1. Introduction

This paper is an investigation of the CP layer in Sason Arabic in comparison to other Arabic dialects. It aims to introduce and discuss the complementizer system of the language and the interaction of complementizers with the components, e.g. topic or focus, which occur in the Left Periphery within the research program Cartography following mainly (Rizzi 1997, 2001; Cinque 1999; Cinque and Rizzi 2008).

Sason Arabic is one of the many Arabic varieties spoken in Anatolia. These dialects are part of the larger Mesopotamian dialect area, in other words they can be considered as a continuation of the Iraqi Arabic dialects. Jastrow (1978, 2005, 2006) classifies the dialect in the Sason area as a member of Kozluk-Sason-Muş group.

2. Complementizers in Sason

Sason has two complementizers: \textit{le, ta}.\footnote{The subjunctive marker in Sason is homophonous with the complementizer \textit{ta}. I will not go into its discussion here.} Let us begin with a description of the distribution of these complementizers. Consider (1).

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{ali iddā i-si le a-habb-u}
\begin{flushright}
Ali claim 3m-do that 1sg-love-him
\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}
‘Ali claims that I love him.’
\end{flushright}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{irə-nni leyla ta ta-či}
\begin{flushright}
want-1sg Leyla subj 2f-come
\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}
‘I want Leyla to come.’
\end{flushright}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item *\textit{irə-nni ta leyla ta-či}
\begin{flushright}
want-1sg subj Leyla 2f-come
\end{flushright}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Some speakers, including Ibrahim Akkuş, pronounce it as \textit{ne}, but for the sake of consistency, I will use the \textit{le} throughout, which also reflects my pronunciation. Moreover, \textit{le} has other functions as well.
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{le sabi iči …}
\begin{flushright}
that boy 3m.come
\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}
‘when the boy comes…’
\end{flushright}
\item \textit{bont le kemal}
\begin{flushright}
daughter of kemal
\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}
‘kemal’s daughter’
\end{flushright}
\end{enumerate}

See Talay (2001) for a discussion of similar contexts in Hasköy dialect.
b. *ali ʿiddā i-si ʿande i-habb-u
   Ali claim 3m-do who 3sg-love-him
   ‘Ali claims who loves him.’

c. *ali ʿiddā i-si ʿal a-habb-u
   Ali claim 3m-do if 1sg-love-him
   ‘Ali claims if I love him.’

In (1)a, _le_ appears in embedded declarative clauses with the main verb ‘to claim’, in (1)b the thematic verb is followed by an wh-phrase, which makes the sentence ungrammatical, and (1)c _ta_ also leads to ungrammaticality. Note that _le_ is different from Standard Arabic (StA) indicative complementizer ʿanna although they both take a finite clausal complement. For instance, in StA the order VSO is the unmarked order, as illustrated in (2)a, however, it is not possible in a clause embedded under ʿanna, as shown in (2)b (Shlonsky 2000).

(2) a. kataba ʿal-walad-u ʿal-risaalat-a.  
   wrote the-boy-nom the-letter-acc
   ‘The boy wrote the letter.’

   (I) claimed that wrote the-boy-nom the-letter-acc
   ‘I claimed that the boy wrote the letter.’

The comparison shows that unlike _le_, the Standard Arabic ʿanna cannot be followed by a verb, which makes VSO, the unmarked constituent order of StA, impossible in embedded finite clauses. Let us now discuss the distribution of the complementizer _ta_.

(3) a. ali meraq i-si ʿal a-habb-u mo-habb-u⁴
   Ali wonder 3m-do if 1sg-love-him neg-1sg-love-him
   ‘Ali wonders if I love him.’

b. *ali meraq i-si le a-habb-u
   Ali wonder 3m-do that 1sg-love-him
   ‘Ali wonders that I love him.’

The example (3) shows that embedded polarity interrogatives are introduced with the complementizer _ta_ ‘if’ and that _le_ ‘that’ cannot be embedded under a verb like ‘wonder’ which belongs to a class of verbs that require an interrogative complement (Huang 1982).⁵ The example

⁴ This is reminiscent of the Turkish coordination in this type of constructions, which has the following form:

   Ali he-nom love-and love-nmlz-poss-acc wonder do-prog
   ‘Ali wonders if I love him or not.’

⁵ The dubitative complementizer _ta_ appears in some clause types as well, e.g. optative or conditional clauses. See J. Hoekstra (1993) for similar functions of the Modern West Frisian complementizer _oft_.

---

3 See section 4.1 for the discussion of the complementizer layer in Standard Arabic.

5 The dubitative complementizer _ta_ appears in some clause types as well, e.g. optative or conditional clauses. See J. Hoekstra (1993) for similar functions of the Modern West Frisian complementizer _oft_.
(4) shows that the verb RF ‘to know’ has no selectional restrictions, that is, may optionally take an interrogative complement.

(4) a. a-ref le kemal ja
    1sg-know that Kemal came.3m
    ‘I know that Kemal came.’

    b. a-ref ta kemal ja
    1sg-know if Kemal came.3m
    ‘I know if Kemal came.’

The data from (1) to (4) shows that the choice of the complementizer depends on the thematic verb of the matrix clause. However, this is not the whole picture. Consider (5), where the two complementizers co-occur.

(5) a. ali meraq i-si ta le a-habb-u mō-habb-u
    Ali wonder 3m-do if that 1sg-love-him neg-1sg-love-him
    ‘Ali wonders if I love him or not.’

    b. *ali iddā i-si ta le a-habb-u
    Ali claim 3m-do if that 1sg-love-him
    ‘Ali claims that I love him.’

The contrast between (5)a and (5)b shows that with a verb such as ‘wonder’ that requires an interrogative complement, the complementizers ta and le co-occur, whereas the co-occurrence is ruled out when embedded under a verb such as ‘claim’, which does not permit an interrogative complement. The following sentences with the main verb ‘to know’, which imposes no selectional requirements, support this conclusion.

