

- Jespersen, O., 1937. *Analytic Syntax*. Copenhagen.
 Lyons, J., 1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge.
 Mishor, M., 1987. 'Latset Tetse' etc., *Language Studies* 2-3, 177-197. [In Hebrew].
 Ornan, U., 1969. *Syntax of Modern Hebrew*. Jerusalem [In Hebrew].
 Rosén, H. B., 1966. *Good Hebrew, Studies in Syntax*. Jerusalem [In Hebrew].
 Ross, J. R., 1986. *Infinite Syntax*. New-Jersey.
 Rubinstein, E., 1969. *The Nominal Sentence, Studies in Contemporary Syntax*. Tel Aviv [In Hebrew].
 Schwartzwald, O., 1976. Regarding the Grammaticality and Creation of Extrapositional Sentences, *Bar Ilan Annual* 13, 321-340. Ramat Gan [In Hebrew].

Adrian Măcelaru

Center for Arab Studies,
University of BucharestON THE ORIGIN OF THE INTRANSITIVE FORM IV VERBS
IN CLASSICAL ARABIC

1. Introduction

It is common knowledge that Proto-Semitic had a prefix $*\check{s}(a)^1$ which would serve the function of deriving causatives from basic verbs (Kienast 2001:484). The antiquity of this morpheme must be extremely remarkable since an affix /s/ with causative meaning is attested in many other branches of the Afroasiatic phylum, as for instance Berber, Cushitic and Egyptian. The sibilant $*\check{s}$ of this Proto-Semitic prefix has subsequently undergone, in a number of Semitic languages, phonetic changes, becoming /ha-/. In other Semitic languages this phonetic change has went even further so that the prefix under discussion has ended up as /'a-/. Classical Arabic belongs to this last category, although it preserves relics of the preceding two stages; thus, the 'sibilant-stage' can be seen in Form X, *istaf'ala*, while the 'laryngeal h stage' is met in a few verbs, cf. *harāqa* 'pour out' < *rāqa* 'flow out, pour fourth' (Fleisch 1979:II,283).

The Arabic verbal form derived by means of the prefix 'a- is usually called Form IV. Its original Semitic (and most likely even originally Afroasiatic) basic meaning is causative. As it is often the case with derivational morphemes, Classical Arabic Form IV displays, beside the causative value, other meanings, too. Thus, there are Form IV verbs having the same meaning as the basic verbs from which they are derived. Then, there are Form IV verbs that have noncausative values. Larcher (2003:53-65) classifies these noncausative meanings of Form IV verbs:

¹ We are not tackling here the question whether the vowel /a/ following the sibilant is part of the causative prefix or has an epenthetic origin, since neither possibility impinges on the results of our present discussion.

'expositive', 'privative', 'tropative', 'implicitly reflexive factitive', 'meritative', 'deventive' and 'adverbial'.

The way these noncausative meanings might be correlated with the originally causative value and, eventually, driven back to the latter has been subject of interest many studies. One of the latest and most important discussions of the issue is that carried out by Larcher (2003:53-67). The most difficult challenge one has to overcome while approaching this issue is the existence of Form IV verbs that either are intransitive or do not attest an increase in valency when compared with the basic verbs from which they are derived. The difficulty resides in the fact that these verbs do not evince the very basic feature characterizing causatives against their noncausative counterparts from which causatives are derived, that is an increase in valency.

In the present paper we will try to show that at least some intransitive meanings exhibited by Form IV verbs might have arisen from the indirectness of the causation originally expressed by this derived verbal form.

2. Form IV as an indirect causative

A prototypical indirect causation may be depicted as exhibiting the following features: a visible both physical and temporal distance between the cause and its effect and a balance of control over the effect that usually inclines in favour of the causee rather than in favour of the causer. The fact that the causer exerts a low degree of control over the final effect of the causation or, even more, that it completely lacks such control enables the causee to impede the occurrence of the effect, by that making causation fail. In such an event we deal with a nonimplicative causation.

