Against Broad Subjects in Arabic

Muteb Alqarni
King Khalid University
mutebalqarni@gmail.com
moteebalqarni@kku.edu.sa

Abstract: In reply to Doron & Heycock (1999, 2010), Heycock & Doron (2003) and Alexopoulou, Doron & Heycock (2004), the current article argues that the multiple nominative constructions of the Japanese type do not exist in Arabic. Based on three pieces of evidence from binding, A’-interception and Case, the article shows that the so-called broad subject is a clitic left dislocated element base-generated in the A’-domain. The article therefore supports Landau (2009, 2010), who denies the existence of broad subjects in Hebrew, concluding that broad subjects do not exist in Semitic languages at all.
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1. Introduction

In the past decades, the core-periphery distinction made by Chomsky (1995: 19-20) has attracted a considerable volume of research, where the core involves grammatical properties determined by the principles and parameters of Universal Grammar (UG), whereas the periphery involves marked idiosyncratic facts with less straightforward relations with UG. This modularity hypothesis, i.e. that grammar is modular in structure, leads to the formulation of the A-A’ distinction. The A-domain is the locus of potential θ-role assignment, whereas the A’-domain has no potential θ-role assigners. To accommodate peripheral constructions such as topic and focus, Rizzi (1997) proposes a cartography for the A’-domain as shown in (1).

(1) ForceP > TopP > FP > TopP > FinP

In (1), ForceP is the projection that marks the sentence as declarative or interrogative, whereas FinP stands for the typical tense phrase (TP). As for focus phrase (FP), it is situated between two topic phrases (TopPs).

11 Abbreviations used in this article are as follows: 1=First Person; 2=Second Person; 3=Third Person; ABC= Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri; ACC=accusative; ADH=Alexopoulou, Doron and Heycock; BA=Buhairi Arabic; BS(s)=Broad Subject(s); CA=Classical Arabic; CLLD=Clitic Left Dislocation; DH=Doron and Heycock, or Heycock and Doron; DNC(s)=Double Nominative Construction(s); DU=dual; F=Feminine; FM=Focus Marker; GEN=genitive; IMPERF=imperfective; M=Masculine; LA=Levantine Arabic; MNC(s)=Multiple Nominative Construction(s); NOM=nominative, NS(s)=Narrow Subject(s); MSA=Modern Standard Arabic; PERF=perfective; UG=Universal Grammar.
According to Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri (2010, henceforth ABC), Arabic uses two strategies in forming unbounded dependencies between initial fronted NPs in the periphery and their internal positions in the clause: (i) gap strategy or (ii) resumptive strategy. Focus constructions such as the one in (2) employ gap strategy and associate initial NPs with gaps inside the clause, where the gap is symbolized with \( \emptyset \). Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) constructions, in contrast, employ resumptive strategy and relate initial NPs to resumptive pronominal clitics inside the clause as in (3)\(^2\).

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) & \quad \text{fa:y-a-n} & \text{farbia} & \emptyset & \text{zayd-u-n} \\
& \text{tea-ACC-INDEF} & \text{drank.3.M} & \text{Zayd-NOM-INDEF} \\
& \text{Tea, Zayd drank.} \quad \text{(ABC, 2010: 202, ex. 33a)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(3) & \quad \text{a:tal-mi:dat-u} & \text{ra?a:-ha} & \text{sami} & \text{l-ba:rihat-a} \\
& \text{the-student.F.S-NOM} & \text{saw.3.S,M-her} & \text{Sami.NOM} & \text{the-night.F-ACC} \\
& \text{‘The student, Sami saw her last night.’} \quad \text{(ABC, 2010: 191, 1b)}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that the fronted NP in the focus construction in (2) takes the case of its corresponding gap, namely the accusative, whereas the initial NP in CLLD in (3) is marked with the nominative case. Ouhalla (1994) argues that both the focused and CLLDed NPs in (2) and (3) occupy spec,FP in (1). However, the former lands in spec,PF via movement whereas the latter is merged to it via direct base-generation. Aoun & Benmamoun (1998) and ABC (2010) follow Ouhalla’s (1994) analysis of (2), but they differ in their analysis of (3) arguing that CLLDed elements should occupy the available specifiers of TopPs that are projected at various points in the Rizzian structure.

Unlike Ouhalla (1994), Aoun & Benmamoun (1998) and ABC (2010), Doron & Heycock (1999, 2010 henceforth DH) and Alexopoulou, Doron & Heycock (2004, henceforth ADH) argue that the CLLDed element in (3) is simply a subject merged in the A-domain, particularly to spec,TP. According to DH and ADH, the CLLD construction in (3) is similar to the Japanese Multiple Nominative Constructions (MNCs) in (4) where two NPs with the nominative marking -\( \text{ga} \) can occur sentence-initially.

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \text{mar-y-ga} & \text{kami-ga} & \text{nagai} & \text{(koto)} \\
& \text{Mary-NOM} & \text{hair-NOM} & \text{long} & \text{(fact)} \\
& \text{‘(the fact that) Mary has long hair.’} \quad \text{(DH, 1999:70, ex. 1a)}
\end{align*}
\]

Using the terminology of DH and ADH, the outer or left-most NP \( \text{mar-y-ga} \) ‘Mary’ in (4) is a Broad Subject (BS), whereas the internal or second NP \( \text{kami-ga} \) ‘hair’ is a Narrow Subject (NS). According to DH and ADH, both Levantine Arabic (LA) and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) have the same MNC as in (5) and (6) from MSA.

\[
\begin{align*}
(5) & \quad \text{hind-u-n} & \text{yuqa:bilu-ha} & \text{tˤ:fulla:b-u} \\
& \text{‘The fact that Mary has long hair.’} \quad \text{(DH, 1999:70, ex. 1a)}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^2\) We have rewritten all the Arabic examples cited from other works using the gloss and transcription conventions endorsed in this paper.
Hind-NOM-INDEF meet.3.M-her the-students.M-NOM

‘Hind, the students are meeting her.’ (DH, 1999:70, ex. 3a)

(6) ʔal-bayt-u ʔalwa:n-u-hu za:hiyat-u-n
the-house-NOM colors-NOM-its bright-NOM-INDEF

‘The house, its colors are bright.’  
(DH, 1999:70, ex. 3b)

In (5) and (6), the external nominative NPs hindu ‘Hind’ and ʔalbaytu ‘the house’ are BSs, whereas the internal nominative NPs tˤtˤalla:bu ‘the students’ and ʔalwa:nahu ‘its colors’ are NSs. DH and ADH propose that the so-called BSs in (5) and (6) are base-generated in spec,TP while the NSs originate in spec,VP/AP, where external 0-roles are assigned. The NSs later move to spec,TP, yielding a multiple specifier structure.

In this paper, we will take issue with DH and ADH’s analysis, arguing that the so-called BSs are simply CLLDeed elements merged in the A’-domain as proposed by Ouhalla (1994), Aoun & Benmamoun (1998), and ABC (2010). Given that the CLLD construction in (3) and the so-called BS constructions in (5) and (6) are similar in terms of surface structure in that they both involve fronted NPs associated with resumptive pronouns, namely ha ‘her’ for (3) and (5) and -hu ‘its’ for (6), they become inextricably entangled. The distinction between CLLD and BS constructions only lies in where this fronted NP should be merged? Should it be merged to spec,TP in the A-domain, hence BS; or to spec,FP/TopP in the A’-domain, hence CLLD?

Although previous works have attempted to resolve this issue (see e.g. Alotaibi 2019), we find their augments less comprehensive than our arguments presented here, and we take issue with some points in their rebuttals when relevant. In this article, we find the claim that Arabic has two subjects occupying two specifiers of TP so strong that it challenges the uniqueness of the clausal subject (spec,TP) that holds across languages. Thus, we will reject DH and ADH’s proposal limiting the number of Arabic subjects to the thematic one which is in itself a controversial element in the literature (see ABC, 2010 ch. 3). We will use various tests that distinguish between A- and A’-positions, such as binding conditions, A’-interception and Case, to prove that the so-called BS is base-generated in an non-argument position above spec,TP. Because DH and ADH assume that the multiple nominative cases in the clause periphery in Arabic necessitate recursive specifiers of TP, we will present new data where the so-called BS is marked with the accusative case, hence excluding spec,TP as a case checking configuration for BS.

