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This paper investigates co-occurrence restrictions between Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) and quantificational elements in Sason Arabic. Based on interpretational restrictions and scope properties of such structures, I show that the Immediate Scope Constraint applying at the level of LF is not enough to account for these co-occurrence restrictions in Sason Arabic, and that a PF constraint against homophonous sequences and a locality restriction on Quantifier Raising are required in addition.
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1. Introduction

Sason Arabic (SA) is an understudied, endangered Arabic dialect spoken in eastern Turkey (Jastrow, 2005) by around 6,000 speakers. SA is one of the Arabic language islands (Jastrow, 2011), and is classified as part of the Kozluk-Sason-Muş group.¹ This language is primarily spoken by trilingual speakers of SA, Armenian, and Kurdish/Zazaki, for whom, especially over the past two decades, the official language Turkish has also become a language of daily use.

* I thank Otto Jastrow and Abbas Benmamoun for providing me with their works on Arabic, Balkız Öztürk, Bernhard Schwarz, Robert Frank, Raffaella Zanuttini and Meltem Kelepir for their suggestions and questions. I am grateful to Sean Gleason for proofreading the paper. Thanks to the participants of the ALS28, especially Susi Wurmbbrand and Lina Choueiri for their valuable comments. I thank the two anonymous reviewers whose comments helped improve the paper substantially. I am also grateful to Cihan Yüntür, Hikmet Yüntür, Delal Akkuş and Sabri Yağmur for sharing their native speaker intuitions with me. This project is funded by the TÜBİTAK-BİDEB 2228 grant.

1. This paper presents data from the dialect spoken in the villages of Purşeng, Batman, and Kuzzi, Bitlis. The data consist of material elicited in the Field Methods course taught in Spring 2013 at Bogazici University, papers that came out of that course, and data I collected from native speakers.
This paper is based on the observation that there are certain restrictions on the ordering of NPIs. Consider the following examples:

(1) a. *kul nes mā-dar tunes every person NEG-called.3M anybody
   Intended reading: ‘Everyone didn’t call anybody.’
 b. tunes mā-dar kul nes anybody NEG-called.3M every person
   ‘Nobody called everybody.’
 c. *mā-dar tunes kul nes NEG-called.3M anybody every person

In (1a) the universal quantifier phrase kul nes ‘everybody’ precedes the NPI tunes ‘anybody’, and the structure is uninterpretable. However, in (1b) the order is reversed and the structure becomes acceptable. In (1c) the NPI is in the postverbal position, but still precedes the universal QP. Interestingly, this configuration is deemed ungrammatical by native speakers.

I argue that the judgments in (1a) and (1b) are due to two factors: scope rigidity and inherent properties of the quantificational element involved. Specifically, I show that NPIs are subject to Linebarger’s (1980) Immediate Scope Constraint (ISC), which requires them to be in the immediate scope of negation. That is, at LF there cannot be another intervening quantificational element between negation and the NPI it licenses. This proposal assumes that NPIs do not need to be licensed in overt syntax in SA. That is, Benmamoun’s (1997) claims for NPIs in Moroccan Arabic, adopted in Soltan (2012) for Egyptian Arabic, do not carry over to SA. I will further argue that although the ISC, coupled with LF reconstruction of QPs and/or raising of the negative operator along the lines of Beck & Kim (1997), seems to explain some constructions, it fails to account for the whole range of data, such as (1c). I propose that certain constructions/configurations like (1c) are filtered out by the PF component (e.g. Bobaljik, 1995; Franks, 1998; Boškovic, 2001, 2002; Bobaljik and Wurmbrand, 2012), even though their LF representations are well-formed. Moreover, I will argue that the locality of QR along the lines of Bruening (2001), coupled with an intervention effect, helps account for certain other constructions.

Note that I avoid labeling some of the starred structure as “ungrammatical”, and use the term “uninterpretable” or “unacceptable” to reflect the difficulty of interpretation that speakers have with such structures. Some of the structures in this paper may sound “grammatical” or “good” to some native speakers at first, but most speakers consulted find them unacceptable when they actually try to interpret them. A similar intuition is reported in Beck (1996) for German structures and in Kelepir (2011) for the Turkish structures which exhibit intervention effects.
The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses some aspects of the phrase structure of SA: the position of the verb and the preverbal subject. Section 3 introduces the NPIs in SA, followed by an examination of whether the NPIs in SA need overt licensing. Section 4 discusses NPI-QP co-occurrence restrictions in the light of the ISC, Neg Raising, and reconstruction, and presents the problematic cases. Section 5 discusses the effects of a PF restriction on NPI-QP orders and a locality condition on QR in various constructions.

2. Phrase structure of Sason Arabic

V-to-T raising

SA is a verb-raising language, like other Arabic dialects (Fassi Fehri, 1993; Benmamoun, 2000). This is evidenced by the sentences in (2), which show that adverbial adjuncts and floated quantifiers may appear between the verb and the direct object in SA.