(6) a. sabi mi-y-are (*ta) le abun mat fo-harp
    boy neg-3m-know if that father-his died.3m in-war
    ‘The boy doesn’t know that his father died in the war.’

    b. sabi mi-y-are ta (le) abun mat fo-harp
    boy neg-3m-know if that father-his died.3m in-war
    ‘The boy doesn’t know if his father died in the war.’

Note that this sentence is grammatical in the conditional reading if followed by an appropriate context, but out in the intended meaning. I will rule out the other meanings throughout unless related to the discussion.
In (6)a, the intended meaning is factive and as such *ta is excluded, whereas in (6)b an embedded interrogative interpretation is intended and complementizers co-occur.\(^8\) The order of the complementizers is fixed, that is, *le ... ta order is ruled out.

\[(7) \quad *\text{ali meraq isi le ta ahabbu mō-habb-u.} \quad \text{Ali wonder 3m-do if that 1sg-love-him neg-1sg-love-him} \]

Note that multiple complementizers with the same sequence are encountered in some Germanic languages (Haegeman 1992:46–47), which also exhibit a fixed order.\(^9\)

\[(8) \quad \text{Dat is niet zo gek als of dat hij gedacht had} \quad \text{this is not as crazy as if that he thought had} \]
\[
\quad \text{‘This is not so crazy as he had thought it.’} \quad \text{(Dutch dialect; E. Hoekstra 1992:191)}
\]

\[(9)\quad \text{Vi kender mange lingvister som at der vil læse denne bog} \quad \text{we know many linguists C° C° C° will read this book} \]
\[
\quad \text{‘We know many linguists who will read this book.’} \quad \text{(Danish; Vikner 1991:112)}
\]

3. Interaction of Complementizers with Other Elements in CP

The data thus far indicates that *ta *le is a possible sequence in embedded polarity interrogatives, let us now look at the interaction of these two complementizers with other constituents in the left periphery.

\[\text{Sometimes in embedded interrogative it is possible to use only *le, as illustrated below:}\]

\[(i) \quad \text{ɔstaŋhɔrtu le ali ja māja} \quad \text{asked-2sg that ali came.3m neg-came.3m} \]
\[
\quad \text{‘I asked if Ali came or not.’}
\]

One might suspect that this indicates that *le is compatible with both embedded declaratives and interrogatives. However, I argue against on the basis of the fact that (i) the opposite pattern is out, i.e. *ta is excluded in declaratives (see (1c)), and (ii) that when embedded under verbs like know, which do not have selectional restrictions, the interrogative meaning is excluded in cases where only *le is used.

\[(ii) \quad *\text{a-ref le kemal ja} \quad \text{1sg-know that Kemal came.3m} \]
\[
\quad \text{Intended: ‘I know if Kemal came.’}
\]

Hence, I will assume that in cases like (i), the complementizer *ta is there, but is left unpronounced.

\[\text{As has already been pointed out in the literature, the embedded interrogative in this case is licensed through the presence of negation or question in the matrix clause Adger and Quer (2001).}\]

\[\text{Rizzi (2001:290) points out that languages like Spanish permit the sequence in the opposite order que si ‘that if’ in some embedded questions, which he interprets as the overt cooccurrence of the force head with Int.}\]
3.1. Order with respect to FOCUS

The two elements have certain properties in common: for instance, both are compatible with f(ocus)-phrases which must follow them, similar to the properties of se ‘if’ and che ‘that’ in Italian (Rizzi 2001:289).

(10) a. *iddā i-sī le ALA adi-t-lu (aya la).
   claim 3m-do that THIS gave-2m-him (not that one)
   ‘He claims that you gave him THIS, not that one.’

   b. iddā isi ALA le aditlu (aya la).
   claim 3m-do THIS that gave-2m-him (not that one)

(11) a. *meraq i-sī ta ALA adi-t-lu, (aya la).
   wonder 3m-do if THIS gave-2m-him (not that one)
   ‘He wonders if you gave him THIS, not that one.’

   b. meraq isi ALA ta aditlu (aya la).
   wonder 3m-do THIS if gave-2m-him (not that one)

Based on the similarity, we can assume the following:

(12) a. ta … FOC

   b. le … FOC

Now let us discuss the position of f-phrase in cases where the complementizers co-occur.

(13) a. *ali meraq i-sī ta le ALA KITAB adit ša kemal, ay naïgar la.
   Ali wonder 3m-do if that THIS BOOK gave.2m to Kemal (not the other one)
   ‘Ali wonders if you gave kemal THIS BOOK, (not the other one).’

   b. ali meraq isi ta le adit ALA KITAB ša kemal, ay naïgar la.
   Ali wonder 3m-do if that gave.2m THIS BOOK to Kemal (not the other one)

   c. *ali meraq isi ta ALA KITAB le adit ša kemal, ay naïgar la.
   Ali wonder 3m-do if THIS BOOK that gave.2m to Kemal (not the other one)

   d. ali meraq isi ALA KITAB ta le adit ša kemal, ay naïgar la.
   Ali wonder 3m-do THIS BOOK if that gave.2m to Kemal (not the other one)

Amongst the (at least) four combinations, only (13)a is possible. The contrast between (13)a and (13)b indicates that contrastive focus interpretation is not available in post-verbal, i.e. in-situ, position. This contrast has been articulated for other Arabic dialects, e.g. Standard Arabic, Lebanese Arabic. For instance, Moutaouakil (1989) argues that the two types of focus constructions are not equivalent in discourse: while the in-situ focus functions as presentational focus, fronted f-phrases can only be understood contrastively, that is, as opposed to a
presuppositional/pre-existing information, which they deny (Ouhalla 1994; Aoun et al. 2010). Hence, only (14)b represents a felicitous answer to the question in (14)a.

(14) a. šu šərib zayd? Lebanese Arabic (Aoun et al. 2010:202) 
what drank.3ms Zayd ‘What did Zayd drink?’

b. šərib zayd ŞAY drank.3ms Zayd tea ‘Zayd drank TEA.’

c.  *

The example (13)c shows that a focused phrases cannot intervene between ta and le, whereas (13)d indicates that a configuration where an f-phrase precedes ta is also disallowed. Thus, the ordering restrictions gives the following sequence.

