general instances of the static passive type with an embedded *that*-argument (cf. (23-25)). The generalisation is thus as follows: Arabic and English converge in the static passive with a *that*-argument because they converge in the staticness of this argument (cf. also (21-22)). Recall, further, that the canonical passives in Arabic and English as recorded in subparadigm C4 are in general instances of the static passive type with a PP-argument in the former language and corresponding instances of the dynamic passive type in the latter (cf. (28-31)). Likewise, the generalisation runs as follows: Arabic and English diverge in the static passive with a PP-argument because they diverge in the syntactic behaviour of this argument. Yet, this latter generalisation does not imply functional divergence in the canonical passive, but rather functional convergence reflecting functional heterogeneity among the two types of this construction as seen in the preceding section. In other words, divergence in the syntactic behaviour of the PP-argument results in two empirical observations: first, functional heterogeneity in accord with subparadigm C4 (static passives in Arabic versus dynamic passives in English); and second, functional divergence in terms of subparadigm D2 (static passives in Arabic versus nonpassives in English).

But the English nonpassive in this case may also arise from an English rendering of an Arabic static passive with a *that*-argument that is not structurally represented, an interesting example, albeit marginally exceptional, which employs the ditransitive verb *qa:la* 'to say' in particular as will be seen presently. First, let us cite a few examples with reference to the PP-arguments in Arabic as well as the lexical properties of the lexical verbs involved. For instance, certain verbs of Form I in Arabic incorporate three-radical roots which are to do with the basic meaning of a state, quality or condition such as *a-th-n-* (relating to the basic meaning of 'possibility'). The affixation of the formative morpheme *-a-i-a* into this root will give rise to the verb-form *athina*, a causative verb which requires that a nonhuman entity (the direct object) be identified with the state in question for a human entity (the indirect object). Thus,
the verb establishes a causative link with the preposition *li-* ‘for/to’, hence the expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal under canonical passivisation.

To include all this information in the English counterpart, the state in question must be verbalised via causative verbs such as *make* and *declare* as in ‘to make/declare something possible for someone’. If, however, the passive form of the Arabic verb is subjunctivised by the particle of infinitiveness *an* ‘(in order) to’ as in (47a) below, it would be stylistically inappropriate to maintain the passiveness of the English counterpart as in ‘in order for something to be made possible for someone’. Consequently, the Arabic static passive (47a) below is rendered into a syntactically different construction in English as in (47b). Notice that the implicit pronominal *huwa* ‘he’ in the gloss stands for the explicit nominal expletive *it* in the literal translation. Notice, also, that the particle *an* is syntactically deleted, and that the preposition *li-* ‘for’ is phonetically realised as *la*- when the indirect object is pronominalised as in *hum* ‘them (m).

(47)  

(Gloss: to be made possible (he) for-them [in the-abiding] (Obl))  
(Lit.: In order for it to be made possible for them in abiding.)

b. [They were] begging leave to stay behind.*'

Certain verbs of Form IV in Arabic incorporate three-radical roots which have to do with the basic meaning of a human activity such as *s-r-k-* (relating to the basic meaning of ‘participation’). Due to the verbal and causative nature of the formative morpheme *a--a-a* as seen (cf. (43)), its affixation into this root as in *a?raka* will suggest that a human or nonhuman entity (the direct object) be specifically participant or associate of God (the indirect object) in His creation and dominion. Accordingly, the resultant verb-form establishes a causative

193

---

16 In any event, if the Arabic static passive (47a) is to be rendered into an English canonical passive, the latter would only exhibit an instance of the dynamic passive type as in (ia) below, thereby marking functional convergence in terms of subparadigm C4. Yet, this would not appear to evade stylistic inappropriateness, for which reason both Ali’s (1934/46) and Arberry’s (1964/90) versions also render the Arabic static passive in question into a syntactically different construction in English as in (ib-c) respectively.

(i)  

a. In order for them to be allowed/permission to abide.  
b. And [they] came to claim exemption [from not abiding]. (IX:90)  
c. [They were] asking for leave [to abide]. (IX:90)
relation with the preposition bi- ‘with/in/to’ to incorporate the indirect object (alla:hi ‘God’ in this case). This relation will therefore lead to the expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal under canonical passivisation due to the staticness of the derived PP-argument.

Again, to represent all this information in the English counterpart, NPs like associates and participants should be verbalised via causative verbs like set up and attribute as in ‘to set up or attribute associates/participants to God’. Consequently, the linguistic unacceptability that would arise from the dynamic passivisation of this verbalised expression in English makes it necessary to render the Arabic static passive in (48a) below into syntactically different constructions in English as in (48b-c), which are two alternative renderings cited from Dawood’s (1956/90) version. Notice that the implicit pronominal huwa ‘he’ in the gloss stands for the explicit nominal expletive it in the literal translation. Notice, also, that the blank [...] both in the gloss and the literal translation stands for the whole residual of the verbalised expression in question.

(48) a. inna alla:ha la: yagfiru an yusraka bi-hi. (IV:48; IV:116)
   (Gloss: will God not forgive what be set up [...] (he) with-Him (Obl))
   (Lit.: God will not forgive that it is set up [...] to-Him.)
   b. God will not forgive those who serve other gods besides Him. (IV:48)
   c. God will not forgive idolatry. (IV:116).

Certain verbs of Form VIII in Arabic incorporate three-radical roots which are associated with the basic meaning of a state, quality or condition such as k-l-f- (relating to the basic meaning of ‘difference’). Due to the verbal nature of the complex of formative morphemes i-ta-a-a (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (34)), their affixation into this root as in iktalafa will

17 Notice that Ali’s (1934/46) version offers two further English renderings of the same Arabic source as in (ia-b) below: the former (ia) appears to dynamically passivise the verb set up, the verbalisation marker of the expression itself (cf. the gloss in (48)), whereas the latter (ib), like Dawood’s (1956/90) version, still exhibits a nonpassive construction. Furthermore, Arberry’s (1964/90) version seems to dynamically passivise the verb associate, the verbal representation of the human activity itself, in both cases as in (ic). In the dynamically passivised renderings (ia) and (ic), in particular, the direct object (the NPs partners and aught respectively) are moved to subject position, the original position of the nominal expletive in the Arabic counterpart (48), thereby marking functional convergence in accord with subparadigm C4.

(i) a. God forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him. (IV:48)
   b. God forgiveth not (the sin of) joining other gods with Him. (IV:116)
   c. God forgiveth not that aught should be with Him associated. (IV:48; IV:116)
necessitate that the state in question be identified with a human activity within a reciprocal implication. That is, it will suggest that a collective representation of a human entity (the subject) have different opinions about a human or nonhuman entity (the direct object). Accordingly, the resultant verb-form constitutes a causative link with the preposition fiː ‘about/of’, thereby rendering this direct object ‘syntactically absent’ in the form of an indirect one (see note 4). Such a link will thus give rise to the expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal under canonical passivisation due to the staticness of the derived PP-argument.

Likewise, to represent all this information in the English counterpart, the state in question should be causatively verbalised within a reciprocal implication via stative verbs such as have and adopt as in ‘to have/adopt different opinions about/of something’, or via the verbal representation of the state itself as in ‘to differ in opinion about/over/on something’. As a consequence, like the case of (48) above, the linguistic unacceptability that would proceed from the dynamic passivisation of verbalised expressions such as these results in rendering the Arabic static passive in (49a) below into syntactically different constructions in English as in (49b-d), which are cited from Dawood’s (1956/90), Ali’s (1934/46) and Arberry’s (1964/90) versions respectively. Notice that the implicit pronominal huwa ‘he’ in the gloss stands for the explicit nominal expletive it in the literal translation. Notice also that the blank […] both in the gloss and the literal translation stands for the whole residual of the verbalised expression with have.

(49) a. fa-iktulifa fiː:-hi (al-kita:b). (XI:110)
   (Gloss: but-was had […] (he) about-it (the-Book) (Obl))
   (Lit.: But it was had […] about it (the Book).)
   b. But differences arose about it (the Book).
   c. But differences arose therein (i.e. the Book).
   d. And there was difference regarding it (the Book).\(^{18}\)

\(^{18}\) Although reciprocal verbs in English such as argue, disagree and dispute may convey virtually the same meaning of the verb-form iktalafa in Arabic, the intended implication would not be transparent when they undergo dynamic passivisation as in (ia-c) below. This is because the Arabic verb-form in the static passive (49a) implies that some believed in the Book and others did not, whereas this polarity may be ambiguous in these English verbs.
One final example to be cited here concerns the lexical verb qa:la ‘to say’ in Arabic, a ditransitive verb whose two objects may act as an embedded that-argument as seen in the previous section. If the that-argument is structurally represented in Arabic or English, then the canonical passive version will reflect an instance of the static passive type, thereby leading to an example which marks functional convergence in accord with subparadigm C2 (functional homogeneity) (cf. (23)). If, however, the that-argument is not structurally represented in Arabic in particular, then the canonical passive version will still exhibit an instance of the static passive type, but the external argument, which strictly refers to an indefinite human Agent, may be mentally signified in terms of the physical signifier of the activity in question (‘saying’ in this case). That is, the nominal expletive may imply the meaning of something which physically represents this activity (the observable medium of transmission) such as sawt ‘voice’ or kalimah ‘word’, thus acting as a semantically realised ‘NP’ to take the theta-role of the external argument itself as in (50) below.

(50) a. wa-qal:la ya: ardu. (XL:44)
    (Gloss: and-was said (he) O earth (Nom))

   b. (Lit.: And it was said [as a voice]: ‘O earth’.)

   c. (Lit.: And it was said [as a word]: ‘O earth’.)

Interestingly, in order to maintain this exceptional signification in the English rendering, the semantically realised ‘NP’ voice or word may well be structurally represented as a syntactic category NP, so as to occupy the subject position in a typically unpassivisable construction with a lowered degree of transitivity. That is, the lexical verb employed in this construction may be a transitive or intransitive verb which is in principle passivisable, but whose theta-role assignability may not be identified with the external argument referred to above. In both cases, the lexical verb would not assign an external theta-role that may be structurally represented, hence its unpassivisability, and therefore the pragmatic equation of the whole construction with the Arabic static passive in (50) above as illustrated in (51a-b) below.

Notice that both Dawood’s (1956/90) and Ali’s (1934/46) versions coincide in maintaining the

(i) a. The Book was argued about/over.
   b. The Book was disagreed about/on/over.
   c. The Book was disputed about/over.
exceptional signification being talked about as in (51a-b) respectively, whereas Arberry's (1964/90) version tends to introduce a rather literal rendering of the same static passive as in (51c) below.

(51)  
a. A voice cried out: 'Earth, .... (XI:44)  
b. Then the word went forth: 'O earth! .... (XI:44)  
c. And it was said, 'Earth, .... (XI:44)

In this section, the functional divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction (from the viewpoint of the former language) has been discussed and exemplified in accord with paradigm D stated in (9d) and the second empirical observation recorded in (10d). The discussion has also been taken up by reference to the two types of this construction, for which reason paradigm D has been considered in terms of two subparadigms, D1 and D2, with the former relating to the dynamic passive type and the latter to the static passive type. For ease of reference to the examples recorded in paradigm D, all the verbs used in these examples are listed in appendix B (cf. the appendices). The next section will consider the functional divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction (from the viewpoint of the latter language this time), the concern of paradigm E stated in (9e) and the third empirical observation recorded in (10e).

4.4 Passives in English not Arabic

As mentioned at the outset of the preceding section, functional divergence in the canonical passive construction exists between any two languages instantiating this construction, provided that the divergence operates in two alternating directions from the viewpoint of either language. Thus, at one extreme, there are certain canonical passives in Arabic which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English for reasons which are to do mainly with the idiosyncratic properties of the lexical verbs incorporated in the former, as we saw throughout the discussion of paradigm D in the previous section. At the other extreme, there are also certain canonical passives in English which do not function as corresponding
canonical passives in Arabic for reasons that cannot always be accounted for in terms of the idiosyncratic properties of the lexical verbs involved, as will be seen throughout the discussion of paradigm E in this section.

Given the statement of paradigm E in (9e), the third empirical observation recorded in (10e) demonstrates that approximately 54.5% of the total number of canonical passives in English (497 out of 911 examples) do not function as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic, a much higher percentage than that recorded in paradigm D. Although not all these examples would constantly mark functional divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction from the perspective of the latter language, such a percentage is indicative of the fact, among others, that the notion of passivisation, as an essentially pragmatic process, can be semantically expressed via a number of structurally distinct devices in Arabic specifically. For the purposes of clarification, some of these devices will be referred to throughout, though the noncanonical passive construction is not the concern of the present study. Like the case of paradigm D, the distinction between the two types of the canonical passive (dynamic and static) also suggests that paradigm E be considered in terms of two further subparadigms as stated in (52).

(52)  

a. **Subparadigm E1:** The number of canonical passives of the dynamic type in English which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic.  

b. **Subparadigm E2:** The number of canonical passives of the static type in English which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic.

Similarly, the third empirical observation recorded in paradigm E as in (10e) shows in fact that the figure of 497 examples addresses the residual level of the potential frequency difference between Arabic and English in the canonical passive but from the standpoint of the latter language this time. Thus, the comparatively high percentage recorded in this level (approximately 54.5%) is also proof that there exist certain canonical passives in English which, upon functioning as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic, would exhibit either linguistic unacceptability or pragmatic and stylistic inappropriateness, even though some may
not mark ungrammaticality from the viewpoint of the standard norm of Arabic, as will be seen presently. But, first, let us introduce the frequency counts of these canonical passives in accordance with the two subparadigms stated in (52) above as in (53) below.

(53)  

a. **Subparadigm E1**: 497 examples  
b. **Subparadigm E2**: None

As the frequency counts recorded in (53) illustrate, the concrete figure of 497 examples recorded in paradigm E as in (10e) has in fact brought to light two further empirical observations. The first empirical observation refers to the actual frequency level of functional divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive as recorded in subparadigm E1, where the frequency level shows that the same figure of 497 examples are in fact instances of the dynamic passive type in English which do not function as corresponding instances of either type in Arabic. The second empirical observation relates to the residual frequency level of functional divergence between the two languages in the same construction as recorded in subparadigm E2, where the frequency level illustrates that none of the figure of 497 examples is an instance of the static passive type in English which does not function as a corresponding instance of either type in Arabic. This striking difference between subparadigms E1 and E2 may help explore further insights into the functioning of either type of the canonical passive in English vis-à-vis its counterpart in Arabic.

Recall that the striking difference between paradigms A and B as recorded in (10a-b) is evidence of a low level of frequency overlap between Arabic and English in the canonical passive in general (531 examples versus 911 examples, respectively) (cf. section 4.1). Recall, also, that this low level is identified with the figure of 414 examples, as recorded in paradigm C in (10c) (cf. also section 4.2). Now if all the figure of 497 examples (the result of subtracting 414 from 911) are instances of the dynamic passive type as recorded in subparadigm E1 in (53a), then one would come to the obvious conclusion that no nonpassive in Arabic which may function as a corresponding canonical passive in English would be an instance of the static passive type, though the reverse is not true. This is because Arabic and
English converge in the static passive type with an embedded that-argument, the only category that is constantly static in the latter language, notwithstanding the marginally exceptional cases with verbs such as believe and decide (cf. section 4.3). Given that the nonpassives in Arabic, which may function as corresponding dynamic passives in English, may mark either verbalisation [+V] or nominalisation [+N], the functional divergence between the two languages in accordance with subparadigm E1 will be discussed and exemplified under the two rubrics: ‘dynamic passives vs. nonpassives [+V]’ and ‘dynamic passives vs. nonpassives [+N]’.

