Turkic morphology seen by the Arabic grammarians. The passive

Robert Ermers

Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/hel/520>

DOI: 10.4000/hel.520

ISSN: 1638-1580

Publisher

Société d'histoire et d'épistémologie des sciences du langage

Printed version

Date of publication: 28 September 2020

Number of pages: 73-92

ISSN: 0750-8069

Electronic reference

Robert Ermers, "Turkic morphology seen by the Arabic grammarians. The passive", *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* [Online], 42-1 | 2020, Online since 28 October 2021, connection on 29 October 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/hel/520> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/hel.520>

This text was automatically generated on 29 October 2021.

HEL is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Turkic morphology seen by the Arabic grammarians. The passive

Robert Ermers

1 Introduction: the sources

- 1 Arabic treatises of other languages present an intriguing type of source material for a number of reasons. These treatises, written by specialists educated in the Arabic grammatical tradition, deal with Turkic vocabulary, grammar, morphology and phonology. In their concise descriptions and analyses, they apply extant concepts, yet they occasionally find that they have to adapt them to this new language. In this contribution, I intend to analyse what their authors write about the passive and about passive constructions.¹
- 2 The sources used for this paper are the following:
 - *Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk* by Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī (eleventh century; ed. Kültür Bakanlığı 1990);
 - The Margin Grammar — a large compilation of sections on Turkic grammar (eleventh-fourteenth century) in the margins of a copy of the *Kitāb al-ʿIdrāk* Veli ed-Dīn manuscript;
 - *Kitāb al-ʿIdrāk li-Lisān al-ʿAtrāk* by ʿAbū Ḥayyān al-ʿAndalusī (fourteenth century; ed. Caferoğlu 1931);
 - *Al-Tuḥfa al-Zakiyya fī al-Luġa al-Turkiyya*, anonymous (fourteenth century; ed. Halasi-Kun 1942);
 - *Kitāb al-Qawānīn al-Kulliyya li-Ḍabṭ al-Luġa al-Turkiyya*, anonymous (fourteenth century; ed. Kilisli 1928);
 - *Kitāb Ḥilyat al-Insān wa-Ḥalbat al-Lisān* by Ğamāl al-Dīn ibn al-Muḥannā (fourteenth century; ed. Kilisli 1921).
- 3 Most of them date from the fourteenth century, the one exception being *Dīwān* whose original dates from the eleventh century (al-Kāšġarī, *Dīwān*; Auezova 2005; Dankoff and Kelly 1982-1985).² All of these sources have been edited and published, except the one I have called the Margin Grammar.

- 4 The Margin Grammar is an as yet unpublished grammar of Turkic, scribbled in the margins and between the lines of the Veli ed-Din 'Idrāk MS. The author of the Margin Grammar is unknown; in fact, it is probably not an entirely original work, considering the fact that a considerable number of fragments are almost literal copies from other known sources, mainly *Qawānīn*, 'Idrāk and *Dīwān*, while the style and set-up of some others shows strong resemblance to *Tarǧumān* (ed. Houtsma 1889) (Ermers 1999: 41f).
- 5 Of these sources, 'Abū Ḥayyān's work is of particular interest, because, in addition to 'Idrāk, other works of his on Arabic grammar have been preserved, such as his *Irtiṣāf* (e.d al-Namās 1984, 1987, 1989) and his commentary on Ibn Mālik's *Alfiyya*. This makes it possible to compare his statements on grammar in 'Idrāk with passages in his other studies.
- 6 The sources describe different varieties of Turkic. *Dīwān* describes Ḥāqānī, a Turkic language spoken in Central Asia at the time, whose modern descendant is Sariǵ Yugur or Yellow Uyghur (Clauson 1965). The fourteenth-century sources describe the language of Mamlūk military slaves in Egypt and Syria, who spoke a Kipchak language —probably (Crimean) Tatar— with Oǧuz (Turcoman) material (Berta 1998). A precise determination of the Turkic language described in each work is complicated, one reason being that there are large overlaps between languages and subgroups regarding morphology and vocabulary, and another that the Arabic script as it is used in the sources does not easily allow for the expression of nuances in vowels, such as the distinction between e/ a, o/u and ö/ü respectively (Ermers 1999).
- 7 From both morphological and syntactical perspectives, there are considerable differences between Arabic and Turkic. Most Arabic nouns, verbs, and adjectives can be derived from a root, whereas in Turkic word formation is based upon stems. Not surprising, therefore, is the notion that in Arabic grammar a central concept of a verbal root (rather than a stem) was developed, consisting of consonants to which other consonants (*ḥurūf*, sg. *ḥarf*) are added as prefixes and infixes, thus adding derived meanings (*ma'nā*, pl. *ma'ānī*) and forming new patterns (*wazn*, pl. *'awzān*) that are more or less predictable in form and function. Probably for this reason, the Arabic grammatical tradition could develop into a functional grammar, in which given forms (and positions) are correlated with certain meanings (see e.g. Bohas and Guillaume 1984; Owens 1988 & 1990; Versteegh 1995 & 1997; Sheyhatovitch 2018: 169ff; Ayoub and Versteegh 2018). This perspective was enhanced by the divine status of Arabic as the language of the Qur'ān, which, it was believed, thus could only have been chosen because of its perfectness and logic in form and structure. As this perspective on grammar was the only one available, all scholars were educated in this model regardless of their origin.

2 Passive in Arabic and in Turkic

2.1 Arabic morphology: consonants of augmentation (*ḥurūf al-ziyāda*)

- 8 Arabic uses morphological infixes, prefixes and suffixes which are placed onto a three-consonantal root. In the Arabic grammatical tradition, the notion of prefixes and infixes to this root is illustrated in an abstract way with the help of the paradigmatical

root *f-l*, which in turn is derived from the verb *fa'ala* 'to do'.³ When filled with the appropriate vowels, the pattern *fa'ala* signifies 'he did'.

- 9 With the help of the appropriate paradigmatic form, the base consonants from any root can easily be distinguished from any additions. In Arabic grammar, the augmented meaningful elements are called *hurūf al-ziyāda*; all augments are consonants. For example, the augmented consonant in the paradigmatic form *'a-f'ala* (paradigm IV in Western studies of Arabic) is *'a*, and the same holds for the prefix *in-*, *in-fa'ala* where the augment is *n* only (paradigm VII). After the insertion of the pre- and infixes, often a (secondary) shift of the vowels (*naql al-ḥaraka*) occurs, for example, often the first root consonant, *f*-, loses its vowel.
- 10 In some paradigms, meanings are added by the simultaneous augmentation of two consonants. For example, the paradigm (VI) *ta-f-ā'ala* signifies reciprocity, i.e. the action of the verb is carried out together or reciprocally by several agents.
- 11 Note that in the Arabic morphological tradition the concept of long vowels as morphemes did not exist. The so-called long vowels were understood as a sequence of a consonant, a glide, preceded by a vowel sign: *ā* = /a"/, ⁴*ī* = /iy/, *ū* = /uw/. In this way, for example, the verbal pattern of the conative form, *fā'ala*, is understood as /fa""ala/, and the additional meaning is attributed to *'alif*, represented as /"/.
- 12 Earlier (Ermers 1999: 270-282) I analysed how Arab grammarians dealt with transitivity and causativity in Turkic. My conclusions were that they tried to uphold their theories regarding the correlations between form and function for Turkic as well (see also Ermers 2007). Yet they had to recognize that in other languages functions could be expressed by different syntactical and morphological elements that did not resemble their Arabic counterparts.⁵ They were forced, to some extent, to engage in comparative and universal linguistics. In this contribution, I intend to examine how they dealt with the passive form.