(15) ta >> le >> FOC

3.2. Order with respect to wh-elements

Another property that has important implications for the analysis of the left periphery in Sason concerns the position of le with respect to the different kinds of operators hosted by the C-system. Relative operators in headless relative clauses in Sason may be followed by the complementizer le, but cannot be preceded by. 10

(16) a. qay tə-saddeğ tə-ğul-ni amma (le) tə-mme int. 2m-believe 3f-tell-me where (that) 3f-go ‘Do you believe that she tells me where she goes to?’

b. mə-tə-ğul-ni (*le) šəne (le) ki tə-qri neg-3f-tell-me that what that be.3f 3f-read ‘She doesn’t tell me what she is reading.’

---

10 Note that another function of the complementizer le is the same as the English that in relative clauses. It appears in cases where the head noun is overtly expressed.

(i) mə-daš-tu ayu kitabād le qarit
neg-saw-1sg those books that read.2m ‘I didn’t see those books that you read.’

(ii) mə-daš-tu šəne le qarit
neg-saw-1sg what that read.2m ‘I didn’t see what you read.’
In (16) the complementizer *le* follows different relative operators, one referring to a place and the other to a thing, object, hence giving us the order *Rel-Op … le*.

Notice that the opposite order is disallowed, as illustrated in (16)b.

In embedded interrogatives, the reverse order is observed. The question operator must follow the complementizer if it is overtly realized.

(17) a. *meraq asi le amma tɔ-mme*
   wonder 1sg-do that where 3f-go
   ‘I wonder where she goes.’

   b. *kɔllom i-stağbər mi-nni (le) ʃəne (*le) a-si*
   every day 3m-ask from-me that what that 1sg-do
   ‘He asks me every day what I read.’

Note that the position of the complementizer with respect to the operator and the choice of the main verb determine the relevant reading in the following contrast.

(18) a. *moša le a-qri kullu čax i-cib-ni (*le) ʃəne le irən-ni*
   for that 1sg-read every time 3m-bring-me that what what want-1sg
   ‘Every time he brings me what I want to read.’

   b. *kɔllom i-stağbər mi-nni le ʃəne (*le) irənni a-qri*
   everyday 3m-ask from-me that what what want-1sg 1sg-read
   ‘Every time he asks me what I want to read.’

The word order restrictions give us the following pattern, which is also what is observed in Italian (Rizzi 2001), with the difference that in Italian it is the complementizer *se* that displays this distribution.

---

11 I should note that speakers, me included, prefer to overtly express the complementizer.

12 Rizzi (2001:290), after mentioning in passing that in languages allowing *if that* order, presumably ‘that’ expresses a position different from and lower than Force, points out that these languages also exhibit *Wh that* sequence as in the many Romance and Germanic varieties. This holds for Sason as well, as long as we consider the *wh* in Rizzi (2001) to be a relative operator in Sason since I will show that the order of *that* with respect to a relative operator and wh-phrase is different in Sason.

13 Another piece of evidence for the order restriction between the relative operator and the complementizer *le* comes from the conditional clauses.

(i) *(ta) [ʃəne le a-qri]* ʃəengkap *(ta) kotti ye, daha baš ye le/ta mo-qri-yu*
   if what that 1sg-read bad be.3 more good be.3 that/if neg-1sg.read-it
   ‘If what I am reading is bad, it is better that I don’t read it.’

   In this context again the order between the wh-operator and *le* is fixed, and in fact the complementizer is no longer optional, an issue I will leave for further research. The parentheses are meant to show that *ta* is allowed to surface in either position.

(ii) *(ta) [ʃəne le qall-ey]*) *(ta) bašteyn ye ...*
   if what that said.3m-2sg.m if real be.3
   ‘If what he told you is true, …’
(19)  (relative *wh*-pronoun) le (wh-phrase) TP

3.3. *Order with respect to Topic*

In this section I investigate the occurrences of Topic in the left periphery, its position with respect to the other constituents.

The previous section concluded that focus phrases must follow the complementizers. On the other hand, topics may occur in different positions.

(20)  

a.  *meraq a-si* kitab ta le qarit-u  
   wonder 1sg-do book if that read.2m-it  
   ‘I wonder if you read the book.’

b.  *meraq a-si* ta le kitab qarit-u  
   wonder 1sg-do if that book read.2m-it

c.  *meraq a-si* ta kitab le qarit-u  
   wonder 1sg-do if book that read.2m-it

The examples in (20) show that unlike focus, topic can precede (20)a, or follow (20)b, or come between the complementizers (20)c. They also support the view that *ta* and *le* occupy two distinct positions, and the former is higher than the latter.

One question that arises regarding (20)c is whether an ordering restriction exists between topic and relative *wh*-pronoun, which may both precede the complementizer *le*. The contrast in (21) provides a hint about the relative position of TopP with respect to the relative operator and the following *le*. (21)b indicates that TopP cannot intervene between the two elements.

(21)  

a.  *mə-tə-gul-ni* ša kemal šone le ada ali14  
   neg-3f-tell-me to Kemal what that gave.3m Ali  
   ‘She doesn’t tell me what Ali gave to Kemal.’

b.  *mə-tə-gul-ni* šone ša kemal le ada ali  
   neg-3f-tell-me what to Kemal that gave.3m Ali

c.  *mə-tə-gul-ni* šone le ša kemal ada ali  
   neg-3f-tell-me what that to Kemal gave.3m Ali

On the basis of the discussion thus far, we have the following configuration.

(22)  TopP >> ta >> TopP >> Rel. Op >> le >> TopP

Before continuing with the discussion, I would like to dwell on the properties of topicalized elements in Sason Arabic. This will make the ensuing discussion more clear.

14 Note that in line with the earlier discussion, if the fronted constituent is focused, it must occur after *le*, otherwise the sentence is rendered bad by the speakers.
3.4. The Nature of Topics in Sason Arabic

Sason Arabic is a VS(O)/SV(O) language both in matrix and embedded clauses with permutations to these basic orders also being allowed (Akkuş 2014, 2015, Akkuş and Benmamoun 2015).