(2) a. *zyer kara ams maitub-ma
    child wrote.3m yesterday letter-a
    ‘The child wrote a letter yesterday.

b. zyar karo killen maitub-ma
    children wrote.3pl all letter-a
    ‘The children all wrote a letter.’

In neither sentence are the verb and the direct object within the same maximal projection as the verb has raised out of VP, over the adverb, (2a), or the floating quantifier, (2b).

Position of the preverbal subject

I take example (3) to show that the subject in an SVO order cannot occupy Spec, TP.

(3) a. ahmad mi-k ya-yel laham
    Ahmad NEG-PAST 3M-eat meat
    ‘Ahmet wouldn’t eat meat.’

b. *mi ahmad ko-ya-yel laham
    NEG Ahmad PAST-3M-eat meat

Based on the distributional evidence in (3), the subject seems to be in an A position preceding both negation and the verb. With respect to the preverbal subject, one question that arises is whether the subject is in Spec, NegP or in a higher
Benmamoun and Al-Asbahi (2013) argue that the subject is in Spec, NegP, possibly to fulfill the EPP requirement that the negative projection host a nominal element. Yet, on the basis of distributional evidence, it is more likely that the preverbal subject is in a higher position and that there is no Spec-head relation in SA between Neg° and the subject.

In (4) a number of adverbs may intervene between the preverbal subject and the neg+verb.

(4) kemal ams ml-kawa le grze-ma aml muhaqqaq
     Kemal yesterday from-after of such-one work definitely
     ma-baxa mu dars
     NEG-failed.3M from class
     ‘After so much work, Kemal definitely didn’t fail the class yesterday.’

Under the assumption that adverbs mark the edge of maximal projections and may not adjoin to the X-bar level (see Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998 and references therein), the ordering of preverbal subject, adverbs, and negation with respect to one another is strong evidence that negation and the subject are not within the same maximal projection.

On the basis of the relative position of the subject and adverbs, I take the preverbal (or more accurately, pre-negational) subject position to be an Ā-position (Fassi Fehri, 1993; Aoun et al., 2010).

3. Negative polarity items

NPIs in SA can be divided morphologically into three groups:

    b. **words that begin with the morphemes tu and habbe**:
       tunes ‘anybody’, tusi ‘anything’, habbe N ‘any N’
    c. **words that do not contain the morpheme tu**: nes ‘anybody’,
       ši ‘anything’.

Indefinite determiners such as ma ‘a, some’, or NPs such as šimma ‘a thing/something’, mozama ‘a place, somewhere’, are similar to their English counterparts some, something in that they tend to be interpreted with wide scope with respect to negation. This is in contrast with their Turkish counterparts, which easily occur in negative sentences with a narrow scope reading (Kelepir, 2011). Compare (6a),

---

3. This idea has been put forward in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) for some other pro-drop languages that show an SVO-VSO alternation.
where the indefinite is used in an affirmative sentence, with the negative construction in (6b).

(6) a. irt-нун ｖи-мм， (гама more ｓи ме ye)
     want.me  thing-a
     'I want something, (but I don't know what it is).'

b. *mi-irt-нун ｖи-мм
    NEG-want.me  thing-a
    Intended: 'I don't want anything.'

If these indefinites were to take narrow scope with respect to negation, the prediction is that they would combine with the morpheme тu 'any' to form NPIs, as in Turkish. Yet this is not possible in SA, (7a). In order to form an NPI, the 'bare' nominal combines with тu 'any' without the indefinite determiner, (7b).

(7) a. *тu moza-mа mo-mmе
     any place-a  NEG-1М.go
     Intended: 'I am not going anywhere.

b. тu moza mo-mmе
     any place  NEG-1М.go
     'I am not going anywhere.

The question is at what level NPIs are licensed in SA, i.e. are they licensed overtly, or covertly at LF? Benmamoun (1997) argues on the basis of data from Moroccan Arabic (MA) that NPIs must be licensed overtly. Benmamoun’s argument against LF licensing of NPIs concerns reconstruction effects. As shown in Aoun and Benmamoun (1996, cited in Benmamoun, 1997 and Aoun et al., 2010), CLLD-ed NPs and fronted PPs in Arabic display reconstruction effects. Consider the following, which shows that anaphors are licensed under reconstruction:

(8) [мsа бoэDhum]и ｋаnу ｌo-wлад ｔoылшibu ｔi
     with  each.other  were.3Pl the-children play.3Pl
     'The children were playing with each other.' (Benmamoun 1996: 32)

Benmamoun contends that if NPIs could be licensed at LF, they would be licensed under reconstruction, like anaphors. However, this prediction is not borne out in the case of MA. A fronted PP cannot contain an NPI, as the following contrast shows:

(9) a. мa-кaнu ｌo-wлаd ｔoылшibu ｍsа
     NEG-were.3Pl the-children play.3Pl with
     ｗyттa wahad
     even one
     'The children were not playing with anyone.'
(9) b. *mà ḥotta waḥd ma-kanu ła-wlad
    with even one NEG-were.3PL the-children
    ʿtyloṣbu
    play.3PL

(9a) and (9b) are identical except that the PP containing the NPI is in situ in (9a) but is fronted in (9b). Based on the ungrammaticality of (9b), along with some other data, Benmamoun concludes that NPIs in MA must be licensed overtly, and not at LF. Soltan (2012) states that the same considerations carry over to Cairene Egyptian Arabic (CEA).