Before undertaking this task, it is important to draw a distinction between DH and ADH’s examples in (5) and (6). Example (5) consists of a verb, namely yuqa:bilu ‘meet’, whereas (6) has no verb but only an adjectival phrase, namely za:hiyat-un ‘bright’. Using descriptive terms, we will term example (5) a verbal sentence and example (6) a verbless sentence. This distinction is important for us to illustrate that the sentences in (5) and (6) cannot pass DH and ADH’s broad-subjecthood tests equally. Sometimes, DH and ADH do not apply the same test to both of them. We will see in sections (3.2) and (3.3) that verbal sentence (5) always fails at passing the subjecthood tests applied to verbless sentence (6).
As far as the structure of BSs is concerned, DH and ADH propose, as sketched in (7) and (8), that the left peripheral NPs in (5) and (6) are directly base-generated in spec,TP, whereas the second NPs originate in spec,VP/AP.

(7)

```
TP
   DP
   hind-u-n
   T
   yuqa:bilu-ha
   VP
      DP
         V'
         t³-r³ulla:b-u
         V
```

(yuqa:bilu-ha)

(8)

```
TP
   DP
   ?al-bayt-u
   T
   AP
      DP
         A'
         ?alwa:n-u-lu
         A
         za:hiyat-u-n
```

Given that the verb in (7) must undergo V-to-T movement to capture the word order in (5), it separates the BS from the NS. DH (1999), however, point out that, sometimes, the Arabic BS is immediately followed by the NS as in (9).

(9)  

```
hind-u-n  ?at³-r³ulla:b-u  yuqa:bilu-una-ha
   Hind-NOM-INDEF  the-students,M-NOM  meet.3,M-PL-her
   ‘Hind, the students are meeting her.’ (DH, 1999:79, ex. 26a)
```

For sentence (9), DH (1999) propose, as in (10), that the NS moves from spec,VP and is internally adjoined as a lower spec,TP.

(10)
Following Doron (1996), DH (1999) motivate the NS-movement to spec, TP as a requirement to check a strong number feature on the head T. Comparing (9) and (5), the plural number morphology appears on the verb only when the NS precedes the verb as in (9). However, when the verb precedes the NS, it takes the default singular form as indicated by the absence of the number gloss in (5).

Although spec,TP is already filled by the BS, DH (1999) claim that merging does not suffice to check strong agreement features. As DH (1999) put it, “We follow the proposal of Chomsky 1995, according to which, an element cannot check off features (such as agreement) of the head if it is merged as the specifier of that head” (p. 77). As a result, the NS must raise to spec, TP to check the strong number feature as drawn in (10) above.

Given that DH (1999) do not clarify whether the verb also moves to the head T in (10), we assume that the NS-movement suffices. Either way, our analysis will not rely on this point; whether the verb moves or not in (10) will not affect the surface word order in (9). DH (1999) and ADH (2004) do not state their assumptions regarding the NS-movement in verbless sentence (6) either. If they suppose that the NS in verbless sentence (6) also raises to spec, TP to check a strong number feature, the representation of (6) will be as in (11).

\[
\text{(11)}
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{TP} & \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{hind-}u-n & \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{T} \\
\text{ť-}rullā:b-u & \quad \text{T'} \\
\text{VP} & \quad \text{V'} \\
\text{DP} & \quad \text{V} \\
(\text{ť-}rullā:b-u) & \quad \text{yuqa:bīhu-una-ha}
\end{aligned}
\]

In fact, and based on DH and ADH’s assumptions, the NS-movement in verbless sentences is required because the NS clearly agrees in number as well as gender with the adjectival complement. Although this is less clear in (6), consider the corresponding example below.

\[
\text{(12)}
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
?\text{al-bint-}u & \quad ?\text{alwa:n-u-hu} & \quad \text{d3ayyid-}u-na \\
\text{the-girl-NOM} & \quad \text{friend.M.PL-NOM-her} & \quad \text{good-M.PL-NOM} \\
\text{‘The girl, her friends are good.’}
\end{aligned}
\]
In (12), the adjective *dzayyidu:na* ‘good’ agrees in plural number with *ʔasˤdiqaʔu* ‘friends’. We therefore assume that the agreement invoked between the NS and the adjectival complement in (12) supports DH’s hypothesis that NS is in charge of checking the strong number feature even in verbless constructions. Furthermore, given that the EPP feature is strong, and the base-generation of the BS in spec,TP is unlikely to check strong features according to DH and ADH’s assumptions, we take it as further evidence that the NS in verbless sentences moves to spec,TP for EPP as well. In these respects, Arabic resembles Japanese in allowing multiple specifiers as in tree diagrams (10) and (11).

The remainder of the paper will be structured as follows. In section (2), we will show how Japanese MNCs exhibit peculiar behaviors not attested in their Arabic counterparts. We will evaluate the arguments proposed by DH and ADH in section (3), arguing that they all lead to an inescapable conclusion: that the alleged BSs are elements base-generated in the A’-domain. In section (4), we will provide further evidence that the so-called BSs are better hosted in a projection above spec,TP. Concluding remarks will be given in section (5).

2. Distinctions between Japanese and Arabic MNCs

Despite DH and ADH’s attempts to draw an analogy between Japanese and Arabic MNCs, Japanese MNCs still behave differently in many syntactic respects. First, the Japanese initial NPs marked with the nominative suffix -*ga* can be up to three elements as in (13) (cf. Heycock, 1993:170, ex. 2b). In contrast, all the Arabic examples cited by DH and ADH are restricted to two nominative NPs as shown in (5) and (6) above. No more than two NPs are allowed in Arabic as obvious from the ill-formed verbal sentence in (14)a and the verbless one in (14)b. Put differently, if MNCs must exist in Arabic, they should be termed Double Nominative Constructions (DNCs).

(13) bunmeikoku-*ga* dansei-*ga* heikinzyumyoo-*ga* short
developed.country-NOM male-NOM lifespan-NOM mizikai
‘In civilized countries, the average lifespan of men is short.’

(14) a. *ʔasˤ-sˤayf-*u hind-*u*-n yuqa:bilu-ha tˤ-tˤulla:b-*u*
the-summer-NOM Hind-NOM-INDEF meet.3.M-her the-students.M-NOM
‘In the summer, Hind, the students are meeting her.’

b. *ʔasˤ-sˤayf-*u l-bayt-*u* ?alwa:n-*u*-hu za:hiyat-*u*-n
the-summer-NOM the-house-NOM colors-NOM-its bright-NOM-INDEF
‘In the summer, the house has bright colors.’

Second, while Japanese has multiple NPs in possessor-possessee constructions as in (4) reproduced in (15) below, Saito (1982) indicates that Japanese also allows a sequence of unrelated nominative NPs as in (16). As pointed out by Kuroda (1986), in (16), the left-peripheral NP as a non-theta subject displays no syntactic relationship with the second NP inside the clause.
((15) Mary\-NOM hair\-NOM long \(\text{fact}\) ‘(the fact that) Mary has long hair.’ \(\text{DH, 1999:70, ex. 1a}\)

(16) physics\-NOM finding-jobs\-NOM difficult Cop ‘Physics [is such that] finding a job is difficult.’ \(\text{Heycock, 1993:179, ex. 27c}\)

This phenomenon is not attested in the Arabic MNCs as in the corresponding example (17) (see also ex. 37 from Hebrew in Landau, 2009:100).

((17) *ʔal-fi:ziya?:?\-u ?i:d3ad-u wað:i:fat-i-n ?amr-u-n sˤaš-b-u-n \(\text{the-physics}\-\text{NOM finding}\-\text{NOM job}\-\text{GEN-INDEF thing}\-\text{NOM-INDEF difficult}\-\text{NOM-INDEF}\)

‘As for physics, getting a job is a difficult matter’

In Arabic, the initial nominative NP in the so-called BS constructions must bind a pronominal element within the clause. Thus, (17) can be rescued only by an antecedent-pronominal relation between the outer NP and the clause-internal clitic as shown in (18)

((18) ?al-fi:ziya?:?\-u ?i:d3ad-u wað:i:fat-i-n la-ha, \(\text{the-physics}\-\text{NOM finding}\-\text{NOM job}\-\text{GEN-INDEF for-it}\)

‘As for physics, getting a job for it is difficult.’