(23)  a.  kemal qar-\textit{a} kitab-\textit{ad} \hspace{2cm} \text{SVO}
      K \hspace{0.5cm} \text{read.past.3m} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{book-pl}
      ‘kemal read books.’

     b.  qar-\textit{a} kemal kitab-\textit{ad} \hspace{2cm} \text{VSO}
      \hspace{0.5cm} \text{read.past.3m} \hspace{0.5cm} K \hspace{0.5cm} \text{book-pl}

The orders illustrated in (24) are not allowed in Sason Arabic, as in many other Arabic dialects.

(24)  a.  *kitab-\textit{ad} qar-\textit{a} kemal \hspace{2cm} \text{OVS}
      \hspace{0.5cm} \text{book-pl} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{read.past-3m} \hspace{0.5cm} K
      ‘Kemal read the books.’

     b.  *kitab-\textit{ad} kemal qar-\textit{a} \hspace{2cm} \text{OSV}
      \hspace{0.5cm} \text{book-PL} \hspace{0.5cm} K \hspace{0.5cm} \text{read.past.3m}

     c.  *kemal kitab-\textit{ad} qar-\textit{a} \hspace{2cm} \text{SOV}
      \hspace{0.5cm} K \hspace{0.5cm} \text{book-pl} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{read.past-3m}

In (24)a the object precedes the V-S sequence while in (24)b it precedes the S-V sequence. In (24)c, the object occurs between the subject and the verb. All these orders are not acceptable in Moroccan Arabic (Benmamoun 2000), Lebanese Arabic (Aoun et al. 2010) and, as Mohammad (2000) shows, also in Palestinian Arabic.

However, the OVS, OSV, and SOV orders are possible if the object is resumed by a pronominal clitic/agreement inflection on the verb, a construction known as Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD). This is illustrated in (25) (see also (20)).

(25)  a.  kitab-\textit{ad} qar-\textit{en} kemal \hspace{2cm} \text{OVS}
      \hspace{0.5cm} \text{book-pl} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{read.past-3m-them} \hspace{0.5cm} K
      ‘The books, Kemal read them.’

     b.  kemal kitab-\textit{ad} qar-\textit{en} \hspace{2cm} \text{SOV}
      \hspace{0.5cm} K \hspace{0.5cm} \text{book-pl} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{read.past-3m-them}

     c.  kitab-\textit{ad} kemal qar-\textit{en} \hspace{2cm} \text{OSV}
      \hspace{0.5cm} \text{book-pl} \hspace{0.5cm} K \hspace{0.5cm} \text{read.past.3m-them}

It should be noted that the OVS and SOV orders illustrated in (24) also become acceptable if the object is contrastively focused. In such contexts, the object receives focal stress and is not related to a pronominal clitic on the verb. The focused phrase \textit{KITABAD} ‘the books’ is distinguished
prosodically by bearing an extra-heavy pitch accent (indicated in small caps), which is a typical way to mark contrastive foci.

(26)  
a. \textbf{KITAB-AD} qar-\textit{a} kemal \textbf{OVS}  
book-pl read.past-3m K  
‘Kemal read the books.’  
b. kemal \textbf{KITAB-AD} qar-\textit{a} \textbf{SOV}  
K book-pl read.past-3m  
It is possible to attach a phrase introduced by \textit{lāa} ‘not’ as a continuation to either clause in (26), thus excluding the other possible alternative that might be provided (i.e., \textit{dargiyad} ‘magazines’), but it is infelicitous to attach a phrase that includes this other alternative.

(27)  
a. \textbf{KITAB-AD} qar-\textit{a} kemal, dargiyad \textit{lāa} \textbf{OVS}  
book-pl read.past-3m K magazine-pl not  
‘Kemal read the books, not the magazines.’  
b. *\textbf{KITAB-AD} qar-\textit{a} kemal, \textit{u} dargiyad \textit{(inğe)} \textbf{OVS}  
book-pl read.past-3m K and magazine-pl too  
‘Kemal read the books, and the magazines as well.’  
OSV order, on the other hand, is ungrammatical when the object is focused.

(28)  
*\textbf{KITAB-AD} kemal qar-\textit{a} \textbf{OSV}  
book-pl K read.past.3m  
The ungrammaticality is consistent with Shlonsky’s (2000) adjacency requirement, a constraint that states that in Arabic focus phrases need to be adjacent to the verb (see also Bakir 1980). This adjacency requirement also accounts for subject–verb inversion in Standard Arabic \textit{wh}-questions under the assumption that those constructions are a subclass of focus constructions (É. Kiss 1998, 2002; Ouhalla 1994).

(29)  
a. kemal \textit{šine} qar-\textit{a}?  
K what read.past.3m  
‘What did Kemal read?’  
b. *\textit{šine} kemal qar-\textit{a}?  
what K read.past.3m  
The same holds for embedded clauses as well. Below is an embedded clause that shows that \textit{wh}-phrase must be preceded by the subject.

(30)  
a. mō\textit{-re} leyla wara ande \textit{muş-e}  
neg-1sg.know L with whom went-3f  
‘I don’t know with whom leyla went.’
b. ??/* mō-re wara ande leyla mışe
   neg-1sg.know with whom L went-3f

The data suggest that no constituent can intervene between the verb and the f-phrase or wh-phrase. I take this fact to argue that in certain circumstances the lower TopP is not instantiated in Sason (Rizzi, 1997), which makes the fronting of a wh-phrase or an f-phrase across a CLLDed phrase impossible. The order of constituents is illustrated as follows:

(31)   TopP >> ta >> TopP >> Rel. Op >> le >> TopP >> Foc/Wh >> FinP/TP

3.5. The distribution of focus phrases with respect to wh-elements

The configuration in (31) makes no claim with respect to exact positions of focus phrases and wh-phrases in the structure, assuming that they most likely occupy the same position. This is in line with Rizzi’s (2001) analysis of the two constituents in Italian main clauses, where he interprets the incompatibility of focus phrases with wh-phrases in main clauses to mean that they occupy the same position, i.e. the Spec,FocP. On the other hand, Rizzi proposes the following configuration for embedded clauses.