**Dynamic passives vs. nonpassives [+V]**

As mentioned earlier, in languages instantiating the canonical passive construction such as Arabic and English the vast majority of natural instances of this construction are agentless, instances of the so-called ‘short passive’ (approximately 95% in Arabic versus approximately 85% in English) (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3). That is, in the unmarked situation the agentive PP is necessarily deleted, whereas in the marked situation it is necessarily inserted, for which reason the former has been the principal concern of the current study (cf. also chapter 3, section 3.2). However, the difference between the two languages in the percentages just cited is not irrelevant to the matter in hand: The extremely predominant agentless nature of the canonical passives in Arabic (approximately 95%)\(^{19}\) tends to minimise the functional

---

\(^{19}\) In empirical corroboration of the extremely predominant agentless nature of the canonical passives in Arabic (approximately 95%), the figure of 531 examples recorded in paradigm A (cf. (10a)) finds that only 28 examples express overt agentive PPs which incorporate a set of Ps to denote agency but within a very restricted scope of referentiality. These Ps are classified in terms of their frequency counts as follows:

   b. 1 example with the P ?inda ‘at (a meeting of )’ and an animate Agent (cf. III:169).
   c. 1 example with the PP ?ala: lisa ni ‘on the tongue of’ and an animate Agent that is associated with an articulatory activity specifically (e.g. la?ana ‘to curse’, qa:la ‘to say’, etc.) (cf. V:78).
   d. 2 examples with the P bi- ‘by’ and an inanimate Agent (cf. VI:70).

---
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divergence across certain Arabic 'patientive' actives and English agentive passives, since the agentless nature of the canonical passives in English is less predominant (approximately 85%). Given the striking difference between subparadigms E1 and E2 in (53) above, minimisation means, therefore, that there exist in Arabic certain nonpassives [+V] incorporating a patientive NP which play their pragmatic roles in much the same way certain dynamic passives incorporating an agentive PP in English do due to the transitivity of the lexical verbs involved, as shown in (54-55).

(54)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. ula:ʔika yalʔanu-hum allahu. (II:159) 
\hspace{1cm} (Gloss: those (plm) curse (3sm)-them God (Nom)) 
\hspace{1cm} (Lit.: Those who/whom God curses.)
\item b. Those.... shall be cursed by God.
\end{enumerate}

(55)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. wa-ma: akala al-sabʔu. (V:3) 
\hspace{1cm} (Gloss: and-what ate (3sm) the-lion (Nom))
\hspace{1cm} (Lit.: And what/which the lion ate.)
\item b. Or (those which were) mangled by beasts of prey.
\end{enumerate}

In both examples, the patientive NP in Arabic, ula:ʔika 'those' in (54a) and ma: 'what' in (55a), is topicalised via a defining relative clause, for which reason it is moved to the front position of this clause. Topicalisation, therefore, imposes a dynamic nature on this NP, a nature that characterises any category having the potential for movement to subject position under canonical passivisation as illustrated in the English renderings (54b) and (55b). But the agentive NP in Arabic, allahu 'God' in (54a) and al-sabʔu 'the lion' in (55a), is still

It is interesting to see that up to the fourteenth century from was used as the principal P to denote agency in Old English, with the use of other Ps like with, of, at, etc. as secondary. Only later, however, did the P by develop diachronically out of the bound morpheme be- (cf. Fraser, 1987). But the scope of referentiality of the agentive PP in Arabic is still more restricted than that of the English counterpart, since the former refers to one of two sorts of entities: first, an idealised entity such as the abstract reference to God in the unmarked case and the concrete reference to a given prophet in the marked case as in (iiia-b) below; and second, a generalised entity such as the indefinite reference to someone or something in the marked case as in (iiia-b) below.

(ii)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. wa-ma: unzila ilay-ka min rabbi-ka. (V:64)
\hspace{1cm} (Lit.: And what was revealed to you from your Lord.)
\item b. luʔina allathi:na....ʔala: lisa:n da:wu:da:.... (V:78)
\hspace{1cm} (Lit.: Those....were cursed on the tongue of David....)
\end{enumerate}

(iii)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. fa-man ʔufiya la-hu min aki:-hi ʔayʔun. (II:178)
\hspace{1cm} (Lit.: He who is pardoned from his brother aught.)
\item b. an tubsala nafsun bi-ma: kasabat. (VI:70)
\hspace{1cm} (Lit.: Lest a soul be destroyed by what it earned.)
syntactically different from its counterpart in the English renderings: While the former acts as the subject of the transitive verb and is assigned Nominative Case, the latter acts as the object of the preposition, and thus it must be assigned Oblique Case, though it is not morphologically realised. On this account, we can only say that topicalisation of the patientive NP tends to pragmatically neutralise the sharp distinction between Arabic nonpassives [+V] such as (54a) and (55a) and English dynamic passives as in (54b) and (55b), simply because canonical passivisation of the former will entail the necessary deletion of the agentive PP altogether in the unmarked situation (see also note 19).

Although activisation of the English dynamic passives (54b) and (55b) would not result in ungrammatical structures as illustrated in the literal translations (in which case functional convergence in the nonpassive [+V] would be established between Arabic and English), transitive verbs such as laʔana ‘to curse’ and akala ‘to eat’ in Arabic in (54a) and (55a) are not the only type of lexical verbs which may lead to examples in accordance with subparadigm E1. In particular, there exist in Arabic other lexical verbs which are characterised by a low transitivity nature, and, more importantly, whose theta-role assignability is not identified with the external argument. Accordingly, lexical verbs such as these do not assign an external theta-role, hence their unsusceptibility to canonical passivisation and, therefore, their constant representation within a typically active construction. Given that the English counterparts of these verbs do in fact assign an external theta-role, the resultant examples will also mark functional divergence between the two languages in terms of subparadigm E1. Some of these examples will be cited and explained with reference to the lexical properties of the lexical verbs in question.

Certain verbs of Form I in Arabic are potentially intransitive whose three-radical roots have to do with the basic meaning of an activity such as i-m-m- and h-q-q- (relating to the basic meanings of ‘completion’ and ‘fulfilment’ respectively). Therefore, the affixation of the formative morpheme -a-a-a into these roots as in tamama and haqaqa (phonetically realised as
*tamma* and *haqqa*) will lead to a formation of stative and resultative verbs due to the absence of the causative marker in this morpheme. Since the English counterparts *complete* and *fulfil* are potentially transitive verbs which mark causativisation (albeit not morphologically realised), the only way to achieve the stativeness and resultativeness of the Arabic verbs *tamma* and *haqqa* is via the canonical passivisation of the former as in ‘to be completed’ and ‘to be fulfilled’. We have, therefore, a seemingly constant contrast between nonpassives [+V] in Arabic and dynamic passives in English as shown in (56-57) below. Notice that the three-radical roots *t-m-m-* and *h-q-q-* can also mark causativisation but via the affixation of formative morphemes of Form II and/or Form IV as in *tammama/atamma* ‘to complete/perfect’ and *haqqaga* ‘to fulfil/realise’ (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (9), (17)).

(56) a. wa-tamma-t kalimatu rabbi-ka. (VI:115)
   (Gloss: and-completed (3sf) (intr.) word (Nom) Lord-your)
   (Lit.: *And the word of your Lord completed.)
   b. Perfected are the words of your Lord.

(57) a. haqqa-t ṣalay-him kalimatu rabbi-ka. (X:96)
   (Gloss: fulfilled (3sf) (intr.) for-them word (Nom) Lord-your)
   (Lit.: *The word of your Lord fulfilled for them.)
   b. (Those) for whom the word of your Lord shall be fulfilled.

Certain verbs of Form V in Arabic are morphologically intransitive whose three-radical roots are associated with the basic meaning of an activity such as *q-t-ʔ-* (relating to the basic meaning of ‘cutting’, ‘breaking’, etc.). Thus, the affixation of the complex of formative morphemes ta-a-a-a into this root as in *tagattaʔa* will lead to a formation of a reflexive verb due to the suffixation of the reflexive marker *ta-* (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (20)).

Again, since the English counterpart, *cut* or *break*, is a potentially transitive verb, the only way to achieve the reflexiveness of the Arabic verb-form *tagattaʔa* is through passivising the former either canonically as in ‘to be cut/broken’ or periphrastically as in ‘to get cut/broken’. This is because the intransitive version of the English counterpart does not imply reflexivisation as such, but rather an inherent quality of the object associated with the activity in question (e.g. *Sandstone cuts/breaks easily*). Consequently, a contrast between a nonpassive [+V] in Arabic and a dynamic passive in English would be established as in (58)
below. Notice that the root *q-t-är-* can also mark transitivity when it takes Form I as in *qata?ala* ‘to cut (off)’ or Form II as in *qatta?ala* ‘to cut up’ (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (11)).

(58)  
  a. laqad taqatta?ala bayna-kum [al-wisa:lu]. (VI:94)  
    (Gloss: has cut (3sm) (Ref) among-you [the-bond] (Nom))  
    (Lit.: *The bond among you has cut.*)  
  b. Broken are the ties which bound you.

Certain verbs of Form VIII in Arabic are also morphologically intransitive whose three-radical roots are to do with the basic meaning of an activity such as *h-d-y-* (relating to the basic meaning of ‘guidance’). Thus, the affixation of the complex of formative morphemes *i-ta-a-a* into this root as in *ihtadaya* (phonetically realised as *ihtada:* ) will also lead to a formation of a reflexive verb due to the infixation of the reflexive marker *-ta-*, as is the case with the previous example cited in (58) above (cf. also chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (33)). Likewise, since the English counterpart *guide* is a potentially transitive verb which does not mark reflexivisation, the only way to maintain the reflexiveness of the Arabic verb-form *ihtada:* is via the canonical passivisation of the former as in ‘to be guided (to the straight path)’). As a result, we have a seeming constant contrast between a nonpassive [+V] in Arabic and a dynamic passive in English as in (59) below. Notice, also, that the root *h-d-y-* can nonetheless mark transitivity when it takes Form I as in *hadal*: ‘to guide’ or Form IV as in *ahda:* ‘to lead/conduct’.

(59)  
  a. la?alla-kum tahtadu:na. (II:53; II:150)  
    (Gloss: may-you (plm) guide (3plm) (Ref))  
    (Lit.: *You may guide (Ref) to the straight path.*)  
  b. You might be rightly guided.

One further example to be cited here concerns a verb of Form IX in Arabic which is constantly intransitive, and the three-radical root it incorporates is associated with the basic meaning of a colour state specifically such as *s-w-d-* (relating to the basic meaning of ‘being black’). Thus, when the complex of formative morphemes *i--a--a* is affixed into this root, the resultant verb-form *iswadda* will mark reflexivisation even more strongly than verbs of Form V and Form VIII do, as seen above (cf. also chapter 1, section 1.2, examples (40)). Given that causation may also be reified in an external Agent, this verb-form may act pragmatically as a canonically passivised verb though still exhibiting an active structure. Accordingly, to
represent both reflexivisation and reification of causation in the English counterpart, the transitive verb *blacken* should be canonically passivised as in ‘to be blackened’, since the intransitive version does not imply externalisation of agency (e.g. *His hands blackened with oil*). Consequently, a contrast between a nonpassive [+V] in Arabic and a dynamic passive in English would also be established as in (60).

(60) a. yawma....taswaddu wuju:hun. (III:106)
   (Gloss: day (Acc) blacken (3sf) (Ref) faces (Nom))
   (Lit.: One day other faces shall blacken (Ref).)
   b. [The day when] other faces are blackened.

**Dynamic passives vs. nonpassives [+N]**

Having discussed some of the examples which establish a contrast between nonpassives [+V] in Arabic and dynamic passives in English, the striking difference between subparadigms E1 and E2 recorded in (53) above also indicates that there exist in Arabic certain nonpassives incorporating a variety of derived nominals which play their pragmatic roles in much the same way certain canonical passives in English do. Given the conclusion that no nonpassive in Arabic may function as a corresponding static passive in English (but not vice versa), the examples being talked about seem to also establish a contrast between nonpassives [+N] in the former language and dynamic passives in the latter, thereby marking functional divergence between the two languages in accordance with subparadigm E1. Some of these examples will be cited and explained with reference to the types of derived nominals which are incorporated in typically nonverbal sentences in Arabic specifically.

Certain derived nominals in Arabic take the form of what is traditionally known as *ism al-maf'ul* ‘nomen patientis’, a substantival category which is equatable with the passive participle or adjectival passive in languages such as English. Thus, in Arabic there is a morphological distinction between the nomen patientis as in *maksu:r* ‘broken’ and the canonical passive form of the cognate verb it is derived from as in *kusira* ‘to be broken’, whereas in English the morphological distinction does not exist (e.g. *be broken* in both cases),
for which reason syntactic ambiguity would be expected on the part of the latter. Accordingly, identification of the nomen patientis in English would only be determined by pragmatic exigencies so far as predication is concerned (e.g. _The glass was broken when I got it_). It is, therefore, the attributive representation that has little bearing on pragmatic exigencies which may lead to a contrast between a nonpassive [+]N incorporating a nomen patientis in Arabic and a dynamic passive in English as in (61) below. Notice that the nomen patientis _mawrù腠_ ‘reached’ in (61a) is derived from the cognate verb _warada_ ‘to reach/arrive at’, whose canonical passive form is _wurida_ ‘to be reached/arrived at’ (Form I).

(61)  

(Gloss: and-evil the-watering-place (Nom) the-reached (Nom)).  
(Lit.: And evil is the reached watering-place.)

b. Dismal is the [watering-] place they shall be led to.

Other derived nominals in Arabic take the form of what is traditionally known as _ism al-fa:?il_ ‘nomen agentis’, a substantival category which is equatable with the active participle in languages such as English. But, unlike the case of the nomen patientis just mentioned, in both languages there is a morphological distinction between the nomen agentis as in _ka:tib_ ‘writer’ and the canonical passive form of the cognate verb it is derived from as in _kutiba_ ‘to be written’, and thus syntactic ambiguity would not be expected. If, however, the active form of the cognate verb in Arabic marks inherent reflexivisation as in _naja_: ‘to save oneself’, then it would be more pragmatically and stylistically appropriate to render the resultant nomen agentis _na:jì_ ‘the saviour of oneself’ into a canonically passivised form of the English counterpart or its synonym as in ‘to be saved/freed’. Consequently, a contrast between a nonpassive [+]N incorporating a nomen agentis in Arabic and a dynamic passive in English would be established as in (62) below. Notice that the nomen agentis _na:jì_: in (62a) is phonetically realised as _na:jìn_.

(62)  

a. wa-qà:la li-llathì: Thanna anna-hu na:jìn. (XII:42)  
(Gloss: and-said (3sm) to-whom thought (3sm) that-he saviour (Ref))  
(Lit.: And he said to the one who thought that he was the saviour of himself.)

b. And [he] said to the [one] who knew would be freed.

Other derived nominals in Arabic take the form of what is traditionally called _al-masdar_ ‘the verbal nominal’ (literally, ‘the source’), a substantival category that can be equated with the
derived nominal (or the derived gerundive, for that matter) portraying the activity of its
cognate verb in English. Thus, like the case of the nomen agentis referred to above, in both
languages there exists a morphological distinction between the verbal nominal as in *kalq*
‘creation/creating’ and the canonical passive form of the cognate verb it is derived from as in
*kuliqa* ‘to be created’, thereby steering clear of syntactic ambiguity. If in Arabic, in particular,
the verbal nominal acts as the object of a given preposition and the resultant PP acts as the
predicate of a nominal sentence, then, again, it would be more pragmatically and stylistically
appropriate to render this substantival category into a canonically passivised form of the
cognate verb or its synonym in English as in ‘to be created/raised to life’. We have, therefore,
a possible contrast between a nonpassive [+N] incorporating a verbal nominal in Arabic and a
dynamic passive in English as in (63).

(63)  a. a-?inna: la-fi: *kalqin jadiidin*. (XIII:5)
  (Gloss: Ques-we indeed-in creation (Obl) new (Obl))
  (Lit.: Are we indeed in a new creation?)
  b. Shall we [indeed] be raised to life again?