The third syntactic difference between Japanese and Arabic MNCs follows from the fact that Japanese BSs typically occur in embedded clauses after the phrase \textit{koto} ‘the fact’ as in (15) above. In matrix clauses, however, DH \(\text{1999:70, ft2}\) admit that the same two nominative NPs will become awkward. Under that scenario, the initial NP, functioning as a topic, must be marked with the particle -\textit{wa} as in (19).

((19) Mary\-TOP hair\-NOM long ‘Mary has long hair.’

In Arabic, however, the double nominative NPs appear naturally in matrix clauses as in (5) and (6) above. As will be shown in sections \((3.2)\) and \((3.3)\), DH and ADH present data that proves that Arabic MNCs are similar to Japanese ones in that they can also appear in embedded contexts. In short, we can simply note that Arabic and Japanese differ in terms of the distribution of these multiple nominative NPs in the clausal structure. Unlike Arabic MNC that can occur in both matrix or embedded clauses, Japanese MNCs appear in embedded contexts only.)
In this section, we have shown three syntactic differences that clearly suggest that Arabic MNCs are not identical to the Japanese ones. This conclusion, however, is predictable because of the typological differences between Japanese and Semitic languages in general (Landau 2009, 2010, and see responses from DH 2010). For instance, Kuroda (1988) and Fukui (1995) argue that Japanese is a non-agreement language, and this parameter makes Japanese MNCs one of a large bundle that includes possessor stacking, scrambling and lack of overt wh-movement. This cluster of phenomena is not attested in Arabic, though, which is by contrast an agreement language. In other words, typological evidence also indicates that BS is less likely to be part of Arabic grammar.

3. The Non-Existence of the So-called BS in Arabic

In this section, we will discuss the evidence that DH (1999, 2010) and ADH (2004) provide to demonstrate the existence of BS in Arabic. Before doing so, however, let us first emphasize two challenges that we may encounter throughout this paper. First, although DH and ADH attempted to prove the subjecthood of BS by comparing it with thematic subjects in Arabic, it should be noted that some scholars have already taken a much stronger position than DH and ADH regarding pre-verbal thematic subjects, arguing that they are base-generated in the A'-domain (Bakir, 1980; Fassi Fehri, 1988, 1993; Plunkett 1993; Akkal, 1996; Khairi, 1996; and Ouhalla, 1997, among many others). Thus, unlike DH and ADH, who generate both BS and (preverbal) NS in the A-domain, those scholars generate them in the periphery instead. In other words, DH and ADH should not assume that it is sufficient to compare BS with thematic subjects to prove its subjecthood, as they may end up comparing BS with another A'-element (i.e. the thematic subject) and finding commonalities between them. Due to space limitations, we will not concern ourselves with the position of (preverbal) NS as much as with that of BS. Our purpose from the above point is to remind ourselves of the long tradition of polemic regarding subjects in Arabic, irrespective of their associations with 0-roles.

Second, unlike DH (1999), who extensively use examples from MSA, ADH (2004:335) replace “Standard Arabic examples with Levantine Arabic, since the facts are parallel”. This exchange of facts leads to considerable confusion as many allegedly grammatical facts in LA are ill-formed in MSA. In other words, the grammaticality judgement between the two varieties is not always the same. Although DH and ADH have written four articles on the so-called BS in Arabic, they provide questionable CLLD constructions in comparison. To illustrate this point, ADH (2004) argue that LA has both BS and CLLD. One of the only two examples that they consider CLLD in their paper is example (20) from Palestinian Arabic, which is quoted from Aoun & Benmamoun (1998: 575, ex. 25a).

(20) ʃu  nakdyʃa  (smeʃte  ?inno)  xabbaruww-a
what   Nadia    (heard.2.S.F  that)  told.3.PL-her

‘What Nadia, did (you hear that) they told her?’ (ADH, 2004:353, ex. 71)

To begin with, example (20) is very dubious to any native speaker of Arabic. Consulting many Palestinian speakers, they all consider (20) ungrammatical. The equivalent example from MSA is ungrammatical as well.
The other example that ADH (2004: 353) provide as an example of CLLD is the one given below.

\[\text{(22) } \text{nadia} \quad \text{haku:} \quad \text{l-a} \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item Nadia, they talked to her.’ (ADH, 2004:353, ex. 72).
\end{itemize}

While (22) may be a clear instance of CLLD, ADH are still hesitant in their judgement, claiming that (22) “could be either an instance of BS or CLLD” (ADH, 2004: 353). With such tentativeness, ADH’s data will never be falsifiable. In other words, an author cannot find a verified CLLD construction that DH and ADH cite in their papers as clear instances of CLLD so that he/she can compare it with their BS constructions and apply their tests to it.

In the following sections, we will confine our discussion to the facts from MSA reported in DH (1999), and we will show that some of DH’s data does not follow the Arabic grammar rules. After correcting the ungrammatical examples in DH and ADH’s papers, we will show how the fixed data proves that the so-called BS patterns with other A’-elements. As for the data from LA, we will show that the arguments built upon them do not provide adequate evidence for the existence of BSs in Arabic either. Let us turn to the arguments that DH (1999) and ADH (2004) present in support of BS in Arabic.

3.1. Evidence from Coordination

In an attempt to demonstrate the subjecthood of BS, DH (1999) and ADH (2004) show that BSs qualify as genuine subjects in conjunct structures such as (23) below.

\[\text{(23) } \text{sayya:rat-i} \quad \text{[lawn-u-ha]} \quad \text{za:hiyy-u-n]} \]

\begin{itemize}
  \item ‘My car has a bright color and is convertible.’ (DH, 1999:73, ex. 8).
\end{itemize}

In (23), according to DH (1999), the initial NP sayya:rat-i ‘my car’ is shared between two conjuncts, the first of which is a sentential predicate lawnaha za:hiyyun ‘its color is bright’, the second being an AP predicate maftu:hatun min al-ʔaʃla: ‘open from the above’ as illustrated in (24).
According to DH (1990), the thematic subject of the first conjunct is *lawnuha* ‘its color’, whereas the first NP *sayya:rati* ‘my car’ functions as its non-thematic BS. Given that AP predicates in Arabic do not license pro-drop, DH argue that the only possible thematic subject of this AP predicate will be the same peripheral NP that functions as BS for the first conjunct. In other words, the NP *sayya:rati* ‘my car’ functions as BS for the first conjunct but a true thematic NS for the second conjunct. This evidence concludes that, in certain contexts, the Arabic BS plays the role of thematic subjects.

Three counter-arguments can be levelled against this evidence. First, if DH and ADH argue that the BS is directly merged as an external spec,TP and is not moved from an internal position, one would inquire about the mechanism by which the very embedded adjective *maftu:ḥatun* ‘open’ assigns an external θ-role to this remote BS which functions as its thematic subject. Adjectives, including Arabic ones, assign external θ-roles to their subjects (Bowers, 1993; Baker, 2003; Assiri, 2011). Thus, there will be a locality violation, and DH and ADH must assume that this initial NP starts in spec,AP and later moves to spec,TP. This proposal, however, will not only contradict their assumptions, but will also involve an impossible movement given that the NS should not move out of a coordinate structure island.

Second, DH assume that strong agreement features such as number in Arabic cannot be checked by base-generated elements. According to DH (1999), “Granted Chomsky’s proposal that strong features cannot be checked by a phrase in the position in which it is merged, the lack of agreement with Broad Subjects follows immediately” (p. 88). In other words, DH expect broad subjects not to agree with any element within the following predicate. However, the NP *sayya:rati* ‘my car’ in (23) unexpectedly agrees in number and
gender with the adjective mafatu:hatun ‘open’. The agreement between the adjective and the so-called BS cannot be established in (24) for another locality violation. Even under the assumption that the number feature should be weak for this structure, the Agree approach proposed by Chomsky (1995) requires that the unvalued φ-features of the probe c-command the valued φ-features of the goal, namely the BS, but this c-command relationship is not satisfied in (24). Under Assiri’s (2011) analysis, which argues that Arabic adjectives are phases, the apparent agreement between the BS and the adjective will be further challenged.