Uncontroversial evidence speaking in favour of the indirect/permissive character of Classical Arabic Form IV causatives is provided by dictionaries. Thus indirect/permissive meanings are found for many Form IV verbs, e.g.: *'aqṭa'a* 'make, let cut, order to cut; allow someone to cut off the tree branches (in his tree-garden)' (Kazimirski 1860:II,768), *'aqbara* 'make, let, allow bury' (Kazimirski 1860:II,659), *'aktaba* 'dictate' (Kazimirski 1860:II,859), etc. As far as the demarcation on the causative continuum between indirect causation, on one hand, and direct causation, on the other, is concerned, Classical Arabic operates it in a point located between sociative causation (causation in which the causer and the cause cooperate for bringing out the effect; see Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002:96-103) and direct causation. This view is supported by the existence of Form IV verbs having a sociative meaning, that is assistive: *'ahfara* 'help someone to dig out a well' (Kazimirski 1860:I,457), *'aktaba* 'teach someone to write' (Kazimirski 1860:II,859), *'antaḡa* 'help a female to give birth' (Kazimirski 1860:II,1191), etc.

Other instances of indirect causatives are the so-called declarative or estimative verbs such as *'abḡala* 'think/find someone to be niggardly' (Wright 1896-1898:I,35), *'aḡbana* 'think/find someone to be cowardly' (Wright 1896-1898:I,35), etc. They express a special type of indirect causation, where the effect does not necessarily take place in the real world but rather in the mind of the causer. Thus, if someone thinks of someone else as being a coward this does not automatically imply the truth that that person is indeed a coward.

Another category of verbs that code indirect causation is made up of the so-called 'expositive' verbs. Fleisch (1979:II,303) describes this type of verbs – called in native Arabic grammars *ta'rīd* – as rendering the idea of exposing someone to the action expressed by the basic verb from which the 'expositive' is derived, regardless if this action takes place or not. An often cited example of such a verb is *'aqtala* 'expose someone to be killed', which derives from the basic verb *qatala* 'to kill'. Larcher (2003:57) cites from Raḡī al-Dīn al-'Astarābādī's *Šarḡ al-šāfiya* the following gloss for *'aqtala*: *'aqtaltu-hu 'ay 'arraḡtu-hu li-'an yakūna maqtūlan qutla 'aw lā* 'I exposed him to be killed, that is I exposed him to be killed, (regardless if) he was killed or not'. Other examples of 'expositives' are: *'abā'a* 'offer for sale' and *'aqbara* 'prepare a grave (for someone)' (Larcher 2003:58). (Other two instances cited as belonging to the 'expositive' verbs, i.e. *'ašfā* 'give a remedy', *'asqā* 'give to drink' are, in fact, sociatives).

At a closer inspection, we find that the basic features characterizing indirect causation are present in 'expositives'. Firstly, they do not imply a direct physical contact between the causer and the causee. Thus, the killing happens not due to a direct act performed by the causer but rather as the result of some other unspecified entity. Neither offering a merchandise for sale does imply physical contact between causer and causee. It is true that the act of killing is instigated by the causer, but it would not take place without the participation of some other entity. Hence, we can imagine a situation like the following. A certain person is wanted by police and someone sees him and informs the police. Policemen go to arrest the wanted person, but he opposes and an exchange of fire shots follows resulting in the death of the wanted person. In this case the killing is, in fact, carried out by the policemen and not by the causer, the person that informed the police. The effect of being killed can also occur through the involvement of a magic spell, disease, poison, trap, etc. From this, it follows that the lapse of time between cause and effect is always clearly observable. The addition at the end of the Arab gloss for 'expose to be killed' of the phrase 'he was killed or not' offers the irrefutable proof in favour of the nonimplicativity of the Classical Arabic 'expositive' verbs. Hence, the causer of the causation expressed by an 'expositive' verb does not possess a sufficient degree of control so that he can overpower the control that the causee has over the causation. This is true for two of the aforementioned examples of 'expositive' verbs, but not for the verb 'offer for