2.2 Two types of passivity in Arabic

- 13 In Arabic grammar, there are two distinct notions of the passive. The first is the so-called internal or apophonic passive of the verb, on the pattern *fu'ila*. This passive stands out in Arabic grammar because it is not expressed by means of an infix or, in Arabic terms, a meaningful particle, but by a vowel change: *fa'ala* → *fu'ila*. The imperfect tense is subjected to changes in the pattern too: *yaf'ilu* → *yuf'alu*. The subject of an internal passive verb is referred to in Arabic grammatical theory as *an-nā'ib* 'an *al-fā'il*, which can be translated as "subject by proxy" or "substitute subject" (Soltan 2009: 535). The verb is "built for the patient" or "the logical object" (*mabnī li-l-maf'ūl*).
- 14 In the traditional Arabic grammatical theory, passivization is regarded as a process in which the agent of a transitive verb (*fi'l muta'addin*) is deleted or kept hidden or "unknown" (*mağhūl*), although not absent, leaving the former object and the verb (Bazzi-Hamzé 2007b: 94). "The subject of the apophonic passive in Arabic is obviously not the agent of the process but rather one who is affected by the process" (Maalej 2008: 224).
- 15 This new situation is reflected in the verb, which assumes a new vowel pattern. Then there occurs a (superficial) syntactical shift, in which the direct object of the original

verb assumes the subject position, i.e. the syntactic role of agent, and receives a corresponding nominative case ending (Carter 1981: 168ff).

- 16 The second way for indicating a passive is the use of the pattern *infi'āl*. This pattern indicates an action without an evident cause:
- 17 The *infi'āl*-pattern by itself expresses an action which the subject carries out by itself, without an agent being implied. According to Abboud-Haggar (2006: 616), it “was used as an alternative for the internal passive” in early texts, such as Qur’anic Arabic.
- 18 However, the *infi'āl* pattern is also used in relation to the semantical notion of *muṭāwa‘a* ‘compliance’, where there is a cause implied; hence Larcher’s (2003: 69) interpretation as a ‘résultatif’. Versteegh (2014: 119) explains the morphological reasoning behind compliance as follows:

Muṭāwa‘a was regarded as the opposite of *ta‘diya*, that is, decreasing the valency of the verb with one, for example, *kasara* ‘to break [transitive]’ versus *inkasara* ‘to break [intransitive]’; *allama* ‘to instruct someone about something’ versus *ta‘allama* ‘to be instructed, to become learned in something’ (Larcher 2012: 75-77). What mattered to the grammarians was the fact that the augment (*ziyāda*) correlated with an additional meaning.

“[t]here is implicit causation underlying all forms of compliance” summarizes Maalej (2008: 225), e.g. *fataḥtu l-bāba fa-nfataḥa* ‘I opened the door and it opened’ (An-Nādirī 1995: 353 *apud* Maalej 2008: 225). An-Nādirī, still according to Maalej (2008: 226), writes that the complier is not necessarily intransitive (*lāzim*), it can also be transitive (*muta‘addī*), which makes sense when the *muṭāwa‘a* is basically a resultative. The *muṭāwa‘a*, from a morphological perspective, therefore does not depend on one single verbal pattern, but can be expressed with several, intransitive and transitive, i.e., VII *infi'āl*, *infa‘ala*; VIII *ifti'āl*, *ifta‘ala* *ḡamamtu-hu fa-ḡtamma* ‘I saddened him, so he was filled with grief’; V *tafa‘‘ul*, *tafa‘‘ala*: *kassartu l-‘aqlāma fa-takassarat* ‘I broke the pencils, so they broke’ (Maalej 2008: 226), and others.⁶ Larcher (2009: 642) writes that Form VII itself is already “the resultative of Form I”, although “in many dialects it is used as a passive of the base form.” The internal passive has become rare in modern Arabic dialects, and this process must have begun a long time ago (Carter 1981: 171). It subsists in some modern dialects on the Arabian Peninsula, e.g. in Qatar it occurs with the *u-i* form, e.g. *ḥad qutil hina?* ‘was somebody killed here?’ (Belova 2009: 306), while for Oman the imperfect 3msg form prefix has been registered, e.g. *yibā* ‘it is sold’ (Al-Balushi 2016: 107; for Yemen see Simeone-Senelle 1997: 407). Instead of the internal passive, therefore, in most variants of Arabic the passive is expressed by means of consonantal prefixes and infixes to the verbal root. As a consequence, the distinctions between the agent-less *fu‘ila* passive on the one hand and patterns like *infi'āl* on the other have disappeared.

(1)	<i>ḍuriba</i>	<i>zayd-un</i>
	hit.PASS.3sg.PAST	Zayd-NOM
	‘Zayd was hit [by someone]’	

(2)	<i>in-kasara</i>	<i>al-ka’s-u</i>
-----	------------------	------------------

	COMPL-break.3sg.PAST	DEF-glass-NOM
	'the glass broke (by itself)'	

2.3 Passive forms in Turkic languages

- 19 In all Turkic languages, semantic and voice changes to verbs are added to a *stem*. The morphemes added can involve one or more consonants (and occasionally vowels). The most common passive suffix is **-(V)l-**, **ört-** ‘cover’ → **ört-ül-** ‘be covered’, **kör-** ‘see’ → **kör-ül-** ‘be seen’ (Róna-Tas 1998: 75; Johanson 1998: 42). In Kazakh (and Turkish), the verbal form with **-l-** is bi-functional. It serves to form both “non-passives without implied agents”, e.g. **yesik aš-ıl-dı** ‘the door opened’ (Kazakh), and “true passives with implied agents” ‘the door was opened (by someone)’ or, in other words, “intransitivized transitive verbs” (Şahan Güney 2006: 128).
- 20 When a verbal stem ends in a vowel or **-l-**, **-(V)n-** is in Turkic used to indicate passivization, e.g. **sı:-** ‘break (trans.)’ → **sı-n-** ‘break’ (Clauson 1972).⁷ This then coincides with the verbal suffix **-(V)n-** which indicates reflexivity, e.g. **yu:-** ‘wash (trans.)’ → **yu:-n-** ‘wash oneself’ (*ibid.*: 870 & 942). Therefore, verbal forms in **-n-** under some conditions can express either passivity or reflexivity, e.g. **kör-ün-** (< **kör-** ‘see’): ‘to be seen’ (passive), ‘become visible’ (reflexive). A third signification of **-(V)n-** is the middle voice, e.g. Karakhanid **al-în-** ‘take for oneself’ (< **al-** ‘take’) (Johanson 1998: 42). The form of the vowel **V** in the passive and reflexive suffixes is subjected to the principles of fourfold vowel harmony in nearly all Turkic languages: u/ü (rounded: back/front) and ı/i (unrounded: back/front). These cannot be rendered in Arabic script (on Kipchak passive suffixes, see Berta 1998: 160).

3 Passive and compliance in the sources

- 21 The question is how the sources deal with passivization and compliance as semantic concepts, how they link the voice to morphemes such as **-(V)l-** and **-(V)n-**, the distribution of these morphemes, and the concepts these morphemes are associated with —i.e. the internal passive or a derived form— and which terminology is used for the notion of stem for suffixes.⁸
- 22 The Turkic passive is dealt with in the sources in different contexts. Unlike Arabic, the past tense verb is not close to the unmarked form, but expressed by an ending, **-DI**, attached to the stem. The Turkic stem alone expresses the imperative. Some sources, as we shall see, discuss the passive in the context of the passive participle, which in Turkic merely requires the appropriate passive suffix to the stem, plus one other suffix which expresses the participle. In Arabic, the passive participle is expressed by means of a combination of a pre- and infix.
- 23 In *’Idrāk*, *’Abū Ḥayyān* uses three different expressions: the first is related to the voice of the verb (*mā lam yusamma fā’iluhu* ‘[the verb] whose agent is not expressed’), the second to the consequences for the syntax (*al-nā’ib* ‘an *al-fā’il* ‘substitute agent’), and the third to the semantic notion of the resultative (*muṭāwa’a*, lit. ‘compliance’).