However, unlike their counterparts in MA and CEA, NPIs in SA are allowed both in situ and in the fronted position:

(10) a. zyar mā-kano kā-illabo ʿara tunes
    children NEG-were.3PL PAST-play.3PL with anybody
    ‘The children were not playing with anyone.’

b. ʿara tunes zyar mā-kano kā-illabo
    with anybody children NEG_were.3PL PAST-play.3PL
    ‘The children were not playing with anyone.’

The examples in (10) illustrate that, unlike in MA and CEA, fronted PPs containing NPIs are allowed in SA. This implies that NPIs can be licensed via LF reconstruction in SA. However, as I argue below, although (10) demonstrates the need for LF licensing, there are also certain PF restrictions that apply to NPIs. Note that this is the same as saying NPIs are also licensed in overt syntax.

4. NPI and quantifiers

This section first investigates the interaction of two quantifiers with negation. I then discuss how Neg Raising and Reconstruction analyses fare equally well in explaining the co-occurrence restrictions between NPIs and QPs in the light of Linebarger’s (1980) Immediate Scope Constraint (ISC).

Quantifiers and negation

There are two representative quantifiers in SA (calabma ‘some’ and kul ‘every’) that exhibit contrasting behaviors when they interact with negation scopally. While calabma ‘some’ takes scope over negation (i.e., it cannot be interpreted within the scope of negation), kul ‘every’ exhibits the opposite pattern and is interpreted...
inside the scope of negation. These properties of these quantifiers result in different scope interactions when they co-occur with NPIs.

The following example illustrates that *calabma* ‘some’ must be interpreted outside the scope of negation.

(11) *calabma* *zyar mā-namo*
    some children NEG.slept.3PL
    ‘Some children didn’t sleep.’  some > neg, *neg > some

The universal determiner *kul* ‘every’, on the other hand, has to take scope under negation.4

(12) *lome* *kul nes mā-dža*
    today every person NEG-came.3M
    ‘Today everybody didn’t come.’  not > every, *every > not

4. An anonymous reviewer notes that not>>every is also true in a situation in which no one came, which is the same interpretation yielded by every>>not.

However, the suggestion to appeal to the implicatures involved, as the same reviewer points out, is not as convincing as truth-conditional judgments. I tested the scopal relation between negation and every with another situation that our consultant, Sabri Yağmur, experienced in real life. Here is the situation: Sabri Yağmur’s father has been going on vacation regularly for the last five years and all his vacations lasted either 10 days or less. Given this background, I first asked our language consultant how he would express this fact. The following is his answer.

(i) *farno* *mī tattīl ala xams snin, u habbe mīmīn*
    Farmo went.3M vacation this five years and piece of them
    *mā-kan mī ašra tiyom fazle*
    NEG-was from ten days more
    ‘Farmo went on the vacation the last five years, and not one of them was more than 10 days.’

After this reply, I constructed the following sentence and asked him if it is appropriate for such a situation.

(ii) *... , u kul čax mā-kan mī ašra tiyom fazle*
    and every time NEG-was from ten days more
    ‘and every time was not more than 10 days.’

The consultant said that he would not use the sentence I constructed for this situation, since it gives him the impression that ‘maybe he spent more than 10 days in at least one of his vacations.’

Based on this, and for the purposes of this article I will assume that ‘every’ must be in the scope of negation, and give (20) at least as suggestive (but not conclusive), as the reviewer suggests. Finally, to contrast this with Turkish, for some speakers of Turkish, including the author of this paper, (ii) would be an appropriate sentence.
NPI-QP interaction: ISC, Neg raising and reconstruction

These opposing scopal properties of *calabma* ‘some’ and *kul* ‘every’ contribute to the (un)acceptability of the structures in (13).

(13) a. *kul nes mā-dar tunes
   every person NEG-called.3M anybody
   *Intended: ‘Everybody did not call anybody.’
   b. tunes mā-dar kul nes
      anybody NEG-called.3M every person
      ‘Nobody called everybody.’

In (13a) the universal quantifier phrase *kul nes* ‘everybody’ is in the subject position and precedes the NPI *tunes* ‘anybody’, and the structure is uninterpretable, whereas in (13b) the order is reversed and the structure becomes acceptable. When they occur together in a structure, the NPI has to precede the universal QP. Note that *kul* ‘everybody’ can be in the subject position of a negative structure when the object is not an NPI, (14).