sale', since inanimate merchandise cannot be conceived as exerting control. In this case, the causer's control is reduced because of the high degree of control possessed by the buyer, which is the one who decides whether the causation is carried out, that is the merchandise is sold, or not, the merchandise remains for sale. Unfortunately, the gloss does not make any reference at all to the causer's volition; therefore, we cannot know for sure whether the causer of the 'expositive' initiates the causation on purpose or unwillingly. The willingness from the part of the causer seems, however, beyond any doubt in the case of actions like those of 'offering for sale' or 'preparing a grave'.

The fact that Form IV causatives may imply lack of control from the part of the causer is also evidenced by Saad (1982), who says that "a form IV verb in certain instances does not have to indicate deliberate action" (Saad 1982:73-4). He illustrates this situation by the following examples:

- (1) 'afsada min ḥaytu yurīdu l -'iṣlāḥa.
'He caused mischief where he meant to make amends.'
(Saad 1982:74)
- (2) *fassada min ḥaytu yurīdu l -'iṣlāḥa.
'He caused mischief where he meant to make amends.'
(Saad 1982:74)

The sentence described in (1) is acceptable, since Form IV can express lack of control from the part of the causer. However, the latter, (2), sounds illogical, since Form II implies that the causer acts volitionally and has full control over the causation.

According to the generally valid principle of iconicity, the conceptual distance between cause and its effect is formally mirrored in the degree of fusion between the morphemes expressing the cause and, respectively, the effect. Therefore, if Classical Arabic Form IV renders indirect causation, then the degree of fusion between the causative prefix and its host (the verbal theme to which it is added) must be looser than the degree of fusion between the morpheme expressing direct causation and its host. And this is indeed what is found: Form IV is construed with the aid of a prefix, /'a-/, while the derivation of Form II (the one used to express direct/coercive causation) involves reduplication (of the second consonant of the root underlying the word from which Form II is derived), which is an instance of one of the tightest possible ways to join together morphemes, i.e. the nonconcatenative morphology.

3. Intransitive Form IV verbs

After having ascertained the indirectness of Form IV causatives, we will examine some of the semantic categories of intransitive Form IV verbs, in an attempt at demonstrating that all these intransitive meanings have their source in the original causative value of Form IV. The categories we have chosen in this aim are the so-called 'deventives' and 'meritatives'.

3.1. The 'deventive' verbs

Larcher (2003:62-4) calls 'deventive' those denominal verbs that the native Arab grammarian tradition describes as expressing *ṣayrūrāt al-ṣay' dā kadā*. A possible English translation of this phrase could be the following: 'the becoming of the thing owning so-and-so', whereby 'the thing' represents the grammatical subject of the verb (which, although it is referred to by 'thing', in fact, it can also be an animate entity) and 'so-and-so' stands for the noun from which the verb is derived. Examples of such verbs are: 'abqala 'produce herbage' < baql 'herbs' (Wright 1896-1898:I,34), 'awraqa 'put out leaves' < waraq 'foliage' (Wright 1896-1898:I,35), 'anğaba 'beget a noble son' < nağīb 'of noble breed' (Wright 1896-1898:I,35), 'ağraba 'suffer from mange, to have mangy camels' < ġarab 'mange' (Larcher 2003:63). We may notice that inasmuch as they have one single core argument, which does not act volitionally, 'deventives' resemble verbs describing involuntary processes (Payne 1997:55). Moreover, both class of verbs imply also affectedness of the core argument, although in the case of 'deventives' this must not manifest itself necessarily as a change in state, as it is the case with involuntary processes (Payne 1997:55). By the affectedness of their single core argument, coded as subject, 'deventive' verbs recall another category of verbs, namely that of submissives or adversative passives, which indicate that the effect of the action expressed by the verb is sustained by the participant grammatically encoded as subject (Klaiman 1991:140). This construction is also known under the term of adversative passive, because the effect to which the subject is submitted is usually detrimental to the subject. However, since the effect is sometimes beneficial for the subject, we see the term 'submissive' as being more appropriate.