If there is a functional layer aP above the lexical AP, Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky, 2001) will dictate that the adjective mafatu:hatun ‘open’ on the lexical head A is inaccessible to higher syntactic operations.3

These two problems related to theta assignment and agreement will not arise if DH and ADH had proposed that sentence (23) involves two sentences as in (25) where the subject of the second sentence is null.

(25) sayyya:rat-i [lawn-u-ha za:hiyy-u-n]
wa- [sayyya:rat-i mafatu:hat-u-n min al?-?a?la:]
and [car.S.F.NOM-my open.S.F-NOM-INDEF from above]
‘My car has a bright color and is convertible.’ (DH, 199973, ex. 8).

DH, however, rejects this option, insisting that the second conjunct is “not a sentence with a null subject” (DH, 1999: 73). This uncompromising position is meant to prove that BS can function as a thematic subject but, as we have seen, this proposal faces serious theoretical challenges. The proposal that allows the second conjunct to be a full sentence with a null subject will solve all these problems. The second conjunct being a sentence, the external theta role and the number agreement can easily be assigned and established as both the adjective and the subject appear in a local configuration. At PF, the subject of the second sentence can simply be deleted similar to other proposals for coordinate constructions in the literature (see e.g. Wilder 1997 and Hartmann 2000)4.

3 Note also that, according to DH and ADH’s assumptions, even the strong EPP feature on the head T should not be checked by the ‘merged’ BS.

4 DH (1999, 2003) and ADH (2004) also provide the following coordinated sentence in (i) as an argument for the existence of BS in Hebrew.

i. ruti yeʃ la savlanut ve-maclixa be-pitron taʃbecim
Ruti there.is to.her patience and-is successful at-solving cross-word puzzles
‘Ruti has patience and is successful at solving crosswords.’

Landau (2009:91, ex. 5), however, takes issue with the above example claiming that he and other native Hebrew speakers reject it. He proposes that example (i) can be remedied by the insertion of a pronominal subject hi ‘she’ after the coordinator ve ‘and’. Alotaibi (2019: 109) similarly suggests that the Arabic example in (25) should be fixed by inserting the overt pronoun hia ‘it’ right after the coordinator wa ‘and’ as in (ii). However, we find example (ii) ungrammatical.

ii. sayyya:rat-i lawn-u-ha za:hiyy-u-n
The new proposal that involves two sentences is more desirable for the two reasons above plus the following third reason: the coordination in (24) is unfavorably established between two different syntactic constituents, which is contra Coordinate Constituent Constraint (Chomsky, 1965; Williams, 1978; Schachter, 1977). As Gazdar (1981:172) puts it, “only items of the same syntactic category can be conjoined”. Under the new account in (25), yet, the coordination is held between two constituents of the same category, namely two sentences.\(^5\)

3.2. Evidence from ECM constructions

DH (1999) and ADH (2004) argue that although English left dislocated elements cannot be embedded underneath ECM verbs as in (26), Arabic BSs can as shown in (27) and (28).

(26) *I believed John, him/he to be a hero. (DH, 1999: 72, ex. 6b).

(27) δˤanantu hind-a-n yuqa:bihu-ta tˤ-tˤulla:b-u

thought.1S Hind-ACC-INDEF meet.3.M-her the-students-NOM

‘I believed Hind to have been met by the students.’ (DH, 1999:72, ex. 7a)

(28) δˤanantu l-bayt-aʔ alwa:n-u-hu za:hiyat-u-n

thought.1S the-house-ACC colors-NOM-its bright-NOM-INDEF

‘I believed the house to be of bright colors.’ (DH, 1999:72, ex. 6.a)

\(^5\) One reviewer argues that coordination between different categories is possible as shown in (i) (cf. Bayer, 1996).

i. John is [NP a Republican] and [AP proud of it].

In (i), however, we assume that the apparent coordination of unlike categories follows from the fact that the head is can select NP and AP as in (ii) and (iii) respectively.

ii. John is [NP a Republican].

iii. John is [AP proud of it].

Verbs such as become that select NP [i.e. a Republican] but not PP [i.e. in the room] cannot allow the coordination of unlike categories such as NP and PP as in (iv) below.

iv. *John becomes [NP a Republican] and [PP in the room].

Moreover, similar to our analysis, Crysmann (2003), Beavers and Sag (2004) and Chaves (2006) argue that example (i) does not involve distinct categories. As shown in (v), they propose that the coordination in (i) involves two VPs; the head of the second is deleted at PF.

v. John [VP is a Republican] and [VP is proud of it].
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At first sight, one can realize that the two embedded NPs in Arabic are no longer MNCs but accusative-nominative constructions. The initial NPs in (27) and (28) cannot retain the nominative case -u as in (29) and (30).

(29) *ðˤanantu hind-u-n yuqa:bilu-ha tˤ-tˤulla:b-u
    thought.1.S Hind-NOM-INDEF meet.3,M-her the-students-NOM
    ‘I believed Hind to have been met by the students.’

(30) *ðˤanantu l-bayt-u ?alwā:n-u-hu za:hiyat-u-n
    thought.1.S the-house-NOM colors-NOM-its bright-NOM-INDEF
    ‘I believed the house to be of bright colors.’

These behaviors in Arabic are in stark contrast to Japanese MNCs where the first NP under the ECM verb can alternate between nominative as in (31) and accusative as in (32) (Kuno 1978).

(31) boku-ga john-ga imooto-ga kirei-da to omowu
    I-NOM John-NOM sister-NOM beautiful-be that think
    ‘I think that John’s sister is beautiful.’ (DH, 1999:72, ex. 5)

(32) boku-ga john-o imooto-ga kirei-da to omowu
    I-NOM John-ACC sister-NOM beautiful-be that think
    ‘I think that John’s sister is beautiful.’ (DH, 1999:72, ex. 5)

The appearance of the embedded ‘double nominative’ NPs in Japanese ECM constructions in (31) makes them eligible for the term MNCs. Example (31) is among the examples that present the MNC in Japanese as an established and uncontroversial phenomenon in the literature. However, as demonstrated in (29) and (30), the alleged BS constructions in Arabic are far from being clear, as double nominatives are missing under ECM verbs.

Moreover, if DH and ADH’s claims are strongly grounded, we predict that all their alleged BSs can be embedded under ECM verbs. Let us consider the following example in (33) which DH (1999: 79) consider to be a BS construction. If this sentence is involved underneath ECM verbs, it becomes ungrammatical as shown in (34).

(33) hind-u-n ?atˤ-tˤulla:b-u yuqa:bilu-una-ha
    Hind-NOM the-students-NOM meet.3,M-PL-her
    ‘Hind, the students are meeting her.’ (DH, 1999:79, ex. 26a).

(34) *ðˤanantu hind-a-n ?atˤ-tˤulla:b-u yuqa:bilu-una-ha
    thought.1.S Hind-ACC-INDEF the-students-NOM meet.3,M-PL-her
    ‘I thought Hind, the students are meeting her.’
As obvious from the ungrammatical sentence in (34), the so-called BS cannot be embedded below ECM verbs. This finding at least suggests that not all the BSs reported by DH and ADH can occur in ECM contexts. We are apparently dealing with non-uniform constructions. Example (34) can be improved only if the BS is separated from the NS by the verb as given in (27). However, it should be remembered that example (33) is the same example in (9) that DH used to illustrate that NS must move to spec,TP to check the strong number feature on the verb. According to DH’s analysis, BS and NS must occupy multiple specifiers for example (33) to be derived. For an unclear reason, this multiple specifier analysis could not generate the ungrammatical sentence in (34) as is the case with the Japanese data in (31).

