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English adjectival passive participles generally do not admit agent-oriented material such as by-phrases and manner adverbs. Marantz (1997), Kratzer (2000), Embick (2004) and others claim that this is because adjectival participles are derived below the VoiceP level where the agent and object case are introduced. Anagnostopoulou (2003) shows that Greek has result state adjectival passive participles that in fact do license agent-oriented material, and accordingly claims these are derived above VoiceP. This construction is nevertheless passive—although an agent is licensed in VoiceP, it surfaces in a by-phrase and may not be externalized. This raises the question of whether the passive nature of such result state adjectival participles is a necessary or contingent, cross linguistically variable, property of the construction. I endeavour to show that Syrian Arabic (like some but not all other varieties of Arabic) has active participles of eventive verbs with the stative, past-shifted interpretation characteristic of result state adjectival participles. Consequently, the morphosyntax of result state adjectives is in principle compatible with agent externalization and object licensing.

While the simplex adjective nāḏīf ‘clean’ in (1a) does not accept the manner adverb bi-diʔʔe ‘carefully’, both the active and passive participles of the morphologically causative verb nāḏłat ‘to clean’ in (1b) and (1c) do so naturally (the latter, then, is like Greek). The active participle has the normal active syntax including an externalized agent and an accusative object. Both constructions in (1b) and (1c) describe the post-state of a cleaning event, characteristic for result state adjectives. Though (1b) has no direct translation in English, it means what (1c) means but expresses the agent directly. Arabic has a null copula in the present tense. The participle is derived by the prefix mi-.

   the-house clean (*with-care) Mona PART-clean-FEM the-house with care
   ‘The house is clean (*carefully).’ [no direct English counterpart]

c. l-beyt mi-t-nāḏḏīf bi-diʔʔe.
   the-house PART-PASS-clean with-care
   ‘The house is cleaned (?!carefully).’

That the adjectival predicates in (1b) and (1c) describe resultant states is clear from their interaction with other constructions. Syrian Arabic has a continuous perfect construction that only accepts stative predicates and an interval description, and asserts that the state has held for the interval. In this construction, the subject is doubled by a dative pronoun. Example (2a) with a simplex adjective translates straightforwardly as the continuous perfect and asserts that a state of the house being clean has lasted for three days. Similarly, (2b) and (2c) assert that the post-state of a cleaning-the-house event has lasted for three days. That is, both assert that the house was cleaned three days previously, and (2b) adds that Mona cleaned it. I translate (2b-c) along those lines, but the Arabic construction is built on an adjectival predicate, not a verbal one.

(2) a. l-beyt ʔiḷu tleet iyyaam nāḏīf.
   the-house ʔDAT three days clean
   ‘The house has been clean for three days.’

b. Mona ʔiḷa tleet iyyaam mi-nāḏḏīf-e l-beyt.
   Mona herDAT three days PART-clean-FEM the-house
   ‘Mona cleaned the house three days ago.’
c. 1-beyt ʔilu tleet iyyaam mi-t-naḍḍif.
   the-house IDAT three days PART-PASS-clean
   ‘The house was cleaned three days ago.’

The situation in Syrian Arabic represents a clear case of participle formation above VoiceP preserving the active/passive voice alternation and the complement frame of the underlying verb. If this is like Greek, it raises the question of why Greek does not have active adjectival participles as well. The Arabic facts tell us at least this much: Wasow’s (1977) claim that adjectival participles fail to license accusative case because they are adjectival is not true, so something else determines whether an adjectival participle may have an agent and/or an accusative complement.

I claim that the difference between Arabic and Greek is related to a morphosyntactic difference: in Greek, the voice distinction is expressed in the same morphosyntactic layer as the category (verb/adjective) distinction. The non-active inflection in (3a) occurs between the stem and agreement inflection, just where the participial morpheme men occurs in the participial construction in question in (3b) (examples from Anagnostopoulou 2003). This suggests that men is itself a kind of non-active voice marking, one that adjectivizes.

(3)  
   a. To grammagramma graf-tik-e.
       the letter-NOM.SG.NEUT write-NON.ACTIVE-3SG.PAST
       ‘The letter was written.’ [verbal passive]
   b. To grammagramma ine gra-men-o.
       the letter-NOM.SG.NEUT is-3SG write-PARTICIPLE-NOM.SG.NEUT
       ‘The letter is written.’ [adjectival passive]

In Arabic, on the other hand, voice is expressed on the verb stem, as either a prefix (n- or t- depending on the morphological form of the verb) or as a stem vowel alternation (not shown here). While for some verbs the participles (again both active and passive) are formed by templatic morphology, which makes it difficult to locate the semantic components of the form, in all the cases where the participle is formed by the concatenative prefix mi-, voice is expressed separately, internal to mi-. In the talk, I present a fleshed out syntacticization of these observations along the lines in (4), according to which the functional architecture of the predicate is more finely articulated in Arabic than in Greek, allowing Arabic to express voice independently of adjectivization.

(4)  
   a. Greek: [[[ verb stem ] {voice, participle} ] agreement ]
   b. Arabic: [[[ participle [ voice [ verb stem ]] ] agreement ]