

## Passive in Persian: Distributed Morphology Approach

Shoja' Tafakori Rezaei<sup>1</sup>, Alireza Soleimani Moqaddam<sup>2\*</sup>

1. Assistant Professor of English Language and Literature, University of Razi, Kermanshah, Iran

2. PhD Candidate in Linguistics, University of Razi, Kermanshah, Iran

Received: 06/03/2017

Accepted: 14/06/2017

“Verbal versus adjectival” dichotomy of passive structures has occurred in studies based on approaches believing two generative component in the grammar, i.e. syntax and lexicon. Distributed morphology (DM) (Halle & Marantz, 1993), a non-lexicalist approach to morphology, takes the theoretical position that there is only one generative component in the Grammar, the syntax, and claims that all derivation of complex objects is syntactic. This descriptive-analytic article is aimed to study the so-called passive structures and the participles used in them, in Persian within the framework of DM, from the perspective of syntax-semantics interface, focusing on Embick (2004). The article tries to answer the following two questions:

a. How can we, based on DM, give a unified analysis of passive structures in Persian and so end the arguments among linguists regarding the existence of passive in Persian.

b. What syntactic features within DM, are responsible for some Persian participles having different interpretations (eventive and resultative).

Regarding the first question, it is predicted that, since Persian verbal and adjectival passives are all complex objects, their derivations, based on the present approach occur in syntax. Regarding the second question, it is hypothesized that, since some Persian participles such as *godaxte*, *bæste* and *araste*, in “participle + *ʃodæn*” structures in passive structures, have different interpretations, there is another kind of participle (resultative) in Persian.

After analyzing the data, it is argued that since Persian verbal and adjectival passives are all complex objects, their derivation, based on the present approach and contrary to previous studies, occur in syntax and their distinction is attributed to the position at which aspect head is merged (above or under *v*). In other words in verbal (eventive) passives the aspect head is merged above “*v* head”, while in simple adjectival passives it is merged under “*v* head”.

Also based on linguistic and interpretive evidences, findings showed that some participles (*godaxte*, *bæste* and *araste*) in “participle + *ʃodæn*” structures are interpreted as both event and resultative. So another kind of participle (resultative), in Persian will be introduced and its unique syntactic features in DM framework will be specified. The significant syntactic difference between the eventive and

\* Corresponding Author's E-mail: soleimani\_a@ymail.com

resultative passives is first attributed to the feature [AG] which is present in eventive passive and missing in resultative ones, and second to the different uses of “fodæn” : as auxiliary in verbal passives and copula or BECOME-operator (Embick, 2004) in resultative passives.

**Keywords:** Distributed morphology; Underspecification; Lexicalist participle.