(14) *kul nes mā-dar Kemal
    every person NEG-called.3M Kemal
    ‘Everybody didn’t call Kemal.’

Linebarger (1980) proposes that NPIs are subject to the constraint that there can be no quantificational element intervening between the NPI and the negative operator that licenses it. Linebarger (1980, p.30) formulates this observation as the Immediate Scope Constraint (ISC):

This formulation stipulates that the NPI be in the immediate scope of the operator NOT. An item is in the scope of NOT if (1) it occurs only in the proposition which is the entire scope of NOT, and (2) within this proposition there are no logical elements intervening between it and NOT.

NPI-idioms, which are only licensed by negation, are one type of example Linebarger provides to show the ISC at work. Linebarger attributes the ungrammaticality of (15b) to an ISC violation triggered by the presences of a second quantificational element.

(15) a. She didn’t budge for me.
   b. *She doesn’t budge for everybody.
      i. * NOT [∀x: x is a person] (she budes for x)
      ii. * [∀x: x is a person] NOT(she budes for x)
Linebarger maintains that the two possible readings for (15b) are not available for
the following reasons: the reading in (15bi) “It is not the case that she budges for
everyone” is out because the universal quantifier is intervening between negation
and the NPI at LF, violating the ISC. The reading in (15bii), paraphrased as “She
doesn’t budge for anybody,” is not available because the universal quantifier cannot
take scope outside the negation. Since both of the possible readings are ruled out
by some constraint, this structure is uninterpretable.

Returning to the SA constructions in (13), if the ISC is operative in the licens-
ing of NPIs, then the unacceptability of (13a) is expected. Assume for a moment
that there are at least two scope positions for the negative operator (as in Beck and
Kim, 1997): one taking scope over the subject and one under the subject. This will
give us two possible LF representations for (13a), represented in (16).5

(16)  a. *LF representation-1 of (13a)
    negation scopes over the subject:

    NEG-Op
    \[kul nes \text{ ‘everybody’} \]
    \[tunes \text{ ‘anybody’} \]

b. *LF representation-2 of (13a)
    negation scopes below the subject:

    \[kul nes \text{ ‘everybody’} \]
    NEG-Op
    \[tunes \text{ ‘anybody’} \]

In (16a), \textit{kul nes} ‘everybody’ intervenes between negation and the NPI it licenses.
This clearly violates the ISC. That is why this reading is not available. In the other
potential LF representation in (16b), on the other hand, \textit{kul nes} is outside the scope
of negation. Even though this representation satisfies the specific requirement of \textit{kul} ‘every’ that it should not be outside the scope of negation.
Thus, neither of the LF representations is available, and the structure is expected
to be uninterpretable.

5. The specific positions of the subject, object and the negative operator at LF, i.e. the functional
categories they are located in, are not relevant to the analysis. That is why I do not mark such
details in the representations. What is crucial is the scopal relations between these elements.
Rather than introducing the negative operator in two different positions, it is also possible to assume reconstruction for the subject, while assuming a fixed NEG position above TP. Since the subject is in the CP domain in (13a), we expect it to reconstruct to its base position, and the structure to be grammatical. However, this process would generate the LF representation in (17), which is again ruled out by the ISC.

(17) LF representation of (13a)

\[ *mă\text{-}dar\quad ḳ̃l\quad ṇ̃es\quad ṭ̃unes \]

NEG-called.3M every person anybody

Moving on to the structure in (13b), if we assume different NEG positions we have two possible LF representations, represented in (18).

(18) a. LF representation-1 of (13b)

negation scopes over the subject:

\[ \text{NEG-Op} \quad ṭ̃unes \quad \text{‘anybody’} \quad \text{ḳ̃l ṇ̃es } \text{‘everybody’} \]

b. *LF representation-2 of (13b)

negation scopes below the subject:

\[ ṭ̃unes \quad \text{‘anybody’} \quad \text{NEG-Op} \quad \text{ḳ̃l ṇ̃es } \text{‘everybody’} \]

In the LF representation in (18a), the NPI is within the immediate scope of its licensor, as required by the ISC, and the universal QP is also inside the scope of negation. That is why this reading is available. In the other potential LF representation in (18b), on the other hand, where negation scopes below the NPI subject, NPI is not in the scope of negation, violating the ISC. Therefore, this configuration is ruled out, and only one of the LF representations, namely (18a), is available.

---

6. This is based on the assumption that the preverbal subject is a CLLDed element (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, 1998). However, contra Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, I argue that CLLDed elements do not have to be base-generated in the CP domain, but can also be derived via movement in the sense of Aoun and Benamoun 1998. The reconstruction effects and locality constraints in SA support the movement analysis. For further details, see Akkuş (2014).
It is also possible to account for the data in terms of reconstruction. If in (13b) the NPI reconstructs, the ISC predicts its acceptability because the NPI is in the immediate scope of the operator neg and there is no intervening element as represented by the LF representation in (19).