3.1 The distribution of *l* and *n*

- 24 In some sources, the logic behind the distribution of *l* and *n* is not explained at all. In the Margin Grammar for example, the author writes quite vaguely that the rule regarding the use of *l* and *n* is what one actually hears (*al-samā'*: MG 36a top). Kāšgārī writes at the entry '**ağirla-n-**' (< '**ağirla-**' 'praise', '**ukrima**' 'he was praised') that *n* in this verb can be replaced (*mubdala*) by *l*, yielding the alternative form '**ağirla-l-**', but he does not explain why (*Dīwān* 148,6; Clauson 1972: 94).
- 25 The Margin Grammar writes that an unvocalized *l* is added before the marker of the personal pronoun (*muḍmar*), i.e. probably in case of the past tense verb, or before the marker of the future tense (*istiqbāl*) (MG, 37B right) —an important note, since in Arabic the imperfect tense, used for the future tense, contains elements that express gender and number.
- 26 Kāšgārī states:
For every biradical (*tunā'i*) transitive (*muta'addi*) verb, if you add an *l* to it, it becomes an intransitive (*lāziman*) and passive verb (*mağhūlan*) as explained before.

Wa-kull fi'l 'idā kāna tunā'iyyan muta'addiyan fa-'idā 'adḥalta fihi al-lāma yakūnu fi'lan lāziman wa-fi'lan mağhūlan kamā maḍā. (Dīwān 490)
- 27 The anonymous author of *Qawānīn* provides a short analysis:
The substitute agent (*al-nā'ib* 'an *al-fā'il*).⁹ The rule (*qā'ida*) in this is that you insert (*tuqḥim*) an unvocalized *l* [or an unvocalized *n*] between the imperative form and whatever marker follows.

Al-nā'ib 'an al-fā'il — al-qā'ida fihi 'an tuqḥim lāman sākina ['aw nūnan sākina] bayna fi'l al-'amr wa bayna mā yalī min 'alāma. (Qawānīn 26)
- 28 The author does not elaborate further. Yet 'Abū Ḥayyān in a very concise manner provides more detailed rules regarding the distribution of **-n-**:
If [the verb] is uniradical or biradical, and its second consonant is either vocalised or a silent *l*, or if [the verb ends in] *lā*, which serves the action ('amal), the addition (*mazīd*) is an unvocalized *n* ('*Idrāk* 133).
- 29 'Abū Ḥayyān bases his distribution of **-n-**, on the following criteria:
1. the verb is uniradical, i.e. CV- or
 2. the verb is biradical:
 - a. the final consonant of the [biradical] verb is vocalised (i.e. the stem ends in a vowel), i.e. CVCV- or
 - b. it ends in an (unvocalized) *l*, i.e. CVl- or
 3. the verb, of any length, ends in *lā*- (examples below).
- 30 *Qawānīn* describes four contexts which determine the form of the suffix, i.e. when an *n* is used:
The rule (*dābiṭ*) regarding the position (*mawḍi'*) of the *n* is [1] that the verb¹⁰ consists of one single consonant, like *y* [i.e. **ya-**] meaning 'eat!' (*kul*), [2] or of two consonants, the second of which is vocalised (*mutaḥarrik*), like **tuša**, meaning 'spread!' (*ufruš*), [3] or it consists of two consonants the second of which is not vocalised, but it is an *l* [that is used], e.g. '**al**' meaning 'take!' (*ḥuḍ*), **ṣal** meaning 'throw!' (*irmi*), [4] or the verb has more consonants, the final one being *lā* which

serves the action (*'amal*) [i.e. used to construct denominal verbs], e.g. **yumruq-lā** [**< yumruq** 'fist' 'punch!' (*ulkum*) **'aylā** 'work!' [**< 'ay ~ e:d** 'material'¹¹] (*i'mal*) and **sūy-lah!** [**< sōz** 'word' 'talk!' (*taḥaddat*) and the like. These are the positions of the *n*, and all the rest [is] the position of the *l*. [5] So you say in the constructions of these examples according to their order: **yi-n-il-dī** ['he was eaten'] and **tuša-n-dī** ['it was spread'], **'al-in-dī** ['it was taken'], **ṣal-in-dī** ['it was thrown'], **yumruq-la-n-dī** [**< yumruq** 'fist' **> yumruq-la-** 'to punch'] ['he was punched'] and **sū-la-n-dī** [**< sū** 'water' **> sū-la-** 'to water'] ['it was watered'] and use this as a general rule (*qis*).

Wa-l-dābiṭ li-mawḍi' al-nūn 'an yakuna al-ismu [sic, al-fi'l, R.E.] [1] 'alā ḥarf [wāḥid] naḥwa ya bi-ma'nā 'kul'. [2] 'aw 'alā ḥarfayni wa-l-tānī minhumā mutaharrik naḥwa tuša bi-ma'nā ufruṣ'. [3] wa-'ala ḥarfayni wa-l-tānī minhumā sākin wa-lakinnahu lām, naḥwa 'al bi-ma'nā 'ḥud', wa-ṣal bi-ma'nā 'irmi'. [4] aw yakūna al-fi'l 'alā 'aktar min dālīka wa-'āḥiruhu lā, allati li-l-'amal naḥwa yumruq-lā¹² bi-ma'na 'ulkum', 'aylā bi-ma'nā 'i'mal' wa-sūyilah bi-ma'nā 'taḥaddat' wa-naḥwa dālīka. Fa-hāḍihi mawāḍi' al-nūn wa-mā 'adāhā mawḍi' al-lām. [5] Fa-taqūlu fī binā' hāḍihi l-'amṭila 'alā t-tartīb yi-n-il-dī wa-tuša-n-dī, 'al-in-dī, ṣal-in-dī, yumruq-la-n-dī wa-sū-la-n-dī wa-qis 'alā dālīka. (Qawānīn 26)

- 31 If we rephrase Qawānīn's statements in a more formal notation, the following picture of the distribution of *n* emerges:
1. CV- —one consonant, e.g. **ya-**;
 2. CVCV- —two consonants, a vowel follows the second consonant, e.g. **tuša-**;
 3. CVl- —two consonants, the last one being an *l*, e.g. **ṣal-**;
 4. -lā —verbal stem ends in -lā— this category includes denominal verbs —e.g. **yumruq-lā-**, a denominal verb from **yumruq** 'fist'.
- 32 Yet the examples Qawānīn gives still deviate from these rules. For example, instead of **yi-n-il-dī**, ['it was eaten'], which contains a combination of *n* and *l*, i.e. a two passive suffixes on the stem **yi-** 'to eat', one would expect a form like **yi-n-**.¹³ Another point is that in his account the anonymous author does not account for the distribution of *l*.
- 33 If we combine this statement with 'Abū Ḥayyān's concise summary, it evolves that they are essentially identical:
1. (CV)CV- —one or two consonants;
 2. (CV)CVl- —two consonants, the final one being an *l*;
 3. verbal stem ending in -lā.
- 34 The limitation in both sources on the number of consonants is difficult to understand as there are many verbs consisting of more than two consonants, not ending in -lā to which -n- can be added.

