The Grammatical Influence of English on Arabic in the Passive Voice in Translation

Basem I. M. Al-Raba'a

Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, Indiana University Bloomington

Goodbody Hall 219, 1011 E. 3rd St. Bloomington, IN 47405-7005, USA

Tel: 1-843-814-2470   E-mail: alrabaa@indiana.edu

Abstract

This short paper addresses the idea that translation as a case of language contact can prompt convergence between Arabic and English. I hypothesize that using the by-phrase along with the agent in the Arabic passive structure has been modeled, via a grammaticalization process, on its English counterpart in translation. This process has led to pattern replication, i.e. borrowing the abstract features of the source language (English). The findings reveal that not only foreign language learners initiate a language change alongside bilinguals, but also that the former are much more involved in this process than the latter.

Keywords: Contact linguistics, Translation, Grammaticalization, Passive voice

1. Introduction

This section sets forth an introductory overview of this study and its purpose, data collection, and the subjects of the study.

1.1 Overview

Language contact is a worldwide sociolinguistic phenomenon that manifests itself in various aspects. Languages in contact can linguistically influence one another. Such a contact can induce several linguistic results some of which are lexical borrowing, grammaticalization, and code switches.

The study of grammaticalization has been an area of interest for many scholars (Heine & Kuteva, 2003; Matras, 1998; Matras and Sakel, 2007; Campbell, 1993; & Winford, 2003). Grammaticalization, as defined by Heine and Kuteva (2003: 529), is "a process leading from lexical to grammatical and from grammatical to more grammatical forms". They add that "the study of grammaticalization is also concerned with constructions and larger discourse units", for constructions and larger context settings shape the development of grammatical forms (p. 529). Grammaticalization goes through successive stages ranging from slight to heavy structural borrowing. Grammatical borrowing in translation is perhaps the first stage of contact-induced grammaticalization.

This short paper is concerned with the structural borrowing from English to Arabic in translation. This type of borrowing manifests itself in the employment of the English structure of passive voice in texts or sentences translated from English into Arabic. This process might only occur when an English sentence, which needs to be translated into Arabic, consists of a passive verb and an agent, i.e. when the doer of the action co-occurs with a passive verb. Such a case might be accounted for in terms of structural borrowing, given that the co-occurrence of a passive verb with an agent is highly avoided in Arabic as opposed to English.

Winford (2003: 62) notes that transference of structural features is rarely triggered by direct borrowing, but rather by either the mediation of lexical borrowing or bilinguals who, in most if not all cases, initiate structural changes. Therefore, this study is an attempt to make explicit, if any, the type of grammaticalization employed and its frequency, which subgroup (bilinguals as opposed to monolinguals who know some English) of the participants tend to be (more) influenced by the English passive structure and/or what kinds of agency are involved in the borrowing of structural features, and finally what possible assumption(s) could be suggested to account for the occurrence of any structural borrowing.

1.2 Data Collection

The data has been collected by means of distributing a sheet of paper and/or sending email messages to the participants. The researcher asked the participants to translate ten English sentences, five passive and five active, into Arabic. The passive sentences, with which this study is concerned, include passive verbs accompanied by agents. The active sentences have functioned as distractor sentences so it was not fairly obvious to the participants what

structure I was interested in.

1.3 Subjects of the Study

The study groups include eleven Jordanian and Syrian Arabic-English bilinguals and twenty native speakers of Arabic who learned (some basics of) English as a foreign language. The participants are of different age groups, ranging from twenty to thirty-five years old. The bilinguals were all born into Arab families in the USA. They master both Arabic and English, for the former is the language of the home and of the community (the Arab community in Flint, Michigan) and the latter is the language of schooling and of the surrounding bigger environment (living in the USA). It is also noteworthy to mention that the bilinguals were sent to Arabic schools on Sundays to learn Arabic. The English foreign language learners (the second group) were all born in Jordan. They learned English in schools, starting from the fifth grade until the twelfth grade. They used to take only one course in English every year; the main focuses of the English courses were reading and grammar. Interestingly enough, those Jordanian native speakers of Arabic have not practiced English because it is never spoken in Jordan except in some rich parts of the capital *Amman* on a few occasions. Only do they speak some English words which have been borrowed from English and, accordingly, have been assimilated into the morphosyntactic system of Arabic. The second group can be also called monolinguals with some basic knowledge of English, especially reading and grammar.