(19) LF of (13b) via reconstruction

\[ \text{mā-dar tunes kul nes} \]
\[ \text{NEG-called.3M anybody every person} \]
\[ \text{‘Nobody called everybody.’} \]

Furthermore, kul ‘every’ needs to be in the scope of negation, which is also fulfilled. Hence, (13b) is grammatical according to reconstruction, which also yields the available representation in (18a).

Now let us turn to another set of data where an NPI and a QP co-occur:

(20) a. *\[ \text{mā-dar kul nes tunes} \]
\[ \text{NEG-called.3M every person anybody} \]
\[ \text{Intended: ‘Everybody did not call anybody’} \]

b. *\[ \text{mā-dar tunes kul nes} \]
\[ \text{NEG-called.3M anybody every person} \]
\[ \text{Intended: ‘Nobody called everybody.’} \]

The structures in (20) are the overt orders, not LF representations. Note that in (20a) the universal QP intervenes between negation and NPI, a configuration ruled out at LF by the ISC. That is, in line with its LF counterpart, the s-structure is also uninterpretable. Note that covert movement of the NPI object above the subject would yield an LF that does not involve an ISC violation. However, this option would involve an LF-PF mismatch in that the order of the two QPs is different at LF versus PF. Interestingly (20b), whose LF satisfies the ISC and is predicted to be grammatical, is also ungrammatical. Notice that it has the same LF representation as (13b). Example (20b) thus suggests that a structure predicted to be acceptable by the ISC is ruled out by some other mechanism in the language, most likely a constraint in the PF component. If this analysis in correct, it supports the conclusion that PF can rule out certain constructions that are interpretable at LF.

---

7. A reviewer claims that this paper does not provide an account for (1c) and lacks a uniform account for the cases in the paper. However, I believe that the paper explains this example via a PF-constraint by first considering the other options, e.g. the ISC, scope-rigidity etc. and eliminating them as an answer, then concludes that a PF account is the most plausible solution. Regarding the second point, I think that although the examples are similar, a monolithic account, such as the ISC or PF constraint, would fail to explain the whole data. Hence, more than one account seems to be necessary.
5. The effects of PF on NPI-QP orders

In this section I will argue that in addition to LF requirements, SA has certain PF restrictions that help account for the patterns of NPI-QP orderings given in (13) and (20).

Phonology-induced effect

In the structure (20b), the requirements of the NPI and the universal quantifier are satisfied: at LF the NPI c-commands the universal QP, satisfying the ISC, and the universal is in the scope of negation. Given that the structure should be acceptable, contrary to fact, at least two related questions arise:

a. Is the universal quantifier, the NPI, or both responsible for the ungrammaticality?
b. Would the adjacency of any NPI and QP lead to illicit constructions?

Example (21a) shows that an NPI and a QP can be licitly adjacent, answering (b). It is also possible to have two adjacent QPs, (21b), or two adjacent NPIs, (21c).

(21) a. mā-dar tunes rice kilen
   neg-called.3SG anybody men all
   ‘Nobody called all the men.’
b. mā-daro calabma bmad kul nes
   neg-called.3PL some girls every person
   ‘Some girls didn’t call everybody.’
c. mā-dar tunes habbe bint
   neg-called.3M anybody any girl
   ‘Nobody called any girls.’

The negative answer to the second question answers the first question as well: we see that it is not the adjacent co-occurrence of an NPI and a QP (21a), or two QPs, (21b), or two NPIs, (21c), that yields the ungrammaticality, but rather the adjacency of these two particular constituents that somehow results in an unacceptable structure.

This suggests that what we have is an instance of LF and PF conflict and that PF is the winning side in this clash. In fact, the literature defending an LF-PF match is not new, and this proposal has been explicitly made in a number of studies (Bobaljik, 1995, 2002; Bobaljik and Wurmbrand, 2012).8 For instance,

8. I thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting that I make this point more explicit.
Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2012) posit ‘soft constraints’ to account for the correlation between the word order and the (un)availability of scrambling and ‘scope rigidity’.\(^9\) They postulate that those constraints are unidirectional: LF is calculated first and determines PF (contra Reinhart, 2005).

With respect to SA, I propose that the presence of the element nes ‘person’ twice, coupled with the absence of morphological case in the language to differentiate the function of each constituent, makes reconstruction impossible. This analysis predicts that if an NPI or a QP with nes is used twice adjacently, the structure should be ungrammatical. This prediction is also borne out:

(22) a. tunes má-daş tunes anybody_neg-saw.3M anybody ‘Nobody saw anybody.’

b. *má-daş tunes tunes anybody_neg-saw.3M anybody anybody

(23) a. kul nes má-daş kul nes every_person_neg-saw.3M every_person ‘Everybody didn’t see everybody’

b. *má-daş kul nes kul nes NEg-saw.3M every_person every_person

The sentences in (22) and (23) show that when NPIs or QPs with similar form are adjacent, the result is unacceptaable.\(^10\)

These facts are evidence for the claim that we are dealing with a rather intricate interplay of phonology (the PF constraint in question) and syntax (the option

9. Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2012) argue that scope rigidity (the apparent absence of QR) is a property not of languages, but of specific configurations.