One final example to be cited here concerns an Accusative nominal which acts as the cognate
or absolute object of a syntactically deleted cognate verb such as *subha:na* ‘exaltation’, where
the deleted cognate verb *sabbaha* ‘to exalt’ is normally imperfectivised and inflected in accord
with the first-person-singular pronominal as in *usabbihu* ‘I exalt’. This Accusative nominal
also takes the form of the verbal nominal referred to above, a substantival category whose
semantic function is to intensify the activity portrayed by the deleted cognate verb it is derived
from (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2, example (22)). Accordingly, there is a morphological
distinction between the verbal nominal *subha:na* ‘exaltation’ and the canonical passive form
of the deleted cognate verb as in *subbiha* ‘to be exalted’, and thus syntactic ambiguity would
not be expected. Given the idiosyncratic behaviour of this verbal nominal in Arabic, it would
be more pragmatically and stylistically appropriate to render it into a canonically passivised
form of the ‘inserted’ cognate verb in English as in ‘to be exalted’. As a consequence, a
possible contrast between a nonpassive [+N] incorporating a verbal nominal in Arabic and a
dynamic passive in English would be established as in (64) below. Notice that the literal translation maintains the lexical representation of the deleted cognate verb usabbihu ‘I exalt’.

(64)  a. subḥa:na-hu [....] ?am-ma: yušriku:na. (IX:31; X:18)
     (Gloss: His-exaltation (Acc) above-what associate (3plm))
     (Lit.: [I exalt] His exaltation above what they associate with God!)
  b. Exalted be He above those whom they deify besides Him! (IX:31)
  c. Exalted be He above the gods they serve besides Him! (X:18)

Finally, throughout the discussion of paradigm E in this section the third empirical observation recorded in (10e) has demonstrated that all the nonpassives in Arabic (be they verbal [+V] or nominal [+N]) which may function as possible canonical passives in English are in fact instances of the dynamic passive type, the concern of subparadigm E1 stated in (52a) and the empirical observation recorded in (53a). This indicates that none of these nonpassives in Arabic would function as a corresponding instance of the static passive type in English, though the reverse does not hold, as illustrated in subparadigm E2 stated in (52b) and the empirical observation recorded in (53b). Accordingly, one can draw the obvious conclusion that if functional divergence exists between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction from the viewpoint of the latter language, as it naturally does, then it only exists in the dynamic type of this construction. For ease of reference to the examples recorded in paradigm E (subparadigm E1 in this case), all the verbs used in the English counterparts in these examples are listed in appendix C and alphabetically ordered in accordance with the English alphabet (cf. the appendices).

4.5 Summary

In section 4.1, a brief outline of the primary objectives of the first three chapters was introduced to arrive at the two sorts of the native speaker’s internalised knowledge of the canonical passive construction: first, linguistic knowledge which includes the structural and lexical components; and second, pragmatic knowledge which comprises the semantic and
logical components. Given the universal distinction between the dynamic and the static types of this construction, some remarks were made on the syntactic behaviour of the dynamic and static categories as well as their pragmatic import in Arabic and English. The discussion moved onto the symmetrical balance in the internalised knowledge which native speakers of either language would possess of the same construction, and how this balance has bearing on the functional relation between al-majhu:liyyah in Arabic and passivisation in English. In order to consider this functional relation from all possible angles, a particular approach to the potential frequency differences between the two languages in the construction in question was identified with five paradigms (A, B, C, D, and E), with the last three being the subject-matters of sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 respectively. As a standard corpus of data for this approach, the frequency counts were recorded on the basis of the first nineteen chapters of the Koran and their English counterparts in Dawood’s version (1956/90).

In section 4.2, the functional convergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction was discussed and exemplified in accordance with the first empirical observation recorded in paradigm C. Because the one-to-one correlation between instances of the dynamic and static passive types does not always hold in the two languages, paradigm C was considered in terms of four subparadigms (C1, C2, C3, and C4), with the first two addressing functional homogeneity and the second two functional heterogeneity. While functional homogeneity indicates the actual one-to-one correlation between instances of either type in Arabic and English, functional heterogeneity denotes the contrast between instances of one of the two types in one of the two languages and instances of the other type in the other language. For ease of reference to the examples recorded in paradigm C, all the Arabic verbs used in these examples are listed in appendix A and classified in accordance with the verb-forms they take (cf. the appendices).

In section 4.3, the functional divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction (from the standpoint of the former language) was discussed and exemplified in
accordance with the second empirical observation recorded in paradigm D. Furthermore, because this functional divergence exists in both the dynamic and static passive types, paradigm D was considered in terms of two further subparadigms (D1 and D2). Subparadigm D1 addresses the dynamic passives in Arabic which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English, whereas subparadigm D2 deals with the static passives in the former language which do not function as corresponding canonical passives in the latter. Either subparadigm was, therefore, explained by citing examples from the intended corpus of data. For ease of reference to the examples recorded in paradigm D, all the Arabic verbs used in these examples are listed in appendix B and classified in accordance with the verb-forms they take (cf. the appendices).

In section 4.4, the final section, the functional divergence between Arabic and English in the canonical passive construction (from the standpoint of the latter language this time) was discussed and exemplified in accordance with the third empirical observation recorded in paradigm E. Initially, this paradigm was also considered in terms of two further subparadigms (E1 and E2), with the former relating to the dynamic passive type and the latter to the static passive type. Given that all the nonpassives in Arabic (verbal [+V] and nominal [+N]) which may function as possible canonical passives in English are instances of the dynamic passive type in the latter language, the discussion was concerned with subparadigm E1 specifically. Finally, this led to the conclusion that no nonpassive in Arabic which may function as a possible canonical passive in English is an instance of the static passive type, but the reverse is not true. For ease of reference to the examples recorded in paradigm E (i.e. subparadigm E1 specifically), all the verbs used in the English counterparts in these examples are listed in appendix C and alphabetically ordered in accordance with the English alphabet (cf. the appendices).
CONCLUSION

In the first chapter, where the discussion is confined to the morphophonological dimension, section 1.1 offered some remarks on the morphophonological structure of the active verb in the written variety of Arabic (Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA)), and on how the derivatives that are generated from the three-radical root in the unmarked situation are symbolised algebraically in terms of a finite set of morphophonological patterns. The section also identified the element that operates as a morphophonological base in Arabic as well as its ‘typological’ counterpart in English. Section 1.2 was taken up by a consideration of the active morphophonology of ten main verb-forms in Arabic with reference to their essential lexical properties (that is, the grammaticisation which determines their morphophonological and semantic properties). For ease of exposition, here, each of these ten main verb-forms was symbolised algebraically in accordance with the three-variable notation $(X, Y, Z)$, where each concrete example is accompanied by its equivalent in English. Section 1.3, the final section, explained and exemplified the canonical representation of the passive morphophonology of the ten main verb-forms in Arabic (i.e. their grammaticisation as well) together with the ‘typological’ counterpart of this system in English. Here, the discussion included both the regularities and the irregularities of this system in either language, the former being explicable in a uniform fashion and the latter nothing more than historical accidents. The section was concluded with some remarks on the crosslinguistic variation between Arabic and English in the structural patterning of the canonical passive verb for representing both lexical and nonlexical information. These may be summarised in the following way:

1. The canonical passive verb in Arabic (e.g. *kusira* ‘to be broken’) consists of two bound morphemes: first, the three-radical root *k-s-r-* which assigns the main lexical information (the basic lexical meaning of ‘breaking’ in this case); and second, the formative morpheme -*u-i-a* (Form I, *XuYiZu*) which is responsible for nonlexical information such as Agr, Tns, and Pass.
b. The canonical passive verb in English (e.g. *was broken*) consists of two bound morphemes and a free one: first, the underlying lexical form of the verb *break* which can be equated with *k-s-r-* in (1a) above; second, the past participle marker *-en* (i.e. *-n*) which is the Pass morpheme itself; and third, the functional category (the Aux *be*) which acts as a verbalisation marker to be responsible for Agr and Tns.

In the second chapter, where the discussion is restricted to the pragmalinguistic dimension from the viewpoint of language use, section 2.1 gave a brief account of the traditional approach to canonical passivisation in Arabic and English and underlined the logical flaws of this approach, an approach which held that transitivity was a decisive precondition for the natural occurrence of canonical passivisation. Section 2.2 considered the relationship between the semantic notion of transitivity and the syntactic process of passivisation with special reference to Medieval Arabic Linguistic Theory. The purpose was to specify the sorts of categories that can be promoted to subject position under canonical passivisation on the one hand, and to shed more light on the logical flaws of the traditional approach on the other. Section 2.3 discussed the fundamental pragmalinguistic properties of the so-called ‘personal passive construction’ in Arabic and English, and explained the promotional nature of the direct object in respect of other categories with some reference to Relational and Functional Grammar. The section also touched on the diachronic overlap between the personal passive and the anaphoric reflexive in order to illuminate further aspects of the former construction. Section 2.4, the final section, examined the essential pragmalinguistic properties of the so-called ‘impersonal passive construction’ in the two languages involved, and identified two different subtypes of this construction exhibiting the same expletive interpretation of the subjectivised pronominal (viz. with PP-arguments and *that*-arguments). Following this, the section introduced what was provisionally termed, the ‘personalised’ version of the impersonal passive for further analysis in the third chapter. Finally, the section was concluded with the general pragmalinguistic definition of the canonical passive construction as in (2) below, a definition which was stated within the conceptual limitations of the terms referred to above.
The third chapter concentrated on the general principles which are said to underlie canonical-passive formation in Arabic and English within the framework of Universal Grammar (UG). Section 3.1 offered a sketchy historical account of the paradigmatic shifts in the derivational system from the 1950s to the present decade insofar as they are relevant to the canonical passive construction in the two languages involved. Generally, these shifts can be observed in three distinctive phases: first, the TGG model up to the 1970s; second, the early version of the P&P model in the 1980s; and third, the later version of the P&P model in the 1990s (the subject-matters of sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 respectively). Section 3.2 considered the canonical passive construction according to the TGG model up to the 1970s, where the construction was assumed to result from the application of a transformational rule known as Pass-transformation. The section also underlined the main criticisms forwarded against this rule. Section 3.3 discussed the canonical passive construction according to the early version of the P&P model in the 1980s, where the Pass element was identified with ‘theta-role absorption’ and ‘Case absorption’ (an identification which imposes an argument status on the Pass element). The section also highlighted the conceptual defects of this analysis and showed that the Pass element absorbs neither Case nor theta-role assignment. Section 3.4, the final section, introduced an alternative analysis of the construction in question with some reference to the later version of the P&P model in the 1990s. Here, the Pass element is treated as a functional category in its own right, a treatment that is crucial for scrutinising virtually unnoticed aspects of the canonical passive construction and reconsidering all the misleading terms that have been used to describe several types of this construction. Finally, the section was concluded with the new syntactic definition of the construction, a definition
which now indicates that, both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically, there exist only two types, viz. the ‘dynamic passive’ and the ‘static passive’. These are stated in (3) below.

(3) a. In both the dynamic and static passive, the E-subject does not move to [Spec, AgrP] position to become the I-subject.

b. In the dynamic passive, DC is coindexed with [Spec, Pass], and therefore moves to [Spec, AgrP] position to become the I-subject.

c. In the static passive, SC is not coindexed with [Spec, Pass], and therefore does not move to [Spec, AgrP] position to become the I-subject.

The fourth and final chapter drew on the potential frequency differences in the canonical passive construction between Arabic and English within a particular approach to functional convergence and divergence. Section 4.1 defined the two sorts of knowledge internalised by the native speaker in respect of the canonical passive construction (viz. linguistic knowledge and pragmatic knowledge). The section also illustrated how this knowledge has bearing on the functional dimension (i.e. whether or not a given instance of the canonical passive construction in Arabic functions as a corresponding instance of the same construction in English (and vice versa)). Following this, the particular approach to the potential frequency differences between the two languages was identified by using five paradigms (A, B, C, D, and E), with the last three being the topics of sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 respectively. Section 4.2 discussed the functional convergence in the canonical passive construction between Arabic and English in accordance with paradigm C. Because the one-to-one correlation between instances of either type of this construction (the dynamic and the static) does not always hold in the two languages, paradigm C was considered in terms of four subparadigms (C1, C2, C3, and C4), with the first two referring to functional homogeneity and the last two to functional heterogeneity. Section 4.3 explained the functional divergence between the two languages from the perspective of Arabic, the concern of paradigm D. Since this divergence does exist in either type of the canonical passive construction, paradigm D was considered in terms of two subparadigms (D1 and D2), with the former addressing the dynamic passive type and the latter the static passive type. Section 4.4, the final section, discussed the functional
divergence between the two languages from the perspective of English this time, the concern
of paradigm E. Given that this divergence only exists in the dynamic passive type, paradigm
E was considered in terms of only one subparadigm (E1) due to the fact that no static passive
in English does not function as a corresponding canonical passive in Arabic.

The identification of linguistic knowledge, in particular, resulted from the new syntactic
definition of the canonical passive construction arrived at in the third chapter (cf. (3a-c)),
whereas the identification of pragmatic knowledge led us to reconsider the pragmalinguistic
definition of the same construction stated at the end of the second chapter (cf. (2a-d)). This
indicates that the intentional production of any natural instance of the canonical passive
construction would reflect the two sorts of the native speaker's internalised knowledge of this
construction, viz. **linguistic knowledge** and **pragmatic knowledge**, with the former
consisting of the **structural component** and the **lexical component** and the latter comprising
the **semantic component** and the **logical component**. Both sorts of knowledge of the
construction in question are shown in (4a-b) and (5a-d) below.

(4) **Linguistic knowledge:**
   a. The *dynamic passive* requires that the dynamic category (i.e. the direct object
       or any category standing proxy for it) move to subject position.
   
b. The *static passive* requires that the static category (i.e. the direct object or any
       category standing proxy for it) remain in its base position, and that the subject
       position be occupied by the nominal expletive.

(5) **Pragmatic knowledge:**
   a. Topicalisation of 'patiency' (or its syntactic equivalent) in the dynamic passive
       and impersonalisation of agency in the static passive.
   
b. Reification of causation in both constructions.
   
c. Externalisation of agency in both constructions.
   
d. Demotion of external agency in the dynamic passive and nonpromotion of inter-
       nal 'patiency' (or its syntactic equivalent) in the static passive.

Seen as a universal definition of the canonical passive construction (a definition which seems
to be true in all natural languages instantiating this construction), the identification in (4) and
(5) would in principle underline the symmetrical balance in the linguistic and pragmatic
knowledge that both the native speaker of Arabic and the native speaker of English, for instance, would internalise of the same construction. The establishment of symmetrical balance in such a perspective is nothing to do with whether or not Arabic and English constantly exhibit functional convergence in the natural instances of the canonical passive construction. If the two languages converge, the concern of paradigm C in the fourth chapter, then both the internalised knowledge of the Arabic canonical passive and that of the English counterpart would exist in parallel (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2). If, however, the two languages diverge from the viewpoint of Arabic or English, the subject-matters of paradigms D and E respectively, then the internalised knowledge of the canonical passive construction in this sense would not exist in parallel, though still in principle symmetrically balanced (cf. chapter 4, sections 4.3 and 4.4).

Recall that there exist only two distinctive types of the canonical passive construction both intralinguistically and crosslinguistically: the dynamic passive type and the static passive type (cf. (4) and (5)). Likewise, the establishment of symmetrical balance in the internalised knowledge of this construction is nothing to do with whether or not the canonical passives that mark functional convergence between Arabic and English constantly exhibit a one-to-one correlation between the natural instances of either type. For this reason, paradigm C was considered in terms of four subparadigms (C1, C2, C3, and C4), with the first two addressing functional homogeneity and the last two relating to functional heterogeneity (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2). Furthermore, in the case of functional divergence from the viewpoint of Arabic, the universal distinction between the two types of the canonical passive construction also resulted in considering paradigm D in terms of two subparadigms (D1 and D2), with the former referring to the dynamic passive type and the latter to the static passive type (cf. chapter 4, section 4.3). Only in the case of functional divergence from the viewpoint of English did the distinction lead us to consider paradigm E in terms of only one subparadigm (E1) due to the sole existence of this functional divergence in the dynamic passive type (cf. chapter 4, section 4).
Therefore, the symmetrical balance in internalised linguistic and pragmatic knowledge of the canonical passive construction as well as the workings of this knowledge as shown in (4) and (5) above should be made clear in the light of the frequency subparadigms just mentioned. Suppose that an Arabic-speaking monolingual happens to intentionally produce the Arabic dynamic passive ADP and the Arabic static passive ASP in any relevant context, and that ADP and ASP constantly function as the corresponding English dynamic passive EDP and the corresponding English static passive ESP (the concerns of subparadigms C1 and C2, respectively). We would then want to deduce that the English speaking monolingual, who is exposed to the same relevant contexts, produces EDP and ESP via the utilisation of exactly the same linguistic and pragmatic knowledge stated in (4) and (5) above. That is, the linguistic and pragmatic knowledge underlying ADP and ASP would operate in parallel with the linguistic and pragmatic knowledge underlying EDP and ESP. In this case, we can identify the nature of the lexical verbs incorporated in either type as in (6) below, given the typological convergence between Arabic and English in the potential dynamicness of the direct and indirect objects and in the staticness of the that-argument within the unmarked situation.