2. Theoretical Background

Arabic has always been in contact with other languages throughout history. Versteegh (2010: 637-638) proposes that speakers of Arabic borrowed words from other languages (Syriac, Latin, and Greek) as a result of language contact even before Islam. The status of Arabic as a superimposed language after it was established as the new cultural, administrative, and religious language of the Islamic empire did not make it impenetrable to the effect of other cultures. He adds that Arabic has borrowed a large number of English words, especially in the language of the electronic media, due to the globalization of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, the foreign loans are being gradually replaced by Arabic terms; for example, the word *ħasub* has become the official word for its English counterpart *computer*, and *shibh* for *pseudo-* (Versteegh, pp. 638-639).

Contact situations can be rich environments that eventually give rise to contact-induced grammaticalization. It is very likely that languages in contact will undergo structural changes in the course of time. Such a process might be relatively different from one situation to another; i.e. it might be much quicker or slower in some situations than others. Matras (1998: 282) points out that "language contact acts as a laboratory of language change where properties may become transparent that are otherwise obscure, and so it may allow deeper insights into the functions of grammatical structures and categories."

It has been suggested that there are three types of structural changes triggered by language contact in cases of language maintenance: direct borrowing of structural elements (which is quite rare), indirect structural diffusion through lexical borrowing (which is fairly common),

and the indirect structural transfer through SL agentivity in cases of bilingualism and accommodation among linguistic groups. Given that, two languages can have structural convergence when previous grammatical differences are reduced and/or eliminated either because one language adopts grammatical features of the other, or because both languages adopt a compromise between their structures (Winford, 2003: 62-63). Winford makes explicit the social contexts of contact situations that give rise to structural convergence. Such social contexts include the demographics of the groups (e.g. numerical ratios, power, and prestige relationships), the settings in which language contacts occur, the type and frequency of social interaction the groups have, the relation of language to social identity in groups and attitudes towards mixing languages, and the degree of shift in contact settings (p. 90).

Views on grammatical borrowing can be placed between the two extreme ends along the continuum, ranging from impossible to possible syntactic borrowing. Campbell (1993) discusses various views on structural borrowing. Some of these views are: the structural-compatibility requirement (which is not absolutely true), where grammatical borrowing is possible only between similar systems; grammatical gaps have a tendency to be filled through borrowing (a claim which has counter-examples), where languages borrow useful constructions they lack while being in contact with other languages; free-standing grammatical forms are easier borrowed than bound morphemes; borrowability is based on rankings of grammatical categories, where some categories rank higher on the borrowability scale; and the principle of local functional value, where a morpheme is unlikely to be diffused if its grammatical function can be understood only in the context of a broader morphosyntactic environment.

Campbell (1993: 101-103) briefly summarizes the most salient proposals for universals of grammatical borrowing. These proposals are: non-lexical properties can only be borrowed from the same source language after lexical items; nouns are borrowed more easily than other categories (e.g. verbs); derivational affixes are borrowed before inflectional affixes; and lexical items of the grammatical type cannot be borrowed unless the rule determining their linear order regarding their head is also included.

Grammaticalization induced by language contact rests on a strategy by which grammatical concepts are transferred from the model language (M) to the replica language (R). This strategy involves a mechanism sketched, by Heine and Kuteva (2003: 533), as follows:

a) Speakers of language R notice that in language M there is a grammatical category Mx.
b) They develop an equivalent category Rx, using material available in their own language (R).
c) To this end, they draw on universal strategies of grammaticalization, using construction Ry in order to develop Rx.
d) They grammaticalize construction Ry to Rx.

It should be noted that this kind of mechanism is related to a gradual process which does not happen overnight and may accordingly involve several generations of speakers; it may even extend over centuries.