3.2 *L* and *n* as markers of the internal passive

- 35 All sources deal with the internal passive, yet not in the same way. Qawānīn, for example, relates Turkic *l* and *n* to the Arabic *u-i* pattern in the unmarked verb: "The rule (*qā'ida*) in this is that *n* is that you insert (*tuqhim*) an unvocalized *l* [or an unvocalized *n*] between the imperative form and whatever marker follows" (cf. also 4.1). Examples (without Arabic equivalents) are **ya-n-il-dī** 'it was eaten' (which contains a double passive, one -n, directly after the stem, **ya-** 'eat', and a second passive suffix in -il-), **tuša-n-dī** 'it was spread out' [**< tuša-**], **'al-in-dī** 'it was taken' [**< 'al-** 'take'], **ṣal-in-dī** 'it was set free' (**< ṣal-**), **yumruq-la-n-dī** 'he was punched' [**< yumruq-la-** 'to punch']

[denominal v. < **yumruq** ‘fist’], **sūla-n-dī** ‘it was watered’ [< **sū-la-**, denominal v. < **sū-** ‘water’] (*Qawānīn* 26).¹⁴

- 36 'Abū Ḥayyān briefly discusses the passive form with **-Vl-** under the heading “Chapter on the addition” (*al-Qawl fī al-ziyāda*) where a great number of nominal and verbal are listed ('*Idrāk* 111-116). He writes: “[the **l**] is added (*tuzādu*) as an indication (*dalālatan*) that [the verb] is ‘formed for the passive form’” (*binā' al-fi'l li-l-maf'ūl*) ('*Idrāk* 115), i.e. the internal passive:
- 37 Not only *l*, according to 'Abū Ḥayyān, but also *n* serves the function of marker of the internal passive as well. Elsewhere, in the “Chapter on the substitute of the agent” ('*Idrāk* 133), 'Abū Ḥayyān gives the following examples of *n* and the internal passive: **ya-dī** – '*akala*, **ya-n-dī** – '*ukila*; **ši-dī** – '*kasara*, **si-n-dī** – '*kusira*. Some of these examples recur in a summary under the header “the logical object whose agent is not mentioned” (*al-maf'ūl mā lam yusamma al-fā'ilu-hu*) ('*Idrāk* 112) albeit without translations into Arabic.

(3)	'ur-il-dī
	beat-PASS-3sg.PAST
	'he was beaten'

3.2.1 The passive participle

- 38 The author of the Margin Grammar chooses an approach based upon the passive participle, which in Turkic is marked by a passive stem plus the ending **-KAN**:

[1] The “passive participle” in Arabic —as is well-known— can only be [derived] from the transitive verb (*al-fi'l al-muta'addi*); the same is true in Turkic. [2] Its marker (*'alāma*) [i.e. of the passive participle] is that you insert (*tudḥīl*) an unvocalized (*sākin*) *l* or an unvocalized (*sākin*) *n* between the basic imperative verb (*fi'l al-'amr al-muḡarrad*) and the marker of the connected agent (*al-fā'il al-mawṣūl*).

[1] *Ism al-maf'ūl* – *wa-qad 'ulima fī al-'arabiyya 'annahu lā yakūnu 'illā min al-fi'l al-muta'addi fa-kaḡālika fī al-turkiyya*. [2] *Wa-'alāmatuhu 'an tudḥīla bayn fi'l al-'amr al-muḡarrad wa-'alāma al-fā'il al-mawṣūl lāman sākinan (sic) 'aw nūnan sākinan (sic)*. (MG 36a top)

- 39 The author here says, first, that a passive form can only be construed from a transitive verb. This is not entirely true, because in Arabic grammar intransitive verbs, e.g. *ḡahaba* ‘go’, the formation of impersonal passives is allowed (Girod 2007: 315): e.g. *ḡuhiba 'ilā al-quḡsi*, lit. ‘it was went to Jerusalem’ (Saad 2019 [1982]: 2).
- 40 He then explains that the marker *l* is put after the stem, but before **-KAN**. He exemplifies this with **wur-ḡān** (*al-ḡārib*) ‘the hitter’ and **wur-ul-ḡān** (*al-maḡrūb*) ‘the one that is hit’. He then analyses the participle ending **-ḡān** as the marker of the connected agent (*al-fā'il al-mawṣūl*), and thus appears to assign other significations to it, perhaps because this same ending is also used for the active participle. The Turkic ending does not contain any information regarding gender, number or passivity:
- 41 A similar statement can be found in *Tuḡfa*. The passive participle (*ism al-maf'ūl*) and the passive according to the pattern *fu'ila* (*al-mabnī li-mā lam yusamma fā'iluhu*):

“Its marker [i.e. of the passive participle] is an unvocalized *l* which follows (*talī*) the verb (*fi'l*) [i.e. the verbal stem] in the three tenses (*ḥālāt*) for all pronouns”.

‘*Alāmatuhu lām sākina talī al- fi'l talāt ḥālāt fi jamī' aḍ-ḍamā'ir.* (Tuhfa 47v5)

- 42 The Arabic examples given here, surprisingly, contain conjugated verbs with the internal passive rather than their passive participles, e.g. *musiktu* ‘I was taken’) and their Turkic equivalents with **-(V)l-**, e.g.:

(4)	wur-ḡān
	hit-PART.PAST
	‘the hitter’, ‘who was hit’

(5)	wur-ul-ḡān
	hit-PASS-PART.PAST
	‘the one that is hit’

(6)	ṭūt-ül-dū-m
	take-PASS-PAST-1sg
	‘I was taken’

3.3.2 K as a marker of passivity

- 43 In Turkic, there is a considerable number of deverbal adjectives ending in **-(V)K**¹⁵ (i.e. **-ik**, **-uq**, etc.).¹⁶ It makes sense to consider it a marker of passivity, albeit in a limited context, e.g. **ač-uk** ‘open’ (< **ač-** ‘open’), **yar-uq** ‘split’ (< **yar-** ‘to cleave’), **oy-uq** ‘hole’ (< **oy-** ‘to hollow out’), and **yül-ük** ‘shaven’ (< **yül-** ‘to shave’).¹⁷ The formation of these adjectives is, as far as I know, not productive.
- 44 These adjectives in **-(V)K** can be translated with passive participles in Arabic. This is the approach chosen in *Tuhfa*. *Tuhfa* (p. 48r) lists thirteen Arabic passive participles (of the *maḥḥūl* pattern) along with their Turkic equivalents, all of them ending in **-Vq/-Vk**, e.g. *maḥḥūh* – ‘**ağ-īq** ‘open’, *mašqūq* – **yār-īq** ‘split’, *maḥzūz* – **kārt-īk** ‘notched’ [< **kert-** ‘to notch’],¹⁸ suggesting that **-(V)K** is a marker of passivity. As we shall see, Ibn Muḥannā too considers *q* to have this function (cf. 4.3.1), but he mistakes **sin-uq-** for a verbal stem.
- 45 Kāšgarī takes this same reasoning regarding the use of the variants of **-(V)K** one step further as he considers them verbal augments in relation to the passive voice of a verb (p. 328). He gives two exemplifying phrases with a verb in **-(V)K** which he translates with an Arabic internal passive. Note that in Turcological studies **-(V)K** is not considered a productive suffix with verbal stems.¹⁹

- 46 The Turkic verb [**bassiq-**], Kāšġarī writes, derives from an original form (‘aṣl) **bas-dī** plus the *ḥarf q*. **Bas-** is, in fact, a common verb which is used in the sense of ‘to attack’.
- 47 In Kāšġarī’s view, the verb in 7b too consists of a stem (**bal-**) plus the suffix *k/q*. In Turcology though, **balīq** is not derived from the stem **bal-**, but from an obsolete stem **ba:**.²⁰ Kāšġarī seems to acknowledge this, because he lists **bālīġ** as a noun elsewhere in his work, with the meaning ‘the wounded one’ [*al-ġarīḥ*, p. 205; also p. 107 & 131]. Perhaps a more accurate translation of 7b therefore may be ‘the man was a wounded one’.

(7a)	bass-iq-tī ‘ar
	<i>buyyita al-raġulu</i>
	‘the man was suddenly attacked’

(7b)	‘ar balīq-ti
	<i>ġuriḥa al-raġul</i>
	‘the man was wounded’

3.3 Turkic *l* and *n* as markers of *infi‘āl* and *muṭāwa‘a*

- 48 The grammarians could not always decide whether the Turkic augments *l/n* stood for the internal passive or for other forms. It appears that they prefer the *infi‘āl* rather than the internal passive, possibly because this also involves the addition of a consonant.
- 49 ‘Abū Ḥayyān in his *’Idrāk* deals with the *l/n* both in the context of the internal passive, as I discussed above, but also in the compliance. He writes:
- If the verb consists of one consonant (‘*alā ḥarf wāḥid*), like their utterance ‘he broke (tr.)’ (*kasara*) **si-dī**, in the compliance (*muṭāwa‘a*) a silent *n* is used instead of an *l*. Thus for ‘he broke (intr.)’ (*inkasara*) you say **si-n-dī**.