(6) a. **Subparadigm C1**: The lexical verb incorporated in ADP and EDP is either a passivisable transitive verb or a ditransitive verb whose two objects cannot act as a nominal sentence.

b. **Subparadigm C2**: The lexical verb incorporated in ASP and ESP is specifically a ditransitive verb whose two objects can indeed behave as a nominal sentence (i.e. the that-argument itself).

Suppose, on the other hand, that the Arabic-speaking monolingual happens to intentionally produce ADP and ASP in any relevant context, and that ADP constantly functions as a corresponding ESP and ASP constantly functions as a corresponding EDP (the concerns of subparadigms C3 and C4, respectively). We would also want to deduce that the English-speaking monolingual, who is exposed to the same relevant contexts, also produces ESP and EDP via the utilisation of exactly the same linguistic and pragmatic knowledge stated in (4) and (5). However, the knowledge underlying either type in the two languages would not operate in parallel as in the case of subparadigms C1 and C2, but rather a 'proactive' switch
from the knowledge underlying ADP to that underlying ESP and a ‘retroactive’ switch from the knowledge underlying ASP to that underlying EDP would be expected, albeit within the same universal representation of the canonical passive construction. In this case, we can also identify the nature of the lexical verbs incorporated in either contrast as in (7) below, given the typological divergence between Arabic and English in the syntactic behaviour of certain categories within a marked situation.

(7) a. **Subparadigm C3**: The lexical verb incorporated in the ADP-ESP contrast is either a verb subjectivising a *that*-argument in Arabic (e.g. *awha:* ‘to reveal’) or a verb embedding an infinitival argument in English (e.g. *decide*).

b. **Subparadigm C4**: The lexical verb incorporated in the ASP-EDP contrast is either a verb necessitating a PP-argument in Arabic (a less marked case) or a verb subjectivising a *that*-argument in English (e.g. *believe*).

Now if we are able to identify the nature of the lexical verbs incorporated in the canonical passives in Arabic that do in fact function as corresponding canonical passives in English, then paradigm C would seem to be the best available criterion for predicting the presence or absence of the one-to-one correlation between instances of either type of this construction in the two languages, given that there exist only the dynamic passive type and the static passive type. With this caveat in mind, where the four subparadigms C1, C2, C3, and C4 address the functional convergence in question from all possible angles, a marginally exceptional situation in which a lexical verb like *qa:la* ‘to say’ in Arabic may assign a different lexical meaning would also be captured, since the same lexical verb may result in examples in accordance with subparadigm C4 due to the modality or type of *maqu: al-qawl* ‘the object of saying’ (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2, examples (32-33)).

Furthermore, suppose that the Arabic-speaking monolingual happens to intentionally produce ADP and ASP in any relevant context, and that neither ADP nor ASP functions as a corresponding EDP or ESP (the subject-matters of subparadigms D1 and D2, respectively). We would then want to deduce that the English-speaking monolingual, who is exposed to the same relevant contexts, produces constructions that are syntactically different from ADP and
ASP (call them ‘English nonpassive constructions’ (ENCs)) via the utilisation of linguistic and pragmatic knowledge underlying ENCs. Accordingly, the Arabic-speaking monolingual would be in a position to utilise his/her internalised knowledge of the linguistic and pragmatic aspects of the canonical passive construction as stated in (4) and (5) above, whereas the English-speaking monolingual would not, even though the same contextual clues that are relevant to either type of this construction are available for the latter. On the basis of this account, we can identify the nature of the lexical verbs incorporated in ADP and ASP as in (8) below, bearing in mind the absence of the one-to-one correlation between the argument structures (and therefore between the theta-roles assigned to the arguments in these argument structures) which are s-selected by certain lexical verbs in Arabic and their English counterparts in accordance with paradigm D.

(8)  
   a. **Subparadigm D1**: The lexical verb incorporated in ADP is either transitive or ditransitive, and entails in the English counterpart the verbalisation of a nominal and/or adjectival representation such as those listed in (9) (cf. chapter 4, section 4.3).

   b. **Subparadigm D2**: The lexical verb incorporated in ASP is phrasalised via a given preposition, and entails in the English counterpart the verbalisation of a nominal and/or adjectival representation such as those listed in (10) (cf. chapter 4, section 4.3).

(9)  
   a. *rahima* ‘to have mercy on someone’ or ‘to be merciful to(wards) someone’.
   b. *waritha* ‘to be heir to someone’ or ‘to be someone’s heir’.
   c. *tawwaqa [bi-]* ‘to put something around someone’s neck’.
   d. *aṭṭa*: ‘to cause someone volitionally to suffer harm/hurt’.
   e. *ahsana* ‘to make a woman chaste through wedlock’.
   f. *naḍaːn* ‘to call out to someone saying that’.
   g. *ahalla* ‘to make/declare someone or something lawful for someone’.

(10)  
   a. *athīna li* ‘to make/declare something possible for someone’.
   b. *ašraka bī* ‘to set up/attribute associates or participants to God’.
   c. *iktaːlaʃa fiː* ‘to have/adopt different opinions about/of something’ or ‘to differ in opinion about/over/on something’.

Now if we are able to identify the nature of the lexical verbs incorporated in the canonical passives in Arabic that do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English, then, like the case of paradigm C discussed above, paradigm D would seem to be the most reasonable criterion for predicting the functional divergence between the two languages in either type of this construction from the viewpoint of Arabic, given that this functional
divergence exists both in the dynamic and the static passive types. With this proviso in mind, where the two subparadigms D1 and D2 address the functional divergence in question from both angles, a marginally exceptional situation in respect of either subparadigm would also be accounted for. On the one hand, the potential dynamicness of the cognate and adverbial objects in Arabic may lead to examples in accordance with subparadigm D1 regardless of the degree of transitivity (cf. chapter 4, section 4.3, examples (44-46)). On the other, the ditransitivity of lexical verbs such as qa:la ‘to say’ in Arabic may also result in examples in accordance with subparadigm D2, particularly when the that-argument is not structurally represented (cf. chapter 4, section 4.3, examples (50-51)).

Conversely, suppose that the English-speaking monolingual happens to intentionally produce EDP and ESP in any relevant context, and that EDP, but not ESP, does not function as a corresponding ADP or ASP (the concern of subparadigm E1 specifically, since no ESP does not function as a corresponding ASP or ADP). We would then want to deduce that the Arabic-speaking monolingual, who is exposed to a context identical to that of EDP, produces a construction that is syntactically different from EDP (call it an ‘Arabic nonpassive construction’ (ANC)) via the utilisation of linguistic and pragmatic knowledge underlying ANC. Accordingly, unlike the case of subparadigms D1 and D2 just explained, the English-speaking monolingual would be in a position to utilise his/her internalised knowledge of the linguistic and pragmatic aspects of the canonical passive construction (viz. the dynamic passive type) as stated in (4) and (5) above, whereas the Arabic-speaking monolingual would not, even though the same contextual clues that are relevant to this type are available for the latter. On this basis, we can identify the nature of the lexical categories incorporated in ANC as in (11) below, given that ANC may mark verbalisation [+V] or nominalisation [+N] in accordance with subparadigm E1.

(11) Subparadigm E1:
   a. [+V]: The lexical category incorporated in ANC is a verbal representation which does not assign an external theta-role, and requires in the English counterpart a verbal representation that is dynamically passivised such as those listed in (12) below (cf. chapter 4, section 4.4).
b. [+N]: The lexical category incorporated in ANC is a nominal representation which derives from a cognate verb, and requires in the English counterpart a verbal representation that is dynamically passivised such as those listed in (13) below (cf. chapter 4, section 4.4).

(12) a. *tamma* (Resultative) versus ‘to be completed’.
b. *haqqa* (Resultative) versus ‘to be fulfilled’.
c. *taqataʾa* (Reflexive) versus ‘to be cut/broken’.
d. *ihdada* (Reflexive) versus ‘to be guided’.
e. *iswadda* (Reflexive) versus ‘to be blackened’.

(13) a. *mawruːd* (Nomin Patientis) versus ‘to be led to’.
b. *naːjin* (Nomin Agentis) versus ‘to be freed’.
c. *kālq* (Verbal Nominal) versus ‘to be created/raised to life’.
d. *subḥaːna* (Cognate Object) versus ‘to be exalted’.

Likewise, if we are able to identify the nature of the canonical passives in English that do not function as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic, then, like the case of paradigms C and D discussed above, paradigm E would also seem to be the most plausible criterion for predicting the functional divergence between the two languages in the dynamic passive type of this construction from the viewpoint of English, given that this functional divergence exists only in this type. With this conditioning in mind, where subparadigm El specifically addresses the functional divergence in question from this sole angle, a particular situation in which Arabic transitive verbs such as *laʔana* ‘to curse’ and *akala* ‘to mangle/eat/devour’ assign an external theta-role would also be captured, since the same verbs may lead to examples in accordance with subparadigm E1 due to the topicalisation of the patientive NP within a defining relative clause (cf. chapter 4, section 4.4, examples (54-55)).
APPENDICES

For ease of reference to the first nineteen chapters (or suras) of the Koran and their English counterparts in Dawood's version (1956/90), all the verbs that are used in the canonical passive construction in accordance with paradigms C, D, and E are listed in appendices A, B, and C respectively. As discussed in chapter 4, these paradigms concern the potential frequency difference and similarity between Arabic and English in this construction. The frequency counts recorded in each of these paradigms have exhibited some measure of functional convergence between Arabic and English on the one hand, and functional divergence between Arabic and English from the viewpoint of either language on the other, as stated in the following way:

Paradigm C: The canonical passives in Arabic that function as corresponding canonical passives in English (Appendix A).

Paradigm D: The canonical passives in Arabic that do not function as corresponding canonical passives in English (Appendix B).

Paradigm E: The canonical passives in English that do not function as corresponding canonical passives in Arabic (Appendix C).

The Arabic verbs which are listed in appendices A and B are classified in terms of the ten main verb-forms discussed in chapter 1, where the verbs classified under each verb-form are alphabetically ordered in accordance with the Arabic alphabet. The English verbs listed in appendix C, on the other hand, are alphabetically ordered in accordance with the English alphabet. Notice that the Roman and Arabic numerals to the right of each example refer to the numbers of the chapters and verses of the Koran respectively. Notice, also, that certain verbs in either language may recur in more than one example (i.e. assignment of more than one lexical meaning would be expected), and that certain references may even incorporate more than one lexical verb.
Appendix A

Passives in Arabic and English

Form I: XaYaZa/XaYiZa

akath\a  ‘to accept’, ‘to commit’, ‘to take’
wa la: yu?kathu....?adlun. (II:48)
(Gloss: and not to be accepted (3sm) ransom (Nom))
[And no] ransom shall be accepted....

afaka  ‘to mislead’
a-fa-an:na: tu?faku:na. (X:34)
(Gloss: how-that be misled (3plm))
How is that you are.....misled.

amara  ‘to bid’, ‘to command’, ‘to order’
(Gloss: then-do (Imp) what be bidden (2plm))
Do, therefore, as you are bidden.

b\akasa  ‘to deny’
w-a:hum....la: yub\kasu:na. (XI:15)
(Gloss: and they not be denied (3plm))
Nothing shall be denied them.

ba\zatha  ‘to raise’, ‘to resurrect’
a-ya:na yub\zathu:na. (XVI:21)
(Gloss: will be raised to life (3plm))
They will be raised to life.

taraka  ‘to forsake’
\a:tru:k:. (IX:16)
(Gloss: would be forsaken (2plm))
You would be forsaken.

tala  ‘to recite’, ‘to proclaim’
tu\a:.....ay\a:tu alla:hi. (III:101)
(Gloss: be recited (3sf) revelations (Nom) God (Gen))
God’s revelations are recited.

thaqifa  ‘to find’
\a:y\a:n:ma: thuqifu:. (III:112)
(Gloss: wherever be found (3plm))
Wherever they are found.

jaza  ‘to require’, ‘to reward’, ‘to punish’
ma:....yu?jza bi-hi. (IV:123)
(Gloss: who be required (3sm) with-it (Obl))
He.....shall be requited.

ja\zala  ‘to ordain’
in\a:ma: ju?\a:la al-sabtu. (XVI:124)
(Gloss: was ordained (3sm) the-Sabbath (Nom))
The Sabbath was ordained.

hakara  ‘to gather’, ‘to assemble’
\a:nu-kum....tu\j\a:ru:na. (II:203)
(Gloss: shall be gathered (2plm))
You shall be gathered...
hamada 'to praise'
yuhibbuna an yuhmadu: (III:188)
(Gloss: wish (3plm) be praised (3plm))
[They] wish to be praised.

hama: 'to heat'
yauma yuhma: alayha:. (IX:35)
(Gloss: day (Acc) be heated (3sm) on it (Obl))
The day...when [they] shall be heated.

kalaqa 'to create'
(Gloss: was created (3sm) the-man (Nom) weak (Acc))
Man was created weak.

d&a?:a: 'to call upon'
(Gloss: if be called upon (3plm))
....if [they] are called upon.

thabaha 'to sacrifice'
wa-ma: thubiha... (V:3)
(Gloss: and-what be sacrificed (3sm))
Also of those [that are] sacrificed....

thakara 'to mention', 'to consecrate'
an yuthkara...ismu-hu. (II:114)
(Gloss: to be mentioned (3sm) name (Nom)-His)
His name to be mentioned....

ra?ima 'to show mercy'
l?illa-kum turhamuna. (VII:63)
(Gloss: may (2plm) be shown mercy (2plm))
[You may] be shown mercy.

radda 'to reward', 'to ward off', 'to call back', 'to restore', 'to return', 'to save'
yuradduna ila:...al-?atha:bi. (II:85)
(Gloss: shall be rewarded (3plm) with the-punishment (Obl))
[They] shall be rewarded with....punishment.

razaqa 'to give', 'to provide'
ruziqu:.....min thamaratin. (II:25)
(Gloss: be given (3plm) from fruit (Obl))
They are given fruit.

sa:qa 'to lead'
yusa:qu:na ila: al-mawti. (VIII:6)
(Gloss: were being led (3plm) to the-death (Obl))
They were being led to....death.

sa?ala 'to demand', 'to question'
kama: su?ila mu:sa:. (II:108)
(Gloss: as was questioned (3sm) Moses (Nom))
[As it] was....demanded of Moses.

sajana 'to throw into prison'
illa: an yusjana. (XII:25)
(Gloss: shall be thrown into prison (3sm))
[He shall] be thrown into prison.
"to nourish", "to water"
ysqa: bi-?ain.... (XIII:4)
(Gloss: be nourished (3sm) with-water (Obl))
[They] are nourished by....water.

goza
"to debar"
wa-?addu:.... (XIII:33)
(Gloss: and-were debarred (3plm))
For they were debarred....

garafa
"to spare", "to avert"
man yusqafu ?an-hu.... (VI:16)
(Gloss: who be spared (2sm))
He who is spared....

galaba
"to crucify"
aw yuslabu:.. (V:33)
(Gloss: or shall be crucified (3plm))
Or [they] shall be crucified.

daraba
"to stamp", "to pitch"
gurbat ?alay-him al-tillatu.... (II:61)
(Gloss: was stamped (3sf) on-them the-shame (Nom))
Shame....[was] stamped upon them.

taba?a
"to (set a) seal"
(Gloss: was sealed (he/it) on hearts (Obl)-their)
A seal was set upon their hearts.

Thalama
"to wrong"
wa-antum ?u Thalamu:na. (II:272)
(Gloss: and-you not be wronged (2plm))
You shall not be wronged.