Language change in contact settings can lead to direct replication of linguistic matter, abbreviated *MAT*, from a source language, i.e. replication of morphological and phonological materials. Another scenario is when language contact leads to re-shaping of internal structures of the replica language; in such a case (Matras and Sakel, 2007: 829-830) "it is the patterns of distribution, of grammatical and semantic meaning, and of formal-syntactic arrangement at various levels (discourse, clause, phrase, or word) that are modeled on an external source." This process is called pattern replication, abbreviated *PAT*. The language-processing mechanism responsible for PAT involves identifying a structure playing a pivotal role in the model construction, and matching it with a structure in the recipient language, to which a parallel pivot role is assigned in a new replica construction. It should be noted here that grammaticalization is only one by-product of pivot-matching.

MAT, which is outside the scope of this paper, usually has to do with lexical borrowing, whereas PAT with structural borrowing. Examples of the former abound in most, if not all, languages; Arabic, for instance, borrowed many vocabulary items (MAT) from English and then integrated them into its own phonological and morphological system, such as computer, CD, telephone, bank, fax, film, corner, out, foul (the last three are used only in soccer), etc. Examples of PAT are somewhat common in world languages. The grammaticalization of the use of the by-phrase followed by an agent in the passive structure, which I will discuss below in details as it is the main topic of this paper, is an example of pattern replication and pivot-matching in Arabic under the influence of English.

3. Review of Literature

It is undeniable that translation among languages generates contact settings through which the occurrence of lexical or structural borrowing is quite possible. Therefore, languages might influence one another with respect to structural borrowing through translation. The literature relevant to this study is somewhat limited in scope. Among those linguists who have studied grammaticalization in translation are Becher et al., 2009; Baumgarten & Özçetin, 2008; Steiner, 2008; and McLaughlin, 2011.

Becher et al. (2009: 125) address the question of whether and how translation as a case of language contact can give rise to convergence and divergence between two languages. There is a general tendency that the communicative norms in other languages are influenced and changed by the dominant status of English through language contact in covert translation and comparable text production. The two studies Becher et al. present indicate that convergence induced by translation does not occur unconditionally. Becher et al. did not find, in the first study, any signs of convergence between English and German in the use of modal verbs, whereas the use of concessive conjunctions, those which initiate sentences, in translated and comparable German texts displays convergence with Anglophone usage patterns in the second. Based on the above dissimilar results, Becher et al. hypothesize that divergence takes place when profound differences between source and target language are perceived by bilinguals as in the case of English and German lexicogrammatical means employed for expressing modality, while convergence occurs when items are perceived as equivalent in form and function as in the case of English and German concessive conjunctions.

Baumgarten and Özçetin (2008: 293) view translations as classic instances of language contact. In their paper *Linguistic Variation through Language Contact in Translation*, they examine "translational language contact between English and German in the genre of written business communication, where translations from English to German seem to act as a conduit through which Anglophone communicative styles enter German text production" (p. 293). Baumgarten and Özçetin show, by the example of the first person plural pronouns *we* and *wir*, "how source text induced language variation surfaces in the German register and how it shapes the interaction between the writer and the reader both in German translations and non-translated German texts" (p. 293).

In his empirical studies of translation as a mode of language contact, Steiner (2008: 337-338) exhibits how texts of various languages, registers, and between originals and translated work vary along parameters that have a bearing on explicitness of discourse. He argues that explicitness of encoding might be of different degrees as is the case of subjectivity, of intersubjectivity, and of objectivity through which languages may have impacts on one another, and that there might be a directionality in situations of language contact in the sense that languages may influence each other in either direction although there is some evidence for directionality for some of them. He thinks that frequency of use will have a bearing on the strength of contact through its quantitative impact. For instance, frequency of translations between given registers and given languages might play a significant role here.

McLaughlin (2011: 22) stresses the idea that translation is not the only factor (and not the most important one) that triggers language change. She points out that the evolution of countless languages has been influenced by linguistic change induced through translation and it continues to affect languages across the world today. She also suggests that the proper place of translation is in contact linguistics, and that translation is a mechanism, like bilinguals' code-switching, which allows languages to influence one another, but linguistic change through translation requires a different kind of model. She metaphorically views translation as a kind of linguistic ambassador that travels between languages, negotiates, mediates, represents, and ultimately influences.