(32)   ForceP >> IntP >> TopP >> FocP >> WhP >> FinP

The example (32) shows that FocP and WhP occupy distinct positions in embedded clauses. This is based on the following contrast.15

(33) a.   Mi domando A GIANNI che cosa abbiano detto (non a Piero)   (Rizzi’s (14))
   ‘I wonder TO GIANNI what they have said (not to Piero).’

b.   *Mi domando che cosa A GIANNI abbiano detto (non a Piero)
   ‘I wonder what TO GIANNI they have said (not to Piero).’

The incompatibility of focus phrases with wh-phrases has been reported for Lebanese Arabic and Standard Arabic (Bakir 1980, Shlonsky 2000, Aoun et al. 2010)

(34) a.   *ʔayna saalim-an qaabala xaalid-un16 (Standard Arabic)
   where Salim-acc met.3m.sg xaalid-nom
   ‘Where was it Salim that Khalid met?’

b.   *xaalim-an ʔayna qaabala xaalid-un
   Salim-acc where met.3ms xaalid-Nom

---

15 Rizzi (2001) posits that in root clauses, wh-elements target the focus projection. Yet in Italian, wh-infinitivals are possible but fronted focus is barred from the left periphery of infinitives (see Bocci 2007, Haegeman 2006). This suggests that Foc and Wh are distinct heads. The interesting question is why the distinction cannot be manifested in root clauses.

16 When the sentence initial focused phrase is a direct object, it appears with accusative case marking in Standard Arabic. The case marking on the fronted focus phrase matches that of the corresponding gap.
This replicates the facts observed in Italian, hence follows from the explanation that question formation is a subclass of focalization, hence the f-phrase and wh-elements target the same position (Shlonsky 2000, Aoun et al. 2010).

Sason Arabic differs from both Lebanese Arabic and Standard Arabic in that f-phrases and wh-elements are permitted to co-occur in main clauses under certain conditions. A f-phrase cannot be preceded by a wh-phrase, but the order where the f-phrase is followed by a wh-phrase is grammatical.

The point of the data is that FOC and Wh are distinct heads and this is reflected in main clauses of Sason Arabic as well. Therefore, coupled with the adjacency requirement of Shlonsky (2000) which states that lower TopP is not instantiated, the configuration in Sason is as follows:17

17 If there is more than one wh-phrase in a clause in Sason Arabic, the leftmost one has to bear stress.
(37)  TopP >> ta >> TopP >> Rel. Op >> le >> TopP >> Foc >> Wh >> FinP/TP

4. Left Periphery of Sason in a Comparative Context

In this section I will compare the configuration in (37) with the analysis proposed for other Arabic dialects. Let us first look at Shlonsky’s (2000) proposal of the complementizer layer in Standard Arabic.

4.1. CP layer in Standard Arabic

In his discussion of the Standard Arabic complementizer ‘anna, Shlonsky (2000: 332) says that ‘anna is associated with indicative mood and finite tense. It cannot be followed by a verb, is typically followed by a DP and this DP manifests accusative case. Moreover, he shows that the unmarked constituent word order in Standard Arabic, VSO, is impossible in embedded finite clauses, as the contrast in (38) shows.

(38)  

(a)  kataba ‘al-walad-u ‘al-risaalat-a.  \(\text{wrote the-boy-nom the-letter-acc} \)  ‘The boy wrote the letter.’

(b)  *za’amtu ‘anna kataba ‘al-walad-u ‘al-risaalat-a.  \(\text{(I) claimed that wrote the-boy-nom the-letter-acc} \)  ‘I claimed that the boy wrote the letter.’

(c)  za’amtu ‘anna ‘al-walad-a kataba ‘al-risaalat-a  \(\text{(I) claimed that the-boy-acc wrote the-letter-acc} \)  ‘I claimed that the boy wrote the letter.’

Shlonsky notes that the morpheme he labels as the accusative case in (38)c, which is associated with the embedded subject resembles the ECM, but argues that it is different from the ECM.\(^{18}\) He posits that the post-‘anna DP to be endowed with a morphological feature, [+F], a nominal

---

(iv)  \([\text{BINTEYN WATU}] \text{(sade kitab-ma) qaro} \)  \(\text{F......f} \)  
\(\text{two girls only only book-a read.3pl} \)  ‘Only two girls read just two books’

(v)  \([\text{BINTEYN WATU}] \text{(SADE KITABMA) qaro} \)  \(\text{*f......F} \)

I will not try to account for the cooccurrence of multiple wh-phrases in the left periphery in this paper. I should however note that the same observations are made for Turkish in Göksel and Özsoy (2000), which is a wh-in situ language.

\(^{18}\) See Shlonsky (2000:332-333) for several arguments.
feature, which happens to have the same phonetic realization as accusative Case. Crucially, [+F] is not the same formal feature as [ACC].

One supporting piece of evidence for the different nature of the morpheme comes from (39) where it attaches to the CLLDed object. Crucially, the first of the two topics manifests the accusative case, namely [+F], while the second shows up with the nominative case, the case manifested by topics (cf. fn 16).

(39) zaˁamtu ˁanna ˁal-risaalat-a ˁal-walad-u kataba-ha
(I) claimed that the-letter-[+F] the-boy-nom wrote-3f.sg
‘I claimed that the letter, the boy wrote it.’

Shlonsky (2000:333) also shows that ˁanna is not uniquely associated with topics, as in (38)c, but there are some non-topic constituents that satisfy the requirement of ˁanna - by checking [+F] - and trigger an agreement suffix on ˁanna, e.g. in a non-referential null subject (of an impersonal passive).

(40) zaˁamtu ˁanna-hu niima fi ˁal-sariir-i. (Shlonsky’s (13b))
(I) claimed that-3m.sg slept in the-bed-gen
‘I claimed that it was slept in the bed.’