Fa-in kāna al-fi‘l ‘alā ḥarf wāḥid naḥwa qawlihim kasara si-dī fa-l-ḥarf alladī ġi‘a bihi li-l-muṭāwa‘a nūn sākina badala al-lām fa-taqūlu fi inkasara si-n-dī. (’Idrāk 110)

- 50 He does not give any other conditions for the change.
- 51 On the same page, ‘Abū Ḥayyān, again, discusses this *l* under the heading of “consonant of the compliance” (*ḥarf al-muṭāwa‘a*). There he translates the Turkic passive verbal form 3.sg **kas-il-dī** with Arabic *in-qata‘a*, which we can analyse as follows:
- 52 It is difficult to tell at this point whether ‘Abū Ḥayyān here refers to the *muṭāwa‘a* in the semantical-interpretative sense, or whether he interprets all instances of *infi‘āl* as *muṭāwa‘a* throughout. The lack of any context in this phrase suggests that the latter may have been the case.

- 53 The author of the Margin Grammar is more explicit. According to him [in Turkic], no distinction is made between the “passive form” (*mā lam yusamma fā’iluhu*) and the *infi’āl* form: they overlap. In Turkic, he writes:

[1] There is no difference between this form [i.e. the form in *fu’ila*] and the *infi’āl*-form; both are rendered by means of addition (*ziyāda*) of the *l*, regardless of whether it is in the past tense (*māḍī*) or the future tense (*mustaqbal*).

[2] You say for example **’ur-ul-dī** i.e. ‘he was beaten’ (*ḍuriba*) and likewise **aş-il-dī** ‘he was hung’ (*şuliba*), and **’iç-il-dī** ‘it was drunk’ (*şuriba*) and the like.

[3] The difference between *al-infi’āl* and [the form *fu’ila*] is that *al-infi’āl* is intransitive (*lāzim*) [while] this [the base form without -l-] is transitive (*muta’addin*). [...]

[4] the *infi’āl* occurs with an *n*, you say **’ari-n-dī** [‘he is cleansed’] or the *infi’āl*-form of ‘the cleansing’ (*al-naḏāfa*), and likewise **kur-u-n-dī** [‘he is seen’] or the *infi’āl*-form of ‘the staring’ (*al-’ibṣār*).

[1] *Bāb mā lam yusamma fā’ilu-hu — lā farqa bayna-hu wa-bayn al-infi’āl fī ziyāda al-lām fī l-māḍī wa-l-mustaqbal*; [2] *taqūl min ḏālika ’ur-ul-dī ’ay ḍuriba wa-kaḏālika ’aş-il-dī ’ay şuliba wa-kaḏālika ’iç-il-dī ’ay şuriba wa-naḥwa-hunna*. [3] *Wa-l-farq bayna al-infi’āl wa-bayna-hā ’anna al-infi’āl lāzim wa-ḥaḏā muta’addin [...]* [4] *wa-qad ya’ti al-infi’āl bi-l-nūn fa-taqūlu ’ār-in-dī ’ay infa’ala min al-naḏāfa w-kaḏālika kur-un-dī ’ay infi’āl min al-’ibṣār*. (MG 52A right)

- 54 The reference to the tenses is not without importance either. In Arabic, the past tense verb of the 3.m.sg is the standard form without any additional consonants. The present/future tense (*muḏāri’* or *mustaqbal*) is formed by means of an extra prefix and a change in the pattern of the stem, e.g. in *ḍaraba/yaḍribu* (‘he hit’/‘he hits or will hit’). In the Turkic verbal paradigm, these are only added to the verbal stem.
- 55 According to Kāşğarī, the effect of the insertion of *n* is that “the verb shifts from transitivity to intransitivity” (*fa-lamma ’adḥalta al-nūna yuqlabu al-fi’l min al-ta’diya ’ilā l-lāzim*: (Dīwān 490).²¹ Kāşğarī suggests that both in Turkic and Arabic there is a similar morphological process in which the *n* causes intransitivity:²²

’ar tukūn yaz-dī (*ḥalla al-rağul al-’uqda*) ‘the man loosened the knot’ but then the *n* is attached and they say **tukūn yaz-in-dī**²³ i.e. ‘the knot is loosened’ (*inḥallat al-’uqda*) and the verb has become intransitive because of the attachment of the *n* to it.

’Ar tukūn yaz-dī ’ay ḥalla al-rağulu al-’uqdata tumma yulḥaqu bi-hi al-nūn fa-yuqālu **tukūn yaz-in-dī** ’ay inḥallat al-’uqdatu fa-şāra al-fi’l lāziman bi-’ilḥāq al-nūn bihi. (Dīwān 490-491)

- 56 Perhaps they maintain that the functions of *n* in Turkic and Arabic here coincide, i.e. namely passivization of transitive verbs.²⁴

(8)	<i>in-qata’a</i>
	PASS.RESULT-cut-3m.sg.PAST
	‘it was cut’ (’Iḍrāk 110, 12-15)

3.3.1 Ibn Muḥannā on the internal passive and *infiʿāl*

- 57 In his work *Ḥilyat al-Insān*, Ibn Muḥannā writes a brief yet elaborate explanation of the passive forms. He announces a discussion of three items: “the fourth chapter on [1] the verb whose agent is not mentioned (*fiʿl mā lam yusamma fāʿiluhu*), i.e. the *fuʿīla* form [2] the form *infiʿāl* and [3] the form *tafaʿʿul*”²⁵ (*Ḥilyat* 129). The patterns *infiʿāl* and *tafaʿʿul* are in Arab grammar often used in the context of compliance (*muṭāwaʿa*).
- 58 Then Ibn Muḥannā proceeds with a description of four instances in which in Turkic an unvocalized *l* is added. His point of departure is formed by the contexts in which one of the passive forms is used in Arabic. The first of these is the internal passive (*maḡhūl*) in which the *l* is, in Ibn Muḥannā’s terms, inserted (*ʿadḡalta*) to the “roots” (*ʿuṣūl*) of the verb, e.g.:
- *aḡḡaḡa* — *ʿal-dī*, *ʿuḡḡa* — *ʿal-il-dī** ‘he took’, ‘he was taken’;
 - *ḡaraba* — *ʿur-dī*, *ḡuriba* — *ʿur-ul-dī*, ‘he hit’, ‘he was hit’;
 - *kasara* — *sin-dur-dī*, *kusira* — *sin-dur-l-dī*, ‘he broke’, ‘he was broken’.
- 59 In all of these examples, the Arabic equivalents have the internal passive. The Turkic forms differ from another. The choice for *ʿal-il-* is peculiar, for the regular passive form of *ʿal-* is, according to the rules, *ʿal-in-*, *ʿal-il-* being quite rare (Clauson 1972: 145). Further, *sin-dur-* is surprising too, because it is a causative form (*-dur-*) and the passivization process shown here (*sin-dur-ul-*) thus contains a cluster of one causative and one passive suffixes.
- 60 Secondly, Ibn Muḥannā explains, the unvocalized *l* in Turkic occurs as a marker where in Arabic the verbal pattern *infaʿala* is used. He illustrates this with the following examples:
- *ṭahura* ‘he was clean’ — *ʿarī-dī*, *ṭaṭahhara*²⁶ — *ʿar-īl-dī* ‘he was cleansed’;
 - *allaqa* ‘he hung’ — *ʿas-dī*, *taʿallaqa* — *ʿas-īl-dī* ‘he was hung’;
 - *farraqa* ‘he separated’ — *taḡ-dī*, *tafarraqa* — *taḡ-īl-dī* ‘it was dispersed’.
- 61 Interestingly, while all Turkic forms indeed contain a passive in *-Vl-*, none of the Arabic examples are an actual illustration of the VII pattern (*infaʿala*). Instead, they are all V forms (*tafaʿʿala*). Perhaps Ibn Muḥannā did not intend to refer literally to the VII *infaʿala* form but rather the notion of *muṭāwaʿa* often associated with this pattern.
- 62 In the third place, according to Ibn Muḥannā, a *q* is used as a marker of passivity, e.g.:
- *kasara*, *s.n-dī* ‘he broke’, *takassara*, *s.n-uq-dī* ‘it was broken’.
- 63 Yet a verbal stem *s.n-uq-*, as far as I know, does not exist; the form *sin-uq* is an adjective to which, in a regular procedure, a past tense ending can be added (Clauson 1972: 837). Moreover, while no doubt derived from the verb *sī-* ‘break’, the adjective already contains *-n-*, which denotes passivity. In proposing here *q* as a suffix, Ibn Muḥannā either follows Kāšġarī (cf. 3.2.2), who also proposes *q* as a marker of passivity, albeit with a less adequately chosen example, or, alternatively, he has had access to sources used by Kāšġarī.
- 64 In a fourth statement, Ibn Muḥannā remarks that instead (*ʿiwaḡ*) of the *l* and the *q* an unvocalized *n* can be used. The condition for using *n* is, he writes, that the preceding consonant is vocalized with an *a* (*maḡtūḡ*) or a *u* (*maḡmūm*). This same *n* also serves as the marker of the equivalent to the V *tafaʿʿul* pattern, the reflexive:
- *ḡasala* — *yū-dī* ‘he washed’, *taḡassala* — *yū-n-dī* ‘he washed himself’