4. The Arabic Passive Voice

Before analyzing and discussing the data, it is very important to fully understand the passive voice structure in Arabic and how it works. Agameya (2008: 558) defines the passive in Arabic as "a sentence structure in which the semantic subject or agent, i.e. the performer of or person/thing responsible for an action, is suppressed and, in fact, cannot be mentioned." This makes the passive in the Arabic Language an impersonal structure. She elaborates as follows:

> In the passive, the understood object of the active verb is the subject of the passive sentence and is marked for this role by nominative case in the Classical/Standard Arabic variety. The verb changes into the passive by either changing the vowels in the stem and tense prefix or by the insertion of a prefix (p. 558).

Agameya adds that passivization is associated with transitive verbs. Transitive verbs in Arabic become passive by changing the vowels in the active verb. Overall, the change in verb

types is regular, and the form it takes is contingent on the tense of the verb (pp. 558-559).

The finite passive, according to Buben ƙ (2008: 552), is formed in two ways in Arabic: "internally (the apophonic passive) and externally (formed by a prefix)." The apophonic passive exhibits the vowel sequence u-i instead of its active counterpart in the perfect (α-α or α-i), whereas, in the imperfect, it exhibits the vowel α instead of the second vowel i/u. Below are some illustrative examples as given by Buben ƙ (p. 553):

Perfect	Imperfect
faʕalα fuʕilα	*yafʕα/i/ulu yufʕalu*
faʕʕalα fuʕʕilα	*yufαʕʕilu yufαʕʕalu*
ʕafʕalα ʕufʕilα	*yufʕilu yufʕalu*

The verbs, formed by the prefix n-, possess passive meaning for the most part; nonetheless, there are also many verbs the meaning of which can be described as that of 'middle voice' in the broadest sense. Thus, this form is usually referred to as 'reflexive passive' as in the example *infaʕalα*. There is also another verb form to which an affix *t* can be added in order to form a reflexive verb as in *iftaʕalα* (Buben ƙ, p. 553).

Buckley (2004: 610) states that the passive voice is used when the agent (the doer of the action) is not known for certain, when it is undesirable to mention the agent, or when there is a need to emphasize the person or thing undergoing the action rather than the one performing it. The passive in Arabic occurs much less frequently than it does in English partly because Arabic is generally unable to express the agent in passive constructions. Besides, the verb *tamma* (to take place or to be achieved) can be used to paraphrase the passive. Furthermore, Mohammed (2006: 40) points out that the agent is sometimes hidden out of fear, brevity, glorification (e.g. not mentioning God in Koran), and debasement.

The question that arises here is how English passive sentences with the agent mentioned can be translated into Arabic. The answer is simply that such English sentences should be changed into active voice constructions when translated into Arabic. For example, the passive sentence *the trees were cut by villagers* should be translated as:

qaṭaʕa   al-qarawiyuna al-ʔashjara.
cut (past)   villagers   the trees
Villagers cut the trees

Buben ƙ (2008) points out that it is possible to augment agentless passive constructions with their active versions if the agent has to be mentioned. In this case the pronominal clitic replaces the direct object (p. 555). An illustrative example would be (passive is abbreviated as Pass. in all the examples below):

quṭiʕat   al-shajara, qaṭaʕaha   al-qarawiyuna.
cut (Pass.) the tree, cut (past) it   the villagers
The tree was cut; the villagers cut it.

Buben ƙ adds that in Modern Standard Arabic the agentive phrase can be added to the passive construction by means of a prepositional phrase that involves the preposition min 'from' or

(less frequently) bi- 'by means of'. Below are two illustrative examples given by Buben ḱ (p.555):

yuħa   ʔilayhi   min Allah.
(it) revealed (Pass.) to him   from   God
It has been revealed to him by God.

ḍuriba   bilʕaṢa.
he struck (Pass.) with a stick
He was struck with a stick

The use of the preposition *min*, as a by-phrase, in the first example is particularly common in Koran when the agent is God, and it is rarely, if not at all, used with other sentences in Arabic. Such a construction is possible in Arabic due to the fact that two objects (one is direct and one indirect) are used along with the agent in passive sentences. Therefore, passive sentences with one (direct) object are grammatically impermissible if the agent is mentioned.