If DH and ADH’s multiple specifier analysis is on the right track, we also predict that the two NPs may both receive the accusative from the verb δ’anantu ‘thought’ as they are structurally located at the same level (multiple spec,TP), and there is no head that blocks the case from being licensed on both of the initial NPs. Yet, this prediction is not borne out, as demonstrated by the ungrammatical sentences in (35) and (36), where both the NPs take an accusative case.

(35)  *δ’anantu  hind-a-n  ?at?-r’ulla:b-a  yuqa:bitu-una-ha

thought.1.s  Hind-ACC-INDEF the-students.M-ACC  meet.3.M-PL-her

‘I thought Hind, the students are meeting her.’

(36)  *δ’anantu  l-bayt-a  ?alwa:n-a-hu  za:hiyat-u-n

thought.1.s  the-house-ACC  colors-ACC-its  bright-NOM-INDEF

‘I believed the house to be of bright colors.’

On the assumption that DH and ADH argue that the accusative cannot be licensed on both NPs because Case features cannot be doubly checked, they should then explain why the two NPs in their examples (5) and (6) receive double nominatives from one predicate (see section 4.3, where DH and ADH’s proposal for Case is further challenged).

Takano (2003, p. c.) investigates Japanese constructions such as those in (31) and (32), where the so-called BS can alternate between the nominative and accusative. He proposes that the nominative marked subject in (31) presents itself as an uncontroversial BS in Japanese. However, the accusative case on the same NP in (32) shows that it is a different construction. Takano treats the accusative BS as a proleptic object rather than a BS. Prolapse is a structure where a matrix verb selects two objects (NP and TP), and the NP “is semantically related to the predicate of the embedded clause... [with] a coreferential pronoun” (Salzmann, 2017: 1).

Following Takano’s treatment of Japanese accusative-nominative constructions (32) above, the Arabic accusative-nominative constructions in (27) and (28) can be straightforwardly derived. For (27) and (28), we propose that the verb δ’anantu ‘thought’ selects two complements: NP (the so-called BS, but it is now an object), and TP (that includes the ordinary subject). The verb will directly assign the accusative to the first complement (i.e. the BS), whereas the NS inside the second complement (i.e. the TP) will invariably take the nominative from the embedded clause. This analysis will account for the
accusative-nominative constructions in (28) and (27), and exclude the nominative-nominative constructions in (29) and (30) as well as the accusative-accusative constructions in (35) and (36).

3.3. Evidence from Non-Peripheral Position

Following the same line of reasoning, DH (1999) claim that Arabic BS, unlike English CCLD in (37), can follow the auxiliary ka:na ‘was’ as shown in (38) below.

(37) *Was the house its colors (were) bright. (ADH, 2004: 335, ex. 17b)
(38) ka:na l-bayt-u ?alwa:n-u-hu za:hiyat-u-n
was.3.m the-house,m-nom colors-nom-its bright,f-nom-indef
‘The house was of bright colors.’ (DH, 1999:73, ex. 9)

First, example (38) is ungrammatical⁶. In Arabic grammar, ka:na is an auxiliary that “takes a subject in the nominative and it requires that the complement be in the accusative case” (Ryding, 2005: 635) as in the following examples.

(39) ka:na l-bayt-u dʒami:l-a/*u-n
was.3.m the-house,m-nom beautiful,m-acc/*nom-indef
‘The house was beautiful.’
(40) ka:nat ?alwan-u-hu za:hiyat-at-a/*u-n
was.3.f colors,f-nom-its bright-f-acc/*nom-indef
‘Its colors were bright.’

In (39) and (40), the subject (i.e. the first NP) bears the nominative case whereas the complement is in the accusative. In DH’s example (38), however, no accusative marker is attested, perhaps because DH want to keep their double nominative construction intact. Even if we assign the accusative case to the whole adjectival predicate as in (41), the example will still be ungrammatical due to another independent factor, namely agreement.

(41) *ka:na l-bayt-u ?alwa:n-a-hu za:hiyat-a-n
was.3.m the-house,m-nom colors,f-acc-its bright,f-acc-indef
‘The house was of bright colors.’

Example (41) is, and will always be, ill-formed due to the lack of agreement that arises from the embedding of lbaytu ‘the house’ under the auxiliary ka:na ‘was’. Note that, in both (39) and (40) above, the auxiliary ka:na agrees in gender with both the first NP and its

---

⁶ Alotaibi (2019:109, ex. 16) considers example (38) grammatical as assumed by DH and ADH. However, we will show that this example is clearly ungrammatical in MSA and cannot be fixable for independent factors.
complement. The lack of gender agreement yields ungrammatical instances as shown in the data below.

(42)  *kaːna  l-bayt-u  dʒaːmiːl-at-a-n  
      was.3.M  the-house.M-NOM  beautiful-F-ACC-INDEF

‘The house was beautiful.’

(43)  *kaːnat ʔalwan-u-hu  zaːhiya-a-n  
      was.3.F  colors.F-NOM-its  bright.M-ACC-INDEF

‘Its colors were bright.’

Given that the verb kaːna in (41) agrees in gender only with the BS, and the sentential predicate (the NS plus the AP) takes a different gender, the example becomes ungrammatical. Whether the auxiliary kaːna is in masculine or feminine gender, example (41) will remain incorrigible due to the impossibility of establishing gender agreement between these elements: the BS, the NS and the AP predicate.

Furthermore, DH and ADH embed BS under the auxiliary kaːna using a verbless sentence in (38). However, they did not apply the same test to verbal sentences including the BS. Embedding the BS under the auxiliary kaːna in verbal sentences is not possible either, as in (44).

(44)  *kaːnat  hind-u-n  yuqaːbilu-ha  tˤ-ʔullːaːb-u  
      was.3.F  Hind-NOM-INDEF  meet.3,M-her  the-students-NOM

‘It was Hind that the students meet her.’

In (44), the BS hindun ‘Hind’ cannot be embedded under the auxiliary kaːnat ‘was’. Only if this so-called BS appears before the auxiliary does the example become grammatical as shown in (45).

(45)  hind-u-n  kaːna ʔatˤ-ʔullːaːb-u  yuqaːbilu-una-ha  
      Hind-NOM-INDEF  was.3.M  the-students.M-NOM  meet.3,M-PL-her

‘Hind, the students were meeting her.’

However, under DH and ADH’s assumptions, hindun ‘Hind’ in (45) will be a left dislocated A’-element as it must precede the auxiliary. When the same fronting applies to the BS in verbless sentence (38) above, it also becomes acceptable as in (46).

(46)  ?al-bayt-u  kaːnat ʔalwaːn-u-hu  zaːhiya-t-a-n  
      the-house.M-NOM  was.3.F  colors.F-NOM-its  bright.F-ACC-INDEF

‘The house was of bright colors.’

By doing so, all the problems related to case and agreement in (38) are resolved. In (46), the auxiliary kaːnat agrees in gender with both the NP ʔalwaːnuhu ‘its colors’ and the adjectival complement zaːhiyatan ‘bright’. Also, the first NP ʔalwaːnuhu ‘its colors’ appears in the
nominative whereas the complement za:hiyatan ‘bright’ appears in the accusative. In sum, and according to DH and ADH’s assumptions, the fronting of BSs in examples (45) and (46) confirms that these elements cannot be BSs, but CCLD instances such as the English example in (37) that cannot be embedded under the auxiliary was.

2.4. Evidence from Quantified subjects

DH and ADH argue that the wh-phrases in (47)a and the quantifiers in (47)b,c from LA provide evidence that these examples are BS rather than CCLD constructions.

(47)  

a. mi:n faṣar-ha t'awi:l  
who hair-her long?  
‘Who has long hair?’ (ADH, 2004:338, ex. 26a)

b. kull wahde faṣar-ha t'awi:l  
every one.f hair-her long  
‘Everyone has long hair.’ (ADH, 2004: 340, ex. 32b)

c. wala wahde faṣar-ha t'awi:l  
no one.f hair-her long  
‘No one has long hair.’ (ADH, 2004:340, ex. 32a,c)

According to ADH (2004), if the examples in (47) are really CCLD constructions, they should be ungrammatical because wh-phrases and quantifiers in Romance languages are not allowed in CCLD contexts as shown in (48) from Italian.