Zaraqa
"to bring", "to range"
(Gloss: shall be brought (3plm) to Lord (Obl)-their)
[They] shall be brought before their Lord.

?afa
"to pardon"
fa-man ?ufiya la-hu.... (II:178)
(Gloss: who be pardoned (he/it) for-him (Obl))
He who is pardoned....

gafara
"to forgive"
sa-yugfaru ?ana:.... (VII:169)
(Gloss: shall-be forgiven (he/it) for us (Obl))
We shall be forgiven....

galaba
"to overthrow", "to defeat"
sa-tuglabu:na. (III:12)
(Gloss: shall-be overthrown (2plm))
You shall be overthrown.

galla
"to chain"
gullat aydi:-him. (V:64)
(Gloss: may be chained (3sf) hands (Nom)-their)
May their....hands be chained!
fatana  'to afflict', 'to test'
ann-hum yuftanu:na... (IX:126)
(Gloss: were afflicted (3plm))
....they were afflicted.

qa'la  'to say'
wā-ithā: qīla la-hum.... (II:11)
(Gloss: and-when be said (he/it) to-them (Obi))
When it is said to them....

qabila  'to accept'
lā: yuqbalu....ṣafāʔatun. (II:48)
(Gloss: not be accepted (3sm) intercession (Nom))
[No] intercession shall be accepted....

qatala  'to slay', 'to kill', 'to put to death'
li-mān yuqtalu.... (II:154)
(Gloss: who was slain (3sm))
Those [who were] slain....

qadda  'to tear', 'to rent'
in kā:na qam:i:su-hu quddā.... (XII:26)
(Gloss: if be torn (3sm) shirt (Nom)-his)
If his shirt is torn....

qaraʔa  'to recite'
iḥā: qurʾa al-qurʾa:nū.... (VII:204)
(Gloss: when be recited (3sm) the-Koran (Nom))
When the Koran is recited....

qāda:  'to settle', 'to seal', 'to end', 'to resolve', 'to do'
wā-quḍiyya al-ʔamru. (II:210)
(Gloss: and-be settled (3sm) the-fate (Nom))
[The] fate will have been settled.

qataʔa  'to annihilate'
fā-qutṭa ḍābiru....allatḥi:na Thalāmu:.. (VI:45)
(Gloss: thus-was cut (3sm) root (Nom) who wronged (3plm))
Thus were the evil-doers annihilated.

kataba  'to decree', 'to order', 'to count', 'to note'
kutibā ʔalay-kum al-qisā:su. (II:178)
(Gloss: be decreed (3sm) for-you (Gen) the-retaliation (Nom))
Retaliation is decreed for you.

kathāba  'to deny'
annā-hum kuthībū.... (XII:110)
(Gloss: they (Nom) be denied (3plm))
....they were denied....

kafara  'to deny'
fa-lan yuḵfaru:-hu. (III:115)
(Gloss: shall not be denied (3plm)-it (Acc))
[It] shall not be denied them.

kawa:  'to brand'
fa-tuḵwā:....jibā:hu-hum. (IX:35)
(Gloss: and-be branded (3sf) foreheads (Nom)-their)
And their foreheads....shall be branded.
la?ana ‘to curse’
wa-lu?i?u:.... (V:64)
(Gloss: and-may be cursed (3plm))
May they be cursed....

mana?a ‘to deny’
muni?a min-na: al-kaylu. (XII:63)
(Gloss: be denied (3sm) from-us (Obl) the-corn (Nom))
Corn... is denied us.

nagara ‘to (give) help’
wa-?a: hum yunsaru:na. (II:48)
(Gloss: and-nor they be helped (3plm))
Nor any help [shall] be given [them].

naThara ‘to reprieve’
wala: hum yunTharu:na. (II:162)
(Gloss: and-nor they be reprieved (3plm))
Nor shall they be reprieved.

nafaka ‘to sound’, ‘to blow’
yawma yunfa?u fi: al-su:ri. (VI:73)
(Gloss: day (Acc) be sounded (he/it) in the-trumpet (Nom))
....the day when the trumpet is sounded.

nafa: ‘to banish’
aw yunfaw.... (V:33)
(Gloss: or be banished (3plm))
Or [they] shall be banished.

naha: ‘to forbid’
ma: tunhawna ?an-hu. (IV:31)
(Gloss: what be forbidden (2plm) from-it (Obl))
....[what] you are forbidden....

hada: ‘to guide’
(Gloss: be guided (3sm) to path (Obl) straight (Obl))
....[he] shall be guided to a straight path.

wajada ‘to find’
man wujida fi: rahl?hi. (XII:75)
(Gloss: who be found (3sm) it (the cup) in pack (Obl)-his)
He in whose pack the cup is found....

wasala ‘to unite’
(Gloss: what has bidden (3sm) God (Nom) be united (3sm))
What God has bidden to be united....

wada?a ‘to build’, ‘to lay down’, ‘to set in place’
inna awwala bayt?in wuji?a:.... (III:96)
(Gloss: first (Acc) temple (Gen) be built (3sm))
The first temple ever to be built....

wa?ada ‘to threaten’, ‘to promise’
inna ma: tu?-a?u:na:.... (VI:134)
(Gloss: that which is threatened (2plm))
That which you are threatened....
wa?aTha 'to admonish'
ma: yu?2aThu:na bi-hi.... (IV:66)
(Gloss: what were admonished (3plm) with-it (Obl))
....what they were admonished to do.

waqafa 'to set'
ith wuqifu: ?ala: al-na:ri.... (VI:27)
(Gloss: when were set (3plm) before the-Fire (Obl))
....when they were set before the Fire!

Form II: XaYYaZa

baddala 'to change'
yawma tubaddalu al-?ardu. (XIV:48)
(gloss: day (Acc) be changed (3sf) the-earth (Nom))
....the day when the earth is changed.

bašṣara 'to announce'
itha: huššira....bi-al-?untha:. (XVI:58)
(Gloss: when be announced (3sm) with-the-female (Obl))
When a new-born girl is announced....

harrama 'to forbid'
allathi: hurrima ?alay-kum.... (III:50)
(Gloss: what be forbidden (3sm) from-you (Obl))
....the things you are forbidden.

hallā 'to deck'
yuhallawna fi:-ha:.... (XVIII:31)
(Gloss: be decked (3plm) in-it (Obl))
They shall be decked....

kaʃfa 'to lighten', 'to ease'
lə: yuʃfa: ?an-hum al-?atha:bu. (II:162)
(Gloss: not be lightened (3sm) from-them (Obl) the-punishment (Nom))
Their punishment shall not be lightened.

ka?la 'to leave behind'
allathi:na kullifu:.... (IX:118)
(Gloss: who had been left behind (3plm))
....who had been left behind.

thakkara 'to enjoin', 'to give', 'to remind'
mimma: thukkiru: bi-hi.... (V:13)
(Gloss: of-what (Obl) were enjoined (3plm))
....of what they were enjoined.

zalzala (four-letter root) 'to spare'
fa-man zuhziha ?an al-na:ri.... (III:185)
(Gloss: whoever be spared (3sm) from the-Fire (Obl))
Whoever is spared the Fire....

zalzala (four-letter root) 'to batter'
wa-zulzilu:.... (II:214)
(Gloss: and-so were battered (3plm))
And so [they were] battered....

zayyana 'to deck', 'to tempt'
zuyyina....al-haya:tu al-dunya:. (II:212)
(Gloss: be decked (3sm) the-life (Nom) the-worldly (Nom))
....the life of this world is decked....
sakkara 'to dazzle'

sukkirat abśa:ru-na:. (XV:15)
(Gloss: was dazzled (3sf) eyes (Nom)-our)
Our eyes were dazzled....

sawwa: 'to level'
tusawwa: bi-him al-?ardu. (IV:42)
(Gloss: was levelled (3sf) with-them (Obl) the-earth (Nom))
....they were levelled into dust.

sabbaha 'to make one resemble another'
wa-lak'in ṣuḥḥa la-hum. (IV:157)
(Gloss: was made resemble (3sm) for-them (Obl))
He was made to resemble another for them.

żallama 'to teach'
wa-?ullimtum..... (VI:91)
(Gloss: have been taught (2plm))
You have been taught....

żammara 'to prolong'
an yu?żammara..... (II:96)
(Gloss: was prolonged (3sm) his life (Nom))
[His] life [was]....prolonged....

żamma: 'to hide', 'to obscure'
fa-ʔummiyat ?alay-kum. (XI:28)
(Gloss: though was hidden (3sf) from-you (Obl))
Though it [was] hidden from you....

fattaha 'to open'
lā: tufattahu la-hum abwā:bu.... (VII:40)
(Gloss: shall not be opened (3sf) for-them (Obl) the-gates (Nom))
The gates....shall not be opened [for them]....

fassala 'to make plain'
thumma faggilat..... (XI:1)
(Gloss: and be made plain (3sf) (they) (Nom))
And [they] are made plain....

faddala 'to favour'
allath:na fuḍṭilu:..... (XVI:71)
(Gloss: those who be favoured (3plm))
Those who are....favoured....

qatta?a 'to cut off'
aw tuqatta?u aydi:-him.... (V:33)
(gloss: or be cut off (3sf) hands (Nom)-their)
Or....their hands....shall be cut off....

kahthaba 'to reject', 'to deny'
fa-qad kuththiba rusulun.... (III:184)
(Gloss: have been rejected (3sm) apostles (Nom))
....apostles have been rejected....

kallafa 'to charge'
lā: tukallafu nafsun..... (II:233)
(Gloss: not be charged (3sf) a soul (Nom))
None should be charged....
nazzala 'to send down', 'to reveal'
an yunazzala ʔalay-kum min kayrin. (II:105)
(Gloss: be sent down (3sm) to-you (Obl) from blessings (Obl))
Any blessings should be sent down to you.

waffa: 'to pay', 'to requite', 'to give'
yuwaﬀa: ila’y-kum.... (II:272)
(Gloss: shall be paid (3sm) to-you (Obl))
[It] shall be paid back to you.

Form III: Xa:YaZa

da-ra 'to allow to suffer', 'to damage', 'to press'
la: tuḍa-ra wa:lidatun. (II:233)
(Gloss: not be allowed to suffer (3sf) a mother (Nom))
A mother should not be allowed to suffer.

da-ʔafa 'to double'
yuda:ʔafu la-hum al-ʔatha:bu. (XI:20)
(Gloss: be doubled (3sm) for-them (Obl) the-punishment (Nom))
Their punishment shall be doubled....

ʔa-qaba 'to do someone wrong', 'to punish'
ma: ?u:qibtum bi-hi..... (XVI:126)
(Gloss: what have been punished (2plm) with-it (Obl))
.....the wrong that has been done you.

Form IV: aXYaZa

abda: ‘to make plain/known’
tuba: la-kum.... (V:101)
(Gloss: be made plain (3sf) (they) to-you (Obl))
.....they shall be made plain to you.

absala 'to damn'
an tuberculosis nafsun.... (VI:70)
(Gloss: lest be damned (3sf) a soul (Nom))
Lest their souls be damned....

abla: ‘to test’
(Gloss: shall-be tested (2plm) in possessions (Obl)-your)
You shall be tested in your possessions.

athaʔa ‘to cause to be followed by’, ‘to send after’
wada:ʔutiʔu:....laʔnatan. (XI:60)
(Gloss: and-were caused to be followed by (3plm) a curse (Acc))
[They] were cursed....

ʔa:ta: ‘to give’, ‘to reveal’
wada:ʔuti: bi-hi mutaṣa:bihan. (II:25)
(Gloss: and-be given (3plm) the-like (Acc))
For they shall be given the like.

aja:ba ‘to answer’, ‘to receive’
qad uji:bat da:ʔwatų-kuma:. (X:89)
(Gloss: shall be answered (3sf) prayer (Nom)-your)
Your prayer shall be answered.
**aha:** 'to encompass', 'to destroy'
wa-l-?annu: anna-hum uji:ta bi-him. (X:22)
(Gloss: and-fear (3plm) that-they be encompassed (he/lt) with-them (Obl))
They fear [that] they are encompassed....

**ahgara** 'to cause to be preoccupied with', 'to restrain'
allathi:na uhsiru:.... (II:273)
(Gloss: who be caused to be preoccupied with (3plm))
....who, being [caused to be] preoccupied with....

**ahkama** 'to perfect'
u?kimat a?ya:tu-hu:.... (XI:1)
(Gloss: be perfected (3sf) verses (Nom)-His)
....whose verses are perfected.

**ahgalla** 'to allow', 'to make lawful'
tayi:bat in uhi:la la-hum:.... ((IV:160)
(Gloss: good things were allowed (3sf) for-them (Obl))
....good things which were....allowed them.

**akraja** 'to drive', 'to raise', 'to expel'
wad:qad ujg-ijna: min diya:ri-na: (11:246)
(Gloss: and-have been driven (Iplm) from dwellings (Obl)-our)
We....have been driven from our dwellings.

**adkala** 'to admit'
(Gloss: and-be admitted (3sm) the-Paradise (Acc))
And [he] is admitted to Paradise....

**?atha:** 'to oppress', 'to hurt'
?uhi:la: min qabli:.... (VII:129)
(Gloss: were oppressed (2plm) from before (Obl))
We were oppressed before....

**arja?la** 'to refer', 'to return'
wad:ilay-hi yurja?u al-?amru kullu-hu. (XI:123)
(Gloss: and-to-Him (Obi) be referred the-thing (Nom) all (Nom)-it (Gen))
To Him all things shall be referred.

**arsala** 'to send'
allathi:na ursila ilay-him:.... (VII:6)
(gloss: who was sent (3sm) (they) to-them (Obl))
....those to whom [they] the messengers were sent....

**assasa** 'to found'
lai-masjidun ussisa:.... (IX:108)
(Gloss: a-mosque (Nom) was founded (3sm))
A mosque [was] founded....

**a?raba** 'to make/cause to drink'
wad:?u?ribu:....al-?ijla. (II:93)
(Gloss: and-were made drink (3plm) the-calf (Acc))
They were made to drink the calf.

**a?dalla** 'to misguide'
(Gloss: be misguided (3sm) with-it (Obl) who (Nom) disbelieve (3plm))
....in which the unbelievers are misguided.
**atama** 'to nourish', ‘to feed’
wa-la: yut?amu.... (VI:14)
(Gloss: and-not be nourished (3sm))
...and [he] is nourished by none.

**a2adda** 'to prepare'
al-na:ra....u?iddat [la-hum]. (II:24)
(Gloss: the-Fire (Acc) (which) was prepared (3sf) [for-them (Obl)])
...the Fire [was] prepared [for them]....

**a2ta** 'to give'
a?adda fi: min-ha:.... (IX:58)
(Gloss: but-if be given (3plm) from-it (Obi))
If [it] a share is given them....

**aga:tha** 'to shower', ‘to succour’
yuga:thu: bi-ma:?in.... (XVIII:29)
(Gloss: shall be showered (3plm) with-water (Obi))
They shall be showered with water....

**akrata** 'to force'
illa: man ukriha [?ala: al-thabhi].... (XVI:106)
(Gloss: who be forced (3sm) [on the-sacrificing (Obi)])
Those who are forced [to sacrifice]....

**alqa** 'to cast', ‘to throw off/down’
fa-tulqa: fi: jahannama.... (XVII:39)
(Gloss: lest be cast (2sm) into Hell (Obi))
....lest you should be cast into Hell....

**anzala** 'to reveal', ‘to send down’
bi-ma: unzila ilay-ka:.... (II:4)
(Gloss: with-what (Obi) be revealed (3sm) to-you (Obi))
....what has been revealed to you....

**ahalla** 'to consecrate', ‘to dedicate’
wa-ma: uhilla bi-hi.... (II:173)
(Gloss: and-what be consecrated (he/it) with-it (flesh) (Obi))
....also any flesh that is consecrated....

**awha** 'to reveal'
wa-?u:hiya ilay-ya ha:tha: al-qur?a:nu. (VI:19)
(Gloss: and-be revealed (3sm) to-me (Obl) this the-Koran (Nom))
This Koran has been revealed to me.