5. Data Analysis and Discussion

The analysis of the two subject groups' data (Arabic-English bilinguals and native speakers of Arabic learning English as a foreign language) demonstrates that both groups more or less employed similar strategies in translating the five sentences from English into Arabic, but with variation in the number of sentences changed from passive into active. The differences between the two groups are shown in rough percentage terms in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Percentages of the use of passive and active sentences in both groups' translations

Group	Percentage of the use of active sentences (%)	Percentage of the use of passive sentences (%)
1. Arabic-English Bilinguals	64	36
2. Native speakers of Arabic who learned some basics of English as a foreign language	35	65

It is noticeable from the table that approximately sixty-four percent of the bilinguals, on the one hand, translated the English passive sentences into Arabic active sentences, whereas thirty-five percent of the monolinguals did so. Only did thirty-six percent of the former, on the other hand, keep the sentences in the passive after translating them into Arabic (which is impermissible because the Arabic passive sentences contain agents), whereas sixty-five percent of the latter did so. Arabic, unlike English, cannot express the agent in passive constructions as stated by Agameya (2008) and Buckley (2004) (see pages 6 and 7). It is remarkable that the bilinguals are less influenced by English, namely the passive structure, than the English learners. This might be attributed to the idea that bilinguals might have a superior linguistic ability and they are, accordingly, more aware of the systems or structures of their languages than foreign language learners and/or monolinguals.

This notion, though still controversial, has been advocated by many scholars. Bialystok (2001: 139) proposes that the research, conducted on the linguistic awareness in bilinguals and monolinguals, shows that bilingual children had an advantage over monolinguals with respect to syntactic tasks. She adds that there is evidence that bilinguals had advantages and disadvantages in certain tasks of word, syntactic, and phonological awareness (p. 151). Malakoff and Hakuta (1991: 148) point out that "studies of middle-class children suggested that bilingualism leads to increased levels of metalinguistic awareness at an earlier age". They add that studies on balanced bilinguals indicated that bilingualism has a positive effect on the development of cognition (p. 141).

Additionally, Balkan (1970) (cited in Romaine, 1989: 239) conducted a study on bilinguals' and monolinguals' performances. He found that "bilinguals scored significantly better on tests of numerical ability, verbal and perceptual flexibility, and general reasoning by comparison with monolinguals with whom they were matched for non-verbal intelligence and socio-economic status." Besides, he found that those who were born bilingual were markedly superior to both monolinguals and bilinguals who acquired their second language after age 4.

It should be noted here that the participants (of both groups) who translated the English passive sentences into the Arabic passive structure employed similar strategies, as mentioned above, in producing their outputs (translations), but with some variation in the types of Arabic passive sentences employed. To make this clear, we should first briefly consider sentence types in Arabic. Arabic sentences are divided up into two types: nominal sentences which start with a noun or pronoun, and verbal sentences which start with a verb (Ni'mah, 1973: 19). Arabic, unlike English, has a loose word order due to its rich conjugation system. The differences between my subject groups in terms of the percentages of the use of nominal and verbal passive sentences are shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Percentages of the use of nominal and verbal passive sentences in both groups' translations

Group	Percentage of the use of nominal passive sentences (%)	Percentage of the use of verbal passive sentences (%)
1. Bilinguals	0	100
2. Monolinguals	39	61

The above table indicates that none of the bilinguals' passive sentences is nominal; rather, a hundred percent verbal. In contrast, thirty-nine percent of their counterparts, those written by the monolinguals, are nominal and sixty-one percent verbal. Although it is much more preferable to use verbal than nominal sentences in Arabic (especially in some constructions, including the passive voice), we notice that the monolinguals, unlike the bilinguals, used both verbal and nominal sentences. This finding seems to reflect the idea that foreign language learners are also tempted to make compromises between their native and target languages, probably for the sake of easiness.