10. Some languages, such as Turkish, make use of case morphology to reflect the grammatical function of constituents.

   (i) a. Ara-ma-ð generated in place of Ara-ða-ð

   call-NEG-PAST anybody anybody-ACC

   ‘Nobody called anybody.’

   b. Ara-ma-ð generated in place of Ara-ða-ð

   call-NEG-PAST anybody-ACC anybody

   ‘Nobody called anybody.’

In Turkish, subjects are marked with Nominative case and objects with Accusative case. This system allows the same phonological form to be repeated, but with different grammatical functions marked with different cases. It also allows scrambling of constituents, as illustrated above. SA, on the other hand, lacks morphological case to mark the grammatical function.

In SA, the unmarked reading for the order of two NPs following V is VSO, similar to Serbo-Croatian, which also lacks Case (Bošković 2002).
of reconstruction or leaving constituents in situ) and hence what is relevant is the actual phonological form of the NPIs and QPs. Although it is generally assumed in the literature that on the LF side there is some choice in deciding where deletion should take place in nontrivial chains (Chomsky, 1995), it is often assumed that no choice about where deletion should take place in nontrivial chains is available in PF, the head always being the sole survivor.

However, a number of authors have argued that at PF there is also a choice concerning which member of a nontrivial chain survives deletion (e.g. Bobaljik, 1995; Franks, 1998; Bošković, 2001, 2002). For instance, Bobaljik (1995, p. 17) contends that syntactic operations must be filtered by a morphological component. That is, syntactic operations can be forced and blocked if the derivation would otherwise lead to a structure which, though syntactically well-formed, is uninterpretable in the subsequent morphophonological component. Likewise, Franks (1998, pp. 28–31), with the context of a discussion of Slavic clitics under the copy theory of movement (Chomsky, 1995), espouses a ‘filtering’ approach, in which the results of strictly syntactic movements are modulated by the phonology. This approach states that of the various orders generated by syntax, some ‘crash’ at PF because of the failure of ‘convergence’ at PF. The proposal is that in the PF component as well, the deletion of the tail of a non-trivial chain is just a preference, not a requirement.

Entertaining the idea that there is a PF constraint against consecutive (near)-homophonous NPIs and QPs would mean that in examples (22b) and (23b) it is the pronunciation of the lower copy of the subject that leads to a PF violation.

As one reviewer suggests, if SA had a constraint on which copy of a moved constituent gets pronounced, we would expect to see such constraint to apply to cases other than NPI-QP order. In other words, a PF constraint would ‘block’ a sequence of (near)-homophonous wh-words, for instance, along with NPIs and QPs. This is in fact the proposal made in Bošković 2002 for sequences of wh-phrases in multiple wh-fronting languages. This prediction turns out to be correct, as the following examples suggest.

11. The following example hints that it is possible that what is at issue is a PF-constraint against multiple nes in the same domain rather than simple PF-adjacency. I will leave this for future research.

(i) a. *tunes qat/ams tunes mâ-daş
   anybody at all/yesterday anybody NEG-saw.3M
   ‘Nobody saw anybody at all/yesterday.’
   b. tunes qat/ams mâ-daş tunes
      anybody at all/yesterday NEG-saw.3M anybody
      ‘Nobody saw anybody at all/yesterday.’
(24)  a.  adaš  kemal  baxle-ma  
saw.3M  Kemal  mule-a  
‘Kemal saw a mule.’

b.  ande  šine  adaš?  
who  what  saw.3M  
‘Who saw what?’

c.  *ande  adaš  šine?  (possible only as an echo-question)  
who  saw.3M  what  
‘Who saw what?’

The examples in (24) shows that in cases where multiple wh-elements are questioned, the wh-phrases are all fronted; otherwise, an echo-question interpretation is obtained. Contrast this with (25).

(25)  a.  adaš  kemal  naze  
saw.3M  Kemal  Naze  
‘Kemal saw Naze.’

b.  *ande  ande  adaš?  
who  who  saw.3M  
‘Who saw whom?’

c.  ande  adaš  ande?  
who  saw.3M  who  
‘Who saw whom?’

Unlike in (24), in (25) a sequence of homophonous wh-words is ‘blocked’ in the sense of Bošković (2002) and the lower wh-word is not fronted. The fact that a pair-list reading is obligatory when the homophonous wh-element is left in situ suggests that in (25c) we do not have an echo-question.

Thus, we have seen that in SA PF can filter out certain constructions, even if LF allows for them.

Scope rigidity and locality in QR

Scope rigidity in the traditional sense is another place in which we observe the role of PF in licensing the NPI-QP orders in SA.