Now, taking into consideration the fact that 'deventives' have a single core argument, i.e. they are monovalent, and, moreover, their single core argument has patient-like characteristics, how could this type of verb be put in correlation with causative? We posit that an indirect, permissive-like reading of causation can provide this correlation. The permissive causation is an indirect causation that often implies no control at all from the part of the causer. Thus, if one allows something to happen, it does not necessarily do so because he has nothing against that happening. It can be well the case that he has no control over the situation and, hence, there is no other choice left to him than to stay aside. Hence,

the 'deventives' can be seen as verbs indicating that their grammatical subjects allow something to happen to themselves, i.e. they get submitted to the noun from which the Form IV is derived. They do so because they do not exert control over the causation. This is obvious in the case of inanimates, such as 'land' or 'tree', since they never can possess control over the processes expressed by verbs like 'abqala 'produce herbage' or 'awraqa 'put out leaves'. Although the subjects of verbs such as 'anğaba 'beget a noble son' or 'ağraba 'suffer from mange; have mangy camels' are human and, therefore, susceptible of possessing control, in fact, neither they exert control over the situations they are submitted to. The reason for that may be either that the subject lacks control over causation altogether or that he possesses such a control but he either does not want (since, for him, the effect is either non-detrimental or beneficial) or, momentarily, is not able to exert it (because of an illness, carelessness, etc.).

Another question that should be raised here is why cognitive situations like those expressed by 'deventive' verbs are not translated into a linguistic construction in which the grammatical subject would coincide to the real effector (agent) of the situation? We think that the reason for this is of a pragmatic nature: the entity that really brings about the effect possesses an extremely low degree of salience. This can be observed in the case of 'abqala 'produce herbage', for instance. Very likely, the fact that herbage grows covering up a plot of land is not perceived as the result of an action performed by the plot of land but rather as the consequence of either some mysterious, unseen agent or of an action performed by the herbage itself. Nonetheless, the high salience of the plot of land as compared with the very low salience of the herbage makes the Classical Arabic speakers conceptualize this event as it would happen due to an allowance from the more salient participant, i.e. the land. The extremely reduced degree of salience from the part of the real agent is also reflected in the shape of the verbal Form IV, whereby the real agent appears incorporated into the verb. Therefore, in such cases, a Form IV verb may be interpreted as consisting of a verb and an incorporated noun (the real agent). Hence, a verb like 'abqala 'produce herbage', for instance, might be decomposed into 'a- 'LET, ALLOW' + baql- 'herbage'. The assignment of the grammatical subject case to the undergoer makes Classical Arabic 'deventive' verbs similar also to inverses, constructions used to 'downplay the centrality of the agentive participant with respect to the more patient-like participant' (Payne 1997:209-10). Classical Arabic 'deventives' are, just like inverses and submissives, constructions depicting action originating in a non-speech act participant and terminating in a speech act participant, constructions which, usually, are more marked than an action originating in a speech act participant and terminating in a non-speech act participant (Shibatani 2003:279).

Situations similar to Classical Arabic 'deventives' can likewise be found in other languages. Such a language is Romanian, as illustrated in (3-4):

- (3) Dan a făcut râie.
Dan made mange
'Dan was struck with mange.'
- (4) Pisica a făcut purici.
the cat made fleas
'The cat was struck with fleas.'

In Romanian, the *par excellence* effecting verb *a face* 'make, do', which is also used for expressing analytically causation, is called into service in order to describe an event in which a pragmatically more salient participant is affected by the action performed by a less pragmatical one. The latter is either barely visible – in (4) or invisible – in (3).