(48)  

a. *Chi l'hai visto  
who him-saw.2.s saw  
‘Who did you see (him)?’ (ADH, 2004:342, ex 37)

b. *Tutto, lo ho fatto  
everything, it I-have done  
‘Everything, I did it.’

c. *Nessuno, lo ho visto.  
no one him I-have seen  
‘No one, I saw him.’ (ADH, 2004: 339, ex. 29a)

Given that wh-phrases and quantifiers are not allowed in CCLD constructions in Italian in (48), the Arabic examples in (47) must not be CCLD but different constructions, namely BSs. As is clear from this evidence, DH and ADH provide a fallacious argument by judging Arabic data against data found in Romance languages. By doing so, DH and ADH do not leave room for any linguistic variations between Semitic and Romance languages. These dissimilarities between Semitic and Romance languages might be reduced to the licensing conditions in CCLD in each language family.
In this section, we will show that Arabic CLLD constructions are sometimes different from Romance ones and, at other times, similar to them. By doing so, we demonstrate that this evidence is untenable given that empirical evidence can always prove the opposite argument.

Let us point out the differences first. Unlike Romance languages, Arabic requires that a CLLD construction consists of an initial nominative NP associated with a mandatory clitic inside the clause as shown in (49). Note that we put *hind-un ‘Hind’ before the wh-word mata ‘when’ to stress that it is in an A’-position; therefore, it should not be interpreted as a BS generated in spec,TP. What is important here is that clitics, such as *-ha ‘her’ in (49), are obligatory elements in Arabic CLLD constructions.

(49) hind-u-n mata qabala-*\(\text{ha}\) tˤ-tˤulla:b-u
    Hind-NOM-INDEF when met.3.M-*\(\text{her}\) the-students.M-NOM
    ‘Hind, when did the students meet her?’

Unlike the Arabic CLLD construction in (49), Italian CLLD constructions sometimes allow the deletion of clitics from their structure. Cinque (1990) argues that Italian CLLD constructions such as the one in (50)a shares properties with topicalization of the English type in (50)b in that its clitic *ci ‘there’ is optional.

(50) a. A casa, non *\(\text{ci}\) sono stato ancora.
    to home not (there) am been yet
    ‘I haven’t been home yet.’

b. **Shoes like those, I will never wear.**

Another licensing CLLD condition that separates Arabic from Romance languages follows from the fact that Italian allows PPs in CLLD contexts as in (50)a above. However, Arabic CLLD constructions do not allow the fronting of PP as in (51).

(51) *\(\text{ila}\) l-bayt-i lam akun \(\text{thamat}\) baʕd
    to the-house-GEN not am (there) yet
    ‘I haven’t been home yet.’

These differences suggest that DH and ADH should not draw conclusions by simply comparing Arabic CLLD constructions to those in the Romance languages. The ungrammatical Italian examples in (48) above might be attributed to a language-particular factor that is not relevant to Arabic.

In fact, DH and ADH realize that the ungrammatically of the Italian quantifiers in (48)b,c can be attributed to their morpho-syntactic structure. Note that the quantifiers *tutto ‘everything’ and *nessuno ‘no one’ are single words, i.e. bare quantifiers that are not lexically restricted. However, the Arabic quantifiers *kull waḥde ‘every one’ and *wala waḥde ‘no one’ are complex in that they involve a quantifier plus NP. Rizzi (1997: 295) argue that when Italian quantifiers are lexically restricted (i.e. quantifier+NP), they are allowed in CLLD constructions as in (52) and (53).
The examples in (52) and (53) demonstrate that Italian, like Arabic, can allow quantifiers in CLLD constructions. Although ADH (2004) submit that this might be true for a quantifier such as that in (48)b, they argue that this analysis cannot be extended to the Italian down-entailing quantifier in (48)c. ADH (2004: 341) provides (54), where even a complex down-entailing quantifier is disallowed in Italian CLLD constructions.

(52) **tutti i tuoi libri, li ho rimessi a posto**

all the your books them have put-back in place

‘I have replaced all your books.’

(53) **Molti libri, li ho buttati via**

many books them have thrown away

‘I have thrown away many books.’

Consulting Rizzi (p. c.) about the grammaticality of example (54) above confirms that it is ungrammatical in Italian. However, Rizzi provides example (55), where a lexically restricted down-entailing quantifier is still grammatical in Italian CLLD constructions.

(54) **Nessun uomo, lo ho visto.**

no man him I have seen

‘No man, I saw him.’ (ADH, 2004: 341, ex. 34b)

(55) **Nessuno dei suoi amici, lo conosco veramente bene**

No one of his friends, him I know really well

‘No one of his friends, I know him really well.’

These controversies show how problematic ADH’s evidence is. Rizzi claims that (55) is grammatical only if it has a d-linked interpretation. Surprisingly, the Arabic down-entailing quantifier in (47)c must be d-linked as well to be grammatical in Arabic. D-linking seems to be crucial in the case of Arabic examples in (47). For instance, the Arabic wh-phrase in (47)a must be d-linked as well. This makes Arabic similar to Greek which allows wh-words in CLLD constructions with a d-linking interpretation as shown in (56) (Dobrovie-Sorin 1990; Iatridou 1995; Anagnostopoulou 1994).

(56) **pion ton ides?**

who.M-ACC him saw.2.S

‘Who did you see him?’

To summarize, if we want to follow ADH (2004) and compare Arabic CLLD constructions with Romance ones, it will always be easy to make associations between these languages, thus invalidating ADH’s arguments. If we take the opposite view, we can still identify differences between these languages in terms of clitic optionality and PP fronting, and attribute the grammaticality dissimilarities in (47) and (48) to different licensing conditions in CLLD. In short, CLLD should not be expected to be a uniform construction in all the world languages, and any argument relying on the juxtaposition of Arabic CLLD constructions with
those from Romance languages will always be indefensible. It is tantamount to saying that
the so-called BS in Arabic is not a CLLD element in Italian.

4. Syntax of the So-called BS

In this section, we will explore the syntactic position of the so-called BS in Arabic. We will
provide three pieces of evidence that the alleged BS does not occupy an A- but an A'-position
like other left dislocated elements. The first piece of evidence is based on binding and it will
be addressed in section (4.1), whereas the next evidence, drawn from A'-interception, will be
discussed in section (4.2). The final evidence is derived from the case alternations that the BS
displays in the same syntactic position, and this will be laid out in section (4.3).

4.1. Evidence from Binding

Given that DH and ADH propose that BS, like a standard subject, occupies an A position, i.e.
an external specifier of TP, this proposal allows us to use locality diagnostics such as binding
dependencies.

First, according to binding condition B, a pronoun must be free within its binding
domain. In Arabic, subjects cannot bind any pronoun in the same TP. Thus, in (57), the
pronoun -hu ‘him’ must refer to a person other than Ahmed.

(57) ʔaħed-u, tahadaθa ʕan-hu/k/'i
Ahmed-NOM talked.3.M about-him
‘Ahmed, talked about himk/*i’

Given that the BS is a result of merge in spec,TP, condition B violations are not attested in
Japanese MNCs, confirming that the BS really occupies an A position. Note the Japanese
example in (58) where the BS cannot bind the object position which presumably has a null
pronoun (see Heycock, 1993).

(58) nancy-ga tom-ga ie- ni maneita
Nancy-NOM Tom-NOM house to invited
‘Nancyi is such that Tom invited her/k/*i to his house.’ (Heycock, 1993:182 ex. 35)

Like Japanese MNCs, we predict that the so-called BS in Arabic will not bind any resumptive
pronoun within the same clause either. However, this prediction is not borne out as shown
in (59) where the BS hindun ‘Hind’ unexpectedly binds the pronoun -ha ‘her’.