Consider the following in discussion of scope rigidity in SA:

(26)  daro  zyar-teyn  kul  nes  
called.3PSG  children-DUAL  every  person  
‘Two children looked for everybody.  

The above sentence is unambiguous. The surface order reading in which ‘two children’ takes scope over ‘everybody’ is true in a scenario where there is only one set
of two children that look for everybody. Here the object has narrow scope and the
subject wide scope, so at LF their scopal relations are preserved. Now, consider
the following sentence:

(27) *mā-dar [\text{\em tunes} \text{\em calabma zyar}]
    \text{\em neg-called.3M anybody some children}
    \text{\em ‘Nobody called some children.’}

In (27), I assume that both the subject and the object are within the same domain,
i.e., the vP domain. In this configuration, the NPI subject is licensed by negation
and there is no intervening element in the s-structure. However, the structure is
ungrammatical, contrary to the prediction. Now consider the following:

(28) \text{\em tunes mā-dar calabma zyar}
    \text{\em anybody \text{\em neg-called.3M some children}}
    \text{\em ‘Nobody called some children.’}

The most obvious observation is that in (27) the NPI and the QP are within the vP
domain, i.e. in the same phase, whereas in (28) they are within different phases.
Based on this, one can conclude that an LF-PF match must be maintained within
the vP phase level (Chomsky, 2001). This analysis suggests that since calabma
‘some’ in (27) needs to be outside of the scope of negation at LF, it needs to raise.
This modification at LF would yield an LF-PF mismatch, as illustrated in (29).
Therefore, PF eliminates this construction.

(29) *\text{\em LF representation of (27)}:

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}[level distance=1.5cm,sibling distance=2cm,auto]
    \node [text width=2cm] (calabma) {calabma zyar, ‘some children’}
    child{node {$\text{\em \text{\em neg-Op}$} \text{\em ‘some children’}}}
    child{node (vP) {$\text{\em tunes ‘anybody’}$}
        child{node (tP) {$t_1$}}
    }
    child{node {$\text{\em …}$}}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

Let us now first assume \textsc{neg} raising (Beck & Kim, 1997) for (28). \textsc{neg} should raise
to take the NPI in its scope, while the QP would raise above negation, resulting
in reversal of the surface NPI-QP order at LF, giving us the same configuration in
(29). This should be illicit due to the scope rigid nature of the language. Under the
reconstruction analysis, again we will have the reversal of the NPI-QP order. The
QP should again move out of the scope of negation. However, this sentence, unlike
(27), is grammatical even though there is a mismatch in the LF and PF ordering
of the QP and the NPI. Therefore, an LF-PF match account within the vP phase
level at first seems promising but runs into a problem when the vP phase is sent to spell-out since the vPs in (27) and (28) are identical, as illustrated in (30).

(30) \[ \text{NEG} [vP \text{some children}] [vP \{ \text{anyone} [vP V t_i] \}] \]

For the object to escape the vP phase, it must move from its base position before spell-out of the vP. If PF and LF then choose different copies of ‘some children’, a mismatch arises, no matter what happens in the next phase. This would undermine the argument that LF-PF match must be maintained within the vP phase level, since in both (27) and (28) the object would not be interpreted in its base-position but in a higher phase, and so, at the vP level there would necessarily be a mismatch in both cases.

At this point, I would like to entertain the idea of locality, to which QR is subject, along the lines of Bruening (2001). Considering this some form of minimality, an intervention effect could be observed in (27) but not in (28), repeated here as (31a) and (31b), respectively. For the object to undergo QR, the NPI would be in the way in (31a), but not in (31b). Movement of the NPI itself as in (31b), on the other hand, frees up the edge of the vP, and the object can undergo QR above neg:

(31) a. \[ \text{NEG} > \text{anyone} > \text{some children}: \text{QR of object across NPI} \]
   b. \[ \text{anyone}, \text{NEG} > t_i > \text{some children}: \text{QR of object across NPI possible} \]

This account is reminiscent of the intervention effects discussed in Beck (1996), Beck and Kim (1997), although the nature of the intervener is different. In Beck (1996), for instance, inherently quantified expressions block LF movement. The locality proposal and the intervention effect can be extended to double object constructions, again along the lines of the scope freezing effects observed in double object constructions in English (as discussed by Bruening, 2001). Consider the following:

(32) a. \[ \text{*hassan má-Varra habbe bnt ša} \]
   \[ \text{H NEG-showed.3M any girl to calabma rical} \]
   \[ \text{Some men} \]
   \[ \text{Intended: ‘Hasan didn’t show any girls/any of the girls to some men.’} \]
   b. \[ \text{hassan má-Varra (ša) calabma rical} \]
   \[ \text{H NEG-showed.3M (to) some men habbe bnt} \]
   \[ \text{any girl} \]
   \[ \text{‘Hasan didn’t show some men any girls/any of the girls.’} \]

I thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing out this to me and suggesting I try out the locality account.
Notice that in (32a) the NPI precedes and c-commands *calabma ‘some’ in the surface order. Since the NPI has to be in the immediate scope of negation, there is no LF configuration in which the c-command relations are retained, and the quantifier phrase is outside while the NPI is inside the scope of negation. Accordingly, the QR of the object QP is blocked, leading to ungrammaticality. The LF representation is shown below:

(33) *LF representation of (32a):

(32b), however, is available. The QP precedes and c-commands the NPI at s-structure. Hence, the QP can move across \textsc{neg} without the NPI intervening. Moreover, in terms of the ISC, there is no quantificational element that intervenes between negation and the NPI. Consider the following LF configuration.