Hence, in 'deventive' verbs, although the grammatical subject is not the real causer of the action, it is still treated as an instigator, grace to its superior pragmatical salience. On the basis of the analysis just presented, we find the term 'submissive' more felicitous for this Arabic construction than that of 'deventives'.

3.2 The 'meritative' verbs

Larcher (2003:62) uses the term 'meritative' to render the semantic value, described by some Arab grammarians as *istiḥqāq*, 'deserve', which some Form IV verbs show. Thus, a construction like 'aḥṣada al-zarʿu 'the crop was harvestable' is glossed by Sibawayhi (Kitāb, IV, 59-60, apud Larcher 2003:62) as follows: *istaḥaqqā al-zarʿu 'an yufʿala bi-hi l-ḥaṣād*, i.e. 'the crop deserved that harvest is done to it'. Other examples of this value are 'aṣrama 'be cuttable (of date palms)' (Larcher 2003:62), 'alāma 'deserve blame', 'aḥmada 'deserve praise', etc.

Hence, 'meritatives' are, in fact, 'potential passives', a kind of passive expressing that the subject is capable of undergoing an action (Haspelmath 1990:33). This meaning can also be traced back to an indirect causative. Thus, imagine that a person has a specific behaviour that makes another person or other persons blame him. The blamable person is the instigator of the situation but it is very likely that he behaves the way he does not on purpose. Therefore, the blamed person has little or no control altogether over the situation. The same holds for inanimated entities like plants, for instance, which cannot control and stop their own evolution so that avoid being cut down or harvested.

4. From indirect/permissive causative to intransitive meanings

Thus, we suggest that intransitive meanings such as 'deventive' and 'meritative', that Form IV verbs may take in Classical Arabic, have evolved from the indirect/permissive type of causation, rendered by Form IV verbs, as opposed to the direct causation expressed by Form II causatives (see Măcelaru forthcoming). This distinction must go back to a Proto-Semitic common stage. These intransitive meanings of some of Form IV verbs attest a semantic shift from an indirect/permissive causative to an intransitive construction rendering the occurrence of a situation that affects a participant, which participant is somehow hold responsible for the occurrence of the situation. It is very likely that this construction was initially used only with subjects susceptible of exerting control, i. e. animates, and, then, in a subsequent stage, its use has been generalized, encroaching upon inanimates.

Similar parallels – of passive rising from indirect causative – can be encountered in other languages, such as English, German or Olutec (Zavala 2002:286-7). Thus, in English, when used as an auxiliary, the verb 'get' may express either indirect causation or passive. Both these uses are illustrated through the following examples:

- (5) John got him read.
- (6) Mary got shot on purpose.
(Givón and Yang 1994:119)

In English, as Givón and Yang show, unlike the subject of BE-passive, the subject of GET-passive has or is supposed to have some control over the situation. Thus, a sentence like (6), even if it did not comprise the adverbial phrase 'on purpose', it would still entail that Mary is responsible for having got shot. Another peculiarity distinguishing English GET-passives from English BE-passives is that the former put the emphasis on the grammatical subject (the affectee) rather than on the real agent. Hence, specifying the agent sounds odd in the case of GET-passives but not in the case of BE-passives. This is illustrated in (7-8):

- (7) *Mary got shot on purpose, the bastards!
(Givón and Yang 1994:120)
- (8) Mary was shot on purpose, the bastards!
(Givón and Yang 1994:120)

Both these features, the complete downplaying of the real agent, and the affectee's being held somehow responsible for not having exerted control over the situation are also present in the Classical Arabic 'deventive' verbs.