(59) hind-u-ni yuqa:bilu-ha, tˤ-tˤulla:b-u
Hind-NOM-INDEF meet.3.M-her the-students.M-NOM
‘Hindi, the students are meeting her/*i’ (DH, 1999:70, ex. 3a)

Unless the so-called BS is a left dislocated element in an A’-position, sentence (59) should be
ungrammatical. Being grammatical suggests that the BS is not an element base-generated in
the same clause, i.e. in the A-domain. In conclusion, the syntactic proposal from DH and ADH has shortcomings and yields theoretical problems for binding condition B7.

Let us now examine the predictions arising from binding condition A, where an anaphor must be bound within the same domain. Under these conditions, we expect that BS, being generated in spec,TP, easily binds an anaphor because they both appear within the same TP. This prediction is borne out in Japanese as in (60).

(60) sonon hito,-ga kodomogo-ya zibun,-yori atama-ga ii (koto) that person,-nom child-nom self,-than head-nom good (fact)

‘That person, [is such that his/her] child is more intelligent than him/her,’

However, the same prediction is not borne out in the so-called Arabic MNCs below.

(61) a. tˤ-tˤulla:b-u yuqa:bulu:na hind-a-ni nafsihi,-i
   the-students,m-nom meet,3,m-pl Hind-acc-indef herself,f
   ‘The students met Hind herself.’

b. *hind-u-ni tˤ-tˤulla:b-u yuqa:bulu:na-ha nafsihi,-i
   Hind-acc-indef the-students,m-nom meet,3,m-pl-her herself
   ‘Hind, the students met her herself.’

(62) a. ?alwa:n-u l-bayt-i j nafsihi,-i za:hiyat-u-n
   the-house,m-nom colors,f-gen itself,m bright-nom-indef
   ‘The colors of the house itself are bright.’

   the-house,m-nom colors,f-nom-its itself,m bright-nom-indef
   ‘The house,- its colors itself are bright.’

Although an anaphoric relation can be established in examples (61)a and (62)a where both the NP and its anaphor are within the same binding domain, the left dislocation of the NP to the edge of the clause yields ungrammaticality as in (61)b and (62)b confirming that the so-called BSs are not base-generated in an A-position. The disallowed anaphor-antecedent

---

7 Note that this evidence is not helpful for verbless constructions, as in (i), because possessors can bind possessive pronouns from either A- or A’-positions. In English, possessors can bind possessive pronouns in the same TP domain as in (ii,a) or in the A’-domain as in (ii,b).

i. ?al-bayt-u j ?alwa:n-u-hu nafsihi,-i za:hiyat-u-n
   the-house,m-nom colors,nom-its bright-nom-indef
   ‘The house,- its colors are bright.’ (DH, 1999:70, ex. 3b)

ii. a. The man, left his, bag on the floor. (A-domain)
    b. Who, left his, bag on the floor? (A’-domain)
relation in (61)b and (62)b rather emphasize that these clause-peripheral NPs are left 772
dislocated elements in A’-positions. 773
In conclusion, binding principles A and B provide evidence that we are dealing with 774
A’-elements in Arabic rather than BSs as is the case in Japanese. 775
4.2. Evidence from A’-Interception

Another indication that the alleged BS occupies an A’-position follows from A’-interception 779
of wh-movement. In Arabic, wh-words can move across thematic subjects as shown in the 780
example below.

(63) a. qa:bala ʔali-u-n ʔaːliːh-a-n yawma-ams 783
   met.3.M Ali-nom-indef Salih-acc-indef yesterday 784
   ‘Ali met Salih yesterday.’ 785
b. mata qa:bala ʔali-u-n ʔaːliːh-a-n? 787
   when met.3.M Ali-nom-indef Salih-acc-indef 788
   ‘When did Ali meet Salih?’ 789

Although the thematic subject ʔali ‘Ali’ in (63)a is in an A-position, it does not intercept the 791
wh-word mata ‘when’ when the latter is displaced to the clause-initial position as seen 792
in (63)b. In light of DH and ADH’s proposal, we predict that the BS, being merged to an A- 793
position, will not either create islands for any wh-words as is the case in (63) above. 794
However, all the so-called BSs intercept wh-words as presented in the examples below.

(64) a. hind-u-n qaːbalaːha tˤiːtˤullaːb-u yawma-ams 797
   Hind-nom-indef met.3.M-her the-students.m-nom yesterday 798
   ‘Hind, the students met her yesterday.’ 799
b. *mata hind-u-n qaːbalaːha tˤiːtˤullaːb-u? 801
   when Hind-nom-indef met.3.M-her the-students.m-nom 802
   ‘When, Hind, did the students meet her?’ 803
   804
(65) a. ʔal-bayt-u ʔalwaːn-hu zaːhiyat-u-n dʒiddan 805
   the-house-nom colors-nom-its bright-nom-indef very 806
   ‘The house, its colors are very bright.’ 807

---

8 If DH and ADH were to attribute the ungrammaticality of (61)b and (62)b to the intervening NS, they would 780
need to account for the following example from Landau (2009: 94) where the intervening NS in Japanese does 781
not intercept the anaphor binding.

(i) Taro-i ga, usagi-ga zibun-zisini-no, heya de sīnda 788
   Taro-nom rabbit-nom self-gen room in died 789
b. *ma mada zuhuw-wallay l-bayt-u ?alwa:n-u-hu?
   what extent brightness the-house-NOM colors-NOM-its
   ‘How bright are the colors of the house?’

The ungrammatical questions in (64)b and (65)b indicate that these alleged BSs, unlike thematic subjects in (63)b, intercept wh-phrases. These behaviors put the so-called BS on a par with CLLDeq A’-elements that intercepts wh-extraction (ABC, 2010: 229). To formulate grammatical questions equivalent to the ungrammatical ones in (64)b and (65)b, the so-called BS must precede wh-phrases as in (66)a,b.

(66) a. hind-u-n mata qabala-ha tˤuulla:b-u?
    Hind-NOM-INDEF when met.3,M-her the-students.M-NOM
    ‘Hind, when did the students meet her?’

   b. ?al-bayt-u ma mada zuhuw-i ?alwa:n-i-hi?
      the-house-NOM what extent brightness colors-GEN-its
      ‘The house, how bright are its colors?’

The necessity of fronting the so-called BS to form questions confirms that these alleged BSs are indeed A’-elements. ADH (2004), in fact, noticed that their analysis could not capture the A’-interception effects in the ungrammatical examples in (64)b and (65)b. Rather than accepting that the BS is in an A’-position, they say “what is less clear, however, is why this construction which we have argued involves recursive merge as Spec,TP [i.e. BS], should have this [island] effect. At present, we do not have an answer to this question, which we must therefore leave to further research” (ADH, 2004: 354). Earlier research such as Landau (2009, 2010) on Hebrew, and the current paper on Arabic, show that the so-called BS is an A’-element that intercepts wh-phrases.

4.3. Case Alternations

In this section, we will provide new empirical data that challenges DH and ADH’s arguments that Arabic BS is like thematic subjects in that they are marked only with the nominative case (DH 1999: 78). To make this argument clear, it should be noted that BS constructions are marked instances in Arabic, and they are equivalent to other unmarked ones such as those in (67) and (68).

(67) yuqa:bilu tˤuulla:b-u hind-a-n
    meet.3,M the-students.M-NOM Hind-ACC-INDEF
    ‘The students are meeting Hind.’

(68) ?alwa:n-u l-bayt-i za:hiyat-u-n
    colors-NOM the-house-GEN bright-NOM-INDEF
    ‘The colors of the house are bright.’
The NP *hindan* ‘Hind’ in (67) takes the accusative case as the object of the verb, whereas *ʔalbayti* in (68) takes the genitive case as the possessor of the NP. If these NPs are dislocated to the clause-periphery and related to resumptive pronouns in their original positions, they become marked with a nominative case as shown in DH and ADH’s so-called BS constructions in (5) and (6) repeated below as (69) and (70).