• *ḥarraka* ‘he moved (tr.)’ — **t.brā-dī** ‘he moved (intr.)’, *taḥarraka* — **t.brā-n-dī** ‘he (was) moved’.

- 65 Ibn Muḥannā here appears to be saying that in regard to *n*, in Turkic no difference is made between the internal passive and the other passive forms. However, again, neither of the two examples he gives is an internal passive. In addition, his choice of the second Turkic example, **t.brā-dī** is not very adequate, since it is intransitive and clearly not the equivalent of the transitive verb *ḥarraka*.²⁷

3.3.2 Kāšgarī on the combination of *l* and *n*

- 66 The suffixes *l* and *n* occasionally occur in combination with each other in Turkic verbs, e.g. **yaz-l-in-** ‘become loose’ and **yuv-lu-n-**²⁸ ‘roll’. In the reasoning of the Arab grammatical tradition, doubling poses a problem, since these are both meaningful suffixes which essentially serve the same function. Although Kāšgarī (490-411) does not mention this theoretical problem, he analyses the facts in some detail, in relation to the passive-reflexive verbs **yaz-li-n-** ‘become loose’ and **yuv-lu-n-** ‘roll (pass.)’ [**< yuv-** ‘to roll (trans.)’], which convey the same meaning as the simpler alternative passive forms **yaz-il-** and **yaz-in-** and **yuv-ul-**, respectively. In Kāšgarī’s analysis, many of the issues discussed above come together:

[1] Then the *n* is combined (*turakkabu*) with the *l* and they say **yaz-li-n-dī**, i.e. ‘the knot loosens by itself’ (*inḥallat al-‘uqdatu bi-ṭab’ihi*) (*sic*).

[2] They also say ‘**ar tubuq yuv-dī**²⁹ ‘the man rolled the ball’ (*daḥraḡa al-raḡul al-kurrata*). Then they say **tubuq yuv-ul-dī** ‘the ball was rolled by the action of something else’ (*duḥriḡat al-kurra bi-fi’li ḡayrihi*). The same applies in case of [the Arabic verbal form] *tadaḥraḡa* ‘it rolled (intr.)’ [i.e. there is no implied agent]. Then the *n* is attached to it (*yulḥaqu*), and they say **yuv-lu-n-dī**, i.e. ‘it rolled by itself’ (*tadaḥraḡa bi-ṭab’ihi*).

[3] Before the attachment of the *n* to the *l* [i.e. **yaz-il-**], the verb was transitive (*lāziman*) in two aspects (*waḡhayni*). One of them³⁰ was that the action affected it [i.e. the semantic object] (*wāqi’an ‘alayhi*) through an unknown agent (*fā’il maḡhūl*) and the verb follows the same course (*maḡrā*) as the *l* in it.³¹

[1] *ṭumma turakkabu al-nūn ma’a al-lām fa-yuqāl yaz-li-n-dī* ‘ay *inḥallat al-‘uqdatu bi-ṭab’ihi* [2] *wa-kaḡālika yuqālu ‘ar tubuq yuv-dī* ‘ay *daḥraḡa al-raḡul al-kurrata*. *ṭumma yuqālu tubuq yuv-ul-dī* ‘ay *duḥriḡat al-kurra bi-fi’li ḡayrihi wa-kaḡālika ‘idā tadaḥraḡa ṭumma yulḥaqu bihi al-nūn fa-yuqālu* [491] **yuv-l-un-dī** ‘ay *tadaḥraḡa bi-ṭab’ihi*. [3] *fa-qabla ‘ilḡāq al-nūn bi-l-lām kāna al-fi’l lāziman ‘alā waḡhayni, ‘aḡaduhumā kāna yaḡūzu ‘an yakūn al-fi’lu wāqi’an ‘alayhi min fā’il maḡhūl fa-yaḡrī al-fi’lu maḡrā al-lām fihi*.

- 67 What Kāšgarī appears to be saying in this section is that **yuv-ul-** is a passive form with an implied, hidden (or unknown) agent. Yet after the addition of the *n*, resulting in **yuv-lu-n-**, which contains a (vowel shift and a) combination of suffixes —impossible in Arabic—, the verb loses the notion of implied or hidden agent and the action is carried out by itself (*bi-ṭab’ihi*), expressed in Arabic by a passive-reflexive form such as *tadaḥraḡa*.³² Thus he not only distinguishes semantically and functionally the Arabic internal passive from the *infi’āl*-form, he also assigns distinct functions to Turkic verbal morphemes.

3.4 The distinction between stem and root

- 68 While in Arabic the pre- and infixes are inserted before the verbal (or nominal) root called 'aṣl³³ and between its consonantal elements, in Turkic all suffixes are attached to an (almost) invariable stem and clustered to one another. Because of the distinct qualities, the Turkic stem cannot be equivalent to the Arabic root
- 69 In the Margin Grammar and in *Qawānīn*, as we have seen above, therefore the terms *fi'l al-'amr* 'imperative verb' and *fi'l al-'amr al-muğarrad* 'the bare imperative verb' are used. This makes sense, because the Turkic bare stem, devoid of any suffixes, conveys the imperative. Other sources (*Tuhfa*, *Dīwān*) use *fi'l* for the verbal stem. Ibn Muḥannā uses once 'roots' in relation to verbs ('uṣūl, see 3.3.1). In yet another context, the Margin Grammar uses *al-'aṣl al-mufrad al-muğarrad* 'the basic bare root' (MG 36B top).