It is attested in the vast literature on language contact, as we know, that incidents in which bilingual and/or multilingual speakers making a compromise between merging structural patterns tend to occur in contact situations (Winford, 2003: 82-83; and Matras, 2000: 84). Additionally, Lindstedt (2000: 239) adopts Ross's (1996) proposition that bilingualism has led to structural convergence of genetically unrelated languages without language shift in some cases of Papua New Guinea. However, in the corpus of this study the compromise (the employment of nominal passive sentences) is actually made only by the monolinguals. Therefore we can hypothesize that foreign language learning can, alongside bilingualism and multilingualism, lead to lexical and structural convergence.

The analyzed data also demonstrates that the bilinguals expressed the impermissible use of passive sentences only in one way; i.e. they used only one Arabic equivalent (min qibal) to the English by-phrase. In contrast, monolinguals used all possible expressions in Arabic (min qibal, ʕan ṭariq, biwasiṭat, and min xilal). The following examples taken from the data illustrate:

quriʔat   al-jaridah   min qibal Suzan.
read (Pass.) the newspaper   by   Suzan
The newspaper was read by Suzan.

kusira   al-kursi   min qibal Nader.
broken (Pass.) the chair   by   Nader
The chair was broken by Nader.

quriʔat   al-Ṣaḥifah   biwasiṭat Suzan.
read (Pass.) the newspaper   by   Suzan
The newspaper was read by Suzan.

ʔursilat   al-risalah ʕan ṭariq Patrick.
sent (Pass.) the letter   by   Patrick
The letter was sent by Patrick.

tamma   al-ʕamal min xilal Ibrahim.
done (Pass.) the work   by   Ibrahim
The work was done by Ibrahim.

kutiba   al-kitabu min qibal John.
written (Pass.) the book   by   John
The book was written by John.

The first two excerpts have been taken from the bilinguals' translations, whereas the rest from the monolinguals'. It can be noticed from the above examples that the monolinguals remarkably used different Arabic terms that can express the meaning of the English by-phrase compared to the bilinguals who used only one.

Not only can the by-phrase be used in English passive sentences, but also it has other functions shared by Arabic and English when used in other contexts. For instance, the by-phrase can be used in both languages to introduce gerund phrases or nouns, which is usually expressed by the by-phrase followed by a gerund or noun. Below are illustrative examples:

tubarradu   al-maṢaniՑ   bistixdam al-miyah.
cooled (Pass.) factories   by using   water
Factories are cooled down by using water.

yuħaqqiqu al-nas al-najaħ biwasiṭat al-Ցamal al-jad   w-quwat   al-Ɂiradah.
achieve   people success   by   work   hard and strength the will
People achieve success by working hard and having a strong will.

yaðhabu al-Ɂawlad   Ɂila al-madrasah bilħafilah.
go   boys   to   school   by bus
Boys go to school by bus.

As seen in the abovementioned sentences, the use of the by-phrase for introducing a gerund phrase (which expresses an action) or noun is grammatically permissible and even very common in Arabic and English as both languages share such a construction.

Since the use of the by-phrase, followed by an agent in the passive structure, is grammatically permissible in English but impermissible in Arabic, we can argue that speakers of Arabic have (un)intentionally grammaticalized the construction (in which the by-phrase precedes a gerund phrase or noun in active or passive sentences) to a construction in which the by-phrase is followed by an agent in the passive structure under the influence of English. In other words, a new function of the Arabic by-phrase has been created by means of grammaticalization.

This grammaticalization process entails the mechanisms outlined by Heine and Kuteva (2003) and Matras and Sakel (2007) (see pages 4 and 5). Thus, speakers of Arabic (the replica language) have noticed a grammatical category (the use of the by-phrase followed by an agent in the passive voice) in English (the model language). Later, they have developed a category in Arabic equivalent to the one they noticed in English by using material available in their language (Arabic). Eventually, they match the developed Arabic category with the English one (the external source) on which the former has been modeled. The examples below illustrate this point (the last three have been taken from the participants' translations):

tataṭawwar al-mujtamaՑat al-Ɂinsaniyah Ցan ṭariq   al-Ցilm   w-al-Ɂaxlaq.
Develop   societies   human   by   knowledge and morals
Human societies develop by having knowledge and morals.