Along with non-referential null subjects, referential null subjects and wh-traces also satisfy ˁanna. All three elements are phonetically unexpressed and all three trigger an agreement suffix on ˁanna. Following Roberts and Shlonsky (1996) and Shlonsky (1997), he argues that this agreement suffix -hu is not a ‘clitic’ in the sense of a Romance-like reduced pronoun, but the head of an agreement projection, dominating ˁanna.19 Indeed, such enclitic particles are found on all major heads in Semitic, verbs, nouns, prepositions and complementizers, as illustrated in (41).

(41) a. qaabal-tu -hu
meet.pfv-1sg [3m.sg]
‘I met him.’

b. bayt-u -hu
house-nom [3m.sg]
‘his house’

c. qabla -hu
before [3m.sg]
‘before him’

d. ˁanna -hu
that [3m.sg]
‘that him’

19 Without going into details of the relevant derivation, in cases where ˁanna is satisfied by a topic, i.e. by an element in Spec.TopP, as in (38)c and (39), Shlonsky (2000: 335) suggests that ˁanna is raised and incorporated to Top’ and [+F] is checked in TopP.
The idea is that the suffixes in (41) head agreement projections to which the substantive head, ʿanna in this case, raises and (left)-joins.20 The Comp layer of the examples in (41) should therefore be taken to contain an AgrP above XP into which X° raises.21

Finally, through a comparison with the other complementizer ʿinna, which is assertive or affirming, while ʿanna is neutral, Shlonsky concludes that these complementizers must be endowed with a force specification, i.e. contain Force° features. Therefore, syntactically this has the consequence of requiring them to raise to Force°.

Based on the points presented here (and some other arguments), Shlonsky (p. 341) arrives at the following configuration for Standard Arabic.

\[(42) \quad \text{ForceP} > \text{TopicP} > \text{AgrXP} > \text{XP} > \text{TopicP*} > \text{FocusP}…\]  

What is crucial for the present discussion is the restriction that the complementizer ʿanna imposes on the embedded clause, i.e. the impossibility of VSO, and the presence of AgrXP in the left periphery. In the following section, I will compare these with Sason Arabic facts.

4.2. CP layer in Sason Arabic

Similar to Standard Arabic, enclitic particles in (41) are found on some major heads, e.g. verbs (43)a, nouns (43)b, prepositions (43)c in Sason, however, as is evident from the discussion so far not on complementizers.

\[(43) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{adaš-tu-a} \\
& \text{saw-1sg-3f.sg} \\
& \text{‘I saw her.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{bēd-a} \\
& \text{house-3f.sg} \\
& \text{‘her house’} \\
\text{c. } & \text{and-a} \\
& \text{with-3f.sg} \\
& \text{‘with her’} \\
\text{d. } & \text{*le-a} \\
& \text{that-3f.sg} \\
& \text{‘that her’}
\end{align*}\]

I take the lack of agreement on the complementizer and the absence of a restriction banning the complementizer from being adjacent to the verb to suggest that Sason Arabic lacks the AgrP and XP that Shlonsky proposes for Standard Arabic.

20 The specifier of this agreement projection is presumably an A-position and contains an agreeing nominal expression, e.g., pro.
21 Shlonsky uses the symbol $\overline{\text{XP}}$ for this phrase, I will use bold XP to refer to it.
22 For Shlonsky, the TopP above AgrP is not recursive, unlike the one below which can be recursive.
In order to accommodate the ordering restrictions between the complementizers and other constituents in the CP layer, I repeat the configuration in (37) here:

(44)  \[ \text{ForceP} \gg \text{TopP} \gg \text{ta} \gg \text{TopP} \gg \text{Rel. Op} \gg \text{le} \gg \text{TopP} \gg \text{Foc} \gg \text{Wh} \gg \text{FinP/TP} \]

Following the traditional approach, I am assuming the presence of Force° as the leftmost constituent. However, due to the lack of agreement on the complementizers and the ordering patterns, I suggest that in Sason the complementizer does not raise to Force°, unlike Standard Arabic. On the basis of the strict locality between the two elements and following Rizzi’s (2001:290) intuition about \textit{wh that} sequence (cf. (19)), I will assume that the relative operator and the complementizer are in a spec-head relation in the relevant context. We can call this projection \textit{C-op} following (Roussou 2000; Haegeman 2004).

The discussion so far also argues against taking \textit{le} to be in Fin°, as Antonelli (2013:20) does for the doubled complementizer \textit{que} in Spanish.

(45)  \[ \text{Ordeno que esos árboles que los talen.} \quad \text{(Antonelli’s (18))} \]

\[ \text{I order that those trees that them cut} \]
\[ \text{‘I order to cut those trees.’} \]

His argument is that the higher \textit{que} is merged in Force head, while the lower one in Fin head where the irrealis feature is valued. For Sason, this analysis faces a problem since, as mentioned earlier, \textit{le} can be followed by several projections above the Fin°.

Until this point, I have investigated the order of components in the left periphery of Sason. In the next section I discuss the behavior of CLLDed NPs in Sason to determine whether they are base-generated in the CP or are derived through movement.

5. Derivation of CLLDed NPs in Sason

In section 3.4, I showed that the OSV order is ungrammatical in Sason when the object is focused.

(46) \[ \text{*KITAB-AD kemal qar-a} \]
\[ \text{book-pl K read.past.3m} \]
\[ \text{‘Kemal read the books.’} \]

Furthermore, I pointed out that the ungrammaticality is consistent with Shlonsky’s (2000) adjacency requirement, a constraint that states that in Standard Arabic focus phrases need to be adjacent to the verb. This explains why focused phrases must follow CLLDed NPs, as illustrated in (47). As mentioned previously, the adjacency requirement also accounts for subject–verb inversion in Standard Arabic \textit{wh}-questions.

(47) a. \[ \text{faaTimat-u l-wardat-a ?aTaa-ha saalim-un} \quad \text{(Bakir 1980, (18))} \]
\[ \text{Fatima-nom the-rose-acc gave.3ms-her Salim-nom} \]
\[ \text{‘Fatima, the rose Salim gave her.’} \]
b. *f-wardat-a faaTimat-u ?aSTaa-ha saalim-un
   the-rose-acc Fatima-nom gave.3ms-her Salim-nom
   ‘Fatima, the rose Salim gave her.’