**Form V: taXaYYaZa**
**Taqabbala** 'to accept’
fa-tuqubbila min ahadi-hima:. (V:27)
(Gloss: then-was accepted (he/it) from one-of-them (Obl))
[Then] the offering of the one was accepted.

**Form VI: taXa:YaZa**
None

**Form VII: inXaYaZa**
Not passivisable
Form VIII: iXuYaZa

**iltaba?**a 'to follow'
allathi:na utubi?u:.... (II:166)
(Gloss: those who were followed (3plm))
Those who were followed....

**ijtaththa** 'to tear out'
ka-§ajaratin....ujtuthat.... (XIV:26)
(Gloss: like-a tree (Obl) be torn out (3sf))
...like a tree [that is] torn out....

**idiarra** 'to compel', 'to constrain'
fa-man udturra.... (II:173)
(Gloss: but-whoever be compelled (3sm))
But whoever is compelled....

**iftara**:
'to devise', 'to fabricate', 'to invent lyingly'
wa-ma: ka:na.... an yuftara:. (X:37)
(Gloss: and-this-not was to be devised (3sm))
This....could not have been devised.

Form IX: iXYaZZa

Not passivisable

Form X: istaXYaZa

**ista?ifa?tha** 'to commit to keeping', 'to entrust to', 'to confide to'
bi-ma: ustuhfiThu:.... (V:44)
(Gloss: with-what (Obl) was committed to keeping (3plm))
...[that] which had been committed to their keeping.

**ista?afa** 'to oppress', 'to abase', 'to deem weak'
li-allathi:na ustud?ifu:.... (VII:75)
(Gloss: for-those (Obl) were oppressed (3plm))
[For those] who were oppressed....

**ista?aba** 'to allow to make amends', 'to cause to suffer to make amends'
wa-la: hum yusta?tabu:na. (XVI:84)
(Gloss: and-not they be allowed to make amends (3plm))
Nor shall they be allowed to make amends.

**istahza?u** 'to ridicule', 'to mock'
wa-yustahza?u bi-ha:.... (IV:140)
(Gloss: or-be ridiculed (he/it) with-it (them) (Obl))
...or [they] are ridiculed.
Appendix B

Passives in Arabic not English

Form I: XaYaZa/XaYiZa

*athina  ‘to permit’, ‘to allow’
li-yu?thana la-hum.... (IX:90)
(Lit.: For them to be permitted....)
....begging leave to stay behind.

afaka  ‘to mislead’
unThur anna: yu?fakuna. (V:75)
(Lit.: *See how they are misled of the truth.)
See how they ignore the truth.

ba?atha  ‘to raise’, ‘to resurrect’
ila: yawmin yub?athuna.... (VII:14)
(Lit.: ....till the day when the shall be raised.)
....till the day of resurrection.

*tala:  ‘to recite’, ‘to proclaim’
itha: tuliyat....a:ya:tu-hu. (VIII:2)
(Lit.: ....if His revelations were recited.)
....as they listen to His revelations.

thakara  ‘to mention’, ‘to consecrate’
iha: thukira alla:hu.... (VIII:2)
(Lit.: ....if God was mentioned.)
....at the mention of God.

*rahima  ‘*to mercy [t-V]*’
la?alla-kum turhamu:na. (III:132)
(Lit.: *That you may be mercied.)
That you may find mercy.

radda  ‘to return’, ‘to turn upon’
ya: layta-na: nuraddu. (VII:27)
(Lit.: Would that we were returned!)
Would that we could return!

razaqa  ‘to give’, ‘to provide’
ha:tha: allahi: ruziqa:.... (II:25)
(Lit.: This is what we were given/provided....)
This is what we used to eat....

sa.?a  ‘to trouble’
wa-lamma: ja?:at....lu?tan si:?a bi-him. (XI:77)
(Lit.: And when they came to Lot, it was troubled with them.)
And when [they] came to Lot, he grew anxious about them.

saqa:  ‘to water’, ‘to give a drink’
wa-yusqa: min ma?:in sadi:din. (XIV:16)
(Lit.: And putrid water shall he be watered.)
And putrid water shall he drink.

garafa  ‘to spare’, ‘to turn towards’
wa-iha: surifat absa:ru-hum tilqa:?a.... (VII:47)
(Lit.: And when their eyes are turned towards....)
And when they turn their eyes towards....
**daraba** 'to stamp', 'to pitch'

durabat 'alay-him al-dhillatu. (III:112)

(Lit.: Ignominy shall be stamped upon them.)

Ignominy shall attend them.

**Thalama** 'to wrong'

la: taThlimu:na wa-la: tuThlamu:na. (II:279)

(Lit.: You neither wrong nor are wronged.)

[You] suffer no loss and cause loss to none.

**?athara** 'to discover', 'to find'


(Lit.: If it is discovered that both are dishonest....)

If both prove [to be] dishonest....

**ga-da** 'to abate', 'to subside'

wa-gi:da al-ma?:u. (XI:44)

(Lit.: *The floods were abated/subsided.*)

The floods abated/subsided (intr.).

**fatana** 'to afflict', 'to test'

min ba?di ma: futinu:.... (XVI:110)

(Lit.: As for those who after they have been afflicted....)

As for those who after persecution....

**qa:la** 'to say'

fa-baddal[u:....allahi: qi:la la-hum. (II:59)

(Lit.: But they perverted what was said to them.)

But [they] perverted Our Words.

**qatala** 'to slay', 'to kill'

wa-man yuqat:il....fa-yuqta:il.... (IV:74)

(Lit.: Whoever fights....and is killed....)

Whoever fights....[and] dies....

**qa:la** 'to settle, 'to resolve'

li-yuqda: ajalun musamma:.... (VI:60)

(Lit.: ....for your allotted age to be settled.)

....to fulfill your allotted span of life.

**kataba** 'to decree', 'to order'

kutiba 'alay-kum al-qita:lu. (II:216)

(Lit.: Fighting [for God's cause] is decreed upon you.)

Fighting [for God's cause] is obligatory for you.

**mala?:a** 'to fill'

wa-la: muli?ta min-hum ru?ban.... (XVIII:18)

(Lit.: ....and you were filled with terror from them.)

....and [you] fled in terror [from them].

**nagara** 'to help', 'to give help'


(Lit.: Then they shall be helped by none.)

Then there shall be none to help them.

**nahu:** 'to forbid'


(Lit.: And when they violated what they were forbidden....)

And when they....persisted in their forbidden ways....
**HADA**
‘to guide’
illa: an yuhda:.... (X:35)
(Lit.: ....and he is in need of being/needs to be guided.)
....and [he] is himself in need of guidance.

**WARITHA**
‘to be heir’, ‘to inherit’
wai ina ka:na rajulun yu:ratru kalalatun.... (IV:12)
(Lit.: *If a man is heired by no descendants....*)
If a man....leaves neither children nor parents....

**WARA**
‘to hide’
li-yubdiya la-huma: ma: wuriya ?an-huma:.... (VII:20)
(Lit.: ....to reveal to them what was hidden from them.)
....[to] reveal to them....[what] they had never seen.

**WAQADA**
‘to threaten’
(Lit.: ....until they see what they are threatened with.)
....[until] they see the fulfilment of His threats.

**FORM II: XaYYaZa**

**BAŠARA**
‘to announce’, XVI:59
min su:?:i ma: buššira bi-hi.... (XVI:59)
(Lit.: From the badness he was announced with....)
On account of the bad news [he received]....

**HARRAMA**
‘to forbid’
wai-an?awma: nurrimat Thuhu:ru:ha:.... (VI:138)
(Lit.: And beasts whose backs are forbidden [from riding].)
And....beasts which prohibit men from riding.

**HAYYA**
‘to greet’
wa-îha: huyytum bi-tahiyyatin.... (IV:86)
(Lit.: If you are greeted with a greeting....)
If a man greets you....

**THAKKARA**
‘to admonish’, ‘to remind’
fa-lamma: nasaw ma: ûhukiru: bi-hi.... (VI:44)
(Lit.: And when they had clear forgotten what they were admonished with....)
And when they had clear forgotten Our admonition....

**ZAYYANA**
‘to deck’, ‘to tempt’
(Lit.: Thus what the unbelievers did was decked [for them].)
Thus do their deeds seem fair to the unbelievers.

**SAYYARA**
‘to move’, ‘to set in motion’
(Lit.: And if a Koran with which mountains could be moved....)
And if there be a Koran that could move the mountains....

**TAWWAQA**
‘to encircle’, ‘to encompass’
saw-yutawwaqa: ma: bâkili: bi-hi. (III:180)
(Lit.: They will be encircled with what they were mean with.)
The riches they have hoarded shall become their fetters.

**ZAMMARANA**
‘to prolong’
yawaddu aladu-hum law yu:2ammaru:.... (II:96)
(Lit.: Each one of them wishes one’s life to be prolonged....)
Each one of them would love to live [long(er)]....
qatija 'to rend', 'to cleave', 'to cut off' 
aw qutti?at bi-hi al-?ardu.... (XII:31)  
(Lit.: If the earth could be rent with it (the Koran)....)  
[If it (the Koran)] could rend the earth.....

kathhaba 'to deny', 'to disbelieve'  
fa-?abar: ?ala: ma: kuththibu:.... (VI:34)  
(Lit.: But they patiently bore what they were disbelieved....)  
But they patiently bore with disbelief....

kallafa 'to charge'  
l: tukallafu illa: nafsa-ka. (IV:84)  
(Lit.: You are charged for none but yourself.)  
You are accountable for none but yourself.

kallama 'to speak to'  
aw kullima bi-hi al-mawta:.... (XIII:31)  
(Lit.: And if the dead could be spoken to with it (the Koran)....)  
And [if it (the Koran)] could make the dead speak....

najja 'to deliver', 'to save'  
ja:?a-hum nasruna: fa-nujjiya man na§a:?u. (XII:110)  
(Lit.: Our help came down to them, and whom We pleased was delivered.)  
Our help came down to them, delivering whom We pleased.

nazzala 'to send down', 'to reveal'  
law-la: nuzzila ?alay-hi a:yatun. (VI:37)  
(Lit.: Why has no sign been revealed to him?)  
Why has no sign come down to him?

waffa 'to pay', 'to give'  
(Lit.: You shall be paid/given your rewards.)  
You shall receive your rewards.

Form III: Xa:YaZa

na:da 'to call', 'to proclaim', 'to cry out'  
(Lit.: And they will be called: 'This is the Paradise for you'.)  
And a voice will cry out to them, saying: 'This is the Paradise [for you]'.

Form IV: aXYaza

atha 'to cause to be followed by', 'to send after'  
(Lit.: And they were caused to be followed by a curse in this world.)  
[And] a curse followed them in this world.

?ata 'to give', 'to reveal'  
(Lit.: And he is never given a multitude of wealth.)  
Besides, he is not rich at all.

atrafa 'to give exult'  
(Lit.: And the wrongdoers pursued the exult they had been given.)  
[And] the wrongdoers pursued their worldly pleasure.
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"aha:ta" 'to encompass', 'to destroy'
ill: an yuha:ta bi-kum.... (XII:66)
(Lit.: unless you are destroyed.)
...unless the worst befalls you.

"ahyara" 'to restrain'
fa-in uhsirtum.... (II:196)
(Lit.: If you are restrained [from making the pilgrimage]....)
If you cannot [make the pilgrimage]....

"ahsana" 'to marry a couple'
fa-tha: uhsinna fa-in atayna bi-faqi:si:at.... (IV:25)
(Lit.: If they are married [by someone] and they commit adultery....)
If after marriage they commit adultery....

"ahdara" 'to bring', 'to cause to be present'
w&:-u:dirat al-?an fu: su al-5uhhu. (IV:128)
(Lit.: And the avaricious souls were brought.)
[And] man is prone to avarice.

"ahgalla" 'to allow', 'to make lawful'
uhl:la la-kum....al-ra: fthu ila: nisa?:i-kum. (II:187)
(Lit.: Sleeping with your wives is allowed for you....)
It is....lawful for you to lie with your wives.

"?a:thu:" 'to oppress', 'to hurt'
w&:-urthu: f&: sabil:li:.... (III:195)
(Lit.: And they were hurt in My way....)
And those that suffered persecution for My sake....

"arja:ta" 'to refer', 'to return'
thumma ilay-hi turja?u:na. (II:28)
(Lit.: Will you not be returned to Him at last?)
Will you not return to Him at last?

"arsala" 'to send'
am:anu: bi-allathi: ursiitu bi-hi.... (VII:87)
(Lit.: ....[those] who believe in what I was sent with.)
....[those] who believe in my message.

"arkasa" 'to cause to suffer a setback', 'to overthrow'
urkisu: fi:-ha:. (IV:91)
(Lit.: They were overthrown in it.)
They plunge into it headlong.

"a:traka" 'to set up associates to God', 'to (cause to) be a polytheist'
inna alla:h a la: yagfiru an yu:rika bi-hi. (IV:48)
(Lit.: *God will not forgive that it is set up associates with Him.)
God will not forgive those who serve other gods besides Him.

"ata:ta" 'to obey'
illa: li-yuta:ta.... (IV:64)
(Lit.:...only so that he should be obeyed.)
.....only so that men should do their bidding.

"aita:" 'to give'
w&-in lam yu?tu: min-ha:.... (IX:58)
(Lit.: But if they are not given from it....)
But if they receive nothing....
aga:tha ‘to shower’, ‘to succour’

thumma ya?li:....?a:mun fi:-hi yuga:thu al-na:su. (XII:49)

(Lit.: Then a year in which men are showered will come.)

Then will come a year of abundant rain.

agsh: ‘to veil’, ‘to cover’

ka?anna-ma: ugSiyat wuju:hu-hum..... (X:27)

(Lit.: ...as though their faces were veiled by patches....)

.....as though patches....veiled their faces.

alq: ‘to cast’, ‘to throw off/down’

wa?-ulqiya al-saharatu sa:jidi:na. (VII:120)

(Lit.: And the enchanters were cast to prostrate themselves.)

And the enchanters prostrated themselves.

anthara ‘to warn’

wa-li-yuntharu: bi-hi. (XIV:52)

(Lit.: Let them be warned with it.)

Let them take heed [with it].

ahlaka ‘to destroy’, ‘to annihilate’

hal yuhlaku illa: al-qawmu al-Tha:limu:na. (VI:47)

(Lit.: Would any be annihilated but the transgressors?)

Would any perish but the transgressors?

awratha ‘to give as inheritance’


(Lit.: You have been given it (Paradise) as inheritance with what you have done.)

You have earned [it (Paradise)] with your labours.

Form V: taXaYYaZa

None

Form VI: taXa:YaZa

None

Form VII: inXaYaZa

Not passivisable

Form VIII: iXtaYaZa

i?tamana ‘to trust’, ‘to entrust’


(Lit.: Let him who is entrusted restore his trust.)

Let the trustee restore the pledge to its owner.

iktalafa ‘to disagree’, ‘to differ in opinion’, ‘to dispute’

fa-uktulifa fi:-hi. (XI:110)

(Lit.: But it was disagreed about it (the Book).)

But differences arose about it (the Book).

iftara: ‘to devise’, ‘to fabricate’, ‘to invent lyingly’

ma: ka:na had:thi:na yuftara:. (XII:111)

(Lit.: It was not a tale which was devised.)

This is no invented tale.
Form IX: iXYaZZa
Not passivisable

Form X: istaXYaZa
istaXYaZa 'to persecute', 'to oppress, 'to abase', 'to deem weak'
(Lit.: We gave those who were persecuted dominion [in the land]....)
We gave the persecuted people dominion [in the land]....
Appendix C

Passives in English not Arabic

Absolve  qalbu-hu mutma'innun. (XVI:106)
(Lit.: Their hearts shall be at ease (Nomen Patientis).)
Their hearts shall be absolved [by Us].

accept  [wa-] la: tanfa?u-ha: šafa'atun. (II:122)
(Lit.: [And] an intercession shall not benefit it (the soul).)
No intercession shall be accepted from it (the soul).

(Lit.: [And] God's ordains-accomplished (Nomen Patientis).)
God's ordains shall be accomplished.