kana   al-nas yastamiՑuna Ɂila al-Ɂaxbar Ցan ṭariq al-radio.
used to people listen   to   the news   by   radio
People used to listen to the news by using the radio.

yuqas   al-ṭul biwasiṭat al-mitr   fi   al-ordun.
measured (Pass.) length   by   the meter in   Jordan
Length is measured by the meter in Jordan.

kutiba   al-kitabu biwasiṭat John.
written (Pass.) the book   by   John
The book was written by John.

al-kursi   kusira   biwasiṭat Nader.
the chair broken (Pass.)   by   Nader
The chair was broken by Nader.

al-ʕamal   ʔunjiza   ʕan ṭariq Ibrahim.
the work   done (Pass.)   by   Ibrahim
The work was done by Ibrahim.

The first three sentences are grammatical in both Arabic and English. The last three, in contrast, are grammatical only in English. Therefore, the grammaticalization process is observable in the abovementioned sentences. What seems to have happened here is that speakers of Arabic in general and the participants of the study in particular have drawn on the abstract features of the English structure (the use of the English by-phrase followed by an agent in passive constrictions) and then assigned its pivotal role to the new replica construction, namely using the by-phrase and the agent in expressing the passive structure in Arabic. The pivot, based on the argument of pivot-matching nicely addressed by Matras and Sakel (2007), is the use of the by-phrase construction that introduces a gerund phrase or noun in active or passive sentences to form a passive structure in which the agent is preceded or introduced by the by-phrase in Arabic. I assume that this structural change, which has been induced by the process of pivot-matching, happens (only) in translation. Further research is needed in order to support this assumption.

To sum up, this study indicates that translation is indeed a case of language contact as seen by Becher et al. (2009), Baumgarten and Özçetin (2008), Steiner (2008), and McLaughlin (2011) (see pages 5 and 6). Nevertheless, the findings of this study disagree with Becher et al.'s hypothesis that divergence takes place when profound differences between source and target language are perceived by bilinguals (e.g. the case of English and German lexicogrammatical means that are employed for expressing modality), whereas convergence occurs when items are perceived as equivalent in form and function (e.g. the case of English and German concessive conjunctions). In contrast, I hypothesize that items between source and recipient language do not necessarily have to be equivalent in form and function in order for convergence to occur. The convergence of the Arabic and English passive voice structure in some of the participants' translations is an obvious counterexample to Becher et al.'s assumption.

Last but not least, further research (with bigger samples) is needed in this regard in order for my hypotheses to gain support especially that this study has a very small sample (Jordanian

monolinguals and Jordanian and Syrian bilinguals), and that speakers of Arabic in other parts of the Arab World need to be considered (e.g. the Arabian Gulf, Egypt, and North Africa). It would be very useful to also take into account the internal change within Arabic itself.

6. Conclusion

The present paper tackles the idea that native speakers of Arabic have extended the function of the Arabic by-phrase via a grammaticalization process known as pattern replication. It has been suggested that this process has happened as a result of the English influence on Arabic due to language contact (translation) and the dominance of English. The findings of the study reveal that the Arabic speaking monolinguals learning English as a foreign language are much more involved in the grammaticalization process than the Arabic-English bilinguals. This notion is somewhat different from Winford's (2003: 62) view that it is bilinguals who effect a structural change in language contact settings in most, if not all, cases.

References

Agameya, A. Passive (Syntax). In: Versteegh, V. et al. (eds.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, *3*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Balkan, L. (1970). *Les effets du bilinguisme français-anglais sur les aptitudes intellectuelles*. Bruxelles: Aimav.

Baumgarten, N., & Özçetin, D. (2008). Linguistic Variation Through Language Contact in Translation. In Siemund, P., & Kintana, N. (eds.), *Language Contact and Contact Languages* [Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism, *7*, 293-316.

Becher, V. ET AL. (2009). Convergence and Divergence of Communicative Norms Through Language Contact in Translation. In Braunmüller, K., & House, J. (eds.)*, Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations,* 101-152.

Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in Development: Language, Literacy, and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511605963

Bubenk, V. Passive. (2008). In Versteegh, V. et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, *3*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Buckley, R. (2004). *Modern Literary Arabic: A Reference Grammar*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban Publishers.