Lebanese Arabic, on the other hand, differs from both Standard Arabic and Sason Arabic in that focus phrases can either precede or follow CLLDed noun phrases.

(48) a. ʕa kariim zeina ʕarrafnee-ha
        to Karim Zeina introduced.1p-her
   ‘It is to Karim that we introduced Zeina.’

   b. zeina ʕa kariim ʕarrafnee-ha
       Zeina to Karim introduced.1p-her
   ‘It is to Karim that we introduced Zeina.’

In the spirit of the Cartographic enterprise, it amounts to saying that Sason Arabic and Standard Arabic do not instantiate the lower TopP, unlike Lebanese Arabic. Crucially, Aoun and Benmamoun (1998) propose that CLLDed elements do not display a uniform behavior in Lebanese Arabic (LA) and argue that the following generalization holds in LA: a wh-phrase or an f-phrase can be fronted across a CLLDed element derived only by movement and that these phrases cannot be fronted across a base-generated CLLDed element (see also Aoun et al. 2010). The following example illustrates the position of a CLLDed NP with respect to a wh-phrase.

(49) a. naadya fu ʔaalət-la ʔallme?
       N what said.3f-her.dat the-teacher
   ‘Nadia, what did the teacher say to her?’

   b. ʕu Naadya ʔaalət-la ʔallme?
      what N said.3f-her.dat the-teacher
   ‘What Nadia, did the teacher say to her?’

According to Aoun and Benmamoun’s hypothesis, the CLLDed NP in (49)a is base-generated, while the one in (49)b is derived by movement. They make use of reconstruction to support their claim, since reconstruction is a property of chains: it applies only to elements generated by movement (Hornstein 1984, Chomsky 1993).

This line of argumentation implies that CLLDed elements in SA are base-generated, since they must precede a wh-phrase or an f-phrase. Consider the following:

(50) a. ʔa naze ʕašine qal-la muallim?
       N what said.3m-her teacher
   ‘Naze, what did the teacher say to her?’

   b. *ʕašine naze qal-la muallim?
      what N said.3m-her teacher
(51)  a.  
\[ \text{naze MUALLIM adaş-a} \]
N teacher saw.3m-her
‘Naze, the teacher saw her.’

b.  
\[ \text{*MUALLIM naze adaş-a} \]
teacher N saw.3m-her

The ordering restriction is retained even when the CLLDed NP is not separated from its corresponding clitic by an island.

(52)  a.  
\[ \text{naze šine (simat le) qalo-lla?} \]
N what (heard.2m that) said.3pl-her
‘Naze, what did (you hear that) they told her?’

b.  
\[ \text{*šine naze (simat le) qalo-lla?} \]
what N (heard.2m that) said.3pl-her
‘What Naze, did (you hear that) they told her?’

Note that the relation between the CLLDed NP and the clitic can violate island conditions such as the Adjunct Condition (53), the Complex NP Constraint (54), and the Wh-Island Constraint (55).

(53)  
\[ \text{sima-tu kemal müşit qiddam le istaxalt waro-u} \]
heard-1m K went.2m before that talked.2m with-him
‘I heard that Kemal, you left before talking to him.’

(54)  
\[ \text{sima-tu le ali bint istaxalt wara sabi le adaş-a} \]
heard-1m that this girl talked.2m with boy that saw.3m-her
‘I heard that this girl, you talked with the boy who saw her.’

(55)  
\[ \text{sima-tu naze ya-rfo iş sabi adaş-a} \]
heard-1m N 3pl-know which boy saw.3m-her
‘I heard that Naze, they know which boy saw her.’

As these examples clearly illustrate, CLLD constructions consistently violate island conditions. The relevant configurations are given in (56).

(56)  a.  
\[ \text{CLLDed-NP, ... [Adjunct ... X +Clitic]} \]
  b.  
\[ \text{CLLDed-NP, ... [CNP ... X + Clitic]} \]
  c.  
\[ \text{CLLDed-NP, ... [wh ... X + Clitic]} \]

Focus phrases and wh-interrogatives, on the other hand, display island effects: an f-phrase or a wh-phrase may not be related to a gap within an adjunct clause (57)a, a complex NP (57)b, or a wh-island (57)c.
The interim summary is that CLLD constructions related to clitics are not subject to island conditions, whereas focus constructions and wh-interrogatives involving gaps, obey various island effects. These facts can be accounted for if we assume that f-phrases and wh-phrases are generated by movement and move to FocP, while CLLDed elements related to clitics are base-generated, presumably in the higher TopP. This assumption is consistent with standard analyses of Ā-movement in Arabic and other languages. Since they violate various island conditions, constructions with the resumptive pronoun strategy are base-generated (Ross 1967, Cinque 1990).

Now let us discuss the interaction of wh-movement, focus fronting with CLLD. The example (52)a shows that it is possible to have a CLLDed NP followed by a wh-phrase if it is not separated from its corresponding clitic by an island. The construction in (52)a significantly contrasts with the ones in where the wh-phrase follows a CLLDed NP, related to a clitic within a complex NP island, or a wh-island.

The main generalizations are represented in (59).
crossing dependency, which may be adding to the degradation of the sentence. It appears that the dependency cannot cross a \(wh\)-phrase and an island, reminiscent of subjacency effects, though an odd one.