4 Conclusions

- 70 It is obvious that the Arab grammarians recognized the two Turkic suffixes, *l* and *n*, that are attached to the verbal stem in order to indicate the passive form. Yet there are different points of confusion as to the distribution of these suffixes. For example, for some reason they link the distribution of the *n* to mono- or biradical verbs.
- 71 Another problem is the signification. In Arabic, the passive can be expressed by means of an internal passive along the patterns /fu'ila/ —a change within the root (*wazn*)— or /maf'awl/, or via changes to the root, VII *infa'ala* or V *tafa'ala* each signifying different things. While the internal passive refers to an unknown, hidden agent, the VII and V forms refer to an absent agent, the subject of the verb carries the action out by itself. These forms are used in the concept of compliance, the resultative (*muṭāwa'a*) in which an agent carries out the action, while there is a causing element. In Turkic no such differences exists and *n* can be assigned the same signification as the equivalent suffix in Arabic: intransitivization. Most sources take the functional overlap of *l* and *n*, when transferred to Arabic, for granted; only the Margin Grammar explicitly says that they coincide. It seems the authors are confused by this overlap; they would have preferred to assign the Turkic suffixes *l/n* distinct functions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

- Al-Andalusī, 'Abū Ḥayyān. *Kitāb al-'Idrāk fī lisān al-'Atrāk*. Ed. by A. Caferoğlu. Istanbul: Evkaf. 1931.
- Al-Andalusī, 'Abū Ḥayyān. *Kitāb Manhaj al-sālik fī al-kalām 'alā Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. by S. Glazer. New Haven CT: American Oriental Society. 1947.

- Al-Andalusī, 'Abū Ḥayyān. *Irtiṣāf al-Ḍarab fī Lisān al-'Arab*, vol. I, II, III. Ed. by M.A. al-Namās. Cairo: Al-Madanī. 1984, 1987, 1989.
- Halasi-Kun, T. ed. *Al-Tuḥfa al-Zakiyya fī al-Luḡa al-Turkiyya / La langue des Kiptchaks d'après un manuscrit arabe d'Istanbul*, II, Édition phototypique. Budapest: Bibliotheca Orientalis hungarica. 1942.
- Houtsma, M. Th. ed. *Tarǧumān Turkī wa-Aǧami wa-Muǧālī / Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar nach der Leidener Handschrift*. Leiden: Brill. 1889.
- Ibn Al-Muhannā, Ğ.-D. *Kitāb Hilyat al-Insān wa-Halbat al-Lisān*. Ed. by M.R. Kilisli. Istanbul: Matbaa-ı Âmire. 1921.
- Al-Kāšǧarī, M. *Dīwān Luǧāt at-Turk. Facsimile edition of Ali Emiri 4189*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı [Ministry of Culture]. 1990.
- Kilisli, M.R. ed. *Kitāb al-Qawānīn al-Kulliyya li-Ḍabt al-Luḡa al-Turkiyya*. Istanbul: Evkaf. 1928.

Secondary sources

- Abboud-Haggar, S. 2006. Dialects: Genesis. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 1, 613-622. Leiden: Brill.
- Al-Balushi, R. 2016. Omani Arabic: More than a dialect. *Macrolinguistics*, n° 4/4: 80-125.
- Auezova, Z.-A. 2005. *Mahmud Al-Kashgari: Diwan Lughat at Turk*. Kazakhstanskies Vostokovednye Issledovaniia. Almaty: Daik Press.
- Ayoub, G. and Versteegh, K., eds. 2018. *The foundations of Arabic linguistics*, III, *The development of a tradition: Continuity and change*. Studies in Semitic languages and linguistics 94. Leiden: Brill.
- Baalbaki, R. 2009. Aṣl. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 192-195. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Bazzi-Hamzé, S. 2007a. Fā'il. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 2, 83-84. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Bazzi-Hamzé, S. 2007b. Fi'l. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 2, 90-96. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Belova, A. Gr. 2009. South Semitic languages. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 300-315. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Berta, Á. 1998. Middle Kipchak. In *The Turkic languages*, ed. by L. Johanson and É.Á. Csató, 158-166. London: Routledge.
- Bohas, G. and Guillaume, J.-P. 1984. *Étude des théories des grammairiens arabes*, 1, *Morphologie et phonologie*. PIFD 112. Damascus: Institut français de Damas.
- Carter, M.G., ed. 1981. *Arab linguistics: An introductory classical text with translation and notes*. Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series 3, Studies in the history of linguistics 24. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Clauson, G. 1965. An Eastern Turki-English dictionary. By Gunnar Jarring. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N. F. Avd. 1, Bd. 56, Nr. 4. Pp. 338. C. W. K. Gleerup, Lund. 1964. Kr. 50. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, n° 97/1: 57.
- Clauson, G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Dankoff, R. and Kelly, J., eds. 1982-1985. *Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī, Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Diwān Luyāt at-Turk)*. 3 vols. Sources of Oriental languages and literatures; Turkish sources 7. Cambridge MA: Harvard University.
- Ermers, R. 1999. *Arabic grammars of Turkic: The Arabic linguistic model applied to foreign languages & translation of 'Abū Ḥayyān al-'Andalusī's Kitāb al-'Idrāk li-Lisān al-'Atrāk*. Studies in Semitic languages and Linguistics 28. Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill.
- Ermers, R. 2007. The use of morphological patterns in Arabic grammars of Turkic. In *Approaches to Arabic linguistics presented to Kees Versteegh on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*, ed. by E. Ditters & H. Motzki, 435-453. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 49. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Girod, A. 2007. Impersonal Verb. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 2, 315-318. Leiden: Brill.
- Johanson, L. 1998. The structure of Turkic. In *The Turkic languages*, ed. by L. Johanson and É.Á. Csató, 30-66. London: Routledge.
- Khawla, M.F. 2012. Al-muṭāwa'a wa-ta'šišu-hā fi al-'Arabiyya. *Majallat Jāmi'at Tikrīt Li-l-'Ulūm al-Insāniyya*, n° 19/10: 122-135.
- Larcher, P. 2003. *Le système verbal de l'arabe classique*. 1st ed. Didactilangue. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'université de Provence.
- Larcher, P. 2009. Verbs. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 638-645. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Larcher, P. 2012. *Le système verbal de l'arabe classique*. 2nd ed. Manuels. Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence.
- Maalej, Z. 2008. Middle verbs. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 3, 224-227. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Maróth, M. 2009. Qiyās. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 11-14. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- An-Nādirī, M.A. 1995. *Naḥw al-luḡa al-'arabiyya: Kitāb fi qawā'id an-naḥw wa-ṣ-ṣarf*. Beirut: Al-Maktaba al-'Aṣriyya.
- Owens, J. 1988. *The foundations of grammar: An introduction to Medieval Arabic grammatical theory*. Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series 3, Studies in the history of the language sciences 45. Amsterdam/Philadelphia PA: J. Benjamins.
- Owens, J. 1990. *Early Arabic grammatical theory: Heterogeneity and standardization*. Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series 3, Studies in the history of the language sciences 53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia PA: J. Benjamins.
- Redhouse, J.W. 1890. *A Turkish and English lexicon. Shewing in English the significations of the Turkish terms* (Re-pr. 1978). Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları.
- Róna-Tas, A. 1998. Proto-Turkic and the Genetic question. In *The Turkic languages*, ed. by L. Johanson and É.Á. Csató, 67-80. London: Routledge.
- Saad, G.N. 2019 [1982]. *Transitivity, causation and passivization: A semantic-syntactic study of the verb in Classical Arabic*. Library of Arabic Linguistics 4. New York: Routledge.
- Şahan Güney, F. 2006. Functions of the so-called passive morpheme -(I)l- in Kazakh. *Bilig*, n° 36: 125-137.
- Sheyhatovitch, B. 2018. *The distinctive terminology in Šarḥ al-Kāfiya by Raḍī l-Dīn al-'Astarābādī*. Studies in Semitic languages and linguistics 96. Leiden: Brill.

Simeone-Senelle, M.-Cl. 1997. The Modern South Arabian languages. In *The Semitic languages*, ed. by R. Hetzron, 378-423. London: Routledge.

Soltan, U. 2009. Transitivity. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 535-542. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Versteegh, K. 1995. *The explanation of linguistic causes: Al-Zağğāgī's theory of grammar: introduction, translation, commentary*. Amsterdam studies in theory and history of linguistic science 75. Amsterdam/Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins.

Versteegh, K. 1997. *Landmarks in linguistic thought III: The Arabic linguistic tradition*. Routledge History of Linguistic Thought Series. London/New York: Routledge.