Campbell, L. (1993). On Proposed Universals of Grammatical Borrowing. In Aertsen, H., & Jeffers, R. J. (eds.). *Historical Linguistics 1999*, 91-109.

Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2003). On Contact-Induced Grammaticalization. *Studies in Language,* 27(3), 529-72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sl.27.3.04hei

Lindstedt, J. (2000). Linguistic Balkanization: Contact-Induced Change by Mutual Reinforcement. In Gilbers, D. G., Nerbonne, J., & Schaeken, J. (eds.), *Languages in Contact*, 231-246. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Malakoff, M., & Hakuta, K. Translation Skill and Metalinguistic Awareness in Bilinguals. In Bialystok, E. (ed.). (1991). *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Y. (1998). Utterance Modifiers and Universals of Grammatical Borrowing. *Linguistics, 36*(2), 281-331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ling.1998.36.2.281

Matras, Y. (2000). Mixed languages: A Functional-Communicative Approach. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *3*(2), 79-99.

Matras, Y., & Sakel, J. (2007). Investigating the Mechanisms of Pattern Replication in Language Convergence. *Studies in Language, 31*(4), 829-865. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sl.31.4.05mat

McLaughlin, M. (2011). Tradurre/ Tradire: Translation as a Cause of Linguistic Change from Manuscripts to the Digital Age. *New Faculty Lecture Series*, 27. Online Available http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4rc5w95r

Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. Second Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Ross, M. D. (1996). Contact-Induced Change and the Comparative Method: Cases from Papua New Guinea. In Durie, M., & Ross, M. (eds.), *The Comparative Method Reviewed*, 180-217. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steiner, E. (2008). Empirical Studies of Translations as a Mode of Language Contact—"Explicitness" of Lexicogrammatical Encoding as a Relevant Dimension. In Siemund, P., & Kintana, N. (eds.), *Language Contact and Contact Languages* [Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism, *7*, 317-346. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Versteegh, K. Contact and the Development of Arabic. In Hickey, R. (ed.). (2010). *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Winford, D. (2003). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Arabic References

Mohammed, A. A. (2006). al-fiʕl al-mabni lilmajhul fi al-luġah al-ʕarabiya (ʔahamiyatuh, muṢṭalahatuh, ʔaġraḍuh). *majalat jamiʕat dimashq* – al-mujallad 22- al-ʕadad (1+2).

Ni'mah, F. (1973). *mulaxxaṢ qawaʕid al-luġah al-ʕarabiya*. al-qahirah: nahḍat misr lilṭibaʕah w-al-nashir w-al-tawziʕ.

Appendices

Appendix 1. List of Some Arabic Phonemic Symbols

Voiceless glottal stop ……………………………………………………………...……......... /ʔ/

Voiceless pharyngeal fricative …………………………………………………….…..…. /ħ/

Voiceless velar fricative …………………………………………………….………….. /x/

Voiced interdental fricative ...………………………………………………..……. /ð/

Voiceless emphatic alveolar fricative ………………………………………..…… /Ṣ/

Voiced emphatic dental stop ……..……. /ḍ/

Voiceless emphatic dental stop …………………………………………............. /ṭ/

Voiced pharyngeal fricative ………………………………………………..……... /ʕ/

Voiced velar fricative ………….....…………………………………….………. /ġ/

Voiceless uvular stop ………....………………………………………….……….. /q/

All other symbols are standard

Appendix 2. Monolinguals' and Bilinguals' Task Description: Translating Five Sentences from English into Arabic

Dear Participant,

Please, reply in writing to the task below. Your response is of high importance and will be analyzed in a research paper.

Below is the task:

Please translate the following sentences into Arabic:

1. The book was written by John.

2. The man who visited us last night is Syrian.

3. The letter was sent by Patrick.

4. Mahmud wrote an interesting essay about wild life.

5. The chair was broken by Nader.

6. The newspaper was read by Suzan.

7. Hassan drinks a lot of water

8. My family owns a big house.

9. The work was done by Ibrahim.

10. I like traveling and reading.