(69)  
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{hind-u-n} & \text{yuqa:bilu-ha} & \text{tˤ-tˤulla:b-u} \\
\text{Hind-NOM-INDEF} & \text{meet.3.M-her} & \text{the-students.M-NOM} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Hind, the students are meeting her.’ (DH, 1999:70, ex. 3a)

(70)  
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ʔal-bayt-u} & \text{ʔalwa:n-u-hu} & \text{za:hiyat-u-n} \\
\text{the-house-NOM} & \text{colors-NOM-its} & \text{bright-NOM-INDEF} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘The house, its colors are bright.’ (DH, 1999:70, ex. 3b)

If the resumptive pronouns -*ha* ‘her’ and -*hu* ‘its’ in (69) and (70) respectively are replaced with gaps, i.e. if these initial NPs are moved from clause-internal positions forming chains whose feet are gaps (represented as ∅), the fronted NP cannot take the nominative. For verbal sentence (69), the initial NP will rather take the accusative as shown in (71). As for verbless sentence (70), a genitive-marked possessor cannot move and leave a gap in its original position. Thus, it is widely assumed that Arabic sentences cannot begin with an initial genitive phrase, e.g. (72).

(71)  
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{hind-aʃ-u-n} & \text{yuqa:bilu} & \emptyset \\
\text{Hind-ACC/NOM-INDEF} & \text{meet.3.M} & \text{the-students.M-NOM} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Hind, the students are meeting.’

(72)  
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
*ʔal-bayt-i & \text{ʔalwa:n-u} & \emptyset \\
\text{the-house-GEN} & \text{colors-NOM} & \text{bright-NOM-INDEF} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘The house, colors are bright.’

Putting verbless sentences aside and going back to the BS verbal construction in (69) where a resumptive pronoun is necessary, one may inquire whether the BS *hindun* ‘Hind’ can only take the nominative case. If this is true, then DH and ADH’s base-generation of BS in spec,TP have both empirical and theoretical support. Originating in spec,TP, these so-called BS can only be marked with the nominative.

However, Arabic grammar, as shown in (73), allows the so-called BS in (69) to alternate between the nominative and accusative even if the so-called BS is associated with a resumptive pronoun.

(73)  
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{hind-u/a-n} & \text{yuqa:bilu-ha} & \text{tˤ-tˤulla:b-u} \\
\text{Hind-NOM/ACC-INDEF} & \text{meet.3.M-her} & \text{the-students.M-NOM} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Hind, the students are meeting her.’
Sibawayh (b. 765 - d. 796), the father of Arabic grammar, argued that this is possible in Arabic, and he reported example (74), where the initial NP can take either the nominative or accusative. Note that Sibawayh’s example is similar to the BS construction in (73) above, where the initial NP zayd-u/a-n ‘Zayd’ is associated with a resumptive pronoun.

(74)  zayd-u/a-n  darab-tu-hu
Zayd-NOM/ACC-INDEF  hit.1.S.PERF-him

Evidence for this case alternation also comes from the Quran, which reports verbal sentences with resumptive pronouns, where their initial NPs can be alternately cased in the nominative as in (75)a,b or in the accusative as in (76)a,b.

(75) a.  dʒanna:t-u  ʕadn-i-n  yadxl-u-na-ha
gardens-NOM  Aden-GEN-INDEF  enter.3-PL.NOM-them
‘Garden of Aden, they enter them.’ (Quran, 35:33)

b. ʔamma  ʔamu:d-u  fa  hadayn-u/-hum
As-for  Thamud-NOM  COP  guided.1.PL-them
‘As for Thamud’s people, we have guided them.’ (Quran, 41:17)

(76) a.  kull-a  jay?/-i-n  ʔahsʕayna:-hum
every-ACC  thing-GEN-INDEF  enumerated
‘Everything, we enumerated it.’ (Quran, 78:29)

b.  rusal-a-n  qad  qasʕasʕa:-hum  ʕalayka
messengers-ACC-INDEF  FM  narrated.1.PL-them  unto-you
‘Messengers, we have narrated them unto you.’ (Quran, 4:164)

Although the examples in (75) show nominative initial NPs, as is the case in the BS constructions, examples (76) allow accusative initial NPs. All the examples in (75) and (76) are similar in that the fronted NP is originally linked with a resumptive pronoun in an object position. It is worth noting that the left-most NPs in (75)b and (76)b appear in a topic or focus A’-position, either before the complementizer (COP) fa or the focus marker (FM) qad (see Ouhalla [1993: 275] who proposed that focus particles such as qad occupy the head of Focus Projection). These facts show that fronted NPs are not necessarily marked with the nominative but can be marked with the accusative as well.

Further evidence that DH and ADH’s example in (73) can take both the accusative and nominative, as is the case with Sibawayh’s example in (74), comes from island sensitivity. Aoun & Benmamoun (1998) argue that there are two types of CLLD in Arabic, where the first one is a result of movement and respects islands, whereas the other is a result of base-generation and does not respect islands. ADH (2004) take this distinction seriously and argue that “the two variants of CLLD they [i.e. Aoun and Benmamoun] propose in fact involve two distinct phenomenon... [and] their island violating one corresponds to a BS
construction” (p. 337). Sibawayh fortunately recorded examples which are insensitive to relative clause islands as in (77) and (78), where initial NPs still alternate between the nominative and accusative.

(77) zayd-u/a-n dˤarabta dˤaːriyat-ayni yuħibbu-huma

zayd-nom/acc-indef hit.2.m.perf girl-du.acc love.3.s.imperf-du

‘Zayd, you hit two girls whom he loves.’ (cf. Harun, 1988: 107)

(78) zayd-u/a-n dˤarabta radʒul-a-n yuḥibbu-hu

zayd-nom/acc-indef hit.2.m.perf man-acc-indef love.3.s.imperf-du


In other words, under DH and ADH’s conditions, examples (77) and (78), which alternate between the nominative and accusative, should be treated as BS constructions because they violate island conditions. That the so-called BS in (73) can allow the accusative case poses serious challenges to DH and ADH’s analysis which relies on the assumption that Arabic BS can sometimes show properties with Arabic thematic subjects in that they both take the nominative case. Now cased with the accusative or nominative, the so-called BS in (73) cannot share any properties with Arabic nominative subjects, neither should it merge in spec,TP which is not the configuration common for nominative/accusative case checking alternations. Thus far, we do not have a full analysis of these case alternations, leaving them for future research that would need to conduct a comprehensive analysis of Arabic Case in general. These initial NPs may occupy an A’-position where both the accusative and nominative can be checked. It is adequate for us to present example (73) as a challenge to DH and ADH’s analysis, and conclude that the alleged BS, being marked in either the nominative or accusative, cannot share any properties with the genuine (nominative) subjects in Arabic, neither should it originate in spec,TP per se.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we have discussed the status and the syntax of the peripheral nominative NPs in Arabic. We have demonstrated that Arabic does not have constructions like the Japanese MNC as argued by DH (1999, 2010) and ADH (2004). Our results corroborate the findings reached by Landau (2009, 2010), who refutes the existence of BS in Hebrew. Throughout the paper, we have shown that the examples reported by DH and ADH are questionable. When they are grammatical, the arguments that DH and ADH based on them do not verify the existence of BS but rather confirm that the so-called BS is in fact an unambiguous A’-element as suggested by Ouhalla (1994), Aoun & Benmamoun (1998) and ABC (2010). We have also shown that the syntactic proposal that has been given to the BS cannot be maintained based on evidence from binding, A’-interception and case alternations.

All else being equal, this paper does not take issue with DH and ADH’s analysis that rules out movement for BS derivation. The arguments that DH and ADH provide for a base-generation account hold. Given that the so-called BSs do not respect islands, we follow Aoun & Benmamoun (1998), DH (1998, 2010), and ADH (2004) in that these elements, being in an
A’-position, should be merged at the clause edge rather than moved from a sentence internal position.

For future work, we recommend that more focus should be given to the so-called BS from a language acquisition perspective. It has been argued that the structural levels that occur within the core of the clause are acquired earlier than their counterparts in the left clausal periphery (Penner & Müller 1992; Wexler 1996; Müller, Crismann & Kaiser 1996; Marinis 2004). If this is true, DH and ADH predict that their so-called BS constructions, being in the A-domain, will be acquired by Arabic-speaking children earlier than other constructions in the A’-domain such as CLLD, focus and topic. Our prediction, however, is that the so-called BS, CLLD, topic and focus will be acquired at the same time.
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