Versteegh, K. 2014. *The Arabic Language*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Yavrumyan, M. 2006. Das System der Verbalstämme in der Arabischen linguistischen Tradition. Elemente der morphologischen und semantischen Analyse. Bayreuth: Universität Bayreuth.

NOTES

1. The author wishes to thank the anonymous reviewer for his critical remarks.
2. The importance of *Dīwān* is so great, that most Turkic peoples, from Turkey to Kazakhstan, claim it as part of their cultural heritage. In addition, *Dīwān* formed the basis for Clauson's etymological dictionary of Turkic languages (Clauson 1972).
3. See, e.g. Yavrumyan (2006).
4. /'/' represents the 'alif, which is preceded by /a/ (*fāṭḥa*), which then can only be realised as a long vowel (see Bohas and Guillaume 1984: 256-259).
5. It remains to be investigated whether they discerned new functions that were unknown to the Arabic system.
6. Khawla (2012: 129-130) lists eleven verbal patterns for the *muṭāwī'*, one of them, in *fu'ila*, as in *ḡada'ahu fa-ḡudi'a* 'he deceived him, so he was deceived'.
7. Clauson (1972) notes the rare form **al-il-** as a passive of **al-**; also **bil-il-** 'be known' (< **bil-**) (Berta 1998: 160).
8. In the sources, the vowels in Turkic morphemes are occasionally not explicitly written; in those cases, a period is used in the transcription, e.g. **-l-** and **-n-**.
9. On *al-nā'ib* 'an *al-fā'il*, cf. Bazzi-Hamzé (2007a: 82).
10. Correction for 'noun': R.E.
11. Clauson (1972: 57).
12. Em. by the editor.
13. The variant **ye-n-** does exist in the same meaning. The Turkic verb **yaŋ-** (pronounced with front vowels as [yeŋ-] 'to beat, conquer', **yeŋ-** [Clauson 1972]) has a regular passive form, i.e. **yaŋ-il-** 'be conquered'. In Ottoman Turkish, the two verbs **yeŋ-** and **yeŋ-** have merged into **yenmek** 'to overcome', 'to be eaten' (Redhouse 1978 [1890]).
14. *Qawānīn* repeats this same text almost literally when describing how the passive participle is formed (p. 51; see discussion in 3.2.1).
15. K represents the morphemes *k* or *q* depending on whether the word is pronounced back or front.
16. Note that in Clauson's transcription of Turkic **-q** is not used. Whether a word is pronounced back or front is to be inferred from the vowels.
17. Cf. Clauson (1972: 22, 962, 270 & 928).
18. Cf. Clauson (1972: 22, 962 & 738).

19. According to Clauson (1972: 337), Kāšgarī here mistakes the **-q** for the suffix **-siq**.
20. Cf. *ibid*.
21. If we take this remark to also be valid for verbs with **-il-**, this is not entirely true, because there are verbs without **-l-** that are transitive, e.g. **igle-l-**, (< **igle**: ‘be sick’); a disease **igle-l-dī** ‘was suffered’ (Clauson 1972: 107).
22. Kāšgarī elsewhere remarks that the *n* in general causes intransitivity, e.g. for the medio-passive or reflexive verbs (596-597).
23. Correction for **yaz-li-n-dī**, which Kāšgarī mentions as an alternative later on in the text.
24. A step further would be the suggestion that Kāšgarī believed that **-n** has a cross-linguistic signification and that it is the same morpheme in the two languages.
25. Numbers added: R.E.
26. Note that *taṭāhhara* is the passive form to *ṭāhhara* ‘cleanse’, not *ṭāhura*, as Ibn Muḥannā seems to be asserting here.
27. Hence its causative form **tepre-t-**, cf. Clauson (1972).
28. Cf. *ibid.*: 987.
29. On **yuv-** cf. *ibid.*: 873.
30. Contrary to what one would expect here, a second aspect is not mentioned.
31. On *mağrā*, see Maróth (2009: 13).
32. Kāšgarī adds in a subsequent passage on the same page that tetra-radical (*rubāʿī*) verbs that are the result of a procedure of combining, such as **yuv-lu-n-dī**, are transferred (*manqūla*) from a bi-radical (*ṭunāʿī*) verb (**yuv-**) to tri-radical (*tulāṭī*), and from tri-radical to tetra-radical.
33. On *ʿaṣl*, cf. Baalbaki (2009: 191); Bohas and Guillaume (1984).

ABSTRACTS

This paper deals with the analyses of medieval Arab grammarians of passive and resultative verbs in Turkic. In Arabic grammatical theory, certain forms are correlated with unique meanings. In Arabic there are basically two types of passives: first, an internal apophonic passive, indicated by a vowel shift within the verbal root, e.g. /faʿila/ → /fuʿila/; secondly, a passive indicated by the prefix *in-* attached to the root, i.e. Form VII, which results in the infinitive pattern *infīʿāl*—yet verbal forms construed according to the VII paradigm are in addition often interpreted as resultative verbs. In Turkic, verbs can be passivized by adding an **-Vl-** to the verbal stem (under some criteria this is **-Vn-**), e.g. **ʿur-** ‘hit’ → **ʿur-ul-** ‘be hit’; the Turkish **-Vn-** form also expresses the reflexive form, e.g. **ʿur-un-** ‘hit oneself’. In addition, other suffixes may indicate passivization. This poses problems for the grammarians, which they tackle in similar but also very distinct ways: the distinctions between the two passive forms in Arabic, the missing resultative in Turkic, the passive in Turkic, the notion of stem in Turkic versus root in Arabic theory, the position of the inserted element, the criteria according to which the Turkic passive form is not **-Vl-** but instead **-Vn-**, to name but a few.

Cette contribution se penche sur les analyses des verbes passifs et résultatifs en turcique menées par les grammairiens arabes. Dans la théorie grammaticale arabe, certaines formes sont corrélées à une valeur unique. En arabe, il y a essentiellement deux types de passif : un passif apophonique interne, indiqué par une variation des voyelles à l’intérieur de la racine verbale, e.g. /faʿila/ → /fuʿila/, et un passif marqué par le préfixe *in-* attaché à la racine, autrement la forme VII, qui

donne l'infinitif *infi'āl* ; toutefois les formes verbales de la forme VII sont en outre souvent interprétées comme des verbes résultatifs. En turcique, les verbes peuvent être construits au passif en ajoutant au radical un suffixe -**VI**- (dans certains cas -**Vn**-), e. g. '**ur**- 'frapper' → '**ur-ul**- 'être frappé'. La forme -**Vn**- en turc peut également exprimer la forme réfléchie, e. g. '**ur-un**- 'se frapper soi-même'. Il existe en outre d'autres suffixes qui peuvent marquer le passif. Cela pose des problèmes aux grammairiens, qui les traitent de manières diverses encore que voisines : la distinction entre les deux passifs en arabe, l'absence de résultatif en turcique, le passif en turcique, la notion de radical en turcique opposée à celle de racine en arabe, les critères qui distinguent les passifs en -**VI**- des passifs en -**Vn**-, pour n'en nommer que quelques-uns.

INDEX

Keywords: 'Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī, Al-Tuḥfa al-Zakiyya fī l-Luġa al-Turkiyya, Arabic grammatical theory, Ibn al-Muḥannā, Kitāb al-Qawānīn li-Ḍabṭ al-Luġa al-Turkiyya, Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī, passive in Arabic, passive in Turkic, Turkic grammars in Arabic

Mots-clés: 'Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī, Al-Tuḥfa al-Zakiyya fī l-Luġa al-Turkiyya, grammaires du turcique en arabe, Ibn al-Muḥannā, Kitāb al-Qawānīn li-Ḍabṭ al-Luġa al-Turkiyya, Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī, passif en arabe, passif en turcique, théorie grammaticale arabe

AUTHOR

ROBERT ERMERS

Radboud Universiteit, Nijmegen, The Netherlands