Finally, a relationship between indirect/permissive causative and potential passive can be documented in German. In this language, a construction *lassen sich* + infinitive renders a permissive/indirect causation, as illustrated in (9). However, when its subject is inanimate, as in (10), the same construction has a 'potential passive' reading:

- (9) Nesrin lässt sich fotografieren.
'Nesrin has herself photographed.'
(Haspelmath 1990:46)
- (10) Das Fahrrad lässt sich reparieren.
'The bike can be repaired/is repairable.'
(Haspelmath 1990:47)

References

- Fleisch, Henri. 1979. *Traité de philologie arabe. Volume II*. Beirut: Dar al-Machreq.
- Givón, Talmy and Yang, Lynne. 1994. The rise of English GET-passive. In: Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper (eds.), *Voice: Form and function*, 119-150. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language* 14, 25-72.
- Kazimirski, A. De Biberstein. 1860. *Dictionnaire arabe-français*. Beyrouth: Librairie du Liban.
- Kienast, Burkhard. 2001. *Historische Semitische Sprachwissenschaft*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Klaiman, Miriam H. 1991. *Grammatical voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larcher, Pierre. 2003. *Le système verbal de l'arabe classique*. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence.
- Măcelaru, Adrian. Forthcoming. Causative. In: Mushira Eid, Alaa Elgibali, Kees Versteegh, Manfred Woidich and Andrzej Zaborski (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Arab Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saad, George Nehmed. 1982. *Transitivity, causation and passivization. A semantic-syntactic study of the verb in Classical Arabic*. London, Boston, Melbourne: Kegan Paul International.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2002. Introduction: Some basic issues in the grammar of causation. In: Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*, 1-22. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2003. Directional verbs in Japanese. In: Erin Shay and Uwe Seibert (eds.), *Motion, direction and location in languages*, 259-286. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Shibatani, Masayoshi and Pardeshi, Prashant. 2002. The causative continuum. In: Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*, 85-126. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wright, William. 1896-1898. *A grammar of the Arabic language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zavala, Roberto. 2002. Olutec causatives and applicatives. In: Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*, 245-299. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chris H. Reintges

University of Leiden

THE OLDER EGYPTIAN *sdm(.w)=f* PASSIVE REVISITED

1. Introduction

In the course of its productive language history, which spans a period of over four thousand years, Ancient Egyptian went through several developmental stages. Its earliest stage is Older Egyptian, which covers a period of more than five hundred years (ca. 2650-1990 BCE).¹ The language has a rich verbal inflection for the morphological expression of grammatical voice and transitivity alternations. While many of the world's languages lack morphological passives, Older Egyptian represents the typologically marked case of a languages with multiple passives (cf. Keenan 1985:247, Siewierska 1984:23). The one-to-many relation between active and passive verb forms produces sentence pairs of the following kind. (In the Older Egyptian examples, the three morphological passives are boldfaced and glossed as PASS1, PASS2, and PASS3).²

¹ Despite its internal differentiation into Old and Early Middle Egyptian, there is good reason to believe that Older Egyptian constitutes a linguistic continuum, with only minor structural changes in the course of generation-to-generation transmission of the language. Loprieno (1995) provides an up-to-date overview of Ancient Egyptian language history. The language material of this article is drawn from the monumental religious corpora of the Pyramid Texts and the Coffin Texts.

² The following abbreviations are used in the glosses. (Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface-segmental shape): 1 'first person'; 2 'second person'; 3 'third person'; AUX 'auxiliary verb'; C 'subordinating complementizer'; C_{REL} 'relative complementizer'; D 'dual'; DEM 'demonstrative'; EMPH 'emphatic particle'; F 'feminine gender', FM 'focus marker'; GER 'gerund'; LINK 'linkage marker'; IMP 'imperative'; IMPERF 'imperfective aspect'; INF 'infinitive'; INTENS/REPET 'intensive/repetitive stem pattern', M 'masculine gender'; NEG 'negative scope marker'; NOM 'nominalizing affix'; P 'plural'; PASS1 'apophonic passive 1' (*sdm(.w)=f*), PASS2 'affixal passive 2' (*sdm-t(j)=f*), PASS3 'reduplicative passive 3' (*sdm-m=f*), PCL 'particle';