(34) LF representation of (32b):

A related argument for the locality account comes from CLLD constructions, a fact that Akkus (2014) takes as evidence for the movement analysis of the lexical NP in the CLLD construction. Dative and double object constructions in Sason Arabic with CLLD, (35) and (36) respectively, show that a locality condition is respected. This is in contrast with other Arabic dialects where the base position of the CLLD-ed element does not matter (Aoun et al., 2010).13

(35) a. \textit{oratman ku i-qarri l-ala kitab ša herdem}
\textit{teacher aux.3m 3m-make.read the-this book to Herdem}
\textit{‘The teacher is making Herdem read this book.’}

13. This constraint was first noticed by Balkız Öztürk during a data-elicitation session in the Field Methods course taught in Spring 2013 at Boğaziçi University.
b. [l-alā kitab], oratman ku i-qarri-[u],
the-this book teacher AUX.3M 3M-make.read-it
ša herdem
to Herdem
‘This book, the teacher is making Herdem read it.’

c. *[ša herdem], oratman ku i-qarri-[a],
to Herdem teacher AUX.3M 3M-make.read-her
l-alā kitab
the-this book

(36) a. oratman ku i-qarri herdem l-alā kitab
teacher AUX.3M 3M-make.read Herdem the-this book
‘The teacher is making Herdem read this book.’

b. [herdem], oratman ku i-qarri-[a],
Herdem teacher AUX.3M 3M-make.read-her
l-alā kitab
the-this book
‘Herdem, the teacher is making her read this book.’

c. *[l-alā kitab], oratman ku i-qarri-[u],
the-this book teacher AUX.3M 3M-make.read-it
herdem

The examples illustrate that the locality constraint is obeyed in CLLD constructions. This is analogous to locality accounts proposed for English passivization, an instance of A-movement. Consider the passivization in the following double-object construction in English:

(37) a. Alexandra gave Isaac a kiss.

b. Isaac was given a kiss.

c. *A kiss was given Isaac.

Locality-based accounts of this construction explain the differences in terms of the relative ordering of the theme and the goal. Under such accounts, in languages like English only the higher argument – i.e., the goal – can be passivized; otherwise, passivization of the lower argument (theme) causes a violation of locality. Following in essence the locality account suggested for passivization (A-movement), we could propose that CLLD, an instance of Ā-movement, also obeys locality. For instance, in (36c) herdem is higher in the structure, hence lala

14. See Larson (1988) for a case-theoretic account of this asymmetric passivization. Jim Wood (pers. comm.) notes that this account does not work for some Icelandic examples.
litab ‘this book’ cannot skip over it to be CLLDed. This line of argumentation would correspond to the configuration in (38), adopted from Aoun and Benjamoun (1998), where the clitic is coindexed with a lexical NP that can later undergo movement.

(38) \[\text{CLLDed-NP} \ldots \text{t}-X + \text{Clitic}\]

One prediction that follows from the locality and intervention accounts is that if the NPI in (32a) is replaced with a non-intervening element, e.g. an indefinite NP, such as bıntma ‘a girl’, the sentence should be acceptable.\(^{15}\) This prediction is correct, as illustrated in (39).

(39) \[\text{hassan mā-varra} \quad \text{bınt-ma şa calabma rıcel} \]
\[\text{Hasan NEG-showed.3M girl-a to some men} \]
‘Hasan didn’t show a girl to some men.’

Here the indefinite NP precedes the existential QP at s-structure. At LF, the former would raise outside of negation since, as mentioned earlier, it takes wide scope with respect to negation. The QP would also raise, but due to the scope rigid property of the language, the order is retained. Hence, both the inherent properties of constituents and a scope rigidity condition (that can be translated as a locality constraint) are satisfied, thereby yielding it acceptable.

6. Conclusion

This paper has investigated the co-occurrence restrictions between NPIs and quantificational elements in Shason Arabic. Based on the interpretational restrictions and scope properties of such structures, I have argued that these co-occurrence restrictions are due to: (i) Linebarger’s (1980) Immediate Scope Constraint, (ii) a PF constraint against sequences of homophonous elements (in the same domain), (iii) distributional restrictions of quantifiers – i.e., their scopal relations with respect to negation – and (iv) a locality condition on Quantifier Raising.

\(^{15}\) I thank Bernhard Schwarz (pers. comm.) for bringing this point to my attention.
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