(Lit.: [From] the angels-accoutred (Nomen Patientis).)
The angels [will be] accoutred.

admit  [an] yadḳula al-jannata. (II:111)
(Lit.: He shall enter the Paradise.)
[He] shall be admitted to Paradise.

allow  tasri:h u n  bi-ihsa:nin. (11:229)
(Lit.: [She must have] the allowance (Verbal Nominal) to go with kindness.)
She must be allowed to go with kindness.

arm  wa-l-ya?ku:thu: aslihata-hum. (IV:102)
(Lit.: Let them take their weapons.)
Let them be armed.

array  yalbasu:na thiya:ban. (XVIII:31)
(Lit.: They shall be arrayed in garments.
They shall be arrayed in garments.

assemble  yawm un majmu?:un lahu al-na:su. (XI:103)
(Lit.: On the day assembling (Nomen Agentis) all men.)
On the day all men shall be assembled.

assist  inna-hu ka:na mangu:ran. (XVII:33)
(Lit.: His victim-assisted (Nomen Patientis).)
His victim will...be assisted.

attach  fa-la: juna:ha 2alay-kum. (II:240)
(Lit.: There shall be no blame [to attach] to you.)
No blame shall be attached to you.

bear  taqmilu-hu al-mala?:ikatu. (II:248)
(Lit.: The angels will bear it.)
It will be borne by the angels.

beat  wa-al-mawqu:thatu. (V:3)
(Lit.: And the animals-dead by beating (Nomen Patientis).)
[And the animals] that are beaten...to death.

bend  [ku:thu:-hum] in kuntum fa?:ili:na. (XV:71)
(Lit.: [Take them] if you are bending on evil (Nomen Agentis).)
[Take them] if you are bent on evil.
bestow  min ba'di ma: ja?at-hu [al-bayyinatu].... (II:211)  
(Lit.: After it (the sign) has come down to him....)  
After it (the sign) has been bestowed on him....

bewitch  ka-allathji: istahwat-hu al-saya:ti:nu. (VI:71)  
(Lit.: Like [the man] whom the devils bewitched....)  
Like men who, being bewitched by devils....

bind  wa-?ulu: al-ar?ha:mi:.... (VIII:75)  
(Lit.: And those who are relatives by wombs....)  
[And] those who are bound by ties of blood....

blacken  yawma:....taswaddu wuju:hun. (III:106)  
(Lit.: On the day some faces will blacken (Reflexive).)  
On the day some faces will be....blackened.

(Lit.: On the righteous there shall be no blame (Verbal Nominal).)  
The righteous shall not be blamed.

blast  fa-?aga:ba-ha: i?ga:run fi:-hi na:run. (II:266)  
(Lit.: Then a fiery whirl-wind blasted it.)  
[Then it] was blasted....by a fiery whirl-wind.

bless  in tamsas-kum ?asadatun tasu?-hum. (III:120)  
(Lit.: When a fortune befalls you they grieve.)  
When you are blessed with good fortune they grieve.

break  la-qad taqatta?a bayna-kum [al-wi:si:lu]. (VI:94)  
(Lit.: The ties between you broke (Reflexive).)  
....the ties which bound you [are broken].

bring  sa-yah§uru-hum ilay-hi jami:?an. (IV:172)  
(Lit.: He shall bring them all before Him.)  
[They] shall be brought [all] before Him.

burn  fa-sawfa:nu?li:-hi na:ran. (IV:30)  
(Lit.: Then We shall burn him in Fire.)  
[Then he] shall be burned in Fire [by Us].

bury  wa-ka:na ta?ha-hu kanzun la-huma:. (XVIII:82)  
(Lit.: And there is a treasure beneath it for them.)  
[And] beneath it their treasure is buried.

(Lit.: We announce to you a son whose name [shall be] John.)  
You shall be given a son, and he shall be called John.

carry out  wa-lamma: ja?:a amru-na:.... (XI:94)  
(Lit.: And when Our judgement came down (intr.)....)  
And when Our judgement was carried out....

cast  wa-man ya?si ala:ha:....yudkil-hu na:ran. (IV:14)  
(Lit.: But he who defies God....He shall cast him into a Fire.)  
But he that defies God....shall be cast into a Fire.

chain  yadu alla:hi maglu:latun. (V:64)  
(Lit.: God's hand-chained (Nomen Patientis).)  
God's hand is chained.
charge with  ka-sayyibin...fi:-hi Thuluma:tun wa-ra?dun.... (II:19)
(Lit.: Like a storm-cloud in which [there is/are] darkness and thunder....)
[Like] a dark storm-cloud [which is] charged with thunder....

choose  wa-ka-tha:lika yajtabi:-ka rabhu-ka. (XII:6)
(Lit.: And thus your Lord shall choose you.)
[And thus] you shall be chosen by your Lord.

cleanse  kuth min amwa:ll-him ṣadaqatan tutahhiru-hum. (IX:103)
(Lit.: Take alms from them, so that they (the alms) may thereby cleanse them.)
Take alms from them, so that they (them) may thereby be cleansed.

clothe  wa-?ala: al-mawlu:di....kiswa?tu-hunna. (II:233)
(Lit.: [It is incumbent] on the child’s father to clothe them.)
They must be clothed....by the child’s father.

comfort  wa-li-tatm a?in n a q u lu :b u -k u m .... (Ill: 126)
(Lit.: ....[a nd] so that your hearts might be at ease (Reflexive).)
....[and] so that your hearts might be comforted.

compare  ka-man ba?:a bi-sukțin min alla:hi..... (III:162)
(Lit.: [Is he] like him who has incurred God’s anger?)
Can the man....be compared to him who has incurred God’s anger?

complete  li-man ara:da an yutimma al-rida:?ata.... (II:233)
(Lit.: ....if the father wishes [them] to complete the suckling.)
....if the father wishes the suckling to be completed [for them].

(Lit.: ....a bargain which you conclude on the spot between you.)
....a bargain [which is] concluded on the spot [by you].

(Lit.: It is an appointed timing [incumbent] on the faithful.)
[It is] incumbent on the faithful to be conducted at appointed ours.

confront  yawma ta?jidu kullu na?sin ma: ?amilat.... (III:30)
(Lit.: ....when each soul will find what it has done.)
....when each soul will be confronted with [what] it has done.

(Lit.: The Fire shall be his consignment (Verbal Nominal).)
[He] shall be consigned to the Fire.

consume  jannatu?u....fa-ihtaraqat. (II:266)
(Lit.: A garden which consumed (Reflective)....)
A garden [which] was consumed....

consummate  in tallaqtum al-nisa?:a ma:-lam tamassu:-hunna.... (II:236)
(Lit.: ....to divorce your wives before you consummate them.)
....to divorce your wives before the marriage is consummated.

corrupt  la-fasad at al-?ardu.... (II:251)
(Lit.: ....the earth would have become corrupt/putrid (intr.).)
....the earth would have been....corrupted.

curse  ula?:ika yaf?anu-hum alla:hu. (II:159)
(Lit.: Those [people], God shall curse them.)
Those [people] shall be cursed by God.
cut
(Lit.: until their hearts cut into pieces (Reflexive).)
...until their hearts are cut into pieces.
daut
(Lit.: They did never daunt (intr.) for what befell them.)
...they were never daunted by what befell them.
deceive
(Lit.: Their own lies deceive them in their religion.)
...In their religion they are deceived by their own lies.
declare
fa-?thanu: bi-harbin min allah?i..... (II:279)
(Lit.: ...or expect war [against you] from God.)
...or war shall be declared against you by God.
decree
wa-lawla: kalimatun sabaqat.... (XI:110)
(Lit.: And but for a Word which has already anteceded (intr.)....)
...And but for a Word [which has] already been decreed....
defeat
thumma sarafa-kum ?an-hum li-yabitliya-kum. (III:152)
(Lit.: Then He allowed them to defeat you in order to test you.)
[Then] He allowed you to be defeated [by them] in order to test you.
delay
ma: yahbisu-hu. (XI:8)
(Lit.: What [is the reason that] delays it?)
...Why is it delayed?
deliver
fa-lamma: waga?uat-ha:..... (III:36)
(Lit.: And when she bore her (the child)....)
...And when she was delivered of the [female] child....
deny
(Lit.: The bounty of your Lord-not interdicted (Nomen Patientis).)
...None shall be denied the bounty of your Lord.
destroy
anna da:bira ha:-?ula:?! maqta:2un.... (XV:66)
(Lit.: ...for these [wrongdoers]-rooted out (Nomen Patientis).)
...for the wrongdoers were to be utterly destroyed.
deviser
(Lit.: [They] are abominations from the deeds (Verbal Nominal) of Satan.)
[They] are abominations [which are] devised by Satan.
dim
wa?-ala: abs?ri-him gi?sa:watun. (II:7)
(Lit.: On their sights [there is] dimness (Verbal Nominal).)
...Their sight is dimmed.
direct
wa-bi-al-najmi hum yahtadu:na. (XVI:16)
(Lit.: And by the stars they guide themselves (Reflexive).)
...By the stars, too, men [are] directed.
discomfit
li-yuhiqqa al-haqqa wa-yubjila al-ba?tila. (VIII:8)
(Lit.: ...in order to verify Truth and falsify falsehood.)
...so that Truth should triumph and falsehood be discomfited.
disease
wa-alla?hi:na fi: qulubi-him mar?alun.... (VIII:49)
(Lit.: And those in whose hearts [there was] a disease (Verbal Nominal)....)
...And those whose hearts were diseased....
dispute


(Lit.: ...those who believed in what they differed about the truth.)
...those who believed in the truth which had been disputed.

distress

wa-qa?:iqun bi-hi sardru-ka. (XI:12)

(Lit.: And your heart-distressing with it (Nomen Agentis).)
And [your heart] shall be distressed [by it].

divide


(Lit.: Why are you two sects concerning the hypocrites?)
Why are you...divided concerning the hypocrites?

divorce

hatta: tankiha zawjan gayra-hu fa-in ́allaqa-ha;.... (II:230)

(Lit.: ...until she has wedded another man and he has divorced her.)
...until she has wedded another man and been divorced by him.

do

hatta: ja?:a al-haqqu.... (IX:48)

(Lit.: ...until justice came down.)
...but in the end justice was done.

double


(Lit.: Give them a punishment doubling (Verbal Nominal) in the Fire.)
Let their punishment be doubled in the Fire.

doubt

tha:lika al-kita:bu la: rayba fi:-hi. (II:2)

(Lit.: This Book in which [there] must be no doubt.)
This Book is not to be doubted.

drive (out)

ith akruja-hu alathina kafaru;.... (IX:40)

(Lit.: When the unbelievers drove him out....)
When he was driven out by the unbelievers....

drown

inna-hum mugraqu:na. (XI:37)

(Lit.: Indeed they all-drowned (Nomen Patientis).)
[Indeed] they shall all be drowned [by Us].

encamp

ith antum bi-al-?udwati al-dunya:. (VIII:42)

(Lit.: You were on this side of the valley.)
You were encamped on this side of the valley.

end

fa-itha: qadaytum al-sala:ta.... (IV:103)

(Lit.: When you end your prayers....)
When your prayers are ended [by you]....

endow

ya: uli: al-alba:bi. (II:197)

(Lit.: Oh people of understanding!)
You that are endowed with understanding [by Us]!

endure

mathalu allathina kalaw min qabli-kum.... (II:214)

(Lit.: ...like those who endured [the suffering] before you.)
...[like] the suffering which was endured by those before you.

enjoin

nika:lan min alla:hi. (V:38)

(Lit.: [That is] a punishment from God.)
That is the punishment [which is] enjoined by God.

equip

in firu;....thiqa:lan. (IX:41)

(Lit.: If you are with their] weapons, march on....)
[If you are equipped [by them], march on....
exalt
la-hum daraja: tun 2inda rabbihim. (VIII:4)
(Lit.: They will have [special] ranks in the presence of their Lord.)
They will be exalted....by their Lord.

expose
fa-in kitum fa-rija:lan. (II:239)
(Lit.: And if you fear [danger], then pray on foot.)
[And] when you are exposed to danger [then] pray on foot.

favour
wa-min al-muqarrabi:na [ila: allahi]. (III:45)
(Lit.: And [he] shall be one of God's favourites.)
And [he] shall be favoured by God.

fill
wa-jilat qulu:bu-hum.... (VIII:2)
(Lit.: ....those whose hearts fear (intr.) [Us].)
....those whose hearts are filled with awe [by Us].

find
wa-in....lam tajidu: ka:tiban.... (II:283)
(Lit.: And if ....you cannot find a scribe....)
[And] if....a scribe cannot be found [by you]....

finish
qabla an tanfada kalima:tu rabb-i:.... (XVIII:109)
(Lit.: ....before the words of my Lord finished (intr.).)
....before the words of my Lord were finished [by Him].

fix
wa-li-kulli ummatin ajalun. (VII:34)
(Lit.: And for every nation [there is] a space of time [from Me].)
[And] a space of time is fixed for every nation [by Me].

follow
wa-ma:....ittaba?a-ka ilia: allathi:na hum artha:lu-na:. (XI:27)
(Lit.: None but the lowliest of our men follow you.)
[You] are not followed by any but the lowliest of our men.

forbid
gayra muhilli: al-saydi wa-?antum hurumun. (V:1)
(Lit.: You not-allowing (Nomen Agentis) game while you are on pilgrimage.)
Game is forbidden while you are on pilgrimage.

forewarn
(Lit.: Consider the fate of the people-forewarned (Nomen Patientis).)
Consider the fate of those [people] who were forewarned [by Us].

forget
ma: nansaku min a:yatin aw nuni-ha:.... (II:106)
(Lit.: If We abrogate a verse or cause [people] to forget it....)
If We abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten [by people]....

forgive
la-hum ....2inda rabbihim.....magfiratun. (VIII:4)
(Lit.: They will have forgiveness in the presence of their Lord.)
They will be forgiven by their Lord.

free
li-allathi: Thanna anna-hu najin.... (XVII:42)
(Lit.: ....who knew he would be the saviour of himself (Nomen Agentis).)
....[the one] who knew [he] would be freed [by Us].

fulfil
(Lit.: On the day its fulfilment (the Book) comes down [from Us]....)
On the day it (the Book) is fulfilled [by Us]....

gather
hatta: idda:rahu: fi:-ha: jami:2an.... (VII:38)
(Lit.: [And] when they all gathered (Reflexive) in it (the Fire)....)
And when all are gathered there (in the Fire)....
give
Baḍa allathi: jaʔa-ka min al-ʔiḥmi.... (II:120)
(Lit.: After all the knowledge which has come down to you [from Us]....)
After all the knowledge [which] you have been given [by Us]....

gore
wa-al-mutaraddiyyatu. (V:3)
(Lit.: [You are forbidden the flesh of] those animals that are dead from goring.)
You are forbidden the flesh of those animals that are gored to death.

ground
wa-al-ra:sikuna fi: al-ʔiḥmi.... (III:7)
(Lit.: And those-grounding (Nomen Patientis) in knowledge [from Us]....)
[And] those who are....grounded in knowledge [by Us]....

guide
ulaʔika ḥala: hudan min rabbi-him. (II:5)
(Lit.: These are on the right guidance from their Lord.)
These are rightly guided by their Lord.

harden
wa-lac̱kin qasat qulubu-hum. (VI:43)
(Lit.: But their hearts hardened (intr.).)
But their hearts were hardened.

hear
(Lit.: My Lord is indeed the hearer (Nomen Agentis) of [all my] prayers.)
All my prayers are [indeed] heard by Him (my Lord).

herald
wa-min qabli-hi kita:bu mu:sa:. (XI:17)
(Lit.: And the Book of Moses heralded it (the sign).)
And [it (the sign) was] heralded by the Book of Moses.

hide
(Lit.: Nor was God to reveal to you-the hiding (Verbal Nominal).)
Nor was God to reveal to you what is hidden [by Him].

hold
la-hum fi: al-dunya: ḥizyun. (II:114)
(Lit.: They shall have shame in this world.)
They shall be held up to shame in this world.

ignore
ʔa:sal: allahu bi-duʔaʔi rabb-i: ḥaqiyyan. (XIX:48)
(Lit.: I trust that I will not be unlucky with my prayers to my Lord.)
[I] trust that my prayers will not be ignored [by my Lord].

impose
tawbatan min allahi.... (IV:92)
(Lit.: [Such is] a penance from God....)
Such is the penance imposed by God....

infect
fa-amma: allahi:na fi: qulubi-him zayguns.... (III:7)
(Lit.: As for those in whose hearts [there is] disbelief....)
[As for] those whose hearts are infected with disbelief....

inflict
(Lit.: On them half of the penalty [that is] on free adulteresses.)
They shall suffer half the penalty [that is] inflicted upon free adulteresses.

inscribe
 kita:ban fi: quṭa:sin.... (VI:7)
(Lit.: A Book [which is] in real parchment....)
A Book [which is] inscribed on real parchment....

inspire
arsalân min qabli-ka....rija:lan nuʔhi: ilay-him. (XII:109)
(Lit.: We sent before you....apostles whom We inspired.)
....the apostles whom We sent before you....[were] inspired by Our will.
intermix  kalatu: ?amalan satlihan wa-?a'kara sayyi?an. (IX:102)
(Lit.: They had intermixed good works with evil ones.)
Their good works had been intermixed with evil [by them].

judge  ta'a:law ila: ma: anzala alla:hu. (IV:61)
(Lit.: Come to what God has revealed.)
Come to be judged by that which God has revealed.

kill  wa-al-na?i?atu:... (V:3)
(Lit.: [You are forbidden the flesh of] those animals that die from falling.)
[You are forbidden the flesh of] those animals [that are] killed by a fall.

know  wa-ma: tasqatu min waraqatun illa: ya?lamu:ha: (VI:59)
(Lit.: He knows every leaf that falls.)
Every leaf that falls is known to Him.