Given the absence of the lower Spec, TopP, one argument could be that unlike Lebanese Arabic, focus fronting in Sason is ruled out regardless of whether the CLLDed element is related a clitic within or without an island. Hence the higher Spec, TopP might be hosting CLLDed elements with different derivations. We have seen that CLLD constructions violate various conditions on movement, which could be explained with an analysis according to which the base-generated CLLDed element is related to a pronominal clitic, as illustrated in (60).

\[(60) \quad \text{CLLDed-NP}_i \quad [\text{island} \quad \ldots \quad \text{pronoun}, \ldots]
\]

As Aoun and Benmamoun point out, CLLD constructions that do not involve islands (59)a could actually correspond to two different representations: one where the clitic is coindexed with a lexical NP that can later undergo movement (61)a, and another where the clitic is coindexed with a null pronominal that is related to a base-generated CLLDed NP (61)b.

\[(61) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{CLLDed-NP}_i \ldots .t_i-X + \text{Clitic} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{CLLDed-NP}_i \ldots .\text{pro}_i-X + \text{Clitic}
\end{align*}
\]

Applying the reconstruction test, we would expect that the representation in (61)a to be unavailable for CLLD constructions since under no circumstances can \(f\)-phrases or \(wh\)-phrases cross over the CLLDed NP in Sason. Consider the following contrast:

\[(62) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{ibn-}[-a]_i \ tawwil, \ tar\phi \ le \ [kul \ bint]_i \ \text{bas}\alpha-du \\
& \quad \text{son-her tall 2pl-know that every girl kissed.3f-him} \\
& \quad \text{“Her tall son, you know that every girl kissed him.”}
\\
\text{b.} & \quad *\text{ibn-}[-a]_i \ tawwil, \ talat-o \ qiddam \ le \ [kul \ bint]_i \ \text{bas}\alpha-du \\
& \quad \text{son-her tall left-2pl before that every girl kissed.3f-him} \\
& \quad \text{“Her tall son, you left before every girl kissed him.”}
\end{align*}
\]

In (62)a, the quantifier phrase (QP) \(kul bint \) ‘every girl’ can bind the pronoun within the CLLDed NP \(ibna tawwil \) ‘her tall son’. Under the assumption that bound pronouns must be c-commanded at LF by the operators that bind them (Hornstein and Weinberg 1990), the relevant reading in (62)a then follows from the reconstruction of the CLLDed NP containing the bound pronoun below the subject QP. As expected, the pronoun in (62)b cannot be interpreted as bound by the QP within the adjunct clause. This is because the CLLDed NP containing the pronoun to be bound is related to a clitic within an island. Since extraction from islands is not possible, the CLLDed NP in (62)b does not reconstruct under the QP since reconstruction is a property of chains created by movement.

Thus, although Lebanese Arabic and Sason Arabic differ in allowing the lower TopP, we reach the same conclusion regarding CLLD constructions, in that they do not behave uniformly with respect to reconstruction: CLLDed elements that are not separated from their corresponding clitics by an island reconstruct; others do not. Aoun and Benmamoun (1998) account for this observation by linking it to the presence of movement in constructions that display
reconstruction and its absence from those that don’t. Given these observations, I hypothesize that the behavior of CLLD with respect to reconstruction is not necessarily tied to allowing an f-phrase or a wh-phrase crossing over it. Since the lower Spec, TopP is not instantiated due to the adjacency requirement in Sason, CLLDed NPs of different derivations end up occupying the same position. Needless to say, this account of the interaction between CLLDed NPs, focus phrases and wh-interrogatives is a first approximation and is highly tentative and calls for further consideration.23

A related observation for the movement analysis of the lexical NP in CLLD constructions concerns the dative-double object constructions in Sason Arabic, where dative structure (63)a alternates with the double object construction (64)a, and the locality condition is respected.24

(63) a.  
\textit{oratman ku i-qarri l-ala kitab ša herdem}

\textit{teacher aux.3m 3m-make read the-this book to H}

‘The teacher is making Herdem read this book.’

b.   
\textit{[lala kitab]$_i$ oratman ku i-qarri-[$u_i$] ša herdem}

\textit{the-this book teacher aux.3m 3m-make read-it to H}

‘This book, the teacher is making Herdem read it.’

c.  
\textit{*[ša herdem]$_i$ oratman ku i-qarri-[$a_i$] l-ala kitab}

to H \textit{teacher aux.3m 3m-make read-her the-this book}

(64) a.  
\textit{oratman ku i-qarri herdem l-ala kitab}

\textit{teacher aux.3m 3m-make read H the-this book}

‘The teacher is making Herdem read this book.’

b.  
\textit{[herdem]$_i$ oratman ku i-qarri-[$a_i$] l-ala kitab}

\textit{H teacher aux.3m 3m-make read-her the-this book}

‘Herdem, the teacher is making her read this book.’

c.  
\textit{*[lala kitab]$_i$ oratman ku i-qarri-[$u_i$] herdem}

\textit{the-this book teacher aux.3m 3m-make read-it H}

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:

(65) a.  
Alexandra gave Isaac a kiss.

b.  
Isaac was given a kiss.

c.  
*A kiss was given Isaac.

---

23 An interesting question to further pursue is why Standard Arabic does not show this property.
24 This constraint was first noticed by Balkız Öztürk during a data elicitation session in the Field Methods course taught at Boğaziçi University.
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. 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 (64)c herdem is higher in the structure, hence lala litab ‘this book’ cannot skip over it to be CLLDed. This line of argumentation would correspond to the configuration in (61)a, where the clitic is coindexed with a lexical NP that can later undergo movement.

6. Conclusion

This paper investigated the CP-domain in Sason Arabic. I have discussed the distribution of the two complementizers ta and le in the language. I also addressed the question of their interaction with other components of the left periphery, e.g. focus phrases, the order of le with respect to relative operator and interrogative pronoun, and proposed the following configuration:

\[(66) \text{ForceP} \gg \text{TopP} \gg \text{ta} \gg \text{TopP} \gg \text{Rel. Op} \gg \text{le} \gg \text{TopP} \gg \text{Foc} \gg \text{Wh} \gg \text{FinP/TP}\]

The comparison with Standard Arabic complementizer system has revealed that unlike ‘anna, which raises to Force°, complementizers in Sason occur in lower position, similar to Germanic languages allowing if that order.

Further comparison with Lebanese Arabic, which allows topics to follow focus, unlike Sason Arabic has concluded that maybe there is not a strong correlation between the derivation of CLLDed NPs and the availability of certain TopP in the CP, unlike what is suggested in Aoun and Benmamoun (1998).
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