(Lit.: Those [people], there shall be a curse for them.)
A curse shall be laid on them.

lead (astray)  ta?a:law ila: m a: an zala alla:hu. (IV:61)
(Lit.: Come to what God has revealed.)
Come to be judged by that which God has revealed.

leave  wa-masqutu min waraqatun illa: ya?lamu:ha: (V:39)
(Lit.: He who killed a soul is like him who had killed all mankind.)
Whoever killed...shall be looked upon as though he had killed all mankind.

look upon  wa-ala: al-mawlu:di rizqu-hunna. (II:233)
(Lit.: It is incumbent on the child’s father to maintain them.)
They must be maintained by the child’s father.

(Lit.: He who killed a soul is like him who had killed all mankind.)
Whoever killed...shall be looked upon as though he had killed all mankind.

maintain  yuhibbu-hum wa yuhibbu:nu-hu:... (V:54)
(Lit.: ...He loves them and they love Him.)
...[others] who love Him and are loved by Him.

make  qa:la allah:ti:na min qabli-him mithla qawli-him. (II:118)
(Lit.: Those before them made the same demand (statement).)
The same demand (statement) was made by those before them.

make known  ?amma: ja:ka min al-haqqi.... (V:48)
(Lit.: ...from the truth which came down to you.)
...from the truth [which was] made known to you.

mangle  wa-ma: akala al-sab?u. (V:3)
(Lit.: ...or of those that beasts of prey mangled.)
...or [of those that were] mangled by beasts of prey.

(Lit.: Those whose endeavours in this world went astray (intr.)....)
Those whose endeavours in this world are misguided....

(Lit.: Those who go astray (intr.) with their desires....)
Those that are misled...by their desires....
mix
aw ma: igtalata bi-?aThmin.... (VI:146)
(Lit.: ...and what mixes (Reflexive) with [their] bones.)
...and what is mixed with their bones.

number
fa-?ula:?ika ma?a al-mu?mini:na. (IV:146)
(Lit.: [We shall number] those [people] with the faithful.)
They shall be numbered with the faithful [by Us].

note down
illa: absa:-ha:. (XVIII:49)
(Lit.: He notes down all [tidings].)
All [tidings] is noted down [by Him].

oppress
(Lit.: We-oppressed (Nomen Patientis) in the land.)
We were oppressed [by them] in the land.

ordain
wa-ma: a?sa:ba:-kum....fa-bi-?ithni alla?hi. (III:166)
(Lit.: And what befell you....was God's will.)
[And] the misfortune which befell you....was ordained by God.

overcome
i?h yuga?Si:-kum al-nu?wa:sa. (VIII:11)
(Lit.: He caused sleep to overcome you.)
You were overcome by sleep [by Him].

overtake
wa-qad balaga-ni: al-kibaru.... (III:40)
(Lit.: And old age has now overtaken me.)
[And] when I am now overtaken by old age.

overthrow
wa-zahaqa al-ba?i?lu. (XVII:83)
(Lit.: And falsehood has come to nothing (intr.).)
[And] falsehood has been overthrown [by Us].

pardon
(Lit.: Then God shall pardon him.)
[Then he] shall be pardoned by God.

pass
(Lit.: Then judgement verifies itself (Reflexive) on it.)
[Then] judgement is irrevocably passed [on it by Us].

pay
fa-diyyatun musallamatun. (IV:92)
(Lit.: Then blood-money-delivered (Nomen Patientis).)
[Then] the blood-money must be paid.

perfect
wa-tammat kalimatu rabbi-ka. (VI:115)
(Lit.: *And you Lord's word has perfected (Reflexive).)
[And] perfected are the words of your lord [by Him].

persecute
(Lit.: You-persecuted (Nomen Patientis) in the land.)
[You were] persecuted in the land [by them].

plant
jannatun min nak?i?lin. (II:266)
(Lit.: A garden of palm trees from Us.)
A garden [that is] planted with palm trees [by Us].

plunge
fa-i?tha: hum mublisu?na. (VI:44)
(Lit.: And they-plunging (Nomen Agentis) into utter despair.)
And they were plunged into utter despair.
pollute
wa-in kuntum junuhani. (V:6)
(Lit.: And if you-unclean (Nomen Patientis)....)
[And] if you [were] polluted....

preordain
wa-ja2ala la-hum ajalan. (XVII:99)
(Lit.: And He preordains a fate for them.)
[And] their fate is preordained [by Him].

pronounce
al-2ala:qu marrata:ni. (II:229)
(Lit.: [The pronouncement (Verbal Nominal) of] divorce may be twice.)
Divorce may be pronounced twice.

prosecute
fa-ittiba?:un bi-al-ma?ru:fl. (II:178)
(Lit.: [his] prosecution (Verbal Nominal) shall be according to usage.)
He....shall be prosecuted according to usage.

puff up
wa-hum mustakbiru:na. (XVI:122)
(Lit.: And they-proud (Nomen Agentis).)
And [they] are puffed up with pride.

punish
wa-la-hum ?atha: bun al:mun. (II:10)
(Lit.: And they shall have stern punishment (Verbal Nominal).)
[And] they shall be sternly punished.

purge
ba?da islahi:ha:.... (VII:56)
(Lit.: ....after its purgatory (Verbal Nominal).)
.....after it has been purged of evil [by Us].

purify
kuth min amwati:him gadaqata:n...tuzakki:-him. (IX:103)
(Lit.: Take alms from them, so that they (the alms) may thereby purify them.)
Take alms from them, so that they (them) may thereby....be purified.

pursue
fa-?atha:2a-hu s?ha:bun mubi:nun.... (XV:18)
(Lit.: .....fiery comets pursue him (them).)
....[he is] (they are) pursued by fiery comets.

put
(Lit.: And they felt shame (Reflexive).)
And [they were] put to shame.

question
(Lit.: Each of his senses-responsible (Nomen Patientis).)
Each of his senses shall be....questioned [by Us].

raise
a-2ina: la-fi: kalqin jadi:dim. (XIII:5)
(Lit.: Shall we be in a new creation?)
Shall we be raised to life again?

read
yatlu:na-hu 2aqqa tila:wati:hi. (II:121)
(Lit.: They read it (the Koran) the right [way] of its reading (Verbal Nominal).)
[They] read it (the Koran) as it ought to be read.

recite
wa-yatlu:hu s?ahi:dun min-hu. (XI:17)
(Lit.: And a witness from Him recites it (the Koran).)
[And it (the Koran)] is recited by a witness from Him.

reconcile
in yri:da: islahian.... (IV:35)
(Lit.: If they want a reconciliation (Verbal Nominal)....)
If they wish to be reconciled....
record
illa: fi: kita:bin mubi:nin.... (VI:59)
(Lit.: ...but it is (they are) in a glorious Book.)
...but [it is] (they are) recorded in a glorious Book.

reduce
fa-taq?uda: ...mahs?uran. (XVII:29)
(Lit.: For then you should remain penurious (Nomen Patientis).)
For then you should be reduced to penury.

regard
(Lit.: And he who saved it (a soul) is like him who saved all mankind.)
And whoever saved [it] shall be regarded as though he had saved all mankind.

repay
(Lit.: He that does a good deed shall have tenfold.)
He that does a good deed shall be repaid tenfold.

reprieve
inna-ka min al-munThari:na. (VII:15)
(Lit.: You are from the reprieved (Nomen Patientis).)
You are reprieved [by Me].

reproach
fa-taq?uda malu:man. (XVII:29)
(Lit.: For then you should remain blameworthy (Nomen Patientis).)
For then you should be reproached [by them].

requite
la-ha: ma: kasabat.... (II:286)
(Lit.: It (the soul) shall have whatever it has none.)
It (the soul) shall be requited for whatever...it has done.

restore
fa-itha: am intum fa-ithkuru: alla:ha. (II:239)
(Lit.: And if you feel safe (intr.) then remember God.)
And when you are restored to safety [then] remember God.

retain
fa-?imsa:ku:n bi-?a?ru:fin.... (II:229)
(Lit.: ...and then retention (Verbal Nominal) [of a woman] in honour.)
...and then a woman must be retained in honour.

reveal
fa-?imma: ya?tiyanna-kum min-ni: hudan.... (II:38)
(Lit.: But when a guidance (Verbal Nominal) comes down to you from Me....)
[But] when My guidance is revealed [to you]....

reward
fa-la-hum ajru-hum ?inda rabbi-him. (II:62)
(Lit.: Then they shall have their reward from their Lord.)
[Then] they shall be rewarded by their Lord.

ruin
wa-lan tuslihu: ithan abadan. (XVIII:20)
(Lit.: And then you will never triumph.)
Then you will surely be ruined [by Us].

sanction
(Lit.: ...serving idols that God did not sanction [for you].)
...serving idols [which are] not sanctioned by God [for you].

scourge
massa-na: wa-?ahlu-na: al-durru. (XII:88)
(Lit.: Famine befell us and our people.)
We and our people are scourged with famine.

seal
(Lit.: Such are those, God has sealed their hearts....)
Such are those whose hearts....are sealed by God.
seduce

\textit{inna-ma: is}tazalla-hum al-\textit{\^a}ya:nu. (III:155)

(Lit.: Those [people], Satan must have seduced them.)

[Those people] must have been seduced by Satan.

seize

\textit{man ya?i:-hi 2a\^atha:}bun y\^ukzi:-hi...... (XI:39)

(Lit.: He to whom a scourge will come down and disgrace him....)

[He] who will be seized by a scourge that shall disgrace him....

sell

\textit{wa-tija:}ratun ta\^sk\^awna kasa:da-ha:...... (IX:24)

(Lit.: And the merchandise you fear its unsalableness (Verbal Nominal)....)

[And] the merchandise you fear may not be sold....

send (forth)

\textit{wa-la:Kin-ni: rasu:}lu 

m in rabbi al-\^a:lam:i:na. (VII:61)

(Lit.: And I am a messenger from the Lord of the Universe.)

[And] I am sent forth by the Lord of the Universe.

set (free)

\textit{aw tafri:}du: la-hunna fari:datan.... (II:236)

(Lit.: ....or you settle the dowry for them (the spouses).)

.....or the dowry is settled [for them (the spouses) by you].

share


(Lit.: These are for the faithful in the life of this world [and others share them].)

These are for the....faithful in the life of this world (though shared by others).

sharpen

\textit{asmi? bi-him wa-?absir.} (XIX:38)

(Lit.: Sharpen their hearing and sight!)

Their hearing and sight shall be sharpened!

shear

\textit{ma: la-}ha: min qara:rin. (XIV:26)

(Lit.: [It (a tree) will have no roots.] [It (a tree) will be] shorn of all its roots.

show


(Lit.: When they (the signs) came down to us....)

When they (the signs) were shown to us....

slay

\textit{allajhi:}na kuti\^ba \^alay-him al-qatlu:.... (III:154)

(Lit.: Those [of you] who were destined to slaughter (Verbal Nominal)....)

Those of you who were destined to be slain....

smite

\textit{wa-yahillu ?alay-hi \^atha:}bu muq\^im:mun. (XI:39)

(Lit.: And an everlasting scourge will smite him.)

And [he] will be smitten by a scourge everlasting.

spread

\textit{ma:?idatan min al-sama?:i:....} (V:114)

(Lit.: A table from heaven [which We will spread with food]....)

From heaven a table [which will be] spread with food [by Us]....

steep

\textit{Thalimi: anfusi-him:....} (IV:97)

(Lit.: ....while they-wronging themselves (Nomen Agentis).)

.....while [they] are steeped in sin [by Satan].

strengthen

\textit{la-ka:}na:....a\^sadda tathbi:tan. (IV:66)

(Lit.: .... it (their faith) would have been much stronger.)

.....and their faith would have been strengthened.
subdue
wa-hum sa:giru:na. (IX:29)
(Lit.: And [We make them] utterly lowly (Nomen Agentis).)
And [they] are utterly subdued [by Us].

take
fa-riha:nun maqbu:datun. (II:283)
(Lit.: Then pledges-in receipt (Nomen Patientis).)
Then let pledges be taken.

tell
ha:tha: ma: kanaztum. (IX:35)
(Lit.: [We will tell them]: 'This is what you hoarded'.)
They will be told: 'These are the riches which you hoarded'.

tempt
itla: massa-hum ta:?ifun min al-sayta:ni.... (VII:201)
(Lit.: If Satan tempts those [people]....)
If those [people]...are tempted by Satan....

threaten
wa-ka:na wa?dan ma?u:lan.... (XVII:5)
(Lit.: And [We] carried out the punishment [with which We had threatened you].)
And [We] carried out the punishment with which you had been threatened.

throne
wa-ka:na 2ar?hu 2ala: al-ma?:i. (XI:7)
(Lit.: His throne was above the waters.)
[He] was throne above the waters.

touch
wa-lam yamsas-ni: ba?arun.... (XIV:20)
(Lit.: And when no man has touched me [said she]....)
[And] when I have [never] been touched by any man [said she]....

tread
wa-la-hum fi:-ha: azwa:jun mutahharatun. (xI:25)
(Lit.: They will have chaste virgins [in wedding (Verbal Nominal)].)
[They will be] wedded to chaste virgins.

trouble
qad ahammat-hum anfusu-hum. (III:154)
(Lit.: Their own fancies have troubled them.)
[They have been] troubled by their own fancies.

turn
a-?itha: kunna: ?iTha:man wa-rafa:tan.... (XVII:49)
(Lit.: When we are bones and dust....)
When we are turned to bones and dust [by Him]....

utter
min al-qawli illa: man Thulima.... (IV:148)
(Lit.: ......except for the utterance (Verbal Nominal) from a man who is wronged.)
......except when [words] are uttered by a man who is wronged.

vouchsafe
(Lit.: Indeed the signs are at the presence of God.)
[Indeed the] signs are vouchsafed by God.

warn
a-fa-la: tatathakkaru:na. (VI:80)
(Lit.: Will you not remember [Our warning]?)
Will you not be warned [by Us]?
**weigh**

wa-al-wazmu yawma-?ihin al-haqqu. (VII:8)
(Lit.: On that day the weighing (Verbal Nominal) [of all] will be with justice.)
On that day all shall be weighed with justice.

**well out**

wa-fa:ra al-tannu:ru. (XI:40)
(Lit.: And the Oven welled (intr.) out water.)
And water [was] welled out from the Oven.

**withhold**

fa-lamma: ra?a: aydi:-him la: taʃilu ilay-hi.... (XI:70)
(Lit.: But when he saw [that] their hands did not reach it....)
But when he saw their hands being withheld from it....
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